

Enterprise Partnership Theme Board

Board Meeting

14:30 – 16:30, 11th September 2006

Present:

Dr Ita O'Donovan – Haringey Council, **Chair**
Sean Burke – Haringey Council
David Hennings – Haringey Council
Michael Thompson – Mall Corporation
Gary Ince – North London Ltd.
Martin Tucker – Haringey Council
Karen Galey – Haringey Council
Nilam Popat – Haringey Council
Ambrose Quashie – Haringey Council
John Egbo – HAVCO
Dave Kilmartin – Haringey Council
Faiza Rizvi – HarCEN
Lenny Kinnear – Connexions
Yolande Burgess – LSC London North
Linda Banton – Jobcentre Plus
Clive Martinez – Haringey TPCT
Pat Egan – Councillor (Woodside)
Wayne Hoban – Councillor (Alexandra)
Alex Joseph – Selby Trust
Manoj Ambasna – Collage Arts
Janice Robinson – Haringey Council
Alexis Adonis – Haringey Council, **Co-ordinator**

Apologies:

Paul Head – CoNEL
Hugh Jones – NLCC

Agenda Item	Discussion
1. Welcome, introductions and apologies	The Chair welcomed the attendees, introductions were made and apologies received.
2. Minutes of last meeting and matters arising	The minutes of the last meeting were agreed as accurate. There were no matters arising.
3. Terms of Reference and Membership	Karen Galey presented the Terms of Reference and Membership to the Board. It was noted that the position of the Board within the HSP structure was not clear; an organisational diagram will be added to clarify this. The Board's responsibility for skills needed to be included within the TOR, a repeated sentence was noted on page 2 and the TPCT was incorrectly referred to as the PCT. With the above amendments made, the Terms of Reference were unanimously passed.
4. LAA update	<p>Martin Tucker gave a brief overview of the LAA update paper. This outlined the proposed mandatory and optional indicators for the LAA, as well as the proposed stretch targets. All proposals for optional and stretch targets have been drawn from the neighbourhood element of the SSCF and the Local Growth Enterprise Initiative (LEGI) bid.</p> <p>It was noted that this is a first draft of the agreement, to be submitted to GOL on the 29th September. The Enterprise Board, as the Theme Board with responsibility for Block 4 of the agreement, has to approve the optional indicators and stretch targets. Martin Tucker ran through the optional indicators and stretch targets; the LAA will have a total of 12 stretch targets, with 3 of these most likely allocated to Block 4.</p> <p>The Chair noted the integration between the LAA and forthcoming Community Strategy, and the input of the LEGI application and the SSCF programme into these. David Hennings also noted the alignment of the LAA with the Seven Sisters NDC.</p> <p>There will be an opportunity to redraft the LAA by the 15th December, once GOL have made their initial comments on the first submission, and the final document will be submitted on the 15th January. Faiza Rizvi raised concern over the alignment of</p>

	<p>funding streams when the LAA takes effect. The Chair reiterated that the document is still in its draft stage, and if there are any implications around funding streams these can be addressed before the final document is submitted.</p> <p>More information was requested regarding the evidence base and project monitoring for the SSCF programme, and the targeting/expansion rationale. Martin Tucker explained that the three wards targeted for the SSCF programme have the highest levels of worklessness in the borough; while the majority of beneficiaries will be from these wards the programme is not “postcode” restricted. The geographical expansion of the programme to cover more NRF wards will allow greater flexibility in delivery. The embedded evaluation framework will report each month on programme delivery; by January there will be established real data on delivery which will be used to identify any shortcomings.</p> <p>The Chair expanded that the three wards targeted by the SSCF programme were those where the greatest impact could be made, and also those where the most added value could be derived for neighbouring wards.</p> <p>The recommendations for optional indicators and stretch targets were approved by the Board in principle. Members were given two days to submit views on the targets.</p>
<p>5. LEGI Update</p>	<p>Karen Galey gave a summary on the status of Haringey’s LEGI proposal, which is focused on Tottenham and the creation of an Enterprise Quarter to stimulate the growth of an enterprise culture. The proposal is worth £18 million over 10 years (2007 – 2016), and the process is highly competitive. The Chair noted that there has been a high engagement from the business sector in the formation of the bid, and that it contains an integrated package of measures in a focused geographical area.</p> <p>Initial feedback from the LDA has been positive; David Hennings noted that we have worked more closely with the funders to help match their priorities with ours. Manoj Ambasna commented that this proposal was much more integrated than the previous submission.</p> <p>The next stage of the application is a short listing process, with successful bids invited to National Panel interview to be held in early November.</p>

<p>6. SSCF Neighbourhood Element Programme Update</p>	<p>Martin Tucker presented the SSCF Update paper to the Board. Contract negotiation meetings have been held with all providers and delivery of all interventions started on or before the 4th September.</p> <p>Economic Regeneration have held the inception meeting with the evaluators and have agreed a detailed work programme including a first programme meeting with Project Managers, Evaluators and Economic Regeneration on 15 September 2006.</p> <p>A full progress report detailing achievement of outputs, spend and progress towards outcomes will be presented to the Board's December meeting.</p>
<p>7. Community Strategy</p>	<p>Janice Robinson presented the paper on the Community Strategy consultation. Attention was drawn to the 4 questions that are being asked of all HSP Theme Board members. The consultation process is currently open, and members are invited to send their responses to Helena Pugh by the 13th October. Also requested were any relevant consultations that partners have already conducted. Some of the preliminary findings were outlined. Crime and fear of crime have emerged as a concern, along with various other quality of life issues such as improved shopping facilities.</p> <p>1000 responses have been received so far, with the geographical spread of these roughly even throughout the borough. Consultation is being conducted in part through area assemblies to ensure this. From initial analysis responses appear to be similar throughout the borough; a more detailed analysis can be undertaken once the consultation period is over. The question of what would be an acceptable response figure was raised. For qualitative purposes this would be 1% of the total borough population; however it was noted that this is a qualitative consultation.</p> <p>HARCEN would welcome a consultation visit, and Mike Thompson noted that they conduct market research on Wood Green Town Centre which would provide an interesting comparison.</p>

<p>8. Key Performance Indicators Report</p>	<p>Ambrose Quashie presented the KPI report for the 3rd quarter 2006. It was commented that a cross borough comparison would be a useful tool. Barnet and Enfield were suggested; however a more meaningful comparison would be between Haringey and statistically comparable boroughs such as Southwark and Tower Hamlets.</p> <p>Lenny Kinnear noted that the increase in NEET reflects a change in the way NEET is measured; 16 year old school leavers are now included in the figures from the April when they leave.</p> <p>IB/SDA claimant figures in the West of the borough were queried. Possible reasons for these include an older population than in the East of the borough, and the correlation between social housing areas in the West and high levels of deprivation. Some wards also contain large areas of undeveloped land (principally parks) which can affect area based statistics.</p>
<p>9. Future Developments</p>	<p>David Hennings presented to the Board, outlining the key future developments for Haringey. The forthcoming Comprehensive Spending Review may have financial implications for Haringey, and reflect changes in policy direction by central government. The SSCF programme is a pilot, and will not solve the problem of worklessness in the borough on its own. 2012 will provide opportunities for business and employment, and there is a need to consider the best way to harness these.</p> <p>Developing the Upper Lea Valley vision will require thinking afresh on the direction of this. Manufacturing is not the primary focus, and thought is needed on how it will affect the employment and business agendas. Objective 2 funding is ending, and there will be a substantial reduction in the amount of LDA funding for the ULV. There is a need to consider how this decline will be managed, and concurrently tap into new funding streams that are coming online. The rise of unemployment in the national economy is an active problem.</p> <p>The Cultural Quarter has to be revisited; what were we trying to achieve and what has been delivered? It was noted that a Web design firm has recently moved into the Chocolate Factory based on the strength of the IT systems in place. Business Development beyond LEGI needs to be addressed.</p> <p>The principle points raised in the presentation will be used as a template for a brainstorming session at the next Board meeting.</p>

9. A.O.B.	The date of the next Board meeting is: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 5th December• 2:00 – 4:00 pm• Civic Centre