AGENDA ITEM 6
Refresh of Community Safety Partnership arrangements 2015
Recommendations Paper
Community Safety Partnership – Statutory Officer Group – 22nd July

1. Introduction

The CSP (CSP) arrangements were last reviewed in 2012/13 and the recommendations agreed in March 2013 and implemented from 1st April 2013. Since this time there have been a number of developments and challenges, which mean that a light touch review of the Community Safety Partnership is needed. The aim is to ensure:

- The partnership arrangements enable us to fulfil our statutory duties.
- Full coverage of the priorities and themes in the Community Safety Plan.
- A sub-group, project and short-life task group structure designed to deliver and report back on these priorities in a systematic way.
- Appropriate links with other statutory partnership boards – the Health and Wellbeing Board; the City and Hackney Children’s Safeguarding Board and the City and Hackney Adult Safeguarding Board.

This paper makes recommendations about the structure of the partnership, the reporting and tasking arrangements and about the membership of the Statutory Officer Group and new proposed CRP. It also provides pointer to roles for members of the group.

The recommendations are aligned with other strands of partnership activity:

- The refreshed Community Safety strategic assessment
- The new governance arrangements for children and young people’s services
- The identification of shared priorities between the Health and Wellbeing Board, the City and Hackney Local Children’s Safeguarding Board and the City and Hackney Local Adult Safeguarding Board.

The CSP SOG is asked to agree in principle the recommended structure; reporting and tasking arrangements and the membership, subject to comments from the wider group and input from Cabinet members about the join-up of priorities.

The next steps are:

- To seek further input from Cabinet members about join-up across partnership Boards and comments from the CSP wider group over the summer, so that by September we will have adopted the new arrangements.
- To develop Terms of Reference for the SOG and the CRP.
2. Business case

The justification for this review centres on the statutory responsibilities of the Community Safety Partnership and its key role in the accountability structures for partnership work in Hackney. The CSP has oversight of Community Safety Plan and is responsible for ensuring that key statutory responsibilities are met. Partnership governance arrangements in Hackney mean that the CSP is the ultimate accountable body for Community Safety priorities and statutory duties.

Since the 2013 review there have been a number of development and challenges, which mean there is a need for a review and discussions with stakeholders have been focused on these changes and challenges:

- Fundamental service reviews have taken place for domestic violence and abuse and the drugs and alcohol abuse services (DAAT). Both these are sub-groups of the Community Safety Partnership, supporting the delivery of the Community Safety Plan reporting to the CSP.
- New legislation and statutory guidance under the Counter-Terrorism and Extremism Act setting out local expectations about preventing people from becoming involved in terrorism, which means that the sub-group arrangements for Prevent need to be reviewed to ensure delivery of the new expectations.
- Short-life task groups including the young black men task group and the domestic violence and abuse review have reported to the CSP. A standing group of the partnership has been established, the Community Tensions monitoring group, to provide updates in relation to cohesion and hate crime.
- There have been changes to the delivery of probation services with the splitting of the service into two parts - the National Probation Service for high risk offenders and the Community Rehabilitation Company (CRC).
- The Community Safety Plan is being refreshed. There is therefore a need to review the partnership to take account of the above developments and to ensure that the arrangements are able to support the delivery of the Plan as laid down in statute.
- There is also a need to revisit and strengthen the relationship with scrutiny to ensure regular performance reporting on the Community Safety Plan to the Social Inclusion Scrutiny Committee by the SOG, also laid down in statute.

3 Stakeholder engagement

Draft proposals for the new structure (see Appendix attached) were tested with a small number of Hackney stakeholders:

- Head of Safer Communities LBH
- AD for LBH Children and Young People’s Services
- Hackney and City Children’s Safeguarding Board adviser
- CSSI scrutiny support officer
- Head of Service Public Health
• Co-Chairs Community Safety Partnership – Borough Commander and CE LBH
• LBH Deputy Mayor and Cabinet Member for Crime and Community Safety.

Discussions were also held with two other London Boroughs - the London Borough of Lambeth and the London Borough of Newham to test the proposed arrangements. A note of these discussions is available on request.

The Community Safety Partnership wider group have had the opportunity to raise issues to inform the review at the wider group meeting on 10th June 2015, and to submit any further thoughts following the meeting. There is a further opportunity to comment following in principle agreement by the SOG, before the arrangements are adopted from 1st September 2015.

Key points raised

The general view from the wider group partnership meeting and individual comments was that the partnership works well with excellent engagement from most partners. There was general agreement that the refresh of the community safety priorities; the new Prevent statutory responsibilities; and the conclusion of the in-depth service reviews for domestic violence and abuse and drug and alcohol abuse services all provide a good opportunity to review the partnership structures.

Reporting and tasking

It was agreed that we need to build on the existing performance reporting and forward planning for partnership meetings to ensure that a system for systematic reporting and tasking against the priorities in the refreshed plan is in place and that we are able to comply with our other statutory duties. There was a strong feeling that reporting expectations need to be tight to avoid issues falling through the net. There was a shared concern about the limited capacity of officers to attend meetings in a context where capacity is ever-diminishing.

There was a consensus about the proposed model of a small number of sub-groups and the concept of short-life task groups, commissioned by the SOG, to respond to emerging issues which need action. There was also an appetite for one-off events, like the recent Gangs Summit, to re-inforce engagement by partners and explore new areas for innovation.

Focus on drivers to prevent crime and disorder

The proposal for greater space for the partnership to focus on prevention, considering how to better address the drivers of crime and disorder, such as mental health and alcohol and substance misuse, was generally welcome. There was agreement that effective prevention has the potential to reduce pressure on budgets in the longer term, however stakeholders flag the risk to budgets for preventative work in the current financial climate. There was agreement that the SOG and the proposed CRP, which would focus on prevention, need to work closely together.
Joint priorities

The Co-Chairs of the Community Safety Partnership have in place a high level framework for ensuring join-up of shared priorities with the Health and Wellbeing Board; the Hackney and City Local Children’s Safeguarding Board and Adult Safeguarding Boards. This involves regular meetings between the Chairs of all four Statutory Boards.

There was a difference of opinion when it comes to how different partnership boards and groups should work together when it comes to shared priorities, like mental health; preventing extremism; child sexual exploitation and domestic violence and abuse.

One view expressed is that the chairs of the Community Safety Partnership sub-groups are invited to other relevant boards where there are shared priorities. For example the chairs of the Domestic Violence and Abuse and prevent sub-groups would be invited to the Local Children’s Safeguarding Board to account for the focus on children and young people in CSP work.

A counter view is the “cross-over in membership model”, where those officers whose membership of Boards and sub-groups cross-over have responsibility for joining-up shared priorities. In a context where capacity is limited it is recommended that this model is adopted (see recommendations for the SOG).

Another suggestion was that the role of the CRP could be extended to underpin other partnership boards, including the statutory Health and Wellbeing Board, the City and Hackney Adult Safeguarding and Children Safeguarding Boards. The rationale is that the issues which drive crime are often the same issues which underlie the work of other boards, for example the complex needs of families that make multiple and repeated demands on services. This model for joining-up of preventative, underlying issues merits further consideration.
Outline of the proposed partnership arrangements

These recommendations present an arrangement that is flexible and as light touch as possible in terms of bureaucracy and resources whilst enabling the CSP to fulfil our statutory and strategic commitments. This requires a flexible approach to Partnership activity, but with sufficient level of structure and formality to maintain transparency and accountability and enable a number of perspectives to shape the priorities and actions of the CSP.

Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statutory Officer Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The Statutory Officer Group (SOG) is responsible for discharging the statutory duties of the CSP, setting strategy and challenging on performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A small number of sub-groups will be responsible for delivery of the priorities in the plan, reporting to the SOG on a regular basis. Short-life task groups will be commissioned by the SOG where performance issues/trends are identified as requiring review and action. One-off events about issues that need more focus will also be held.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Agenda planning for meetings will build on existing Forward Planning, with agenda items focused on the different priorities in the plan and will set out expectations about issues to cover, format of the report (written/verbal) and the lead officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Membership will remain as at present, comprising the ‘Responsible Authorities’. A CCG representative will be invited to join the group, in line with revisions in Schedule 5 paragraph 84 of the Health and Social Care Act 2012. Each member of the group is responsible for discharging the statutory duties of the CSP, setting strategy and challenging on performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Where there is cross-over of membership between Boards individual members will be responsible for making the links required to join-up priorities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible authorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police – Borough Commander – Simon Laurence – Co-Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Authority – Chief Executive – Tim Shields – Co-Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire and Rescue – Borough Commander – Steve Dudeney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation – NPS – Stuart Webber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation – CRC/MTC Novo – Linda Niemantas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Commissioning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected member responsible for Community Safety</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supported by:

| Assistant Director CYPS – Sheila Durr |
| Head of Safer Communities - Steve Bending. |
| Public Health – Director Public Health – Penny Bevan |

Others

| Others to advise as needed. |

Meeting frequency – 4 times a year
**Community Resilience Partnership**

1. The Community Safety Partnership – wider group will be renamed the Community Resilience Partnership (CRP). The agenda of the CRP will be more focused on prevention providing a space to problem-solve underlying issues which drive crime and disorder. Note: the SOG will continue to fulfil its statutory duty to consult the community on the levels and patterns of crime and disorder by ensuring that this duty is discharged by the CRP.

2. Strengthen the relationship between the SOG and CRP by having a regular update at SOG highlighting issues for discussion and action.

3. Further consideration will be given to an extended remit for the CRP underpinning other Partnership Boards.

4. The Chair of the CRP will attend the joint meeting between Chairs of the CSP, H&WB and the Children’s and Adult Safeguarding Board.

5. **Membership:** membership of the CRP will remain broadly as present. The CEN will be invited to nominate a second representative. A number of representatives will continue to be optional members – who are asked to attend when a particular issue is being discussed. The Assistant Chief Executive is added to this list.

**Members:**
- Cllr Linden – Chair
- CE LBH - Tim Shields
- Borough Commander MPS - Simon Laurence
- Borough Commander LFS - Steve Dudeney
- Probation NPS - Stuart Webber
- Probation CRC/MT Novo - Linda Niemantas
- Clinical Commissioning Group
- Penny Bevan – Public Health
- AD CYPS - Sheila Durr
- HLT - Anne Canning
- Assistant Principal Hackney College - Sylvan Dewing
- East London Mental Health Trust - Dean Henderson
- Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods - Cllr Feryal Demerci
- GLA Member - Jeannette Arnold
- Thames Magistrates Court - Justice Clerk
- CE HCVS - Jake Ferguson
- CEN - Jeanette Collins
- Additional CEN member
- Reuben Tapper – Chair SNB

**Optional members:** required to attend when a particular issue is being discussed
- Prevent Co-ordinator - Tracey Thomas
- Children’s Safeguarding Board Adviser - Rory Mcallum
- Adult Safeguarding Board Representative – Rob Blackstone.
- Housing representative
- Regeneration
- Planning
- Assistant Chief Executive
- Others as needed

**Meeting frequency** – 2 or 3 times a year
The relationship with scrutiny

It was generally felt that the relationship with the Community Safety and Social Inclusion (CSSI) scrutiny committee needs to be as effective and efficient as possible, whilst giving assurance the CSSI is able to fulfil its statutory responsibility to scrutinise the decisions made and action taken by the Community Safety Partnership. The proposal for strengthening and streamlining the relationship with scrutiny around reporting on the progress with the Community Safety Plan met with general approval.

Recommendations

1. Reports on the Community Safety Plan will be taken bi-annually to the CSSI.
2. As an interim measure written reports about the police MOPAC 7 indicators and Stop and Search and Use of Tasers will be produced for the SOG and CRP respectively and passed to scrutiny
3. The Borough Commander will attend scrutiny annually to report separately about police performance
The purpose and priorities of Hackney's CSP

To meet the statutory duties of Community Safety Partnerships and London Borough of Hackney's strategic commitments

A. Statutory Duties

Statutory Duties

The 2006 review of the Crime and Disorder Act and subsequent amendments to legislation resulted in an approach to CSPs that is more flexible and allows more local discretion. However, there remain some key statutory responsibilities which must be met. These are:

- A ‘strategy’ group to be made up of senior representatives from the ‘Responsible Authorities’
- To prepare, implement and performance manage an evidence-led annual strategic assessment and three-yearly partnership plan for the reduction of crime and disorder in the area
- To consult the community on the levels and patterns of crime, disorder and substance misuse and on matters that need to be prioritised by the partnership.
- To reduce reoffending
- To coordinate Domestic Homicide Reviews
- To share information among the responsible authorities within the CSP
- To have a crime and disorder scrutiny committee with the power to review and scrutinise decisions made and action taken by the CSP.
- To assess value for money of partnership activities.

B. LBH Strategic Commitments

Community Safety Plan

Priorities

Gang Crime, Youth Crime and Disorder, Victimisation and Engagement
Alcohol Related Crime and Disorder, Licensing and Safer Socialising
Nuisance Neighbours and Domestic Noise
Burglary, Pedal Cycle Theft and Cycle Safety
Domestic Abuse including Violence Against Women and Girls
Substance Misuse, Treatment and Drug Dealing.

---

1 Police, Local authority, Fire and Rescue, Health, Probation, Elected member responsible for Community Safety
Underlying and cross-cutting issues identified for the refreshed Plan

Mental health

Regeneration, Planning and Housing

Reducing Re-Offending

Substance misuse

Prevention of Terrorism

Prevention of Crime and Disorder (duty on Las under S17 of the Crime and Disorder Act

**Sustainable Community Strategy and Review**

*Sustainable Community Strategy and Sustainable Community Strategy Review*

Hackney’s Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS) is our shared vision for the local area for the next 10 years. It sets out our vision and priorities from 2008-2018. The Review of the SCS recommends that the Partnership remain focused on efforts to reduce crime and keep streets and public spaces cleaner and better maintained. It also recommends that the partnership consider developing a process to improve the collection, monitoring and measurement of community tensions and risks to community safety.

**Equality legislation and Hackney’s Equality Objectives:**

- Deliver actions which aim to narrow the gap in outcomes between certain disadvantaged groups and the wider community
- Improve the way we listen to our residents and respond to service users' feedback to improve services
- Foster good relations by building a strong sense of community, neighbourliness and pride.