

Supplementary Committee Agenda



Overview and Scrutiny Committee Thursday, 8th March, 2007

Place: Council Chamber, Civic Offices, High Street, Epping

Time: 7.30 pm

Committee Secretary: Simon Hill, Senior Democratic Services Officer
email: shill@eppingforestdc.gov.uk Tel: 01992 564249

8.a Supplementary Information (Pages 3 - 24)

Attached is the following information. Please bring these documents with you to the meeting

Item 6 Highways Services Presentation

- List of Questions submitted by Members for presentation.

Item 9 Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme

- 2007/8 Draft Housing Scrutiny Work Plan
- Request for scrutiny review of Rural Transport Issues – submitted by Councillor Mrs H Harding

Item 10 – Local Strategic Partnership Task and Finish Panel

- Final report of the Task and Finish Panel listed as 'to follow' on the main agenda

This page is intentionally left blank

Questions for Highways Services Presentation

Councillor Keith Wright - Chipping Ongar, Greensted & Marden Ash:

- 1) Confusion exists as to whom residents should phone when reporting serious faults in pathways and roads. Who should residents contact?
- 2) Sunken kerbs facilitate cars parking on pavements. Pedestrians and those pushing wheelchairs can often be placed in hazardous situations. What strategies will be adopted to alleviate this problem? This relates especially to Ongar High Street between the Post Office and Ongar Bridge
- 3) Parking on pavements and across car entrances is endemic in the neighbourhood of schools. Structural damage to kerb edges occurs and safety is compromised. Has any strategy for addressing this concern, possibly to install bollards, been considered? Will it be? Chipping Ongar Primary School is a case in point.

Councillor Roland Frankel - Theydon Bois:

- 1) What is the "official" position about whether resident's cars be parked in the street or in driveways?
- 2) Does County Council feel that government policy to reduce car journeys is working in Essex?
- 3) Should cost of traffic disruption (for the road users) be an issue for the time taken on repairs?
- 4) What causes more pollution: a) stopped cars, b) stop/start congested traffic, c) constantly moving cars?
- 5) Since EFDC members permitted commercial development on Chigwell Lane, is there now any possibility of a full M11 junction 5?
- 6) What studies have been made to determine at which point traffic density becomes unsafe?

Councillor Mrs A Cooper - Lower Nazeing:

- 1) At the end of 2006, the total number of road deaths in Essex County Council reached 101. Can Essex Transport confirm the total number of deaths in this District and provide a breakdown of how many occurred on:
 - a) National Motorways and Primary Routes
 - b) County Primary Routes 1 and 2
 - c) Local Routes?
- 2) I understand due to the type of soil/ ground structure in Essex, the single axle Heavy Goods Vehicle is creating ruts in roads across the County. These ruts create a real hazard to vehicles but in particular to cars with low profile wheels. I understand that the Cabinet Member for Transport has requested additional funding from the Government to prepare the roads. If this funding is not received what action will Essex County Council take to eliminate/ reduce the hazard from this type of damage to ensure the safety of other road users?

Councillor Brian Sandler Chigwell Row

When are the pavements and roads in my Chigwell Row Ward going to be repaired/resurfaced and indeed whilst asking, I should include the whole of Chigwell? I am getting totally exasperated with being told that there is no money in the kitty! I have many elderly residents living in Chigwell Row and they are finding it very difficult coping with the poor conditions.

Councillor David Stallan – North Weald Bassett

1. Work on A414 starting on 12/3/07, why has there been no consideration of the fact the first bus leaves Ongar just after 6am and any delay will cause residents who use this first bus service to be delayed getting to work.

2. We have two streetlight in North Weald (one in School Green Lane and one in Beamish Close) which have been reported as all day burners by the Parish Council (both by telephone and also at a meeting attended by ECC at the Parish Council)and nothing has been done to address this. Particularly as the one in Beamish Close took 7 months to get to work in the first place.

3. Repeated emails to Mr. T baker being ignored requesting works done on the kerbstones in Beamish Close and School Green Lane and requesting works to be done on the road in School Green Lane. The kerb stones have been repaired but no reply to my enquiries regarding the condition of the road.

Councillor Stephen Murray, Loughton Roding

1. Why do some of your officers never reply to telephone messages ?

2. Why do some of our major roads such as Valley Hill and Oakwood Hill (with major traffic flows) continue to have dangerous pot holes ?

3. Why is a much used pedestrian footpath between Cheltenham Gardens and Highland Avenue still unpassable after heavy rain having being walked with Colin Nash just before the transfer from EFDC to Essex Highways ? (I have never received any correspondence to suggest this work was not going to be done)

4. Why is a lamp column on a busy junction (Oakwood Hill , Valley Hill and Roding Road) still not working for many months despite residents calling and myself contacting Essex Highways Lighting engineers on a weekly basis ?

5. Do you feel that this part of Essex with its dense population and hence heavy traffic flows is obtaining its fair share of resources from the central Essex pot ?

6. Are you beginning to understand why local residents and some district councillors are very dissatisfied with the level of service provided by Essex Highways ?

**Housing Scrutiny Panel
Work Programme 2007/8**

PROGRESS REPORT

Item	Priority	Original Report Deadline	Current Position
WORK PROGRAMME			
Issues Within the Original Work Programme			
(1) Implementation of Choice Based Lettings	High	Ongoing in 2007/8	
(2) Annual Ethnic Monitoring Review of Housing Applicants	Medium	July 2007	
(3) Draft Housing Strategy Statement & Strategic Housing Action Plan	High	October 2007	
(4) Annual Review of the Housing Allocations Scheme	High	October 2007	
(5) Six-monthly Progress Report on Housing Business Plan Action Plan	Medium	January 2008	
(6) Six-monthly Progress Report on Strategic Housing Action Plan	Medium	April 2008	
(7) Updated draft HRA Business Plan	High	April 2008	

**Housing Scrutiny Panel
Work Programme 2007/8
PROGRESS REPORT**

Item	Priority	Deadline	Current Position
WORK PROGRAMME			
Implement Housing Assistance Policy 2007.	High	August 2007	
Private Sector Housing Strategy Action Plan.	High	Ongoing during 2007/2008	
Progress on meeting PSA7 target on Decent Homes.	High	Ongoing during 2007/2008	

**Request by Member for Scrutiny Review
2007- 08 OS Work Plan**



Please complete the form below to request consideration of your issue by the
Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Proposers Name: Councillor Heather Harding	Date of Request 02/03/07
Supporting Councillors (if any): Councillors Mrs S Perry, R Church, K Chana	
Summary of Issue you wish to be scrutinised: <p>The role of public transport in and around the rural locations in the District.</p>	
<p align="center">NOTE: ENTRIES BELOW RELATE TO ISSUE CATEGORIES OF THE PICK PROCESS. PLEASE REFER TO THE EXPLANATORY NOTES TO THIS FORM FOR FURTHER INFORMATION</p>	
Public Interest Justification: <p>With the growth of commuter parking and the problems it causes residents, the Council needs to address the issues surrounding why commuters feel they have no alternative but to drive to the stations. Several residents in homes in Sheering have expressed concern about local public transport and raised the need for a review of the situation.</p>	

Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area:

A busy and used bus service would be economically viable – creating less congestion/ emissions

Council Performance in this area (if known: Red, Amber, Green):

Poor in Lower Sheering

Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?)

Essex County Councillor G McEwen has concerns about re-routing and has been in discussions with Arriva. I believe the issue is a major concern for most rural Councils.

Office Use:

Pick score:

Considered By OSCC:



Epping Forest District Council

SCRUTINY

REPORT OF LOCAL STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP TASK AND FINISH PANEL

February 2007

Contact for enquiries:

John Scott, Lead Officer

Epping Forest District Council, Civic Offices

Epping, CM16 4BZ

jscott@eppingforestdc.gov.uk

01992 56 4051



CONTENTS

1. Chairman's Foreword.....	3
Panel Composition:.....	4
2. Introduction and Overview	5
Summary of issues scrutinised	5
Public Interest Justification	5
Terms of Reference	6
How we went about the task.....	6
3. Recommendations:	7
4. Report	8
A start to the process:.....	8
Meeting with the Chairman of the LSP:	9
Marina Sherriff and Action Group Chairs.....	10
The Local Area Agreement.....	11
And finally	11
5. Conclusions	12
6. Acknowledgements.....	14
List of people who gave evidence to our Panel	14
Appendix 1	15



1. Chairman's Foreword

Foreword by Councillor Mary Sartin – Chairman of the Panel

This Task and Finish Panel was set up in the knowledge that much would be changing within Local Government in the foreseeable future. We knew that the Local Government White Paper would be published later in 2006 but we also had the Government's consultation paper on Local Strategic Partnership which had already been produced. This document was our starting point and from there we were able to explore the current working of the LSP and look at where it was heading in the future.

In order to do this, we had to talk to those directly involved and I would like to express my sincere thanks to the various people who gave up their already busy schedules to come and meet the panel. After a presentation from Marina Sherriff, the Community Strategy and Partnership Manager it was agreed that she should attend future meetings which has proved very useful.



Links between the LSP and the Local Area Agreement meant that a presentation from Richard Puleston from Essex County Council, helped our understanding of how these links will become closer.

We also held discussions with members of the LSP Board, including the Chairman, David Butler, which gave us a further insight into the workings of the Partnership. More information was obtained through talking to some of our own Heads of Service who Chair some of the Action Groups which form part of the LSP.

I hope that you will take the time to read this report and consider our recommendations.

Finally, I would also like to thank John Scott (Joint Chief Executive (Community)), Chris Overend and Zoe Folley of Research and Democratic Services for their help and guidance in working towards the conclusion of the task set for the Panel by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. I would also like to add a thank you to my fellow Panel members for their input into the work.

Councillor Mrs M Sartin
February 2007



Panel Composition:

The Panel comprised the following Members:

Councillors Mrs M Sartin (Chairman), Mrs P Smith (Vice – Chairman), Mrs S Clapp, Mrs A Cooper, J Demetriou, Mrs J Lea, A Lee, Mrs J H Whitehouse and J M Whitehouse

The Panel met on six occasions. The attendance record for which was as follows:

Member	Attendances
Councillor Susan Clapp	0
Councillor Antoinette Cooper	3
Councillor Jimmy Demetriou	0
Councillor Jeanne Lea	4
Councillor Tony Lee	2
Councillor Mary Sartin	6
Councillor Penny Smith	4
Councillor Janet Whitehouse	6
Councillor Jon Whitehouse	1



2. Introduction and Overview

Summary of issues scrutinised

Our Panel was set up by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in June 2006. Our primary objective was to study the Consultation Paper “Local Strategic Partnerships : Shaping their future” which had been published by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister in December 2005 and to reflect on how the proposals in the Consultation Paper might impact on local arrangements in relation to the Epping Forest Local Strategic Partnership.


We were very clear from the outset that it was not the intention that we should respond to the consultation paper but look to see how the proposals might affect what already happens locally and whether there were any suggestions that might improve current practice that should be taken on board ahead of any legal requirement to do so.

Public Interest Justification

The Local Government Act 2000 put a statutory duty on the District Council to secure the production of a Community Strategy. This was defined as a longer-term vision for the district, which would cover the twenty or so years up to 2021. Government guidance suggested the best way to do this was to bring together all the key players in the area in what was to be known as a Local Strategic Partnership.

The Epping Forest Local Strategic Partnership came into being in late 2002 and was a further development of an already existing Group known as the Epping Forest Community Agencies Group, a group of key players which had been meeting to improve joint working arrangements over a number of years.

The publication of the consultation paper provided the opportunity to look again at those arrangements and advise the Council accordingly.





Terms of Reference

At our first meeting, we resolved that the purpose of our study was to consider the set up and operation of the Epping Forest Local Strategic Partnership and formulate recommendations on its future in the light of the government consultation paper 'Local Strategic Partnerships: Shaping their Future'. To secure this, we agreed the following aims and objectives:

1. To identify the purpose of the Epping Forest LSP, its work, structure, way in which it is held to account, current strengths and weaknesses and the partner agencies involved.
2. To consider the current and future role and involvement of the Council.
3. To consider the nature of the work to be carried out by the Partnership including how the emerging Sustainable Community Strategy is to be linked into the Local Planning Development Framework and other local plans in the context of the government guidance.
4. To consider who should be involved in the organisation, who should attend meetings; ways to increase involvement from residents and groups and publicity arrangements for initiatives.
5. To review the Local Area Agreement and how it should be implemented locally.
6. To consider the District LSP's relationship with the County and other LSP's in the region.
7. To consider available resources, secretariat support, performance monitoring targets and arrangements.
8. To consider how to ensure great Portfolio Holder and 'back bench' Member involvement in the Partnership and the future role for Scrutiny.
9. To consult and agree with the partner agencies any recommendations for change.
10. To identify by the end of September 2006 any recommendations that require extra spending.
11. To consider the Council's involvement with other Partnerships and how any issues identified could be applied to these relationships.

How we went about the task

We met on six occasions and, in addition, individual Members attended meetings of the LSP and its sub-groups. One of our Members also attended a training course run by the East of England Regional Assembly. Ahead of our first meeting we were supplied with copies of the consultation paper, the response to the consultation paper sent by the Epping Forest LSP, and an information pack about the Epping Forest LSP, which contained:

- The Community Strategy;
- A diagram showing the structure, governance arrangements and relationship between the different levels of the LSP i.e. The Community Conference, The Board, the Steering Group and the 7 Themed Action Groups.
- The Constitution and Terms of Reference.
- The dates of meetings of the LSP and its constitutional parts.



3. Recommendations:

1. We note the enhanced role for Local Strategic Partnership's (LSPs) set out in Local Government Bill and stronger role for local authorities in leading the LSP.
2. We note the greater responsibility placed on the Executive for the operation of the LSP, which may fall to the Leader of the Council personally although with power to delegate but we do not support the suggestions in the Local Government Bill that the Leader of the Council should automatically take the chairmanship of the LSP or have influence over the appointment of the Chairman.
3. We believe that the Chairman should be appointed by the whole of the LSP on personal merit.
4. We recognise the voluntary nature of membership of the LSP and, indeed, would reiterate the view that this voluntary nature is one of the LSP's strengths.
5. We welcome the enhanced role for scrutiny with the expectation that the Chairman of the LSP should appear before them at least once each year and the Council's representations on the LSP being held to account.
6. We welcome the greater opportunities for other Members to become more involved via the themed Action Groups.
7. We recommend that longer-term funding should be sought for the LSP and are of the opinion that the overall levels of resource allocated to it by the Council need to be raised.
8. We note that the proposals to produce a sustainable community strategy linked to the Local Development Framework will have resource implications for the Forward Planning Unit within Planning Services and, in that context, we recommend that the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Economic Development should consider these issues and report to the Council on the implications.
9. We believe that the Epping Forest LSP should take a greater role in the County LSP to be in a position to influence decisions made via the Local Area Agreement which might impact on the Epping Forest District.



4. Report

A start to the process:

At our first meeting on 24 July 2006 we thought about the task we had been set and how best to go about it. The consultation paper and its proposals were very clear but we needed to understand how the Local Strategic Partnership works to relate the consultation paper proposals to what happens locally. Therefore, in scoping the arrangements for our study we identified other documents we wished to be made available to us and the people we would like to interview to help us complete the task we had been set. The Joint Chief Executive (Community) gave us an overview to the LSP. He referred to the aims and visions behind the partnership as set out in the Community Strategy 2004-2021, the funding



arrangements and the unease by some over the alleged democratic deficit in the LSP (both in terms of the general concept of LSP's and locally in relation to the Epping Forest Local Strategic Partnership, which the consultation paper proposals sought to address.

We noted the consultation paper contained significant proposals which sought to pass responsibility for the LSP as a whole to the Local Authority Executive, which in turn would create a role for the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. It also proposed greater involvement in the workings of the Partnership for both Cabinet and "back bench" Members and suggests quite strongly that the Community Strategy should become a "sustainable community strategy" co-terminus with and strongly linked to the new Local Development Framework which the Council has to produce.

The legal responsibility to ensure the production of a community strategy has always rested with the District Council, although guidance issued with the Local Government Act 2000 made clear that the best way to produce the document was through a partnership arrangement to be known as a local strategic partnership. However, the new requirement to produce a sustainable community strategy which is clearly linked to the local development framework, spatial planning and regional and national policies seem to shift that responsibility to the District Council with the local strategic partnership taking on the role of consultee.

We noted that the Council appoints two Member representatives to the Board of the LSP and that for the current year our Chairman, Councillor Mrs Mary Sartin in her role as Cabinet Member with responsibility for Environmental Protection and Councillor Mrs Anne Grigg who is the Cabinet Member with responsibility for Planning and Economic Development hold these positions. We further noted that Councillor Mrs Grigg is the Vice Chairman of the LSP Board. The Joint Chief Executive (Community) is the Vice Chair of the Steering Group and Treasurer to the LSP whilst the Themed Action Groups are chaired by a mixture of District Council Heads of Service and Senior Officers from other agencies.

The LSP has its own performance targets and a performance framework in place. It relies entirely on voluntary contributions in both cash and in kind from its constituent members to fund its activities which includes the employment of the Community Strategy and Partnership Manager, Marina Sherriff via the good offices of Voluntary Action Epping Forest.

It has links with the County LSP via the Local Area Agreement arrangements and also works with Harlow LSP from time to time but not other LSP's in the region as there is little common ground



between the diverse areas covered. That said, however, the LSP is a regular attendee at the LSP Network events organised by the East of England Regional Assembly in association with the Government Office for the East of England where LSP's have the opportunity to come together to share experiences and good practice.

Meeting with the Chairman of the LSP:

At our second meeting on 30 August 2006, we had planned to receive evidence from the past Chairman of the Epping Forest LSP, Aidan Thomas, and the current Chairman, David Butler. Aidan Thomas is the Chief Executive of our local PCT and David Butler, the Principal of Epping Forest College. In the event Aidan Thomas was not able to be present, but he did send us a letter in which he highlighted the achievements of the LSP as he saw them and his expectations for the future (See Appendix 1). David Butler did attend and in view of the fact that both he and our Joint Chief Executive (Community) had been involved in the process from the very beginning we had an interesting and fruitful evening.

It was made clear to us that the Partnership had always been aware that it has no legal status and has always worked in that knowledge. Each Member comes to the table on a voluntary basis, working within the limits of their own governance arrangements. The Partnership does not have the ability to direct or overrule the governance arrangements of constituent Members and indeed has always been very clear that it has no wish to do so. This is seen as one of the strengths of the LSP in that agencies work together in the common good because they choose to do so. Whatever they offer, however, is written into LSP Action Plans and the agency making the offer is held to account for delivering against that offer.

The LSP had also recognised that it was asking a lot of busy people and therefore should avoid meetings for meetings sake or the unnecessary creation of new working groups. Wherever possible therefore it adapted existing groups to become the action groups of the Community Strategy Themes. Particular examples can be found in "A Safe Community", "Fit for Life" and "Lifelong Learning".

It was further explained to us that there are two types of LSP, funded and unfunded. Funded LSP's have some form of statutory basis and come about as a result of the Government's Neighbourhood Renewal Area Programme. Harlow is such an organisation. Others such as that in Epping Forest come about from the guidance issued with the Local Government Act 2000. They receive no funding from Government and there is no statutory basis for their existence. It is debateable whether this is a strength or weakness.

We found the information pack on the LSP which had previously been provided, helpful and were able to explore with Mr Butler what benefits he thought the LSP was able to bring to the community of the Epping Forest District. We did this through a series of questions about the LSP in general and the Themed Action Group which Mr Butler chaired dealing with Lifelong Learning. We also heard of the arrangements the LSP had made from the outset of holding an annual Community Conference to provide feedback to the wider community and give them the chance to comment on and influence the work of the Partnership. The Community Conference is held in a different part of the district each year and transport and refreshments are offered to those who attend. The 2006 Community Conference was held in Ongar on 13 October under the banner "Solve it". A number of us were able to attend and indeed two of our Members have joined Themed Action Groups on a voluntary basis (Councillor Mrs Whitehouse, Lifelong Learning and Councillor Mrs Cooper, Green and Unique).

We explored with Mr Butler the aims underpinning the consultation document which seeks to increase the democratic accountability of LSP's by passing responsibility for the LSP to the Local



Authority Executive. We also discussed the suggestion that Local Authority Leaders should chair the LSP.

Mr Butler replied that the District Council had always had a strong influence on the workings of the LSP and he believed that was welcomed by other partners. In Epping Forest, the District Council had always preferred not to take on the Chairmanship leaving that appointment to a free vote. This was not dissimilar to what happened in many other LSP's. The District Council had, however, always taken the Vice Chairmanship and in the early days that position had been held by the Leader of the Council. However, over time, the District Council has reviewed its appointments with the result that the Leader was not always amongst its representatives. Mr Butler recognised and acknowledged the direction of the consultation paper but suggested it needed to be handled with care if we wished to encourage others to continue with their voluntary participation.

We explored a number of examples where added value had been achieved or seemed likely as a result of the partnership arrangements within the LSP, the involvement of Town and Parish Councils, the opportunities for public participation and the interaction with the County LSP and the Local Area Agreement process.

Marina Sherriff and Action Group Chairs

At our third meeting we held a discussion with the Community Strategy and Partnership Manager, Marina Sherriff, and some of the Action Group Chairs in order to understand their roles, the membership of their groups, their relationship with the LSP Board and Steering Group and possible ways in which Members of the Council might become more involved in the process.

We were supplied with a range of documents which included:

- Epping Forest Community Strategy – Key Achievements 2005/06;
- Membership lists for LSP Action Groups;
- The Action Group – Action Plans.



This provided us with some real in-depth knowledge and understanding as to how the work of the LSP was taken forward. We were impressed with the range of organisations that participated in the Action Groups and noted that they covered the complete spectrum of statutory, private sector, not for profit and charitable agencies that deliver services within our district. We invited Marina Sherriff to attend all future meetings of our Panel.

We were particularly interested in the interplay between the two non Council Chairmen that were present, Frances Haste (Fit for Life) and Matt Roberts (Green and Unique). Both of these had had

involvement with LSP's elsewhere which had compared less favourably with their experiences so far with the Epping Forest Local Strategic Partnership. Matt Roberts in particular advised that he had only recently taken on the Chairmanship of the Green and Unique Group. He said he had been both surprised and impressed by the past achievements of his group and expressed support for the successful outcomes achieved by others. He reported that he had relayed such positive information back to the Corporation of London and recommended that priority be given to the work of his group. In his view the issue was not so much about what was done but how it was achieved. His group worked with agencies such as the Lee Valley Park, the Environment Agency, DEFRA and National England. He was continuing with his approaches to the farming community and the County Landowners Association and expressed disappointment at their lack of positive involvement.



A full record of this debate is set out in the notes of our meeting but we were impressed by both the enthusiasm displayed and the wide range of issues tackled by the LSP and its Action Groups.

The Local Area Agreement

At our fourth meeting we were pleased to welcome Mr Richard Puleston, the Head of Community Planning and Regeneration for Essex County Council who gave a presentation on the current situation regarding the Local Area Agreement (LAA) for Essex.

We had been supplied with details of the five LAA priorities that EFDC had signed up to, the LAA itself, a copy of a LAA organisation chart produced for the LSP and a letter received from the County Council Chief Executive which gave an update on the LAA. Further information on the agreement can be found on the Essex County Council Website under the LAA section. The address is: www.essexcc.gov.uk.

Mr Puleston gave an interesting explanation of the LAA process, the six-month review and the year one refresher required by Government. He explained that the LAA was a means to join up funding streams at a local level by bringing together a number of public sector partners around shared targets and objectives. The LAA was delivered via the county level LSP in association with District LSP's (a government requirement) and was a mixture of national and local performance targets. The Essex LAA had been signed in March 2006.

He gave a very full explanation of the structure, performance management, funding, research and Member involvement in the LAA process details of which are set out in the notes of our meeting (25 October 2006) along with the slide pack which Mr Puleston used to assist his presentation.

We noted that our Council's achievements against the five LAA priorities, which we have agreed to prioritise, are included within the Council's Performance Management Framework and reported on a regular basis to the scrutiny panel of Finance and Performance Management.

And finally

Over the course of our study we have seen various items from the Local Government Press, received a copy of a briefing note from the Local Government Information Unit (LGIU) and shared information from National Conferences attended by Members of our Panel or Officers which were relevant to the work of the Panel. All of these are contained in our work file or referred to in the notes of our meetings. Finally on 12th January 2007, some of us attended the briefing session held at the Council's offices in association with the Local Government Information Unit on the Local Government White Paper and the Local Government Bill, which is now in process. Some of that will impact on the workings of the Local Strategic Partnership but it is too early in the process to say precisely what the effects will be.



5. Conclusions

1. We have found a great willingness amongst the various agencies in the Epping Forest District to work together in order to produce value for money solutions which result in better outcomes for our constituents.
2. Those agencies, public, private, not for profit and charitable are represented by a lively and enthusiastic range of people who demonstrate great affection for the Epping Forest District and the people who live, work or visit our area.
3. The District Council has played a leading role in this process and was the founder Member of the Epping Forest Community Agencies Group which evolved into the Local Strategic Partnership.
4. Senior Members have played an active role in this process but perhaps the reporting back arrangements have not been as good as they should have been. This has led to the situation where Members generally have felt excluded from the process and therefore had suspicions and concerns about the Local Strategic Partnership itself. In our view those concerns are not justified.
5. The minutes of the Local Strategic Partnership are provided in the Council Bulletin so all Members have the opportunity to keep abreast of what is happening.
6. That Portfolio Holders should become members of or take a greater interest in appropriate Action Groups.
7. Those Members of the Executive appointed to represent the Council on the Board of the LSP should be more pro-active in reporting back to the Council on the work of the Partnership.
8. Members with a particular interest in the work of the Theme Groups can volunteer to join those action groups and in our experience will be welcomed.
9. The Local Strategic Partnership has developed its own website which can be accessed via the Council's website where information is freely available.
10. The financial position of the LSP is in our view a matter for concern. It relies on voluntary contributions from its constituent members and survives from year to year. The withdrawal of that support by any one contributor would cause extreme difficulties. The District Council contributes £10,000 each year but this is not assured and is met from DDF funding. The County Council is likely to offer a 3-year funding deal to all LSP's, which comes from top slicing the reward element of the LAA targets. This should be welcomed.
11. It seems clear to us that the consultation paper proposal to give political responsibility and accountability to the Executive of the District Council will become a reality via the Local Government Bill presently before Parliament.
12. This responsibility seems likely to pass to the Leader personally under the new arrangements although as we currently understand it, the Leader will have the power to delegate (i.e. practically what happens now).
13. The Leader will be given the right to chair the LSP or at least to approve the appointment of the Chairman. Whilst recognising the vital role the District Council must play in terms of leadership of the LSP, we are not persuaded this is absolutely necessary and would prefer to see the Chairman of the LSP appointed by its Membership on merit.



14. All of these changes will bring the LSP more closely into the Local Government family and create a stronger role for Overview and Scrutiny to oversee and influence the work of the LSP.
15. We are persuaded that the LSP is already carrying out the role of “Partnership of Partnerships” as envisaged in the consultation document. To that end we were pleased to see it adopt the Children and Young Peoples Strategic Partnership (CYPSP) as its eighth Theme Action Group in accordance with a recommendation we made through the study process.
16. We note the requirement for the Community Strategy to evolve and develop into a “Sustainable Community Strategy”. However, it seems to us that the requirement to align the “Sustainable Community Strategy” with the Local Development Framework, and to reflect regional and sub-regional plans where relevant, turns the original process in the 2000 Act on its head. It now seems that the District Council will have to produce the Sustainable Community Strategy and use the mechanisms of the LSP for the necessary and important consultation process. The legal responsibility for the production of the Community Strategy has always rested with the Local Authority.
17. This is likely to be a resource intensive process, especially when coupled with the production of Local Development Framework. In that context the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Economic Development should consider and report to the Council on the implications for the Forward Planning Unit within Planning Services.
18. We have noted the Consultation Paper suggestion that there should be more effective joint working between LSP’s and regional organisations. This seems more difficult to achieve in Shire Counties but to an extent already seems to be happening within Essex. The County Partnership engages with regional bodies on a formal basis and Local Partnerships engage with the County Partnership. Local Strategic Partnerships also have the opportunity to participate in the Regional LSP Network, which the Epping Forest LSP does on a regular basis. However, we accept that this liaison could be further developed.
19. Whilst acknowledging that liaison could be improved we would prefer to see such process evolve rather than be imposed. The East of England is a large and diverse community where it is important to acknowledge that one size does not fit all.
20. We note the debate around the consultation paper proposals that various bodies should have a legal duty to have regard to the Community Strategy in preparing service plans etc. The Council had already taken this on board as demonstrated in the current Council Plan and therefore we feel no further comment is required.
21. Likewise there are mixed views on whether designated bodies should have a legal duty to participate in the work of the LSP as already applies in the case of the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership. A little encouragement sometimes helps but on balance we think participation on a voluntary basis is likely to be more productive.
22. We acknowledge that the LSP can have an important role to play in supporting neighbourhood engagement and in ensuring that Neighbourhoods can influence strategic local priorities, e.g. the Epping Forest LSP input into the East of England Plan consultation especially in relation to North Weald and the South and West of Harlow.



6. Acknowledgements

List of people who gave evidence to our Panel

John Scott	-	Joint Chief Executive (EFDC) Vice Chair LSP Steering Group LSP Treasurer
Chris Overend	-	Policy Officer, EFDC Admin Support to LSP
Aidan Thomas	-	Chief Executive (EFPCT) (Written evidence only)
David Butler	-	Principal, Epping Forest College Chairman, Epping Forest LSP Chair, Lifelong Learning Action Group
Marina Sherriff	-	Community Strategy and Partnerships Manager Epping Forest LSP (Voluntary Action, Epping Forest)
Alan Hall	-	Head of Housing Services (EFDC) Chair, Homes and Neighbourhoods Acton Group
John De Wilton Preston	-	Head of Planning Services & Economic Development (EFDC) Chair, Economic Prosperity Action Group
Frances Haste	-	Associate Director of Public Health (EFPCT) Chair, Fit for Life Action Group
Matt Roberts	-	Superintendent of Epping Forest Chair, Green and Unique Action Group
Richard Puleston	-	Head of Community Planning and Regeneration ECC



Appendix 1

Epping Forest **NHS**

Primary Care Trust

Ref: AT/hw

Direct Line: 01279 827572

Confidential Fax: 01279 827622

The Laurels
St. Margaret's Hospital
The Plain
Epping
Essex CM16 6TN

Tel: 01992 902 010
Fax: 01992 902 012

30th August 2006

The Chair
Epping Forest District Council
Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Dear Madam,

I am writing to apologise for the fact that due to unforeseen circumstances I will not now be able to attend the meeting this evening as agreed.

I deeply regret this, because as the former Chair of the Local Strategic Partnership I would very much welcome the opportunity of discussing it with the Committee.

The LSP has in my view a wide range of benefits to local people and to the development of services in Epping Forest, and while improvements to joint working are always possible I feel strongly that as a result of the Councils commitment and that of the other key agencies in Epping Forest we have achieved a considerable amount from a standing start, and without the benefit of central funding.

As you know the LSP is not a statutorily constituted body, but it has in fact been able to utilise the strong history of joint working in the District and what is often the strongest form of accountability – commitment to follow through an agreement made with peers to effectively carry out some significant work.

In my view the achievements of the LSP fall into three categories;

1) The establishment of a common thread of thinking between local organisations and strategy for Epping Forest as a result of the consultation on the LSPs strategy. Involvement in the consultation and discussion of strategy has increased the understanding and commitment of the individual organisations involved in the LSP at the highest level. Many of the local organisations might otherwise have developed a very introspective approach to their own strategies,



and plans. This common understanding can only be good for the District and its communities.

2) The establishment of a number of service improvements which have been facilitated by the LSPs sub groups and also at times by the joint working of individual partners facilitated by the LSP. Examples include the Young Peoples Information centre in Waltham Abbey, and the development of voluntary transport services. Both of which have developed through significant commitments financially and /or in kind by several partners. Arguably, of course the strength of joint working locally prior to the establishment of the LSP and the strength of commitment from a lead partner might have meant that they developed in Epping Forest anyway, but their development has included the formal involvement of LSP partners at LSP sub groups.

Other developments – like pooled community transport, and the establishment of new vocational training facilities in Waltham Abbey are in the pipeline and wholly initiated by the LSP.

3) The power of a common agreement by all local agencies in responding to proposals is often, I believe much stronger than the response of one organisation.

This has been illustrated in our case, by the influence of LSPs on the recent successful campaign to establish more local PCTs.

Another example is the influence the LSP was able to have during the course of the debate on the East of England plan. The LSP was able to put a very clear case for more detailed issues such as the need for health and educational infrastructure to be taken into account, without undermining the broader stance of the District Council, and many of the points raised by the LSP are reflected in the final draft plan.

I believe the LSP needs to build upon the strong commitment already shown by the District Council and other key partners such as the PCT, County Council and Police, It is capable of many more practical achievements, and as Trust develops between organisations the potential is huge. Formal joint understanding and joint working is after all what the ordinary member of the public has a right to expect.

I would be very happy to meet with you individually to discuss this further if you wish or to attend an alternative future meeting. Please accept my apologies once again.

Yours sincerely

Aidan Thomas
Chief Executive