Report for:	Overview & Scrutiny Committee
	6th June 2016
Item number:	13
Title:	Social Inclusion – Interim Report
Report authorised by:	Cllr Charles Wright, Chair of Overview & Scrutiny Committee
Lead Officer:	Martin Bradford, Policy Officer & Kathryn Booth, Policy & Equalities Officer
Ward(s) affected:	All
Report for Key/ Non Key Decision:	N/A

1. Introduction

1.1 A Fair and Equal Borough is one of four cross-cutting themes within the Council's Corporate Plan and which sets out the Council's aim to tackle 'the underlying factors of poverty, discrimination and exclusion'. The Council is currently reviewing the Fair and Equal Borough Delivery Plan with a view to re-launching this in 2016.

1.2 In this context, it was agreed that Overview & Scrutiny Committee could support this review process through a series of evidence gathering sessions that would help to develop a more localised definition of social inclusion and develop associated priorities for action.

1.3 This interim report provides a summary of the programme of work undertaken to date by the Overview & Scrutiny Committee and highlights emerging themes from evidence gathering sessions held. The report also sets out the plan of work to complete this review.

2. Cabinet Member Introduction
N/A

3. Recommendations

3.1 That the Committee notes the interim report and:
(i) Confirms the key conclusions arising so far from the review (as set out in section 7.1-7.36);
(ii) Notes the suggestions for further areas of evidence gathering (as set out in sections: 7.4; 7.11; 7.22; 7.28 and 7.35) and agrees what further evidence it wishes to receive;
(iii) Agree the suggested proposals relating to planned engagement with residents in the case study area (as set out in section 8.10);
(iv) Agree the suggested outline programme for the completion of the third and final stage of this work (as set out in section 8.14).

Haringey
LONDON

4. Reasons for decision

4.1 The report provides a summary of the Committee's work on social inclusion completed to date. If agreed, the recommendations detailed above will enable the Committee to complete the agreed social inclusion work-plan.

5. Alternative options considered

5.1 Non completion would limit the contribution of this review to social inclusion work within the council.

6. Background information

Social inclusion in Haringey

6.1 A Haringeystat was held in July 2015 which presented a range of data relating to social exclusion within Haringey. The review highlighted that exclusion can happen at any point in the lifetime of a resident. For some it is temporary, but for others it is chronic, involving multiple problems or problems that multiply over a lifetime. The session also underlined that exclusion within the borough is not random, with particular groups being excluded by ethnicity, age, gender and disability.

6.2 Whilst there have been some areas of considerable success in improving outcomes for disadvantaged groups, such as reductions in teenage pregnancy, the review also highlighted a number of areas of concern. In particular:
- The low take up of childcare amongst disadvantaged communities and that children from poorer families face substantially worse educational outcomes;
- That BME households experience substantially worse outcomes across a range of indicators (e.g. those not in education employment or training, those claiming benefits, or being housed in temporary accommodation);
- That lone parent households represent a high proportion of those housed in temporary accommodation;
- That there is a substantial gap in employment outcomes for lone parent households and disabled residents (particularly those with a mental health diagnosis).

6.3 There is also a spatial dimension to disadvantage within Haringey. The recent update for the Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) highlighted that overall disadvantage across the borough has decreased relative to the rest of the country, reflecting London-wide improvements. However, more deprived parts of the borough have made less progress overall than the least deprived. For example, the Campsbourne estate area has become more disadvantaged since the last IMD.

6.4 Social inclusion is a cross-cutting theme across many services provided by the council and its partners. In this context, it is important that those activities that support social inclusion are embedded within the work of the Council through the Corporate Plan and within Priority Boards. This will ensure that the comparative outcomes for disadvantaged groups are monitored and reviewed with a view to reducing inequalities.

Scrutiny involvement

6.5 Following discussions between the Cabinet Member for Economic Development, Social Inclusion and Sustainability and the Chair of Overview & Scrutiny Committee, it was

Haringey
LONDON

agreed that scrutiny could facilitate and support the review of the Fair and Equal Borough Delivery Plan. In particular, it was noted that scrutiny involvement could help through:

• Contributing to a localised and widely owned definition for what a Fair and Equal Borough means for Haringey;
• Establishing a clear set of priorities for the borough and where limited resources can best be targeted;
• Developing a sound evidence based approach that underpin interventions;
• Identifying how work to address social exclusion is embedded within work across the Council.

Aims, objectives and work-plan

6.6 At its meeting on the 25th January 2016, the Overview & Scrutiny Committee approved the scope and plan of work to assist in the review of the Fair and Equal Borough Strategy. This scope agreed to address the following objectives:

▪ To assess why certain areas and certain communities within the borough have not benefitted as much from London-wide improvements in outcomes;
▪ To assess whether disadvantaged communities within the borough see themselves as excluded and what do they feel are the key barriers to getting ahead?
▪ To identify what success may look like for disadvantaged communities;
▪ To identify what works in supporting disadvantaged communities and helps them to get on;
▪ To review existing plans to ensure that they are focussed on the right areas to tackle the issues these communities are facing?
▪ To assess what can be learnt from other boroughs facing similar issues?

6.7 In meeting these objectives it was agreed that a case study approach would be adopted as this would:

▪ Provide an opportunity to explore how the issues we are concerned with are playing out in some of the most disadvantaged parts of the borough;
▪ Help to understand the views of our disadvantaged communities and the barriers they face to getting on;
▪ Facilitate access to organisations that work with the community to help understand about those interventions that work and those that don't.

6.8 In discussion with officers and the Committee it was agreed with local councillors that the Campsbourne Estate (Hornsey) would be used to provide illustrative case study material to support this review. This area was selected on the following basis:

▪ Using the Index of Multiple Deprivation outcomes this is a disadvantaged area;
▪ Recent IMD analysis suggests that deprivation in this part of the borough has deteriorated, contrary to the borough-wide trend;
▪ The area was identified as a concern within the members briefing on social inclusion;
▪ The area has had less focus to date than other disadvantaged areas which may help to understand some the issues involved;
▪ Whilst the Campsbourne area is deprived, it is surrounded by more affluent areas that make it different to other deprived parts of Haringey.

Campsbourne Estate area

The Campsbourne Estate covers an area of approximately 25 hectares and is located in Hornsey Ward. The estate is bordered by Alexandra Palace Park to the north and Hornsey High Street to the south. The Heartlands runs along the north-eastern side of the Campsbourne, and the Kings Cross mainline provides an eastern border to both.

Haringey
LONDON

There are approximately 500 homes on the estate, most of which are managed by Homes for Haringey on behalf of the Council. Approximately two thirds of these homes are social rent and the remainder leasehold properties.

Whilst there are no medical facilities within the boundaries of the estate, three general practices are located beyond the periphery. A primary school (junior and infants) is also located on the estate at which approximately 400 local children attend.

There are also two supported housing complexes on the estate, which provide support for approximately 75 elderly and disabled people. A Community Centre (CampSpace), operated by Homes for Haringey, is also located on the estate.

6.9   In scoping of the review, Overview & Scrutiny Committee agreed to undertake the review of social inclusion in three stages, which are as set out below:

Stage	Key objectives
(1) Overview of social inclusion and preparation for case study of Campsbourne estate	- Obtain overview through analysis of relevant social inclusion research; - Identification of good practice from other local authority areas; - Develop overview of Campsbourne estate, including overview of key data/indicators; - Identification of key areas of focus for the review of the Campsbourne estate.
(2) Case study of the Campsbourne estate	- Undertake site visit with members and officers; - Conduct focus groups/ interviews with local stakeholders / services (e.g. housing providers, schools, health services, police, regeneration etc); - Conduct focus group with local residents; - Reflect on emerging conclusions.
(3) Reflection on findings of the case study for our corporate approach to social inclusion	- Confirm findings and outcomes from the review; - Consider how the findings from inform the development of our Fair and Equal Borough delivery plan; - Assess how existing corporate plans address the key issues faced in disadvantaged communities in the light of key issues raised by the review.

6.10 To support the progress of this review and specific data collection requirements, a range of methods were employed to ensure the Committee had access to the necessary evidence to assist with its investigation. This included:
   ▪ Desk based reviews (performance data, comparative data from other authorities);
   ▪ Evidence gathering sessions – with other local authorities;
   ▪ Primary data collection – with local stakeholders;
   ▪ Site visit – estate walkabout;
   ▪ Formal panel meetings - to coordinate, plan and monitor work.

Work completed to date

Haringey
LONDON

6.11 In the period February to April 2016, the Overview & Scrutiny Committee has held a number of evidence gathering sessions to support the progress of this work. These are summarised below:

Session No:	Objectives	Key participants
1.	▪ To agree terms of reference and future work programme ▪ Background on social inclusion in Haringey and case study area	▪ Cabinet Member for Social Inclusion ▪ Director of Public Health ▪ Policy & Performance Officers
2.	▪ Comparative data on how social inclusion is tackled elsewhere	▪ LB Lambeth ▪ LB Tower Hamlets
3.	▪ Case study site visit ▪ Meet local front line officers	▪ OSC members ▪ Local ward councillors ▪ HfH officers
4, 5 & 6	▪ Evidence gathering with key stakeholders in case study area	▪ Local primary school ▪ Local GPs ▪ Housing officers ▪ Neighbourhood Policing ▪ Regeneration

7. Key Emerging themes

7.1 Analysis of evidence received by the panel at the above evidence gathering sessions has highlighted 5 key emerging themes:
(1) Ensuring children have the best start in life;
(2) Access to housing;
(3) Post 16 transitions;
(4) Mental health – support to improve community participation;
(5) Social inclusion and access to opportunities.

Ensuring children have the best start in life

7.2 The importance of investing in reducing disadvantage in early life has been highlighted across a wide range of research. The Marmot review[1] – a major strategic review of health inequalities in England post 2010 – noted that improving the start children get in life is crucial to reducing health inequalities across the rest of their life course. According to the review '*Later interventions, although important, are considerably less effective where good early foundations are lacking*'. The review concluded that priority should be given to expenditure on early years services.

7.3 The significant divide in outcomes for children from different backgrounds at the very earliest stages of their life is a key cause for concern. The Child Poverty and Social Mobility Commission's State of the Nation report (2015)[2] noted that less than half of the poorest children in England are ready for school by age five compared to almost two-thirds of other children. The report also highlighted that the complexity of the childcare funding system is hampering efforts to increase maternal employment. School readiness

---

[1] Fair Society Health Lives (Marmot Review): A strategic review of health inequalities in England post 2010.
[2] State of the Nation 2015; Child Poverty and Social Mobility in Great Britain (Child Poverty and Social Mobility Commission), Parliament 2015

Haringey
LONDON

and access to childcare were both key issues highlighted by the Haringeystat on social inclusion:

- Some children are already disadvantaged by the age of 5 - non primary English speakers do 14% worse at this stage and children on Free School Meals do 12% worse;
- Take up of childcare free entitlement amongst disadvantaged two year olds is one of the lowest in London.

Best start in life on the Campsbourne

Although the Campsbourne LSOA has a slightly higher proportion of children and young people than the borough as a whole - 71% of tenancies (91 households) on the estate do not have children.

There is a higher proportion of lone parents in the Campsbourne LSOA compared to Haringey as a whole - nearly half of tenanted households with children or 44 households are lone parents. The local primary school also noted a high proportion of single parents.

The local primary school noted that non-English speaking communities needed additional support to help boost achievement, with academic achievement of EAL learners markedly different. It was felt that enrichment for parents would be of particular value – taking parents out of their comfort zone and opening their horizons for their children.

Local services such as the Children's Centre have not been particularly well used and in spite of all the greenery and amenities, children don't really use these.

Areas for further evidence gathering

7.4 The panel has so far received only limited evidence on the council's current plans for early years provision. In addition the panel has not examined evidence from other local areas on this theme.

Access to Housing

7.5 Housing policy is central to any discussion of social exclusion from the point of view of who is enabled to live where.

7.6 Although social housing continues to represent a significant proportion of housing stock within London, the social rented sector has been in decline as a result of sales under Right to Buy and the inability of councils to replace these. As a consequence there has been an increase in the number of low income households renting from private landlords but with public subsidy in the form of Housing Benefit. It has also changed the profile of the social rented sector, which increasingly houses low income and vulnerable households.

7.7 Although the majority of social housing stock lost has been through Right to Buy sales, there has also been a slight net loss of social housing as a result of demolition programmes linked to urban regeneration. This has been driven in part by a desire to reduce the concentration of poverty on estates by promoting more mixed communities and tenures. However, there are some concerns about how this process contributes to displacement of the urban poor and the extent to which households have been able to return to those areas from where they have been displaced.

7.8 Increasing reliance of poorer households on private sector renting means that displacement of poorer households is now most likely as a result of welfare policy. Reduction of the maximum housing subsidy payable is making large areas of London

unaffordable to low-income households, leaving many households with no choice but to move to the suburbs and beyond. This was a key issue highlighted in evidence from Lambeth council which noted that many families in the private rented sector are being forced out of the borough due to pressures on income. Evidence from Tower Hamlets also illustrated how low welfare changes have disproportionately affected those on low income or benefit dependent households within the private rented sector. Council influence over private sector landlords is limited and in some cases the best advice for households is for them to seek cheaper accommodation further afield.

7.9 The affordability of housing for low income households is a key issue for Haringey, with the Haringeystat on social inclusion pointing to:
- Rising numbers reliant on housing benefit, including an increase in the number of employed residents reliant on housing benefit;
- Low-income residents priced out of the private rental market, with the poorest 10% needing to spend 97% of their income on the average Haringey rent;
- Rising homeless numbers and an increase in the number of households living in temporary accommodation, with a high number of children affected by these issues.

7.10 In Haringey there is also an ethnic and gendered dimension to exclusion from the housing market, with high proportions of black households and single female parents affected by homelessness or reliant on Housing Benefit. The Haringeystat on social inclusion specifically highlighted that:
- 91% of all family heads in temporary accommodation are non White British;
- Two thirds of homeless acceptances are for lone parent households;
- Black households are significantly over-represented amongst housing benefit claimants.

Housing in Campsbourne

The Campsbourne LSOA is predominantly comprised of social rented housing (Homes for Haringey) with 70% of properties social rented compared to 26.8% in the borough as a whole. The Campsbourne estate is comprised of a mixture of social rented and leasehold properties.

The estate houses a large proportion of households that are dependent on Housing Benefit with 68% on full or partial housing benefit.

There is relatively low churn in the population with 50% of social tenants having lived in their properties for 10 years or longer. As such, households are currently likely to be less affected by the issues of affordability or security of tenure experienced by those in temporary or private sector rented housing.

Around 26% of tenancies on the estate are overcrowded, but this is predominantly by no more than 1 bedroom. A number of local professionals talked about issues with overcrowding, including a local GP practice which highlighted the impact of overcrowding and poor condition on the health of its patients. However, it was noted that this was more of an issue for those in private sector accommodation.

The estate itself is not earmarked as part of the Council's estate regeneration programme. However, a new mixed retail and housing development is underway to the west of the estate. It was noted that the challenge for any new development would be

---

Haringey
LONDON

ensuring that it offered benefits to the local community, perhaps most importantly in how the estate is integrated within the wider area.

Areas for further evidence gathering

7.11 The panel has received national evidence and evidence from other local areas on the impact of housing for social exclusion but has not yet received any evidence on the Council's existing housing plans, including planned estate regeneration and housing development. The Campsbourne case study provides a view of the experience of disadvantaged families in social housing but the experience of those in private sector housing and temporary accommodation, which has been raised as a significant issue, has not been explored in any detail.

Post 16 Transitions

7.12 Improving overall outcomes at GCSE has been a particular focus across London, including within Haringey. London boroughs have also compared well to the national picture in terms of the attainment gap between disadvantaged pupils and their peers. A 2015 study on the performance of disadvantaged pupils in London noted that, whilst there was no advantage for disadvantaged pupils compared to those in the rest of England at age 5, pupils showed faster improvements between ages 5 and 11. The study concludes that improvements were a result of gradual improvements in school quality.[3]

7.13 In spite of the positive outcomes for disadvantaged students at GCSE level, the Haringeystat on social inclusion noted that:
  ▪ There is still a 17% gap in attainment at GCSE between pupils on Free School Meals and other pupils;
  ▪ 40% of students in Haringey still leave school without 5 A*-Cs;
  ▪ Children from disadvantaged areas and ethnic minority groups are more likely to end up within the NEET cohort (Not in Employment Education or Training);
  ▪ There continues to be an ethnic dimension to unemployment in the borough, with 17% more White British in employment in the borough than the rest of the population.

7.14 These findings tally with key messages highlighted by other London boroughs that the panel heard from where it was suggested that significant improvement in education outcomes is not translating into improved outcomes at Further Education level or improved employment outcomes for London's disadvantaged young people.

7.15 Inequality post 16 was a key theme within the Child Poverty and Social Mobility Commission's 2015 State of the Nation report. The report notes that young people from poor families are far less likely to go to university, attend a top institution or access certain elite professions. Non graduates therefore tend to come from low income backgrounds and often end up in low pay, low progression careers. The report argues that to address this inequality, the UK needs to:
  ▪ Create a higher education and professional employment system where access to the top jobs and best universities is based on aptitude and ability not background and birth;
  ▪ Reduce the divide between youngsters who go on to university and those who do not – placing greater priority on the non-graduate track into employment.

7.16 The Lord's Committee on Social Mobility has recently published its 2015/16 report *Overlooked and left behind: Improving transition from school to work for the majority of*

---

[3] CASE, *Understanding the improved performance of disadvantaged pupils in London*, September 2015

Haringey
LONDON

young people. The committee focussed on how the UK government could ensure that all young people are offered a high quality career path after they leave school. Key conclusions of this review include:

- Many students leave the educational system without the skills necessary for work and life;
- Existing recruitment practices hinder upward mobility – reliance on informal means of recruitment disadvantages those young people without existing social networks;
- Expansion of higher education has served some groups well but disadvantaged those already underserved by the education system;
- There is a culture of inequality between vocational and academic routes to work. Government policies, funding and incentives all support a focus on academic achievement at GCSE and A level meaning those who don't achieve at this level are poorly served by the system;
- Non-academic routes to employment are complex, confusing and incoherent and do not guarantee routes into good quality employment;
- Apprenticeships are a good way of upskilling people for the future economy but only 6% of 16-18 year olds follow this route. There is a need to support young people who do not follow a pathway to university or an apprenticeship to make successful transitions into the workplace by other routes;
- There is a pressing need for young people to be clearer about the decisions they face at an early age and the future employment options available to them.
- Transitions to work take longer for some young people but this is not recognised in the current inflexible format of 16-18 or 16-19 education;
- An increased role for employers is fundamental to improving school to work transitions.

7.17 Many of the issues covered within the Social Mobility Commission's report chime with evidence that has been presented to the Overview and Scrutiny Panel during its social inclusion review but also reflects some of the issues considered by the Children and Young People's Panel in their separate review on Youth Transitions.

7.18 The Children and Young People's Scrutiny Panel reported their interim findings on Youth Transitions in July 2015. The panel's review focussed particularly on the issue of young people who are at risk of becoming NEET and what kind of interventions might assist in helping them to avoid this. Some of the panel's initial conclusions were:

- Young people with proactive parents or carers appeared to be a lot better placed than others in terms of their future plans;
- The career plans of some young people seemed unrealistic and these young people also lacked a back-up plan if they were unsuccessful;
- Young people are not receiving support and guidance covering the full range of options available;
- Some young people felt there was a negative perception of the local area and that this linked to low expectations.

7.19 As part of their social inclusion review, the panel received evidence from the Tottenham People Programme regarding recent research with local unemployed residents. The research explored local people's perceptions of the reasons for unemployment in Tottenham, with many highlighting a lack of jobs as a key factor. Lack of support and careers advice, lack of qualifications, and lack of experience and skills also featured highly in responses.

Haringey
LONDON

7.20 The low number of jobs per resident in Haringey compared to other parts of London is already an area of concern within Haringey's Young People's Strategy, highlighting the need for local young people to be better equipped to access work across the capital. The Tottenham team felt there were a number of reasons why young people in the area were less likely to access jobs outside the borough, including travel costs, a lack of ambition from parents for their children to look further afield for work, and young people feeling more comfortable working in the local area as this is what they know.

7.21 Approaches that were considered to be most effective in improving young people's routes to work included:
  ▪ A greater focus in schools on preparing young people for what they can do with what they have when they leave school;
  ▪ Developing strong relationships with businesses - Tailored pre-employment; activity linked to the requirements of specific businesses was felt to be particularly effective, such as the approach taken by Works Works in Tottenham;
  ▪ Providing young people with positive examples and support from people who have come from the same background as them.

The Campsbourne: Giving young people the best start in life

The Campsbourne LSOA has a slightly younger population profile compared to the rest of the borough with 23.6% of the population aged 0-15 compared to 20% in the borough as a whole. In 2015? 8 out of 15 children on the Campsbourne taking GCSEs got 5 A*-C including English and Maths (53% of the cohort).

Professionals working on the estate reflected on their experiences of working with young people who had not had a good school experience, some of whom were drawn into crime because they saw no other prospects. They highlighted the importance of engaging with these young people at an early enough stage to show them there was the potential for a different option. Homes for Haringey had previously run a training programme on the estate with a small number of youths with some positive outcomes achieved.

Areas for further evidence gathering

7.22 The panel has so far received only limited evidence on the council's current plans for post-16 provision. In addition the panel has not examined evidence from other local areas on this theme. This theme aligns with the Children's Scrutiny Panel review of youth transitions and any further evidence gathering should therefore coordinate with this review.

Mental Health - How to improve support and participation in community life

7.23 People with long-term mental illness are among the most excluded in society and this emerged as a key theme within the social inclusion Haringeystat. In particular:
  ▪ Mental health prevalence in Haringey is the 10th highest in London;
  ▪ 20 GP practices within the borough have seen an increase in mental health prevalence between 2012-15;
  ▪ Only 6% of those receiving secondary mental health services are in employment;
  ▪ A high proportion of Employment Support Allowance and Incapacity Benefit claimants have mental health problems, representing 46% of ESA/IB claims.

7.24 Employment outcomes for benefits claimants with mental health problems has been a key issue nationally, with 2015 figures indicating just 1 in 10 of claimants with mental health

Haringey
LONDON

problems were helped into work by the Government's Work Programme. The November 2015 Spending Review announced a new Work and Health Programme for claimants with health conditions or disabilities and those unemployed for over 2 years which will replace Work Programme and Work Choice contracts from 2017.

7.25 Rethinking employment pathways for Employment Support Allowance claimants with mental health problems is a key focus for London authorities, including as part of sub-regional devolution deals. The panel heard in particular from Graeme Cook (Institute of Public Policy Research) regarding the mental health and employment work underway in Islington and from Haringey officers regarding the health devolution pilot being developed in the borough.

7.26 Engagement with those out of work or on the brink of employment has pointed to a lack of understanding of health conditions from employers and job centres but also a culture amongst health professionals which does not encourage work. The employment devolution agenda has therefore focussed specifically on raising employment up the health agenda, thinking about employment as a contributing factor to health. Islington has been trialling the use of Individual Placement Support – an evidence-based approach to supported employment for people with a severe mental illness delivered within primary and community care settings. IPS supports people's efforts to achieve steady employment in mainstream competitive jobs with international evidence indicating that 'place then train' models are more effective than traditional approaches such as vocational training in successfully getting people into work.

7.27 The Haringey devolution pilot is exploring 3 key areas:
- Prevention and early help for people at work through an asset based discussion linked to the fit note and enhanced support for employers. It was noted that this area of work is currently under-tested and there are challenges within the context of tight resources to identify who to target.
- Developing a better understanding of the ESA Work Related Activity Group and exploring alternative forms of support outside the Work Programme within the local economy
- Improving collaboration between partners to identify long-term claimants in the ESA support group who should be offered intensive IPS type support to return to work

An evidence based proposal will be developed by December with the proposed approach to be rolled out by April 2017.

Mental health issues in Campsbourne

Hornsey Park medical practice is the nearest to Campsbourne and has one of the highest mental health prevalence rates in the borough. Concerns about high levels of mental health issues were also raised by a number of professionals working with residents from the Campsbourne, including the local primary school and the ASB team. It is unclear what is driving mental ill health in the area though Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder for those coming from war torn areas was highlighted as an issue. The profile of the area also indicates high levels of financial distress which has been identified as a contributory factor to mental health and anxiety.

There are high levels of claims for Employment Support Allowance on the Campsbourne estate compared to the rest of the borough. The Hornsey Park practice noted a high

---

Haringey
LONDON

proportion of patients were diagnosed with depression and that these patients were often some distance from re-entering the job market.

Some professionals raised concerns about access to the professional support needed and a lack of support networks for some with poor mental health. It was felt that there needed to be more opportunities for contact with professionals to informally signpost people for help or opportunities to meet with other peers for informal support.

Areas for further evidence gathering

7.28 The panel heard evidence on current approaches to tackling labour market disadvantage for those with mental health issues, including the evidence based approach being implemented in Islington. Haringey is developing a structured approach to mental health and employment linked to its health devolution pilot. It is proposed that progress on the evidence based proposal being developed for this pilot is reported back to the panel by December 2016.

Social isolation and access to opportunities

7.29 Social exclusion concerns the incomplete or unequal integration of certain groups and individuals into society. Disadvantaged groups tend to be more socially isolated and have more limited social networks with which to access resources and opportunities. This has been a recurrent theme of the scrutiny review (as highlighted below) with the Campsbourne community frequently referred to as poorly connected to wider opportunities and amenities within the borough and further afield.

7.30 This relative insularity was also highlighted as a feature of other disadvantaged communities within the borough, with evidence that young job seekers in Tottenham are unlikely to look for work outside the borough and that people in the area perceive that certain opportunities aren't meant for people like them. The resources and networks that disadvantaged communities are able to access has implications for the borough's ambitions to ensure that all residents can benefit from growth opportunities – suggesting that simply creating new job opportunities in the area isn't going to be enough to help those who are socially excluded.

7.31 The panel heard from Lambeth Council regarding the development of their Financial Resilience Strategy. The Council has undertaken extensive ethnographic research with households on low incomes. Specific issues highlighted by the research included:
   ▪ A majority of those in the study seemed to move in 'poverty circles' – with all of their regular associates in similar financial circumstances;
   ▪ Healthy and stable relationships contributed to resilience, providing cash and non cash support and sources of positive social capital, such as positive role models. Conversely relationship breakdown often cut people off from broader social networks and support;
   ▪ Connections and interactions with agencies could also be a vital asset, especially in times of crisis.

7.32 Lambeth has developed an assets based approach which looks to build on the personal and social assets of individuals and aims to develop their skills and confidence so they are able to support themselves, be resilient and make the most of opportunities for the long-term. The borough has therefore invested in projects which enable residents to support each other and increase their skills, such as digi-buddies and money champions.

7.33 The Panel also received evidence around work in Haringey to reduce social isolation and develop better more supportive networks for isolated or excluded individuals. Those at

Haringey LONDON

particular risk of social isolation include carers, lone parents, people with long-term health conditions and older people living alone. A number of projects to tackle social isolation have been led by the Haringey Advisory Group on Alcohol (HAGA) such as the Neighbourhood Connects project. Neighbourhood Connects is a community based project aimed at enabling people to be more connected to their community. The projects takes an asset based approach, connecting people to tailored and relevant opportunities and engaging them in community activities.

7.34 Another recurrent theme of the review has been the need to develop sustainable approaches when engaging with disadvantaged communities. Professionals noted a history of short-term projects and programmes introduced in these areas to support local people which were not sustainable once funding streams came to an end. Much knowledge and experience was lost with the demise of project work and residents also became weary of a constant cycle of new schemes. It was felt that further thought should be given to the sustainability of projects, embedding these in permanent services or looking to train local residents to deliver outcomes in the longer-term.

Social isolation and access to opportunities on the Campsbourne

A number of evidence sessions highlighted a perception that the estate is closed off from the wider area with few accessing the estate that don't live there and few of those on the estate accessing opportunities beyond it. There was a feeling that the physical construction of the estate and its geographical location contributed to this relative isolation. Professionals pointed to a lack of local infrastructure or a focal point for the estate that residents could congregate around and a lack of good public transport connectivity. It was felt that schools and other public buildings represented a potential resource for bringing the community together.

Insularity on the estate is partly also about aspirations and perceptions of belonging. It was noted that despite the proximity of Alexander Palace and Park to the estate, many estate residents did not make use of these facilities and felt that such opportunities were 'not for them'. Although numerous residents associations feed into developments at Alexander Palace none advocate for or represent Campsbourne residents. Whilst some activity to promote external interests and aspirations already take places, more needs to be done to promote the aspirations of local people to extend opportunities beyond the estate.

Professionals noted that it was difficult to engage local residents on the estate and pointed to low levels of community participation. A lack of language skills was felt to be one component of this, particularly amongst the Turkish speaking community and older community members.

Social networks were also felt to be underdeveloped and limited to those with a similar social background. This was highlighted particularly through the example of the local primary school, where increasing preference for the school amongst middle class families was leading to more divided social connections rather than greater inclusion. However, after-school activities had been successful in facilitating the mix of different cultural and social groups of families and had helped socially isolated parents and families to engage with others and to develop supportive networks.

Haringey
LONDON

Areas for further evidence gathering

7.35 The panel has heard about good practice approaches to reducing social isolation and increasing resilience amongst disadvantaged communities, including Lambeth's asset based approach to financial resilience and Haringey's Neighbourhood Connects project. The panel may wish to explore this issue further in relation to the Council's regeneration programmes, in particular consideration of the Tottenham People's Programme.

7.36 Social isolation and exclusion has been a key theme relating to the Campsbourne and it is suggested that it would be helpful to explore in more detail through the planned focus group with residents from the estate.

8. Next Steps

Stage 1 – Overview of social inclusion

8.1 In the first stage of the review, the scrutiny panel received a range of evidence providing background to the review topic of social inclusion. This has included national research - for example from the Centre for Social Exclusion - and evidence from other local areas on their approach to tackling local disadvantage.

8.2 The panel has also considered high level data highlighting key themes specific to social inclusion within Haringey, including the Haringeystat on social inclusion.

8.3 Finally, the panel has received evidence on some of the Council's current activities which link to the social inclusion agenda, including the health devolution pilot and the Business in the Community work completed within Tottenham.

> **It is recommended that the panel:**
> **Confirm the key conclusions arising so far from the review (as set out in sections 7.1-7.36)**

Stage 2 – Case study of the Campsbourne estate

8.4 The scrutiny review is taking a case study approach focussed on the Campsbourne estate. This approach is intended to enable the panel to better understand how social inclusion is playing out in some of the most disadvantaged parts of the borough.

8.5 To date the panel has completed a site visit of the estate area and has received evidence from local services working in the area, including the police, local primary school, housing officers and health practitioners. The next phase of the case study will be to engage with local residents from the Campsbourne estate.

8.6 The intended objectives of resident engagement as set out within the review scope are to explore:
- Whether residents in the case study area see themselves as excluded
- What local residents feel are the key barriers to getting ahead
- What success looks like for these communities

8.7 The panel has previously discussed options for running focus groups with local residents on the Campsbourne estate as the main vehicle for conducting this resident engagement.

8.8 A list of proposed discussions topics to shape the focus group discussion has been drafted which is attached as Appendix A This list is based on key issues relating to the

Haringey LONDON

Campsbourne estate raised in discussions with professionals as part of the evidence presented to the panel to date.

8.9 Given their close links with residents on the estate and experience in conducting engagement work of this type, it is proposed that the Homes for Haringey resident's engagement team support recruitment and delivery of the focus groups.

8.10 It is proposed that a minimum of three focus groups should be arranged, one of which is undertaken with Turkish speaking communities on site.

> **It is recommended that the panel agrees:**
> ▪ **The proposed discussion topics for the focus groups as set out in Appendix A**
> ▪ **That Homes for Haringey are engaged to support the recruitment and delivery of the focus groups**

Stage 3 – Reflection on findings of the case study for our corporate approach to social inclusion

8.11 The third stage of the scrutiny review is intended to assess how well our existing corporate plans are addressing the key issues faced in disadvantaged communities and to inform the development of the Council's Fair and Equal Borough delivery plan. Key objectives of this work will be to:
▪ Agree a localised definition of what a Fair and Equal borough means for Haringey
▪ Establish a clear set of priorities
▪ Identify how work to address social exclusion will be embedded within the work of the Corporate Plan priority boards

8.12 The scrutiny panel review is taking place alongside a series of discussions with the Corporate Plan priority boards, reviewing how the boards are contributing to the Fair and Equal Borough theme through their delivery plans. To date initial discussions have been held with Priority 1 Board and Priority 2 Board. These discussions have focussed on:
▪ Reviewing existing plans and indicators where equality targets have been set
▪ Understanding the board's priorities for inclusion and where the board feels resources should be focussed
▪ Identifying where there may be gaps in the coverage of inclusion issues within existing indicators and plans, including where stronger links are needed across the priority boards to address inclusion themes

8.13 It is proposed that stage 3 of the review is structured around the plans of the five delivery boards, with representatives from each board invited to provide evidence to the panel in terms of how their current delivery plans are taking account of the needs of disadvantaged and excluded groups within the borough.

8.14 In advance of these meetings, the panel may wish to agree a list of key lines of enquiry to discuss with each board, including any particular plans/ areas of work they wish to examine in more detail. Based on the evidence received to date by the panel, the following are proposed as potential lines of enquiry:

Priority No.	Potential lines of enquiry
Priority 1	▪ How is the priority board addressing early disadvantage? – including through the development of an early help model ▪ Plans around post 16 transitions – including pre-16 work with schools

Haringey
LONDON

Priority 2	▪ Mental health and employment – further report/ update on the health devolution pilot once local proposals are finalised ▪ How are our current plans targeted at improving the resilience of vulnerable adults?
Priority 3	▪ How are we ensuring access to the borough's key amenities for our disadvantaged communities? ▪ How is our work on gangs and VAWG addressing the needs of disadvantaged groups?
Priority 4	▪ How are our plans around post 16 transitions addressing the needs of disadvantaged groups?– including area skills review, apprenticeships ▪ How are our regeneration plans ensuring benefits are felt by all sections of the community?– including an overview of the Tottenham People programme
Priority 5	▪ How are we looking to improve the experience of low income groups in temporary and private sector accommodation?

It is recommended that the panel agree to hold further evidence gathering sessions for the following:
a) to obtain further evidence to assist the review as identified in 7.4; 7.11; 7.22; 7.28 and 7.35 of this report;
b) to hear from corporate priority leads on how delivery plans are tackling exclusion among disadvantaged groups;
c) to review the evidence received and draw conclusions and recommendations from this work.

9. Contribution to strategic outcomes

9.1 The work of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee will directly contribute to the corporate priorities of the Council, as the resulting conclusions and recommendations will inform the update of the Fair and Equal Borough Strategy and associated action plans.

10. Statutory Officers comments (Chief Finance Officer (including procurement), Assistant Director of Corporate Governance, Equalities)

Finance and Procurement

10.1 This is an interim report setting out the conclusions drawn by the panel so far and setting out next steps. As such there are no financial implications at this stage. Once the panel has made its recommendations there will need to be an assessment of any implications arising from those recommendations and this will be taken into account in the council's response.

Legal

10.2 There are no legal implications arising from the recommendations sought in the report.

Equality

10.3 The Council has a public sector equality duty under the Equalities Act (2010) to have due regard to:
- ▪ Tackle discrimination and victimisation of persons that share the characteristics protected under S4 of the Act. These include the characteristics of age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex (formerly gender) and sexual orientation;

Haringey LONDON

- Advance equality of opportunity between people who share those protected characteristics and people who do not;
- Foster good relations between people who share those characteristics and people who do not.

10.4 Once complete, the work of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee will be expected to reduce inequality and promote social inclusion through:
- Contributing to a localised and widely owned definition for what a Fair and Equal Borough means for Haringey;
- Establishing a clear set of priorities for the borough to focus social inclusion work;
- Developing a sound evidence based approach that underpin social inclusion interventions;
- Identifying how work to address social exclusion is embedded across the Council.

11. Use of Appendices
Appendix A is a draft schedule for focus groups.

12. Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

Appendix A – Outline focus group schedule (DRAFT)

Timing		
2-3 mins	***Introduction and housekeeping:*** • Welcome and thanks for coming • Introduce moderator and scribe • Ensure everyone has completed consent form (explains the purpose of the focus groups, that participation is voluntary, that the session will be recorded and information provided will not be identifiable)	
1min	**Outline some rules of engagement:** • It's important that everyone participates and everyone's contribution is respected • Information provided in the focus group must be kept confidential • Turn-off mobile phones if possible	
2-3 mins	***Purpose*** • Who we are and what we're trying to do • What will be done with this information • Why we asked you to participate The purpose of this focus group is to help us to understand the experiences of people living on the Campsbourne estate. At today's session we particularly want to explore: • How you feel about the area where you live • The key issues which you feel affect your quality of life • Your access to services, opportunities and places within the borough and beyond • Your aspirations and what affects your ability to achieve these As participants to introduce themselves and confirm how long they have lived on the Campsbourne.	
	Any questions.....	
15-20 mins	**Discussion topic 1 (Quality of life)** What it's like living in Campsbourne: • What makes an area a good place to live? • What are some of the positive things about living on the Campsbourne estate/in Haringey borough? • What are some things that aren't so good about this as a place to live? Wellbeing: • What are the most important things that contribute to health and wellbeing?	

Haringey
LONDON

	• What are the most important things that you think would improve your own health and wellbeing?	
15-20 mins	**Discussion topic 2 (Access to opportunities)** Access to opportunities: • What opportunities/ services do you regularly access? • What services do you feel have made the biggest difference to your quality of life/ wellbeing and why? Accessing opportunities outside of the immediate area: • To what extent do you feel able to access services/ opportunities/ public spaces across the borough? Explain. • Do you access services/ opportunities outside of Haringey? If not, why not? • Are there opportunities/ services/ places you don't feel you can access and if so, why not? • Do you engage in any community activities? If not, why not?	
15-20 mins	**Discussion topic 3 (social inclusion/ resilience/ aspirations)** • What does success look like for you? • What are your current aspirations? – For you/ for your family? • What do you think helps you most to achieve these (goals)? • What do you stops or limits you from achieving these (goals)?	
	Closing questions: Of all the things discussed today what to you is the most important?	

Haringey
LONDON