

Recommended Item from the Scrutiny Committee held on 23rd March 2010

844. POLICY AND PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT GROUPS

1) Progress on Reviews

(d) PPMG4

The Chair of PPMG4 presented the report of the first annual Community Safety Review which PPMG 4 had undertaken. This was now a statutory function for Scrutiny Committee. She thanked the officers involved for all their hard work.

It was noted that most of those interviewed had raised public perception of crime as an issue. The Head of Community and Street Services noted that an improvement plan had been formulated to improve Anti Social Behaviour perception with minimum standards which were to be monitored by GOEM.

Moved by Councillor M. Dooley and seconded by Councillor S. Peake
RECOMMENDED that (1) the Executive approve the Community Safety Review,

(2) Legal Services and the Community Safety Officer work with Inspector Ian Palfreyman to produce some standard terms of reference for working groups,

(3) Members of the new Safe and Inclusive Communities Scrutiny Committee consider the areas for possible Community Safety Review and choose one to put on their work plan.

(Solicitor to the Council/Head of Democratic Services)

Committee:	Scrutiny Committee	Agenda Item No.:	10 (2) (d)
Date:	23rd March 2010	Category	
Subject:	Annual Review of Community Safety	Status	Open
Report by:	PPMG4		
Other Officers involved:	Head of Community and Street Services Housing Enforcement Manager Community Safety Officer Democratic Services Officer		
Director	Solicitor to the Council		
Relevant Portfolio Holder	Councillor B.R. Murray-Carr, Portfolio Holder for Community Safety		

RELEVANT CORPORATE AIMS

COMMUNITY SAFETY – Ensuring that communities are safe and secure

There is a statutory duty for Local Authorities to carry out an annual review of Community Safety Partnership.

TARGETS

The report covers the following targets within the Corporate Plan:

1. Tackle Anti Social Behaviour (ASB) and its causes.
2. Assist everyone in feeling safe and secure at home and outdoors.
3. Reduce levels of crime in the district.

By scrutinising the work of the Community Safety Partnership.

VALUE FOR MONEY

Not Applicable

THE REPORT

Please see attached.

ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

As outlined in the attached report

IMPLICATIONS

Financial : None

Legal : None

Human Resources : None

RECOMMENDATIONS to the Executive

1. That Legal Services and the Community Safety Officer work with Inspector Ian Palfreyman to produce some standard terms of reference for working groups.
2. That members of the new Safe and Inclusive Communities Scrutiny Committee consider the areas for possible Community Safety Review and choose one to put on their work plan.

ATTACHMENT: **Y**
FILE REFERENCE:
SOURCE DOCUMENT:

Scrutiny Review of Community Safety

By

**Bolsover District
Council**

January/February 2010

Contents

	Page
Foreword	3
Introduction	4
Scope of the Review	5
Key Findings	5
Issues Being Considered in Other Areas	6
Possible Subjects to Consider for Review in 2010/11	8
Conclusion	8
Recommendations	9
Appendix 1	10
Appendix 2	11

Foreword by Councillor Mary Dooley Chair of the Review Panel

This is a new approach to our reviews of the future short, sharp, task and finish.

The aim of our review was to learn about the involvement of the responsible authorities, and other partners indirectly linked to this partnership.

The partners we interviewed were:

Christine Flinton DCC

Inspector Ian Palfreyman Derbyshire Police C Division

Jo Selby Community Safety Officer BDC

Cllr Brian Murray-Carr Community Safety Portfolio holder
BDC

John Ritchie, Head of Community and Street Services

Steve Helps, Derbyshire Fire and Rescue

Julie Lewis Neighbourhood Management Project Co-ordinator BDC

We have gathered their information to be able to formulate their ideas and put them into practice for other reviews 2010/2011. The comments during the interviews indicated that the input from Bolsover District Council to this partnership were excellent.

My thanks must go to Sandra Peake and Jim Smith for their valued contribution throughout this review. Also to Sarah Sternberg, Solicitor to the Council, Adele Whyllie, Trainee Solicitor and Abby Brownsword, Democratic Services Officer for their assistance and advice.

Mary Dooley Chair of PPMG4

1 Introduction

This is the first year that Scrutiny members have been statutorily required to review the work of the Community Safety Partnership (CSP). It has therefore been an intense information gathering and learning exercise by the members involved in the review. This has set up members well for the review next year by the new safe and inclusive Communities Scrutiny Committee.

The intention – as expressed in the scope – is to identify a review topic for next year. This would need to be a topic that will add value and assist the work of the CSP. This has not been easy in view of the work and high reputation of the CSP, particularly amongst partners.

Community Safety is one of the Council's 6 corporate aims and is therefore very important in terms of the Council achieving its objectives and making a real difference to the people of Bolsover District's area.

2 Scope of the Review

2.1 The review aimed to learn about the different roles of the Responsible Authorities and other Partners in the Community Safety Partnership and to formulate ideas for the Community Safety Review in 2010/11.

2.2 The review panel comprised the following members:

Councillor M. Dooley (Chair) - PPMG4

Councillor J.E. Smith - PPMG4

Councillor S. Peake - PPMG4

The review panel was supported by the following officers:

Sarah Sternberg - Solicitor to the Council

Adele Wylie - Trainee Solicitor

3 Key Findings

Strengths

- 3.1 Partners felt that the Community Safety Partnership was well organised, forward thinking and proactive with a keen and active Portfolio Holder. Strong leadership is being shown. The Partnership has been held out as an example of good practice by the Chief Constable of Derbyshire Police.
- 3.2 Partner interviewees confirmed that the Community Safety Team at Bolsover District Council has very good working relationships with other Partners.
- 3.3 The CAN Rangers were a good resource and were the visible authority on the street and link to the Police. They also provided an integral link to the CSP and its action Plan and were described by 2 interviewees as an invaluable asset to the CSP.
- 3.4 The Authority was at the forefront of new techniques and was the first District Council in the area to obtain Dispersal Orders and one of the first to obtain ASBOs. It was also engaged with partners on a number of diverse projects such as YES, (the Youth Engagement Scheme) with the fire service which is targeted at potential arsonists/ ASB.
- 3.5 There has been a year on year reduction in crime, most notably in serious acquisitive crime and violent crime. This is reflected in the results for NIs 16 and 20. These crimes have the largest number of crimes being committed but are the best performing in terms of reductions in numbers of crimes over the years.
- 3.6 It was felt that Community Safety was well embedded at Bolsover District Council, though no evidence was presented to confirm this view. **As stated above,**

community safety is one of the Council's 6 corporate aims.

- 3.7 It was felt that it was beneficial to have a Community Safety Sergeant based in Sherwood Lodge, as a visible part of the partnership.

Areas for Further Improvement

- 3.8 The public perception of Anti-Social Behaviour in the Bolsover District Council was that there is a problem with crime. This came out in the Place Survey results. This perception is not based on actual crime rates. Further education and publicity was necessary in order to change the perception of Anti-Social Behaviour.
- 3.9 It was felt that the Community Safety Team spent so much time working to lower crime and Anti-Social Behaviour rates that they did not take the time to publicise their successes often enough.
- 3.10 It was felt by interviewees that information sharing was good, although this could be improved.
- 3.11 More input from Parish and Town Councils was necessary, especially in the light of their responsibility under Section 17. Perhaps more directed engagement with the Parishes on community safety was also required.

4 Issues to be considered in Other Areas

4.1 Poor Perception of Anti-Social Behaviour

The poor perception of Anti-Social Behaviour was being actively dealt with by the CSP and the Council, assisted by the ASB Squad from GOEM. An Anti-Social Behaviour Delivery Improvement Plan has just been produced which has outlined the tasks/initiatives Bolsover District Council and the CSP intend to undertake in the next few months to address the issue of poor Anti-Social Behaviour perception. A large part of the Improvement Plan was the publication of Anti-Social Behaviour - Minimum - Standards of Response by 31st March 2010.

PPMG4 noted concern from a number of interviewees over the effectiveness of the publicity being carried out to reduce the perceptions of crime. The PPMG noted work was being carried out to improve this. This should be looked at to see what progress had been made at the next review.

4.2 Budget Uncertainties

Much of the Community Safety money comes through Derbyshire County Council and the Local Area Agreements. Money is split between the 8 Derbyshire authorities for serious acquisitive crime, it also includes £30,000 for an Anti-Social Behaviour Officer (this post is incorporated within the role of the Tenancy Enforcement Manager) and £25,000 to be spent on projects to do with Community Safety.

There is Home Office funding for one more year for the Senior Parenting Practitioner and one more year from the PCT for the Domestic Violence Officer. It looks certain that for 2011/12, there will be no more funding for the Senior Parenting Practitioner or the Domestic Violence Officer and the £30,000 for the

ASB Officer and the £25,000 for projects will also be withdrawn.

All the posts feature heavily in Bolsover District Council's Corporate Plan and the Council will need to prioritise where it spends its money. It should also be noted that Community Safety gives a lot of funding to Leisure Services for outreach work and diversionary activities. This may also cease as funds are cut.

Both the Council and the CSP will have to review budgets for future years.

4.3 Review into CAN Rangers

A review into the work of the CAN Rangers is currently being carried out by the Head of Community and Street Services and the Tenancy Enforcement Manager. This will be reported to Executive.

5 Possible subjects to Consider for Review in 2010/11

- 5.1. The importance given to the Community Safety role within the partners in the CSP other than the responsible authorities and whether there is sufficient input by these partners.
- 5.2. The views of external organisations e.g. Citizens Panel, tenants groups, community associations, businesses, Parish and Town Councils and other groups should be sought. This may occur as part of the ASB improvement plan.
- 5.3. Review the response of Bolsover District Council departments to Section 17 and how far section 17 is embedded in day to day business.
- 5.4. Review the involvement of Parish and Town Councils in the CSP.

- 5.5. Review the outcomes achieved from implementing the ASB improvement plan in 6 months time.
- 5.6. Review the relationship with the LSP to see if stronger and more practical links can be made.

6 Conclusion

The Partnership is well regarded by partners and is achieving clear outcomes in some areas – for example in relation to serious acquisitive crime. As would be expected from a CSP that is performing well and is well established, the CSP is also taking action to improve itself. The ASB improvement plan that has just been produced and the CSP improvement plan are both evidence of this.

7. Recommendations

- 7.1 That Legal Services and the Community Safety Officer work with Inspector Ian Palfreyman to produce some standard terms of reference for working groups.**
- 7 That members of the new Safe and Inclusive communities Scrutiny Committee consider the areas for possible Community safety review and choose one to put on their work plan.**

Appendix1 - Methodology

Although not strictly a 'Spotlight Review', this review had many of the same features. The review process was intensive and completed over a short period of time by a small panel of 3 Scrutiny Committee Members. The approach centred on gathering evidence via 'interviews' and discussions with officers, members and other stakeholders. The review was not intended to provide a detailed analysis, but to identify quick wins. The review process can be summarised as:

Stage 1 - A briefing meeting to consider the evidence gathering session and formulate a list of stakeholders.

Stage 2 - A short programme of evidence gathering sessions including interviews with officers, members and stakeholders.

Stage 3 - A short report drafted in consultation/conjunction with the panel chair and service officers. The report contains a summary of key strengths, areas for improvement and recommendations.

Stage 4 - A final meeting of the Policy and Performance Management Group to agree the report before its submission to Senior Management Team, Scrutiny Committee and the Executive.

Appendix 2 - List of Stakeholders Engaged During the Review Process

Bolsover District Council

Jo Selby, Community Safety Officer

John Ritchie, Head of Community and Street Services

Julie Lewis, Neighbourhood Management Project Officer

Councillor Brian Murray-Carr, Portfolio Holder for Community Safety.

Derbyshire County Council

Christine Flinton, Assistant Community Safety Officer

Derbyshire Police

Inspector Ian Palfreyman

Derbyshire Fire and Rescue

Steve Helps, Group Manager of the Prevention Department, North Area