

**EPPING FOREST LOCAL STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP
AWAY DAY FOLLOW-UP MEETING**

Date: 27 November 2008

Time: 2.00 - 3.15 p.m.

MINUTES

Present:

Councillor Mrs D Collins (Epping Forest District Council) (Chairman)
Julie Chandler (Office of the Deputy Chief Executive) (Epping Forest District Council)
Jacqui Foile (Chief Officer, Voluntary Action Epping Forest)
Councillor Mrs Anne Grigg (Epping Forest District Council)
John Gilbert (Director of Environment and Street Scene, Epping Forest District Council)
Derek Macnab (Deputy Chief Executive, Epping Forest District Council)
John Preston (Director of Planning and Economic Development)
Nick Roberts (Essex County Council)
Caroline Skinner (West Essex Primary Care Trust)
Barbara Stock (Epping Forest College, representing the Learning Partnership)
Brian Surtees (Parish/Town Councils)
Lindsay Swan (Housing Directorate, Epping Forest District Council)
Colin Thompson (Parish/Town Councils)
Lonica Vanclay (Epping Forest CYPSP)
Yvette Wetton (West Area Co-ordinator, Essex County Council)
Simon Williams (Essex Police)

Supporting Officers:

Chris Overend (Office of the Chief Executive, Epping Forest District Council)

Apologies:

Monica Bird (Learning and Skills Council)
Alison Cowie (Director of Public Health, West Essex Primary Care Trust)
Gay Ellis (Representing Epping Forest District Faith Groups)
Teresa Glynn (ACL Essex, representing the Learning Partnership)
Councillor Ann Haigh (Epping Forest CYPSP)
Alan Hall (Director of Housing, Epping Forest District Council)
Juliane Heinecke (City of London - Epping Forest Conservators)
Catherine O'Connell (Epping Forest Locality Director, West Essex PCT)
Peter Sadler (Principal, Epping Forest College)
Ray Skinner (Essex Fire and Rescue Services)
Clive Snell (Business Representative)
Paul Thomson (Superintendent, City of London - Epping Forest Conservators)
Caroline Wiggins (Safer Communities Co-ordinator, Epping Forest District Council)

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

Councillor Di Collins welcomed everyone and, in doing so, reminded them of the background to the decision to hold this meeting rather than the Steering Group, that there had been a discussion at the recent LSP Away Day regarding the Partnership's constitutional arrangements, with a consequent decision to revise those

arrangements and it had been felt both logical and appropriate to hold a follow-up meeting to the Away Day, at which the matter could be progressed further.

In turn, all present at the meeting introduced themselves and provided information on their background and roles.

2. REPORTS ON STRATEGIC AWAY DAY AND OPTIONS FOR THE FUTURE OPERATION OF THE LSP

As the report on the Away Day of 8 October 2008 and the consequent report on the options for the future operation of the LSP were inextricably linked, it was agreed that the two should be considered together.

Derek Macnab reminded those present that the purpose of the Away Day had been for the LSP to clarify and refocus its roles, agree and outline the key ambitions and priorities for the next five years and develop a structure and way of working that most suited these ambitions. At the Away Day it had also been agreed that a report should be submitted to the LSP Board identifying the emerging LSP priorities and setting out a proposal for the structure of the LSP, and other forms of working. In addition, at the Away Day, a presentation had been given by Ian Davidson of the Audit Commission on the new Comprehensive Area Assessment and how that would be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the LSP and its partners, how much its priorities expressed local need, how well its outcomes were delivered and what the prospects were for future improvement.

At the Away Day, concerns had been expressed regarding the lack of clarity surrounding the LSP's roles. A subsequent discussion had clarified these as being a need to act strategically, to commission work from partnerships, to scrutinise performance and delivery against the Community Strategy and act as an advocate for the District. It had been further agreed that, in carrying out these roles, the LSP should:

- take its priorities direct from evidence of the needs of Epping Forest's communities;
- develop a Community Strategy identifying and prioritising gaps which the LSP should address through its partnerships;
- establish a good understanding of its partners' overall priorities in delivering to those needs;
- commission work to utilise the combined resources of partners to tackle the strategic gaps;
- identify and tackle emerging needs within the area;
- review performance and delivery with strategic priorities.

Utilising a technique called "Future Backwards", the Away Day had led to the identification of a number of ambitions and priorities for the period to 2013, and a range of critical milestones and practical steps required for the achievement of those ambitions. There had been a recognition of the need for the work to be aligned closely with the Comprehensive Area Assessment, LAA2 and the Local Development Framework and a general consensus that the delivery of the priorities could best be

achieved through a combination of fixed partnerships, e.g. the statutory ones of the CYPSP and CDRP, Task and Finish Partnerships and "on-call" resources from partners.

The paper prepared by Derek Macnab on the options for a new partnership organisational structure had developed further the issues and outcomes emerging from the Away Day. In doing so, the report also reviewed the background to the formation of the LSP, the current organisational arrangements and how those arrangements might be reviewed to achieve the ambitions and priorities determined. In the report, the emerging priorities had been rationalised as follows:

- reduction of current health inequalities, in particular addressing life expectancy variations across the District, and recognising the needs of an ageing population;
- improving prospects for young people through the raising of levels of educational attainment and improved delivery of other services targeted at young people;
- protecting the special "Green Belt" character of the District and reducing its Carbon Footprint, whilst still promoting tourism, economic regeneration, better public transport and the delivery of affordable housing;
- increasing access to public services which meet the express needs of residents and improve their quality of life;
- adequately planning for the future through the development of a sound Core Strategy as part of the Local Development Framework;
- delivering improved outcomes locally, in respect of targets contained within the Essex Local Area Agreement 2.

The Away Day had helped identify both the strengths and the weaknesses of the current LSP structure. The strengths had included the encompassment of a wide range of agencies and the provision of a good 'vehicle' for sharing information and encouraging partnership working. Conversely there was a need for the Partnership to ensure that it had the correct people participating at the right meetings, to strengthen accountability and performance management. The conclusion of the Away Day, combined with a review of the LSP's current Constitution, had resulted in the identification of the following proposed future key roles of the LSP:

- preparing and ensuring the implementation of a Sustainable Community Strategy for the District, identifying visions and key priorities, monitoring progress annually, and keeping the strategy up-to-date;
- ensuring that the benefit from working together results in something over and above what the individual member agencies of the LSP would achieve working alone and, therefore, delivers better services for local people;
- working with the Essex Partnership to improve outcomes in the District through the Essex Local Area Agreement;

- developing an active relationship between the Sustainable Community Strategy and the Local Development Framework, and using both to mutual advantage in achieving sustainable communities;
- bringing together local plans, partnerships and initiatives to provide a forum through which the public, private, voluntary and community sectors can work effectively together to meet local needs and priorities;
- identifying and commissioning services to meet needs identified through the Partnership;
- ensuring the strategies of the partnerships belonging to the LSP align with the Sustainable Community Strategy and contribute to the "well-being" of the District;
- promoting the engagement of all Epping Forest's people and communities in decisions about the future of the District, working to ensure that the views of traditionally under represented and hard-to-reach groups are obtained;
- ensuring that partner organisations adopt the Partnership's aims and objectives and endeavouring to implement them within and through their own organisations;
- identifying, commenting and lobbying on issues of importance to Epping Forest at local, county, regional, national and European levels;
- undertaking an ambassadorial role for the District and promoting the image of Epping Forest.

In advising the meeting that four options for the future structural arrangements for the LSP were being put forward, Derek Macnab stressed that his report was a "draft" and that the ideas were very much open for debate. The four options referred to in the report were, namely, to retain the current structure, a delivery model based on the Local Area Agreement, a geographical area-based model and a Fixed Partnership and Task and Finish model whereby the Panels could be commissioned to undertake specific projects (but retaining the statutory elements of the CYPSP and CDRP). Derek pointed out that, whilst there might be a need to evaluate the role of the Board at a later stage, it was considered important to retain it at this stage and each of the options put forward envisaged that retention. Similarly, each option provided for a "Steering Group" or equivalent, albeit that the make-up and role of that Steering Group might well vary depending on the option chosen. Those present were asked for their comments on the various options and, where meetings had been held, the Chairmen of the Action Groups were asked to put forward the views of those Groups.

Brian Surtees felt that the proposals contained in the report provided a good way forward and that Option 4 was the one most likely to bring the required results. He stressed that this option would require someone able to provide the required level of support and a knowledge of research and ongoing issues. Colin Thompson pointed out that the concept behind the original Steering Group was to avoid a "silo" mentality and ensure there was liaison on cross-cutting issues between the different thematic areas when this was appropriate. He expressed a desire for similar provision within whatever new arrangements were agreed. Derek Macnab said that, whilst the diagram provided with Option 4 might suggest that any Task and Finish Panel set up would fall within one of the four blocks of Sustainable Communities, Healthier

Communities, Children and Young People, or Safer and Stronger Communities, the likelihood was that individuals from the different blocks would sit on the Task and Finish Panels.

In emphasising that the LSP needed to be "local", "strategic", and a working partnership, Yvette Wetton said that it also had a responsibility to ensure there was effective performance management and community engagement. Yvette added that this was all the more important bearing in mind the forthcoming Corporate Area Assessment, in which the LSP would play a key role. In that regard there was a need for the LSP to act as advocates for the District. In expressing her support for Option 4, Yvette highlighted the requirement for the Task and Finish Panels to be set up in response to the needs established through community engagement on the issues affecting local people, rather than just in response to the national targets put forward by the Government.

Colin Thompson said that he would not feel comfortable with the LSP adopting a strict geographical area-based approach as per Option 3. Concurring with these comments, Simon Williams said that whilst such an approach was appropriate for the CDRP, the LSP needed to adopt a wider approach. Simon also felt there was a need to move away from the current structure as embodied in Option 1 and that, whilst Option 2 had some merits in terms of its close alignment with LAA, he felt that Option 4 with the allocation of specific tasks to provide for delivery, was the one most suitable for the needs of the Epping Forest District. Jacqui Foile concurred that Option 4 provided for the most effective means of participation by the partner organisations.

In expressing her support for Option 4, Caroline Skinner said there was a tendency under the current arrangements for tasks to be identified without them ever being concluded. Brian said he also felt that Option 4 was the one most likely to bring about the required results. Lonica Vanclay considered that Option 4 was the one most pertinent for the LSP, although she felt there was a need to explore further how the different blocks could be brought together through a joint planning process. Julie Chandler expressed the view that Option 4 provided for more effective performance management. Whilst she felt that there might be a need for the Lifelong Learning Action Group to be retained in its own right, Barbara Stock said that such an arrangement could be accommodated within the Option 4 model, the concept of which Barbara supported.

Nick Roberts said that the Getting About Action Group had also felt it, or an equivalent group, had a role to play in the LSP in the future. Nick added that, from his own personal point of view, the difficulty with the existing structure was the lack of opportunity for interaction between the different groups. He was supportive of the idea of being able to commission work and felt that Option 4 was the model most suitable for achieving that. As an example, Nick quoted the drawing up of and delivery of a Transport Plan for the District. In conclusion, Nick felt that the existing arrangements for the Getting About Action Group relied on the commitment of too few individuals.

John Preston reported on the outcome of discussions at the Economic Prosperity Action Group meeting on 25 November. John said that the Action Group had concluded that the standstill situation envisaged in Option 1 was not sustainable and that the area-based approach of Option 3 was unsuitable for economic matters given that these required a wider perspective. John added that the Group had recognised that there were parts of the District which were more deprived than others and that there were merits in targeting these areas for the use of specific measures but it was

felt that these could be dealt with through the “Task and Finish” approach. The Group had also expressed a fear that if it were to be disbanded, the benefits of the relationships which had been established would be lost and that organising individuals to carry out work within a “Task and Finish” setting might not be so readily achievable. The Group had also felt there might be insufficient emphasis on economic prosperity/development within Option 4 and, perhaps persuaded by the use of the words “Our Economy” in the model, had expressed a preference for Option 2. John said that having heard the views put forward at this meeting and a more detailed explanation of what was envisaged, he felt more comfortable with Option 4 than he had done previously. Agreeing with these comments, Chris Overend pointed out that the Away Day had been focussing on ambitions and priorities for the period to 2013. He stressed that the original Community Strategy covered the period to 2021 and the new Sustainable Community Strategy would cover the period beyond that. As such the LSP needed to remain aware of this longer term perspective.

There was general consensus at the meeting that Option 4 was the preferred structure option for the LSP. Accordingly, Derek Macnab undertook to prepare a further report for consideration at the Board meeting on 18 December, developing the concept and proposals contained within Option 4, the Fixed Partnership and Task and Finish Model. Chris Overend undertook to identify a number of potential dates on which the Steering Group contained within that model could meet during 2009.

3. APPOINTMENT OF LSP MANAGER AND LSP ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT

Derek Macnab reported that the closing date for applications in respect of the re-advertised post of LSP Manager had now passed and that a total of 10 applications had been received. Derek said it was hoped to undertake the interviews and make an appointment before the end of the calendar year and, with that in mind, an interview panel needed to be established as soon as possible. Accordingly, it was agreed that the Appointments Panel should include Councillor Di Collins as Chairman of the LSP, Derek Macnab, Jacqui Foile as the Voluntary Sector representative, a representative from West Essex PCT and a representative from the Town/Parish Councils. Yvette Wetton would act as “reserve” in the event of one of the nominees being unable to attend.

Jacqui Foile reported that the advertisement in respect of the vacant post of part time LSP Administrative Assistant was due to be published that week.

4. LOCAL AREA AGREEMENT 2

Councillor Di Collins reported that the Essex Partnership on 28 November, a meeting she would be attending as the LSP’s representative, was due to consider and make a final decision in respect of the PRG bids the LSP had submitted under the LAA 2 process. Councillor Di Collins provided details of the bids submitted as follows:

Reference	Scheme	£
EPP 3	Home Safety Scheme	20,000
EPP 5	Supported Volunteering Initiative	49,844
EPP 8	Supported Programme for People with LD	39,950
EPP 9	Tender for Emotional Health and Wellbeing Group	100,000
EPP 10	Parenting Programme Officer	50,000
EPP 11	Youth Worker – Youth Justice System	140-150,000
EPP 14	Community Transport – Driver Training for Schools Staff	40,120

EPP 15	Co-ordination of CCTV activities	35,000
--------	----------------------------------	--------

Chris Overend informed the meeting that the Epping Forest District LSP Indicative Allocation was £453,000 whereas the total amount of the bids put forward was up to £30,000 in excess of that indicative allocation. Should all the bids be approved, therefore, the LSP would have to determine how to fund the difference between the two amounts. Chris Overend added that the latest advice received was that the PRG might not be released until well into the 2009/10 financial year so that the partners would need to determine how to cover the initial financing of schemes due to commence early in the 2009/10 financial year.

5. GYPSIES AND TRAVELLERS

John Preston informed the meeting that the District Council was currently preparing a "Development Plan Provision" for Gypsies and Travellers to meet the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers in the Epping Forest District and that an LSP involvement on this issue would be appropriate. Accordingly, it was agreed that an item on this matter should be included on the agenda for the LSP Board meeting on 18 December 2008.

6. PRACTICE-BASED COMMISSIONING GROUP

Caroline Skinner reported that the Practice-Based Commissioning Group was to hold a Stakeholder Meeting shortly and would be inviting the District Council to attend that meeting as one of the stakeholders. Caroline undertook to forward details of the meeting as soon as they became available.

7. CYPSP – FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES 2009/10

Lonica Vanclay reminded the meeting that in 2008-09 the CYPSP had identified the following priorities and commissioned a range of services as indicated:

- £50,000 - Service mapping and project development - CYPSP Development Manager
- £64,800 - Improved emotional wellbeing of children and young people
- £60,000 - Improve parenting support and information
- £40,000 - Extend youth activities provision
- £35,000 - Reduced obesity
- £16,780 - Speech and language development

The CYPSP was currently identifying priorities for commissioning for 2009 onwards. The funds available were not yet known. However, sub-groups were working on identifying needs and gaps and existing provision with a view to identifying the services to be commissioned:

Promoting Healthy Lifestyles:

- Obesity strategy
- Healthy lifestyle programmes
- Breastfeeding
- Teenage pregnancy
- Substance misuse
- Killed and seriously injured

Improve aspirations and attainment:

- CAMHs
- Speech and language
- Support to ensure inclusion
- 14 -19 agenda

Provide parents with the skills, advice and support when they need it:

- Parent support and skill development groups
- Topic based information sessions
- Individual, home based parent support
- Information about services
- Early years and childcare

Participation in positive activities:

- Crucial Crew, Reality Roadshow and Road Runner
- Volunteering
- Children and young peoples voice
- Cultural, community and physical activity

8. COMMUNITY CONFERENCE AND FACE THE PUBLIC MEETING

In view of the considerable amount of work still required in respect of the constitutional and structural changes to the LSP, it was agreed that the Joint Community Conference and Face The Public meeting set to be held on 21 January 2009 should be postponed and re-scheduled to be held on a date, still to be determined, in the Spring of 2009.