

ITEM 8

DRAFT Minutes of the Camden Local Strategic Partnership Thursday 8 May, 10:30am, Camden Town Hall

Present

- Cllr Keith Moffitt (Chair of LSP), London Borough of Camden, Leader
- Rob Larkman (Vice Chair of LSP), Camden Primary Care Trust, Chief Executive
- Heather Schroeder, Director of Children's Services, London Borough of Camden
- Charlie Legg, Camden Community Empowerment Network and Camden Central Community Umbrella
- Pat Stack, Camden Community Empowerment Network and Disability in Camden
- Chris Shaw, Camden Town Unlimited, Chair
- Kofi Twumasi-Anokye, Job Centre Plus (in place of Mick Hickey)
- Stephen Jordan, London & Continental Stations and Property, Managing Director
- Moira Gibb, London Borough of Camden, Chief Executive
- Chief Supt Dominic Clout, Metropolitan Police, Borough Commander
- Simone Hensby, Chair, Camden Community Empowerment Network and Voluntary Action Camden
- Barry Peskin, Camden Community Empowerment Network and Age Concern Camden
- Professor David Latchman, Master, Birkbeck College
- Kevin Munslow, Vice Chair, The Holborn Partnership

Also in attendance

- Cllr Ben Rawlings, Executive Member for Community Safety, London Borough of Camden (Item 3 only)
- Tony Brooks, Assistant Director – Community Safety, London Borough of Camden (from Item 3)
- Michael Scorer, London Borough of Camden, Assistant Chief Executive
- Louise Matlock, Government Office for London, Locality Manager – North
- Finn O'Brien, Head of Performance, London Borough of Camden (Item 2 only)
- Rachel McEvilly, Principal Performance Officer, London Borough of Camden (Item 2 only)
- Mary Burguieres, London Borough of Camden, Head of Policy
- Mike Webb, London Borough of Camden, Senior Policy Officer
- Donna Turnbull, Camden Community Empowerment Network, Strategy and Policy Officer

1 Introductions and apologies for absence

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed Professor David Latchman, Master of Birkbeck College and representative of Bloomsbury Colleges, to his first LSP meeting. Apologies were received from Cllr Andrew Marshall, Karen Wilson and Michael Quy.
- 1.2 The Chair informed the LSP of the Council's excellent Corporate Assessment result. He said it was due to calibre of politicians, officers and partners in Camden. He thanked Moira Gibb for her contribution and also Finn O'Brien and Rachel McEvilly who had hosted the Audit Commission inspectors. He encouraged LSP members to attend the modest reception organised by the council for its partners to mark the achievement on 21 May.

2 Camden's Local Area Agreement (LAA), 2008/09-2010/11

- 2.1 Michael Scorer briefly introduced this item by saying that this was the last time the draft LAA would come to the LSP. He handed over to Finn O'Brien and Rachel McEvilly to present the detail of the report.
- 2.2 Rachel provided an update on the indicators and targets. The indicators were broadly unchanged from the draft the LSP saw at its 27 March meeting. However the positive activities for young people and substance misuse by young people indicators had changed from the national indicators to local ones. This was because when their technical details were published, they were found not to be appropriate for Camden. Discussions with central government about a decent homes indicator were ongoing.
- 2.3 Baseline data and targets were now available for many of the indicators. Some had already been agreed by the Government Office for London (GoL) and some were still draft. Of the latter, some targets will not be set by the 30 May deadline because the baseline data is not available. In these cases, they will be revisited in the annual refresh.
- 2.4 There had been some changes since the report was circulated. Rachel informed the LSP that baselines and targets for NI6 on volunteering, NI15 on serious violent crime and NI21 on anti-social behaviour would be set over the course of 2008/09 and not by 30 May. NI51 relating to child and adolescent mental health services had been agreed with GoL although targets for years 2 and 3 would be set at a later date. NI102 on the achievement gap between pupils eligible for free school meals had also been agreed, as had NI123 (smoking prevalence) and NI191 (residual household waste).
- 2.5 Work was continuing on developing local indicators, with baseline data now available for overcrowding, vocational training and qualifications up to level 2 and business start up. Baselines and targets for the

parenting and positive activities for young people local indicators would be set during 2008/09.

- 2.6 The Chair thanked Rachel for her presentation and queried her reference to additional indicators being introduced over 2008/09. Rachel clarified that she was referring to targets that could not be set before 30 May rather than new indicators.
- 2.7 The Chair invited Louise Matlock of GoL to comment on progress. She said that Camden was doing well compared with other London Boroughs. It was a pity that not all targets would be in place by 30 May but recognised that it was far better to wait for the right baseline and target rather than using proxies. She was confident that further progress would be made in remaining two weeks before the deadline. She added that she had received a letter from Philip Colligan, the council officer responsible for decent homes, and would be meeting with him shortly to discuss the issue.
- 2.8 Finn O'Brien then outlined proposals for new LAA governance arrangements which had been broadly agreed at the LAA Steering Group's meeting on 15 April. Firstly it was decided that the Steering Group would fold, recognising it had achieved its original remit of delivering the first LAA. The four thematic partnerships would be at the heart of the new LAA delivery arrangements. However not all indicators fit into the four, so there would be a role for other partnerships and/or other arrangements, which would need to be developed.
- 2.9 The LSP and thematic partnerships would be supported by the council's existing Planning and Performance Group (PPG). The Steering Group agreed that it would be expanded to include statutory partners named as lead partners, which would meet quarterly. Although the voluntary and community sector (VCS) are not statutory partners, the Steering Group decided its membership of the expanded PPG would add value. The PPG would have a co-ordinating role to ensure the LSP receives robust performance management information from the thematic partnerships.
- 2.10 The LAA Steering Group had asked for clarification about roles relating to LAA delivery and these were outlined in Appendix 2 of the report. The delivery plan template had been refined and simplified since the last LSP meeting and could be found in Appendix 3. The completed delivery plans will be available from the meeting on 4 July and thereafter the LSP will see them annually. However they are too detailed to be used for performance management at the LSP. Rather the LSP would receive six monthly performance reports and detailed discussions would be by exception. Thematic partnerships would ensure there were no surprises by using the regular slot to update the LSP on serious delivery issues.

- 2.11 The Chair thanked Finn for her presentation and was pleased to note that the VCS have been included in the PPG. Simone Hensby also welcomed this development.
- 2.12 Barry Peskin asked about the definition of affordable housing referred to in paragraph 2.2 of the report and whether the LSP would have the opportunity to discuss it. Rachel McEvilly replied that she could circulate a revised copy of the LAA narrative which included the definition. The Chair said that the Local Development Framework would address affordable housing in a planning context but that they were working within a preset definition as determined by the Housing Corporation. Rachel added that a common definition was necessary in order to benchmark with other authorities. Barry Peskin took this as confirmation that the council could not set its own definition and the Chair suggested they discuss it further outside the meeting.
- 2.13 Kofi Twumasi-Anokye said that Job Centre Plus was not happy to be named as lead partner for NI152 and NI153 because it is already committed to targets set by central government. It could contribute to the LAA targets but could not lead, particularly NI153 which requires non-mainstream resources to be achieved. Job Centre Plus had written to Rachel about this issue. Rachel replied this was a wider issue for Job Centre Plus and all local authorities but that LAA targets should not conflict with the core business of Job Centre Plus. Moira Gibb added that it should be taken up with GoL since its role is to ensure that central government agencies join up with local government to meet LAA targets. Louise Matlock hadn't heard that this was an issue for Job Centre Plus in other local authority areas but that it would have to be resolved outside the meeting.
- 2.14 Rob Larkman queried why all local NHS trusts were included as partners under NI152 and NI153. Rachel said this was because they are members of the Health Employment Partnership which sits under the Economic Development Partnership and all statutory partners in these bodies had agreed to being named as partners. Rob thought it was odd to include just some employers and thought the list of partners should either be comprehensive or removed.
- 2.15 Simone Hensby was concerned that as well as performance management of the targets, an overview needed to be maintained to identify any gaps that were appearing. Finn replied that she thought the discussions of the delivery plans in thematic partnership meetings would cover this. Simone added that delivery plans should identify where non-statutory funding was being used to deliver targets. Rachel said that this could be included in the guidance for thematic partnerships on completing the plans.
- 2.16 The LSP agreed the four recommendations of the report and the Chair thanked the LAA Steering Group members for their work.

3 Camden Together 2007-2012: progress report on “a thriving and safe part of London and gateway to Europe” subtheme

- 3.1 Dominic Clout presented this report with contributions from Tony Brooks. The report showed how the LSP and the Community Safety Partnership (CSP) are meeting their commitments in the Community Strategy and presented a draft of the new Camden Safe Strategy.
- 3.2 April saw the end of the borough’s third Community Safety Strategy and the CSP can feel proud of its achievements. Camden had the largest reduction in London of reported crimes and of British Crime Survey crimes over the last year. Dominic acknowledged that some people may be sceptical about these measures but stressed that this is how performance is measured. He noted that the Camden New Journal did not report this achievement, probably because it does not fit with their agenda. He saw this as symptomatic of a wider issue around the public perception of crime.
- 3.3 The figures also revealed an even greater success story; sustained crime reduction. Against the 2003/04 government baseline, British Crime Survey crime was down by 30%, the fourth best in London. This equates to 10,000 fewer crimes a year. There have been significant reductions in the hotspot of Camden Town. Dominic said that these results are testimony to the effectiveness of partnership working in areas such as ASBOs, licensing and dispersal orders. He also mentioned the contribution of outreach work done by the VCS and GoL recognising the Drug, Alcohol and Youth Strategies as best practice.
- 3.4 However Dominic acknowledged that the real impact is whether the people of Camden feel safer. Their concerns, as reported to Safer Neighbourhoods Panels, are often around anti-social behaviour (ASB) and youth crime. The Camden Safe strategy sets out an approach to these issues using the ASB ladder model. At its heart is a 54 point action plan which aligns well with the LAA with the latter including indicators such as the perception of drug dealing as a problem and a local Camden Town crime indicator. He reiterated that the challenge is to shift perception. The LSP’s plans to better align Safer Neighbourhoods Panels and Area Forums would also contribute to this goal.
- 3.5 The Chair congratulated the CSP on its achievements and commented that it was frustrating that they were not reflected in the local media. Dominic added that newspapers were a major influence on local opinion.
- 3.6 Cllr Rawlings reiterated that the results were incredible and represented a huge turnaround from when he joined the council. He highlighted a few issues of particular interest to the LSP. Firstly, paragraph 1.4 of the report discusses the wider determinants of crime which are varied and often quite removed from community safety. The

CSP tackles immediate issues such as drugs and alcohol but issues such as poverty, education and jobs are outside its remit. Central government have tried to make tackle them in the context of crime reduction but it is more likely to be successful at a local level and this is where the LSP comes in.

- 3.7 The second issue mentioned by Cllr Rawlings was how the CSP can work better. The Home Office's recent review of Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships stressed the need to move from simple co-ordination to actually driving work forward. It also could work better with the Performance Management Group that sits below the CSP and with the LSP. The relationship with the LSP should strengthen with the appointment of a link member. Finally, Cllr Rawlings highlighted again the question of reputation and said that Camden Town Unlimited were leading for the CSP on this issue, working with local people and on a London level to improve the image of Camden Town.
- 3.8 The Chair said that the regular updates from the thematic partnerships at LSP meetings will help to address Cllr Rawlings's point about the relationship between the two bodies.
- 3.9 Tony Brooks spoke briefly about CSP's new strategy. He said he was impressed with the joint target setting in the LAA process but the police are still on three year targets which hampers partnership working slightly. ASB and youth crime are central to the new strategy (and central to the new mayor's agenda) and the police had challenging targets in these areas. Youth workers and police officers will patrol jointly, an approach unique to Camden. Drugs and alcohol are embedded throughout the report. Engagement is another major theme, particularly the aim to provide the public with as much information on crime as possible, possibly down to street level along with the police's responses.
- 3.10 Before inviting Heather Schroeder to comment on the report, the Chair mentioned the council's outstanding Joint Area Review results and thanked her for her contribution. Heather welcomed the opportunity to speak about young people and crime as they are overrepresented among victims and are often stereotyped as perpetrators. Joint working between Children, Schools and Families and Community Safety was central to the Corporate Assessment and JAR results. The JAR recognised that safeguarding children and young people is everybody's business. She would be proposing to the Children and Young People's Partnership Board that it extend the definition of safeguarding to include prevention of youth crime.
- 3.11 Heather also mentioned that she was a member of the London-wide youth crime partnership board set up by central government to address the issue of knife and gun crime. There are six workstreams, many of which are reflected in Camden's LAA; changes to the youth justice system, changes to Pupil Referral Units, a new school award for crime

prevention, community cohesion and working with the media to combat inaccuracies about young people and crime. The Chair added that the administration had a strong commitment to youth provision.

- 3.12 Chris Shaw thanked Dominic and Tony for a good piece of work but stressed it was important to avoid complacency. He added that Camden Town was the only area that didn't meet the LAA target on crime, citing CTU's survey data which found that only 30% of people in Camden Town felt safe at night compared with 80% during the day. Although perceptions are improving in Camden Town itself, residents of surrounding wards often still avoid the area. The Camden Town Summit will address some of these issues.
- 3.13 Stephen Jordan echoed the comments about perception but pointed out that as a lively, young borough, Camden will inevitably tend to make older people feel slightly threatened. He thought that the visibility of police on cycles on estates builds confidence and should be extended to night-time. The Chair said it was a challenge to maintain the vibrancy while making people feel safer.
- 3.14 David Latchman agreed that safety in the evening was an issue, particularly for his students although anecdotally it seems to be improving. He raised another community safety issue; responses to an act of terrorism. His institution did not know what to advise its staff and students in the aftermath of the July 2005 bombings. Dominic Clout replied that his officers would be visiting higher education institutions to brief them on this issue as well as how to combat perceptions of campus extremism. Stephen Jordan added that London First had run a campaign with the Met and City of London Police on how to respond to incidents. He thought the guidance was very useful. David Latchman was aware of the London First work but felt there was more to be done at a local level. Dominic reassured David that work was taking place locally and Tony Brooks said the council might look at how to spread its internal good practice on emergency planning to local organisations. The Chair thanked David for raising this issue, adding that the LSP is a useful way to make contacts to address operational issues as well as having a strategic focus.
- 3.15 Simone Hensby welcomed the report, particularly its acknowledgment of VCS input, but wondered if it should have identified challenges. CEN had done some work on this and often it was just a case of better communication. Dominic replied that the Camden Safe strategy identifies challenges based on the strategy assessment, an evidence base drawing on surveys, data etc. He said that he would be happy to discuss specific points outside the meeting and would welcome the input.

4 Thematic Partnership Updates

- 4.1 Heather Schroeder drew the LSP's attention to three current pieces of work of the Children and Young People's Partnership Board (CYPPB).
- 4.2 Firstly, 2008/9 is the final year of the current Children and Young People's Plan. It is currently being refreshed and work on the next three year plan will begin in October, with youth crime a top priority.
- 4.3 Secondly, the government has just published new guidance for Children's Trusts, which includes clarification of the relationship between the CYPPB and the LSP. The CYPPB should act as a champion of children and young people's issues at the LSP and ensure that they are embedded in all of the LSP's work e.g. in housing, community safety and transport. The guidance also covers a number of emerging policy issues such as the transfer of 16-19 funding to local authorities and sport. It feels like a relaunch of the children and young people's agenda and should be central to the LSP's work.
- 4.4 Finally, Heather informed the LSP about the launch of the Youth Council. It is currently establishing its priorities and may contact LSP members about them. The Chair added that the Youth Council's structures mirror those of the council, including an executive, and their learning process would be similar to that of new "adult" councillors.

5 Reports on LSP seminars

- 5.1 Mike Webb briefed the LSP on the sustainability seminar that took place on 15 April. He clarified that a "light touch" climate change partnership meant a minimum of meetings etc. The targets for members would be challenging. The Chair was pleased with this since he was keen for the partnership to be ambitious. Simone Hensby was sorry that she was unable to attend the seminar but stressed the need for leadership on sustainability within the local VCS and added that it was working with the council on this issue.
- 5.2 Mary Burguieres tabled a list of people who had accepted invitations to the Camden Business Summit. She commented that the LSP had done well to get the numbers and quality of individuals and the strategy of securing important attendees first had paid off. She reminded the LSP that the event would focus on sounding out businesses on key issues and wouldn't be twisting their arms on particular things. A report on the summit would be presented at the next LSP business meeting and members attending would receive briefing notes beforehand. Stephen Jordan emphasised that getting top people there was key and Chris Shaw said he was hopeful more people from the creative industries would attend.
- 5.3 The Chair updated the LSP on the work of the Social Cohesion Forum. He had drafted a letter to the members of the Forum to mark its first anniversary, summarising its achievements to date. It has had some difficult conversations about combating violent extremism, held a

seminar with Ted Cattle on community cohesion and fed into the LAA. However he felt the Forum still needs to go beyond interesting discussions. He said he would circulate the letter to the LSP and congratulated them on the decision to set up the Forum. The message from the Corporate Assessment was that Camden is so successful because it never rests on its laurels but always looks to the next challenge.

- 5.4 Finally, the Chair said that an LSP working group was being set up as a result of the neighbourhoods seminar held in March.

6 Minutes of the previous meeting

- 6.1 These were agreed.

7 Matters arising and future business

- 7.1 There were none.

8 Any other business

- 8.1 There was none.

The meeting closed at 12:15pm.