

# TEST VALLEY COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP

Date: 19<sup>th</sup> July 2007

<b>Title of paper</b> : Plans for a County Co-ordinating Body for Community Safety	
<b>Prepared by:</b> Jamie O'Reilly	
<b>Present at meeting:</b> Yes	
<b>Leading partner/s:</b> All	
<b>Summary of content and issues raised:</b> The report sets out the progress in the development of a County Co-ordinating Body for Community Safety	
<b>Recommendations:</b>  i) That the Board acknowledges these developments and endorses the recommendation at the end of the report.	
<b>Financial and HR Implications – None</b>	
<b>Promotion of Equality &amp; Diversity – None</b>	
Purpose of paper (tick)	Decision
	Discussion & comment
	Information
	√

**REPORT OF COMMUNITY SAFETY MANAGER**

**COUNTY CO-ORDINATING BODY FOR COMMUNITY SAFETY THE  
CRIME AND DISORDER ACT REVIEW**

**1 BACKGROUND**

On 25<sup>th</sup> April 2007 the Test Valley Community Safety Partnership considered a report that presented some key elements of the Home Office proposals for Crime and Disorder Partnership reforms, which had emerged in correspondence.

One of these elements was the requirement in two tier authority areas, to establish a County wide Co-ordinating body for community safety. Another was the requirement for CDRP's to produce annual 'strategic assessments'.

These developments have become intrinsically linked to a separate development relating to CDRP finance which began at the beginning of April 2006 and saw Safer Stronger Communities Funds being incorporated into the Local Area Agreement Single Pot. Whilst the arrangements for the first two year's would see this largely passed on almost automatically to district CDRP's, it was recognised that this arrangement would cease from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2008. The mechanism for distributing these funds from that date has not been agreed but it is recognised that the funds will be allocated in a way that helps to maximise the delivery of LAA objectives and that the new county co-ordinating body for Community Safety would probably be best placed to address these matters.

**2 PROGRESS SINCE APRIL 2007**

The day before our last Partnership Board meeting, a number of representatives of the Board and Test Valley Borough Council met in Alton with their counterparts from the other Hampshire districts.

The meeting was held to consider the first steps in the development of the County wide co-ordinating body. Key issues which arose were; representation on the Board, the terms of reference, the nature of the commissioning role, the approach to strategic assessments and the relationship with the Local Area Agreement Executive.

Since the event Test Valley representatives provided feedback to the organisers of the Alton event and in turn a draft document collating outcomes has been circulated by the County Council's Policy Section. (see Appendix 1).

There have now been some further developments with a meeting on 9<sup>th</sup> July in Winchester, organised by New Forest District Council. At this meeting, consultant Dr Sohail Hussein provided a presentation outlining his interpretation of just published related statutory instruments, 1830 and 1831. It appears that these have now gone some way to answering a number of questions.

The key points appear to be:

- Representation on county group must include all CDRP Chairs, the County portfolio holder for Community Safety and senior representatives of all proper authorities.
- Strategic assessments are to be carried out at a district level along lines set out therein.
- District CDRP's will develop a Partnership Plan (3 year).
- District CDRP's will develop a strategy group (distinguishing strategic from operational).
- The County co-ordinating group will develop a County Community Safety Agreement. (Although the relationship between this and the Local Area Agreement is not specified.)

The following conclusions emerged at the event after extensive discussion.

1. There are a number of partners who will need to provide county wide data to each of the districts and that it would be best if they were identified as soon as possible and approached by a single point of contact from the Partnership Analysts group.
2. When we discussed priorities, we needed to be clear that we are talking about priority problems/crimes/needs as opposed to priority solutions. Also that there we could foresee three different types of priority emerging from the strategic assessments, ones which were shared priorities that were clearly best addressed at a County level, a second group which related to local priorities which might be shared to some extent with others and a third group

which could only really be considered and dealt with locally.

3. It would be helpful to agree criteria, possibly a matrix which would help us to take a consistent approach to identifying and channelling our priorities before moving into action planning.
4. There are serious difficulties with timelines for this process and it was felt that it would be desirable to have the strategic assessment process completed by around December 2007. However, this means that priorities would not be agreed before this date and effectively action planning could only properly begin after this. This would belong after any of the local authorities and indeed other partners would be in a position to consider budgeting for contingency arrangements in respect of existing community safety partnership projects and work which may not receive funding after April 2008. It was suggested that an early agreement by the Local Area Agreement Executive to 'ring-fence' a certain sum for each community safety partnership, would serve two essential purposes. Firstly, it would provide a figure, on which they could develop contingency plans and budgets as necessary. Secondly, it would minimise any loss of performance due to early loss of staff and interruption of projects which might ultimately, in any case emerge from the new planning processes as agreed actions.
5. The new statutory instruments requirements proscribe only the minimum standards.

### **3 THE COUNTY PRACTITIONER'S FORUM AND THE NEXT STEPS**

The County Community Safety Practitioner's forum met on 11th July where these points were picked up again in the light of the two key considerations;

The County Community Safety Co-ordinating group will not meet again until late September.

It will be too late to address the question of contingency planning and budgets for 2008/09.

#### 4 **RECOMMENDATIONS**

It is proposed that the Test Valley Community Safety Partnership board endorses the following conclusions which were drawn at the Community Safety Practitioner's forum meeting on 11<sup>th</sup> July 2007.

- 4.1 A request should be made to the Local Area Agreement Executive Board that in order to minimise the risk of a loss of momentum when moving from this year's planning arrangements into next year's, then a fixed revenue figure amounting to 50% of current 'District' SSCF revenue allocations being fenced to District CDRP's for 2008/09.
- 4.2 All proper authorities including local authorities, should this year consider how the community safety agenda has developed in recent years and in recognition of these developments, seek to formally mainstream those functions which have in effect become mainstream.

#### APPENDIX 1

1	<b>County-co-ordinating Group for Community Safety</b>
2	<b>25 May 2007 – The Maltings, Alton</b>

#### ***Attendance***

[Click here](#)

#### ***Presentations***

[Community safety in Hampshire – Time for County Co-ordination? - Andrew Lloyd](#)  
[Expectations of a county coordinating group - Dick Oldfield](#)

#### ***Workshop outputs***

[Workshop Outputs](#)

#### ***Proposal based on outcomes***

The key outcome from the event was that there is a clear role for a County co-ordinating group – a draft proposal based on the discussion is as follows:

#### **Draft objectives of a county co-ordinating group:**

- To oversee a strategic community safety assessment for the county

- To agree outcomes and targets for the community safety of the Hampshire LAA, having regard to local need thus re-plement of placing the current LAA Priority EDelivery Group
- To act as a strategic commissioning group for activities which will deliver LAA targets and deliver performance against the relevant wider indicators in the new national outcome framework (200i indicator to be announced)
- To manage performance and account to the LAA Board accordingly
- To make the case for allocation of LAA Grant and wider pooled partner resources
- To influence partner agencies to mainstream community safety (section 17)
- To provide a stronger link between district and county partner agencies and to address the effectiveness of partner contributions at all levels based on CDRP self assessments
- To strengthen the lobbying capacity for partners in relation to resources, enabling measures and policy direction at regional and national level.
- To identify and promulgate "what works"
- To liaise with neighbouring LAAs outside Hampshire on issues requiring cross-boundary working

**Composition of the county co-ordination group**

- The Group should err on the side of inclusivity to begin with and seek to reduce in terms of representation as trust builds.
- The core of the group should mirror CDRPs in terms of the involvement of responsible agencies under the Crime and Disorder Act: Local Authorities, Police and Fire Authorities, Constabulary, PCT.
- All Local Authorities (county and districts should be presented) unless a District Council chooses to agree otherwise with CDRP locally on representation from the area. The agreed district representatives should have the authority to take decisions on behalf of the CDRP and District Council.
- The group may consider arrangements for the attendance of wider partners on a standing basis (probably non-voting) or "by invitation." (eg RSLs, Probation, VCS).
- The group should seek to agree representation from other key partnerships (eg Local Criminal Justice Board, Drug and Alcohol Action team, Youth Offending Team)
- Agreements should generally be by unanimity but a vote in balance will need to be discussed and agreed
- The group should agree the arrangements for appointment of the Chair, mindful of the need for a strong link to the overarching LAA Board.

## ***Next steps***

- It was agreed that these draft proposals should be circulated to all CDRPs and partners for comment. Comments should be returned to: [policy.unit@hants.gov.uk](mailto:policy.unit@hants.gov.uk) **by July 13 07.**
- Dependent on the response to this proposal, it is intended that a target date for the inaugural meeting of the group be set for before the end of July 07.
- The inaugural meeting should consider the detailed regulations when available (expected from Home Office Summer 07) and detailed constitution and terms of reference.
- In the meantime, work on the strategic assessment might be pursued via the Community Safety Managers and Constabulary.
- The issue of elected Member representation needs to be further considered by HCC and District Councils in the light of work for governance around the LAA.