

ITEM 9b

**Minutes of the Camden Local Strategic Partnership
Seminar - Community Strategy Review
Thursday 5 November 2009, 18:00, Camden Town Hall**

Present:

- Cllr Keith Moffitt (Chair of LSP), London Borough of Camden, Leader
- Stephen Jordan, London & Continental Stations and Property, Managing Director
- Mick Hickey, Job Centre Plus, External Relations Manager – Central London District
- Chief Superintendent Dominic Clout, Metropolitan Police
- Moira Gibb, London Borough of Camden, Chief Executive
- Mark Hazelton, London Fire Brigade, Camden Borough Commander
- Dr Mark Atkinson, NHS Camden, Chief Executive
- Dr Quentin Sandifer, NHS Camden and London Borough of Camden, Director of Public Health
- Simon Pitkeithley, Camden Town Unlimited, Chief Executive
- Ann Baxter, London Borough of Camden, Director of Children's Services
- Tass Mavrogordato, The Holborn Partnership
- Pat Stack, Camden Community Empowerment Network and Disability in Camden
- Anju Bhatt, Director Camden BME Alliance (standing in for Sarah Elie)
- Shelagh O'Connor, Camden Community Empowerment Network and New Horizon Youth Centre

Also in attendance:

- Sarah Mullen, London Borough of Camden, Assistant Chief Executive
- Diane Brent, NHS Camden, Director of Estates and Facilities
- Tom Preest, London Borough of Camden, Acting Head of Community Safety,
- Cllr Ralph Scott, London Borough of Camden, Executive Member, Resources
- Jonathan Mills, London Borough of Camden, Interim Head of Performance
- Omar Ralph, Government Office for London, Locality Manager – North London
- Mary Burguieres, London Borough of Camden, Head of Policy
- Yoav Gordon, London Borough of Camden, Senior Policy Officer
- Andrew Pattison, London Borough of Camden, Head of Financial Strategy Unit
- Jim Wintour, London Borough of Camden, Director of Housing and Adult Social Care
- Philip Colligan, London Borough of Camden, Assistant Director, Regeneration and Partnerships
- Marion Kelly, London Borough of Camden, Deputy Director of Finance

1. Apologies for absence

- 1.1 Apologies were received from Cllr Andrew Marshall, Dr David Latchman, Simone Hensby and Sarah Elie.

2 Swine flu briefing

- 2.1 Before the seminar began, the Chair invited Dr Quentin Sandifer to provide a verbal update on the current swine flu situation in Camden.
- 2.2 Dr Sandifer informed the LSP that in late July the Department of Health launched the National Pandemic Flu Service – an online and telephone triage and antiviral authorisation service which helped to reduce the pressure placed on general practice across London during the onset by the pandemic.
- 2.3 Together with a fall in the number of new cases from mid August things had become relatively quiet until recently with a steady rise in the number of new cases in October as evidenced by the daily numbers of people collecting antiviral treatment – from a low of less than 10 a day to about 40-50 a day at the moment.
- 2.4 However, the National Pandemic Flu Service appears to be managing most of this increased demand and there has not been a significant increase in general practice workload, so far.
- 2.5 Antiviral collections are still being managed from one centre – the Boots site at St Pancras station – as has been the case since early September and for now is sufficient though we are watching the situation carefully.
- 2.6 Two new vaccines for H1N1 swine flu were approved by government regulators at the end of September and first batches were released to acute NHS trusts on October 21 – the Secretary of State for Health received the first vaccine delivery at UCLH on that date. Four priority groups have been identified for receipt of the vaccine and include:
 1. Individuals aged six months and up to 65 years in the current seasonal flu vaccine clinical at-risk groups
 2. All pregnant women
 3. Household contacts of immunocompromised individuals
 4. People aged 65 and over in the current seasonal flu vaccine clinical at-risk groups
- 2.7 Vaccination for these groups will take place through primary care
- 2.8 In addition, frontline health and social care staff will be vaccinated and this is currently underway – there has been a good uptake from staff in the acute trusts and PCT provider ie community health and social care staff should start to receive vaccines next week.
- 2.9 Deliveries of vaccines to general practice are just starting to arrive and as soon as a delivery date is confirmed patients in the priority groups are being called to clinics arranged by GPs –NHS Camden expect the first patients to start receiving vaccines late next week although pregnant women are already receiving vaccines through hospital antenatal services.
- 2.10 Contingency arrangements for calling patients have been set up to overcome the effects of the postal strike, and it is hoped to complete the vaccination programme to the priority groups by mid December but this is dependent on vaccine production by the pharmaceutical companies and delivery arrangements organised centrally by the Department of Health – this is a

ITEM 9b

huge (11 million vaccinations across UK, 35,000 in Camden) operation so it should not be a surprise that NHS Camden are in effect running 'just-in-time' arrangements at this stage.

- 2.11 Meanwhile NHS Camden are starting to see an increase in the number of admissions to the acute hospitals with confirmed or clinically strongly suspected swine flu and a concomitant increase in critical care admissions – the majority of these patients are in the 16-64 year age group and have underlying medical conditions. Local trusts are coping well so far and we are monitoring the situation on a daily basis
- 2.12 However, in preparation for increased pressure on acute hospitals NHS Camden have agreed new arrangements for managing patient flows out of hospital and the Delayed Transfer of Care team will operate from tomorrow from a control centre that has been established on the St Pancras Hospital site.

3 Introduction and objectives of the seminar

- 3.1 Following the swine flu update, the Chair welcomed LSP members and officers to the seminar and reminded the group that its major objective was to bring the LSP together to consider the work undertaken over the last year in reviewing the Community Strategy and to consider in greater depth the range of factors which will influence the delivery of the strategy until 2012 and beyond.
- 3.2 The Chair reminded the LSP that significant work had already been undertaken to review the strategy including an analysis of key data and mapping of outcomes against the community strategy goals as well as a series of challenges to each of the thematic partnerships and consideration of the role of the strategy in delivering on key outcomes.
- 3.3 The Chair then invited Sarah Mullen, Assistant Chief Executive, to give an introduction to the biennial review of the Community Strategy and achievements to date.

4 Session one – the biennial review of the Community Strategy

- 4.1 Sarah Mullen introduced the first session of the seminar providing an outline of work undertaken to date as part of the biennial review. She informed the LSP that there had been a strong record of achievement and notable examples of delivery. There was recognition that our visions and aims were demanding and there was still a great deal of work to do in recognising and achieving them.
- 4.2 Messages from the thematic partnerships suggest that that there is continued commitment to the vision and a greater need to work across themes as well as within them. Furthermore the second half of the strategy will have a different context and will be affected by a number of variables including the post down-turn environment, constraints on public finances, changing national priorities and the role of place shaping.

ITEM 9b

- 4.3 In making a sustainable Camden that adapts to a growing population there have been significant achievements in reducing waste and increasing rates of recycling as well as wide ranging investment to improve council houses in Camden.
- 4.4 A number of challenges had also been recognised including that the impact of sustainability improvements are incremental. Furthermore, achieving reductions in Co2 emissions, addressing the longer term impact of additional people, homes and jobs and the impact of this growth on service provision such as schools and adult social care will also pose a number of significant challenges.
- 4.5 In building a strong and inclusive local economy, there have been improvements in educational standards as well as extended provision in childcare places. There had recently been an increase in out of work claimants following a longer periods of overall reductions. Additionally much work had been undertaken to make Camden a better place for business including the regeneration of Kings Cross.
- 4.6 There have been some difficulties in addressing the disparity of skills and worklessness in different parts of the borough and although the impact of the recession has proved challenging, the recovery fund has been established to support businesses, town centres and the visitor economy. There will be continuing challenges around issues of inclusion especially worklessness in the worst performing wards as well as addressing multiple barriers to work caused by the crowding out by more 'job ready' unemployed.
- 4.7 In addressing connectedness and helping people lead active and healthy lives evidence from the social capital survey has shown that 89% of people believe they live in an area where people from different backgrounds get along. Additionally, there has been a reduction in the levels of smoking and in the rate of teenage conceptions above the national average.
- 4.8 There will be continuing challenges to ensure that all demographic groups are supported and engaged with in the borough as well as ongoing efforts to encourage people to alter their behaviour in terms of lifestyle choices and attitudes to health and activity.
- 4.9 There have been significant achievements in making Camden a safe and vibrant place with some of the largest reductions in crime across London and the introduction of PCSOs for Camden Town to address local concerns and increase visibility. There has also been an increase in the number of people attending cultural events in Camden as well as positive feedback from residents on progress made to clean up Camden Town.
- 4.10 There have been a number of challenges around youth crime in the borough, particularly around the reduction of first time entrants into the youth justice system. In addition to this, there are a number of emerging challenges that including hitting our threshold for crime reduction and ensuring that our ongoing work around the Olympics results in significant numbers of people taking up the opportunities it provides.
- 4.11 There had been positive feedback following a series of presentations to the thematic partnerships with a consistent message that the strategy themes remain the right ones and that there is strong consistency between the

ITEM 9b

strategy and the specific strategic documents underpinning the work of the partnerships. Feedback also suggested that the strategy also supports the work of the partners and gives a consistent story about what the partnerships are trying to achieve.

- 4.12 The partnerships did note however that the strategy and its themes were more effective in promoting thinking within individual themes rather than across them, and there may be a need for more joined up thinking across areas including mental health and employment.
- 4.13 The LSP were also informed of a number of changing contexts that were influencing the delivery of the strategy including; the impact of the recession and its changing effects over time, the outlook for public finances and the impact of diminishing resources, the changing context of national priorities and the role of place-shaping in Camden.
- 4.14 The presentation concluded by outlining the four key questions for consideration by the breakout groups;
- Do you recognise this picture of progress so far?
 - What are the implications for the changes in context for your organisation, for the partnership and for the LSP?
 - What can we learn from the example of Camden Town for other places in the borough and how will they look over the next few years?
 - What are you keen for the partnership and the LSP to focus more on over the next two years to deliver our vision for Camden as a borough of opportunity?

5 **Session two – notes from the breakout groups**

- 5.1 The Chair thanked Sarah for her presentation and asked seminar attendees to move into their prearranged breakout groups for further discussions.
- 5.2 **Breakout group one** was facilitated by Dr Mark Atkinson and included, Ann Baxter, Anju Bhatt, Stephen Jordan, Jonathan Mills, Sarah Mullen, Tom Preest and Cllr Ralph Scott.
- 5.3 The group agreed that this was a welcome time for discussion with not just the Council but other bodies facing up to the prospect of financial shortfalls in years to come. Working together could help partners not only to meet financial pressures but also to deliver more coherent services to residents and to tackle difficult issues such as health inequalities. When resources were more generous there was less pressure for integration.
- 5.4 The partnership had delivered some real improvements and it was important to put local achievements in a national perspective; there were some factors that were outside local control such as the recession.
- 5.5 A place-shaping approach had proved useful in relation to the area reviews and developing a model for Gospel Oak. The fact that the strategy remained relevant and meaningful was an achievement in itself, as many organisations did not get this far.

ITEM 9b

- 5.6 Personalisation was a cross-cutting issue which had the potential to change many services fundamentally, and which could provide opportunities for the third sector.
- 5.7 The forthcoming period of constrained resources posed significant challenges. Communicating the need for change and the basis of prioritisation to citizens and residents would not be easy. There was a risk that less visible preventative spending would be adversely affected. While there was appetite for closer joint working governance issues could often prove very difficult.
- 5.8 To help establish the basis for closer integration of services and joint working the partnership could look to establish some pathfinders or exemplars. These could test the principles involved and provide a reference point for further work.
- 5.9 Camden's approach to the recession had been characterised as being thoughtful: the partnership had developed a worked through plan rather than a more immediate but less effective response. There would be benefits to doing the same here.
- 5.10 **Breakout group two** was facilitated by Dominic Clout and included Moira Gibb, Yoav Gordon, Tass Mavrogordato, Finneguella O'Brien, Andrew Pattison, Dr Quentin Sandifer, and Jim Wintour.
- 5.11 The group began its discussion by considering the health perspective and agreed that while there had been significant progress in addressing health issues locally; a great deal of the work had begun prior to the publication of the strategy. It was agreed however that the strategy was steering the partnership in the right direction.
- 5.12 There was a significant need to do more around health inequalities and this might be achieved by recognising the need for greater cross-fertilisation across the themes, for example around the fear of crime and its impacts of health.
- 5.13 This cross fertilisation has never really succeeded although one of the core purposes of the LSP was for this to happen. In this sense, the role of the strategy has failed to bring partners together. It was recognised that that the structure of the thematic partnerships does not reflect the themes of the strategy which in turn has affected the extent to which cross thematic working has failed to materialise.
- 5.14 The group then considered the extent to which the strategy drives the work of partners and although it has been widely adapted to reflect key strategies, both the police and NHS Camden have different drivers of their work such as Police scorecards. However the strategy has contributed to a better understanding of how partners can provide direct support to key areas of delivery such as sustainability.
- 5.15 Although many people didn't directly link progress against key aims with the delivery of the strategy, it was impossible to not notice the impact it has had with many people noting the quality of services compared to other locations. There was a feeling that something had worked positively in Camden.

ITEM 9b

- 5.16 The group then considered the range of challenges facing the partnership specifically the budget cuts facing the police force and the impact this will have on diversionary activities which in turn will have wider ranging implications for community safety.
- 5.17 The impact of the recession and the support for local businesses was also addressed particularly around support for those business in south Camden which although in a process of downsizing have not yet failed and should be recognised and supported as part of a potential are for growth in the borough.
- 5.18 The business community have faced a number of challenges in terms of regulatory barriers and sometimes feel that the strategy does not reflect the business community enough. There have been a number of planning restrictions for example, around mixed space offices with the view held by developers that it could be more appropriately dealt with and soften the ratio of housing to commercial property. Clearly the regulations are too strict and could the Council be more innovative in its application of regulatory matters.
- 5.19 In terms of place-shaping, the work around Camden Town has been resident driven and has been a significant area for addressing and meeting targets although some of these have been short term. Although Camden Town has been a success story it has taken a great deal of resource and input and the real challenge for the future will be how we take this approach and apply it to other parts of the borough.
- 5.20 The key question is whether it will be possible to take what has been achieved and replicate it in another place. Critical to this is an understanding of the place and the roles and activities of partnerships that made it a success.
- 5.21 A further issue for consideration will be the role of individuals in understanding their offering to a place – historically Camden has dealt with ‘sick patients’ rather than those people well placed to help themselves. It will be challenging to get people to recognise their role; Camden Town has a distinct identity and while other areas are likely to have the same there will be a challenge posed by how to excite the population to change themselves and their places.
- 5.22 The group summarised a number key issues for further consideration by the LSP;
- The LSP needs to focus on areas that currently do not have a natural home;
 - Need to release the vibrancy of our culture for residents and we must not lose what is good during the recession (ie diversionary activities and engagement);
 - How the ‘Total-Place’ model might be used to better manage resources across Camden as a whole;
 - Need to be better at encouraging people to do things for themselves.
- 5.23 **Breakout group three** was facilitated by Cllr Keith Moffitt and included Diane Brent, Mary Burguieres, Philip Colligan, Mick Hickey, Marion Kelly, Simon Pitkeithley and Omar Ralph.
- 5.24 The group began its discussion by focusing on the remarkable reduction in crime in Camden Town, which showed how concerted partnership effort could

ITEM 9b

make a significant impact. Most people in the borough recognise that there has been a reduction in drug dealing, and regardless of where residents live in the borough they are positive about this result. Some caution though was sounded about the displacement effect where focussing on an issue in one area can move it to another. We needed to guard against that happening with drug dealing in the borough.

- 5.25 The achievements in the past two years on sustainability were good, but it was important to keep sight of the bigger picture. The community strategy was best when it gave a strong steer to partners about where they could link in their own strategies on sustainability. Residents and businesses had told us in consultations that they thought the public sector's role is to help them to take greater responsibility for their actions.
- 5.26 The group went on to discuss this wider issue of rights and responsibilities and the role of individuals, communities and the state. There was a need to have a conversation with the public about 'hidden subsidies' in public sector spending. Constraints in public spending give added impetus to this informed debate with residents so that they can understand the trade offs in putting resources into one area rather than another.
- 5.27 The principles behind Total Place provide some help in terms of thinking about more joined up services within the borough to help cope with decreased overall resources. An important part of this is understanding what public value is and therefore what is the value of what we deliver.
- 5.28 In Camden we are fortunate in that we still have enormous potential for development and investment. The borough is still 'moving' despite the recession and we should be taking steps to protect and exploit that growth. Hence, engaging with Transport for London and Homes and Communities Agency (transport and housing) were critical.
- 5.29 In order to ensure that those areas where development is not taking place reap the benefits, we needed to work together on getting local people into those jobs. Developing positive partnerships with companies moving into the borough was one answer. The VCS for instance has agreed work placements with Central St Martins. And Kings Cross Construction was a fantastic route for young people to get recognised accreditation and move into jobs. There was more work that could be done with businesses to encourage them to work with local schools and the VCS.
- 5.30 But some experiences in seeking to employ local people had been less successful, for instance local tradespeople and apprenticeships for maintaining some public estates. The group recognised that there are a range of tools that can be used to attract local people and also a range of opportunities – from apprenticeships to internships – that need to be considered within different settings.
- 5.31 Placeshaping in Camden allows us to recognise that very different issues in each area require different solutions, but an approach that knits together partners. We are now having conversations across partners that are catalyst for delivery. We are working well together to deliver on each others agendas – developments in places like Gospel Oak and Belsize demonstrate huge wins for all parties involved. There was a future role for the LSP in bringing businesses into this conversation.

ITEM 9b

- 5.32 A note of caution was raised that the LSP needs to ensure that it's not asking too much of business. The relationship with business should be seen as two way and is in an early stage of development.
- 5.33 The LSP needs to think about the future of the third sector in the borough; there is an issue about larger providers from outside the borough getting contracts over smaller VCS providers in Camden. The danger is that we will lose a whole range of small community organisations because of public sector contracting requirements. If we took a more outcomes based approach, this could be counterbalanced. Greater collaboration across the third sector would also help to keep the value of the sector with decreased funding.
- 5.34 The group summarised a number key issues for further consideration by the LSP:
- The theme of taking responsibility is embedded in the sustainable community strategy already and fits with the direction of travel in public services. The LSP should be seeking to provide more transparent financial information to the public to foster an informed conversation about public policy choices;
 - The LSP should focus on getting local benefits for local people from the development that continues uniquely in Camden;
 - Using our local VCS in the right way to get the most public value and not letting it be swallowed by processes or the recession and
 - Working together on estate management.

6 Session 3 feedback Comments from the groups

- 6.1 The Chair thanked all of the attendees for their participation in the breakout groups and suggested that this format worked well when people knew each other well enough to engender a good and positive discussion.
- 6.2 The Chair invited each of the groups to present back to the LSP their key issues identified during the breakout sessions and which included;
- Taking individual responsibility which may have lost a degree of focus during time of recession;
 - Giving people more transparent financial information;
 - Challenges of getting local people into local jobs and role of internships – how do we create value for people who do not have access to them?
 - Impact of changing economic conditions on the VCS and particularly smaller organisations familiar with their communities being squeezed out;
 - Working together more closely on estate management;
 - Key role of the LSP in leading joint working in the build up to spending restrictions – this will require trust and poses a number of governance issues and will require the surrendering of sovereignty and budgets but can make a real difference to addressing inequalities;
 - Greater integration between partners around work planning including the sharing of office functions and efficient use of property;

ITEM 9b

- Recognition of historical achievements and ensuring that coming economic challenges don't cause us to retrench and undo all of our work;
 - Need for greater devolution of power and better use of Total-Place locally to optimise resources;
 - Need for greater Council flexibility to support businesses and allow business districts to join up recognising what potential growth may bring to different areas;
 - Need to encourage people to support themselves more effectively and provide a greater challenge to the partnership about how it works.
- 6.3 Cllr Scott suggested that most local people did not know that the LSP exists and that is in part because it is not connected to wider democratic processes, reflecting a democratic deficit. If the partnership is to be effective in tackling the different problems that exist in different parts of the borough this will require people to be brought along. The role of engaging with the public and stakeholders is critical. We have high levels of cohesion which we could tap into and encourage people to think about how things are shared out.
- 6.4 Stephen Jordan suggested that the LSP should not be overly critical of its achievements and noted that we already have a robust strategy but which also has the flexibility to adapt to changing circumstances. There is an emerging message that we need to build on our successes and address the challenges that we will face through better and more effective ways of working and sharing of resources.
- 6.5 Sarah Mullen suggested that the LSP focussed on fewer meetings and developed more focussed subgroups that would follow thematic partnerships, allowing the bigger meetings to focus on issues such as place-shaping. Simon Pitkeithley noted a word of caution that fewer meetings may diminish the quality of relationships that have been built over recent years.
- 6.6 The Chair concluded the session by thanking all of the participants for what he felt was a high productive seminar with some useful outcomes for the future work of the LSP.