



Report for:	Community Safety Partnership	Item Number:	
Title:	Community Safety Review -Haringey		
Report Authorised by:	CSP/		
Lead Officer:	Stephen McDonnell		
Ward(s) affected: ALL	Report for Key/Non Key Decisions:		

1. Describe the issue under consideration

- 1.1 This report sets out the summary of the findings of the Community Safety Review carried out over a six week period.
- 1.2 The purpose of the review was to consider strengths and weaknesses of the Community Safety Partnership in Haringey. The review highlights the good work that is taking place in the Borough; consider issues such as good practice in other boroughs, any synergies or duplication of effort and offers quick wins and recommendations for the partnership to take forward. The review provides an opportunity to highlight issues that have not been picked up elsewhere since the structure in the police and council has changed. The scope of the project is set out below:-
 - To meet with all CSP partners and senior officers across the Council to achieve an understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of current arrangements and what actions are required to improve the partnership;
 - To review the CSP's strategic objectives to ensure that they reflect the borough's current priorities and reflect best practice when compared to other partnerships facing similar issues;



- To review the CSP to ensure that it fulfils its duties and potential, incorporating best practice from other partnerships;
- To identify quick wins where through synergies the partnership could combine resources to deliver clear actions;
- To explore the potential for further integrated working and joint resource allocation; and
- To recommend how Haringey MPS, Haringey Council and other partners can be more effective in engaging and communicating with its residents.

1.3 The report is written so that key points under each of the areas in the scope are addressed separately and recommendations, actions and quick wins are identified.

2.0 Recommendations

2.1 The details which support the recommendations are set out in the report in response to each area of the review's scope. Below are the key recommendations from the report:

- That the CSP hold a half day work shop to build relationships across the partnership with the purpose of understanding the aims, objectives and challenges faced by each of the partner agencies.
- That the CSP agree the vision for the partnership and ensure that it is communicated to all stakeholders, partners and the community.
- That the CSP decide what core business is and therefore what should be core funded to reduce crime and the fear of crime.
- That the CSP agree next steps which includes work on evaluating where further support can be offered from across the partnership to achieve improved performance by identifying improved synergies.
- That the CSP are kept abreast of the National and Regional issues to ensure it is aware of and addresses any announcements that may have strategic implications for the partnership.
- That a communications strategy be agreed by the partnership with an events calendar in place. This is to include improved communication within the partnership.
- That information about the partnerships achievements are feed back to the community and wider partnership.



- The Council should consider how it can improve its structure to ensure that it effectively supports the CSP. In considering this structure the Council needs to identify a senior position (Assistant Director or above) to ensure that it has a more effective strategic overview of all matters relating to Community Safety.
- That work begins immediately to ensure bids are in place to gain funding from the MOPAC commissioning process.

3. Background information

3.1 General

3.1.1 The Public Sector is facing significant challenges in terms of the amount of savings that are to be found. The council has already found £65m worth of savings with another £25m to be found over the next 2 years. It is also worth noting that this is in a climate of reduced or no further funding from various government departments which had traditionally grant funded huge areas of work. The MPS are in the process of finding £500m over the next 3 years. Historically, the Council had in place all the services that delivered and offered strategic direction for crime reduction in one division called Safer and Stronger Communities. In order to achieve part of the savings required in January 2011 the Council considered reports which offered up savings by redistributing areas of work to different directorates and disestablishing part of the service. This has led to the current arrangement, which includes:

- Strategic Community Safety team and the Anti Social Behaviour Action Team - Place and Sustainability Directorate;
- Drug Action and Alcohol Team and Emergency Planning - Public Health;
- Youth Offending - Children's and Young Peoples Services; and
- Domestic Violence services - Children's and Young Peoples, Public Health Services and Adult & Housing Services.

3.1.2 In writing this report it is important to acknowledge the sensitivity that exist in Haringey after the shooting of Mark Duggan, the Tottenham Riots in August 2011. This has reawakened the community memory in relation to the Broadwater Farm Riots a generation ago. There have been numerous public inquiries and consultations which followed involving the police and other partners.

3.2 CSP - Legal context

3.2.1 Community Safety Partnerships were established under the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 which was amended by the Police and Justice Act 2006. The



1998 Act sets out who the responsible authorities are and the various duties. Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, as amended by the Police and Justice Act 2006, requires responsible authorities to consider crime and disorder (including anti-social behaviour and other behaviour adversely affecting the local environment): and the misuse of drugs, alcohol and other substances in the exercise of all their duties, activities and decision making. This means that in all policies, strategies and service delivery there is a need to consider the likely impact of crime and disorder. The Act also saw the establishment of the Youth Offending Service.

3.3 Mayor's Office for Crime and Policing (MOPAC)

3.3.1 National changes have led to the establishment of Police and Crime Commissioners across the country. In London that responsibility has fallen to the Mayor of London who has established the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime. The Mayor has appointed a Deputy Mayor, Stephen Greenhalgh, to lead the agenda on his behalf. The key issues being considered by MOPAC are:

- Crime Prevention and Crime Reduction;
- Reducing re-offending – Criminal Justice; and
- Police Accountability.

3.3.2 All budgets relating to crime reduction will be transferred to MOPAC over the next few years, by 2014/15 it will be one block of money and a commissioning framework will be in place. It is unclear at the moment how much will be available (approx £23m) but, authorities will have to demonstrate why projects should be funded and what the expected outcomes will be. MOPAC expect that any funding from that organisation will be spent on crime reduction linking through to their overarching priorities and is not spent on other Council priorities. Since writing this report authorities have been informed that they will need to bid for future funding by December 2012.

3.3.3 MOPAC is working to ensure there is a consistency of measures across London so that it is clear to the public what is being measured, why and the expected outcome. It is intended that MOPAC will be the gatekeeper for central government where any issues relating to crime reduction are funnelled through its structure for comment and or direction.

4.0 Good practice

4.1 Good practice identified in the review included the work of the Emergency Planning Team during the riots in 2011 and the Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH). Synergies with safeguarding both in adults and children's services were picked up as good practice, which recognised the Council as having made significant progress in this area.



5.0 Response to Scope - Overarching findings in summary

To meet with all CSP partners and senior officers across the Council to achieve an understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of current arrangements and what actions are required to improve the partnership;

5.1 All key Members of the Partnership as outlined in the Act above were interviewed. A number of Councillors, Council Officers, Senior Police Officers and members of the Community were also seen. At the time of writing the report 52 individuals had been interviewed by the Review Manager. A summary of the groupings of these individuals is highlighted below:

- 5 x Councillors
- 6 x Corporate Management Team
- 7 x Partners
- 20 x Staff
- 8 x Community
- 1 x MOPAC
- 5x Other Boroughs

5.2 All were asked if they had heard of the Community Safety Partnership. Whilst it was expected that some members of the community had not heard of the partnership it was a surprise to find some Members were not fully aware of the partnership role. Whilst all the statutory agencies were around the table it was unclear whether the Voluntary /Third Sector had been invited to form part of the partnership either through its sub groups or through leading on consultation.

5.3 The Terms of Reference (TOR) for the CSP were revised in 2012 and agreed in June 2012. The TOR is very clear about what the Partnership should be doing and if followed could lead to a number of areas of good practice. The TOR is attached to this report at Appendix one.

Impact on Young People

5.4 One of the issues raised was the level of the savings that were made in the youth service and its possible links to increasing crime. One of the partners felt that this had “a severe impact on the partnership, as there was a dramatic loss of continuity of work and experience”. However the data shows Haringey has reduced the numbers of first time entrants to the youth justice system by 36.3% since 2010. Haringey previously had the second highest numbers of first time entrants in London but now has the 14th highest (out of 32), which clearly demonstrates the degree of improvement. Overall, levels of youth crime are two to three times higher in the east of the borough than the west. However, the



number of incidents of youth crime where one of the accused is a youth are similar across both the North East and South East of the borough, indicating a higher relative proportion in the North East which has a smaller youth population. This is also reflected in the levels of gun, knife and penetrative trauma involving young people, which are highest in the North East. The data shows a clear need for continued work relating to youth crime prevention and early intervention across the borough, but particularly highlights the level of need in the North East. To hold a strategic view the CSP must be aware of the work of the YOS linked to the Troubled Families Initiative (TFI). To address this it is key that representatives from each of these areas should form part of the recently introduced Performance Monitoring Group.

- 5.5 It is worth noting that the YOS has 57 staff of which 40 plus are grant funded. The CSP needs to decide what is core business, for example, if all the funding for the YOS stopped tomorrow could the YOS deliver any of its programme?

Effective Communications

- 5.6 Some of the overarching findings included the fact that, if the CSP is to truly succeed there is a need to build on trust in all areas of the partnership. Improved communication is key and building on the commitment for effective delivery across all areas should be considered as a next step. In particular, the Council and Police could build on communication between the senior levels of the organisations and improve the mechanisms for filtering that information down.
- 5.7 The Police have appointed a partnership Superintendent to work towards this outcome, however his portfolio is expanding and the Council will need to clarify who holds that similar role within the authority. There was a feeling on both sides that more could be done to improve relationships. Although, there has recently been an improvement in developing a shared understanding of the key issues within the borough through a Joint Tasking Group which has resulted in more joint operations on the ground. It is clear that by working together and dealing with difficult issues the CSP will become a more collaborative partnership, understanding the challenges faced by all partner agencies.
- 5.8 The Borough Commander would benefit from having a senior officer (Assistant Director or above) in the Council to negotiate, make and take forward decisions in addition to guiding her through the protocols procedures of a political organisation. Equally this person would be expected to guide the council through the issues faced by the MPS. The Cabinet Member and all partners would also benefit from understanding the challenges and the remit of each of the partner organisations.



5.9 A number of those interviewed were unclear about what was meant by community safety and what the priorities are. The CSP has an opportunity to question and focus on what is important after this review. It will need to agree what the vision is for community safety so that everyone has a clear understanding.

5.10 It is not clear whether effective community input and capacity is facilitated by the partnership. Elsewhere in this report the community's views are expressed in relation to involvement in the CSP.

5.11 Recommendations/quick wins /next steps included:

- The Council should consider how it can improve its structure to ensure that it effectively supports the CSP. In considering this structure the Council needs to identify a senior position (Assistant Director or above) to ensure that it has a more effective strategic overview of all matters relating to Community Safety (good practice across all the boroughs interviewed).
- That the Council continues to chair the recently convened Performance Management Group and that the relevant departments/business units and partners make a commitment to attend and fully engage.
- The review offers an opportunity for the CSP to reconsider its priorities. To make them more focused and ensure that they are deliverable. The priorities should be monitored on a quarterly basis by the CSP.
- The CSP to agree a Vision (strap line) for reducing crime that is clearly articulated.
- The CSP to agree a half day workshop with the purpose of understanding each others organisation.

To review the CSP's strategic objectives to ensure that they reflect the borough's current priorities and reflect best practice when compared to other partnerships facing similar issues;

5.12 The CSP's strategic objectives are set out in the Haringey Community Safety Strategy 2011 2014. They are:

- Reduce serious violent crime (youths and adults).
- Reduce violence against women (including domestic Violence).
- Reduce all property crime.
- Reduce repeat offending (Crime and ASB).
- Provide an effective response to anti-social behaviour (ASB).
- Increase public engagement, confidence and satisfaction.



- Prepare for emergencies and major events (inc. Olympics 2012).

5.13 The Strategic Priorities are:

- Improve partnership governance and information sharing.
- Improved service delivery and public confidence (through engagement and data).
- Deliver coordinated prevention and operational activity.

5.14 The Council's Key Priorities were agreed 16th July 2012 as follows:

- Work with local businesses to create jobs.
- Deliver regeneration to key areas of the borough.
- Tackle the housing challenges.
- Improve school standards and outcomes for young people.
- Deliver responsive, high quality services to residents.

5.15 The Council is clear that community safety is a “golden thread” running through all its priorities and the delivery of all these objectives will have a positive impact in reducing crime and the fear of crime. However at least one member of the CSP stated that there was not a clear link between the Community Safety Strategy and the Corporate Plan. Whilst the Corporate Plan does have Community Safety under other major responsibilities, the Council will need to ensure that it effectively communicates, to all its partners, how its priorities positively contribute to the Community Safety agenda.

5.16 Community Safety is a major concern for Haringey residents, the most recent residents survey carried out in 2010/11 had crime as the top personal concern at 46% that is +11 higher than the previous year and is +8 higher than the rest of London.

5.17 There is a need for the CSP to rethink its priorities, although it must be acknowledged that some of these are set centrally or regionally. With the Strategic Assessment being completed at the time of this review it was felt that as long as all partners have had an opportunity to have an input this should help set the priorities which, should be focused and help to meet the strategic objectives of all the organisations, stakeholders and community. However in this process there must be meaningful consultation with the community.

5.18 Haringey CSP has approximately 11 Strategies/Plans related to community safety. This review has not allowed the time it would require to go through each plan in detail but by way of example, it was noted that the Domestic Violence action plan has 3 strategic aims with over 40 actions, the YOS strategy has 7 strategic aims with 20 actions and the ASB strategy has 2 strategic aims with 11 actions.



- 5.19 Next steps should include reviewing all the plans in line with those that are required by statute and those that are “nice to have”. A further review should be tasked to rationalise the number of strategies and associated action plans and where appropriate the focus should be to adopt a task and finish approach to solving problems. This exercise would also consider how to reduce the current number of meetings (22) associated with community safety.
- 5.20 The London Borough of Lewisham has recently undertaken a similar exercise and has reduced the number of Strategies/Plans to seven.
- 5.21 In all the boroughs interviewed the Community Safety Strategy was co signed by the Borough Commander and the Cabinet Member and an executive meeting structure was in place.
- 5.22 The view was expressed that other boroughs have committed more resources/funding to deliver community safety outcomes. Having spoken to other boroughs in the same family grouping it is clear that reducing crime is a clear priority for all the boroughs. However, in all the boroughs that were contacted there had been a reduction in spend. As would be expected each borough has tackled the reduction very differently. It is difficult to compare like with like for example:
- Southwark have over 200 staff that form part of the community safety family (includes noise team, street scene enforcement, environmental health and trading standards), which is very similar to Single Frontline Services in Haringey.
 - Lewisham have approximately 100 staff including the YOS but not ASB.
 - Hackney has approx 100 staff not including the YOS but includes wardens, pollution team and CCTV.

5.23 Recommendations/Actions/Next Steps included:

- That the CSP is co chaired by the Cabinet Member and the Borough Commander.
- Next steps to include a review of the number of strategies and action plans. A more focused and streamlined approach should be adopted.
- That an Executive meeting is put in place with a minimum of the Cabinet Member, Borough Commander, Superintendent Partnerships, Director/CE, Asst Director who holds the overview. It may be worth considering inviting statutory partners when and if there are particular issues to discuss. This arrangement should be reviewed after six months to ensure the right people are round the table. Notes should be produced.



- The Councils Key Priorities adopted in July 2012 will have an impact on reducing crime. It is important that the community safety “golden thread” linking these priorities is communicated effectively to partners and residents.
- Consider rationalising the number of meetings with the view to a task and finish approach.

To review the CSP to ensure that it fulfils its duties and potential, incorporating best practice from other partnerships;

5.24 The duties of the CSP in line with the Crime and Disorder Act as defined by the Home Office is set out below:-

“The responsible authorities work together to develop and implement strategies to protect their local communities from crime and to help people feel safe. They work out local approaches to deal with issues including antisocial behaviour, drug or alcohol misuse and re-offending.

They also work with others who have a key role, including community groups and registered local landlords. Each responsible authority contributes their own particular local knowledge, professional expertise and resources to ensure that the issues of most concern to local people are prioritised and addressed.”

- 5.25 Bearing the above in mind Haringey CSP may want to consider whether the representation on the partnership is correct. There is an opportunity to consider whether, for example, young people, British Transport Police and voluntary/third sector should be represented.
- 5.26 The Strategic Assessment is part of the statutory duties of the partnership and must be completed on a yearly basis. Good practice would indicate a joint forward in the Community Safety Strategy signed off by the Cabinet Member and the Borough Commander. This would show a commitment and agreement from both to what is in the plan.
- 5.27 As stated earlier in the report, MOPAC will be the holder of all funds relating to crime reduction and it has now become clear that in order for the CSP to fulfil its potential it will need to bid for resources from MOPAC in a very tight timeframe.
- 5.28 A Performance Monitoring Group has recently been set up by the Council. It is expected that all the priority areas for community safety will report to this group. The work of the monitoring group should be built on utilising a traffic light system to report any areas of concern back to the CSP from across the “Community Safety Family”. In such cases an exception report should be produced highlighting risks and measures to improve performance.



Haringey Council

5.29 The review did not find it necessary for all the “community safety family” to sit in the same team but it is essential that a senior officer (Assistant Director or above) in the Council holds the overview which could be managed through a matrix approach. Sharing information on a regular basis (e.g. monthly) and this could be incorporated into the Performance Monitoring Group meeting.

5.30 Best practice identified after speaking to and looking at examples of CSP Strategies from other authorities includes some of the following:

- a. The foreword for the CSP Strategy signed off by the Borough Commander and the Cabinet Member. This sends a message of working together and a joint approach to crime reduction. In Haringey it is signed off by the Cabinet Member.
- b. Involvement of the Voluntary/Third sector, British Transport Police at the CSP meetings or those that provide support or direction for the CSP. This should include MOPAC as funding bids will need to align with MOPACs priorities.
- c. Well established monitoring groups in place chaired by a senior officer.
- d. The police have a higher analyst in place and the local authority strategic community safety team have a dedicated analyst.
- e. Difficult and honest debates about the way forward leading to ownership and clear lines of delivery.
- f. Clear commitment and leadership within the local authority.
- g. Trust and an understanding of the challenges faced by each organisation in the partnership.
- h. Yearly Strategic Assessment to agree the priorities – published on the website.

5.31 Recommendations/Actions Next steps include:

- Consider the best practice set out above and decide which if any the CSP want to take on board.
- That the Strategic Assessment is carried out on an annual basis in line with the Crime and Disorder Act and that all partners contribute.
- That the Strategic Assessment is reviewed on a six monthly basis and that the community are consulted and informed of the outcomes.
- Consider which other organisations would be able to contribute to aims of the CSP and invite them to the meetings.



To identify quick wins where through synergies the partnership could combine resources to deliver clear actions;

5.32 Recommendations/Actions/Next Steps

The following are some quick wins:

- a. The Director of Sustainability and Place should continue to attend meetings and build on the relationship with the Borough Commander.
- b. A monthly meeting with a matrix senior officer as lead to pull together the work/discuss and share information with the Community Safety “family” to make sure that there is an understanding of who is leading on what and pick up on any recent changes. The performance monitoring group could take on this role.
- c. A clear understanding of how the Police Borough Commanders new structure relates to the Council structure.
- d. Joint Communications Officer between the Police and the Council to ensure a co-ordinated approach/response.
- e. The production of a communication strategy to include issues such as information about troubled families’ initiative, DAAT, ASB etc. A calendar of events so that the partnership is aware of the “forward plan”.
- f. Task and finish approach. This could be based on a themed approach.
- g. Next steps to include a review of the ASB team to see where some sharing or joining of resources could lead to improved outcomes.
- h. Work to begin immediately to ensure bids are in place to gain funding from the MOPAC commissioning process.

To explore the potential for further integrated working and joint resource allocation.

- 5.33 Next steps should include further work to explore further or improved integrated working. It is clear to gain the greatest result it is best not to work in isolation. The danger for all partnerships with limited resources available is that some



services seem to be taking a step back. For example the police officers were removed from the YOS even though there is a statutory duty for the police to form part of the team. Since writing this report, this has been partially corrected. This happened because the police also had to have a presence in the MASH.

- 5.34 In order to fully understand the gaps, it is suggested that the police partnership Superintendent work with an officer from the council to explore the potential for identifying and implementing good practice. For example there is potential for better working with the ASBAT. The ASBAT did have a police officer in the team and a dedicated police officer to contact to take cases forward, this no longer exists. The DV service was a good example of a one stop shop but changes have lead to gaps in the service.
- 5.35 Although it is extremely unlikely that Haringey Police Borough Command will be joined with any of the surrounding Boroughs it is worth considering any overlapping issues. This could relate to ASB, gangs, burglary and better use of CCTV to capture or alert the police to any criminal activity.
- 5.36 Next steps would be to consider what the structure for delivering community safety within the local authority should look like. This will need a further in-depth piece of work. There is recognition that resources across the partnership are very tight and that there are further savings to be found. The MPS as a whole is looking to save £500m over 3 years. Haringey council intends to save a further £25m over the next 2 years.

5.37 Recommendations/Actions /Next Steps include:

- As previously recommended the Council should consider the structure required to improve the effectiveness of the authority within the CSP.
- The CSP to decide whether, further work should be carried out in partnership to consider improved synergies or different ways of working.

To recommend how Haringey MPS, Haringey Council and other partners can be more effective in engaging and communicating with its residents.

- 5.38 Communication across the partnership as a whole was seen as an issue. In particular the changes that had taken place within the Council and the Police had not been communicated to the CSP. There was no risk assessment carried out to highlight any improvements, gaps or potential for failure in the new set



up. Similarly the Police have restructured and there was no consultation about why the changes had taken place. This has led to a lack of understanding of who should be contacted in particular incidents.

- 5.39 When asked the question “Who in the Council would you contact to discuss community safety issues?” the majority of the Community Representatives said in the past they would always have contacted the former Head of Safer Stronger Communities. In many cases they were unclear who to contact now but, some were aware of Claire Kowalska and had contacted her. They all named a police officer that they would contact. The view was expressed that some members of the community would prefer to contact the council rather than the police especially with regards to the upcoming sensitivities surrounding the IPCC investigation into Mark Duggan’s death.
- 5.40 A Senior Community Safety Policy Officer with responsibility for the Prevent Agenda is now in place within the Community Safety team and this has been seen as a real positive by the community, which could help in future engagement.
- 5.41 Without doubt communication needs to be improved there is very little use of social media. At the time of writing this report there was no comprehensive Communication Strategy which incorporated issues from across the wider Community Safety Team (e.g. YOS, DAAT, ASBAT, Troubled Families, Economic Development), in place. The strategy should include an events calendar so that it is clear to the community, stakeholders and the partnership what events were coming up. Any communication strategy should consider the use of social media. There should also be improved communication within the council as well as between the council and police. For example the Cabinet Member for Communities plus the responsible officers in the council should be part of the police messaging system. (This can be text or email informing Members and officers of any murders, impending community tension that the police are aware of). Message of the day is a system that allows the council to keep staff updated. For example the 11 ASB orders which had been granted by the courts after years of joint work by the ASBAT could have been communicated.
- 5.42 The response from the Community on engagement included:
- On the whole the community felt that the police had been open and transparent and had tried to engage since the riots.



- That the council had listened to their concerns but they were still frustrated by the lack of action thereafter.
- That since the removal of the post of Head of Safer Stronger Communities it was less clear whom to engage with as part of the process in rebuilding community relations across the partnership.
- A view was expressed that the police and the council were seen as being “too cosy” therefore there was not enough challenge

5.43 Best practice from other authorities. (Lewisham and Hammersmith and Fulham) identified the need for a conference/summit once a year. The purpose would be to inform the community about what had been delivered by the partnership, to hear the community concerns and help to agree priorities for the coming year.

5.44 Concerns were expressed by more than one person about the disestablishment of the Community Police Consultative Group (CPCG). The Community felt that it was a way to ensure Community input and challenge. At the time of writing the report no consultation had taken place with MOPAC about what would be replacing it. There has however been a letter from the Commissioner which talks about Total Policing and this may provide the opportunity for consultation.

5.45 More than one person expressed the view that the changes in the Council structure has led to a loss of knowledge, experience and continuity and this coupled with the changes to the Police structure has meant that it has been more difficult for the community to develop relationships with both partners. However, it was felt to address this it was key to feedback information and engage with the community, which could include communicating achievements particularly to the young people using social media, twitter, face book, via a blog or through working with schools to help to raise awareness. A number of suggestions such as focus groups, one off meetings “have your say”, internet panels plus opportunities to carry our research were all ways to get information to and from a variety of sources.

5.46 Recommendation/Actions/Next Steps

- The CSP needs to consider what is meant by community engagement and ensure that the community is signed up to it.
- There must be feedback to community leaders and residents on actions taken.



- An annual crime summit should be considered as a way of engaging with the community perhaps as part of the priority setting process.
- As set out earlier in the report, a new approach to communication which highlights some of the success of the partnership must be put in place. “You said, we did...”
- Build on the recommendations that have come out of the Tottenham Riots.

6.0 Conclusion

6.1 In answering the question what does success look and feel like all those who were asked the question said:

- clear communication/consultation with actions that delivered clear outcomes;
- prioritise resources to deliver outcomes;
- communication that is balanced and not reactive but more proactive;
- clarity around the top ten performance indicators leading to an ability to understand what is being delivered and whether the partnership is getting value for money;
- more engagement with young people (understanding stop and search);
- develop the vision of the partnership and ensure this is filtered down and understood;
- a single point of contact; and
- measures to improve public confidence.

6.2 At the time of this review the work relating to Domestic Violence was being reviewed by Standing Together and a report is expected shortly.

6.3 In terms of engaging with the community there were a number of recommendations set out in the various reports after the August 2011 riots. This included the following consultations:

- The Citizens’ Inquiry into the Tottenham Riots
- After the Riots: Taking Tottenham Forward.

Building on those recommendations would ensure that action is taken. A communication strategy is key with the use of social media, focus groups, inclusion of young people and community leaders. This will also give the CSP a clear route to consultation.



6.4 The Localism Act 2011 sets out the government's commitment to decentralisation and strengthening local democracy aiming to shift power from central government to individuals, communities and councils. The Act includes measures to improve community empowerment through the right to buy local assets and run local services. MOPAC's new commissioning approach could lead to the community (voluntary/third sector) leading/delivering some of the projects required to reduce crime.

6.5 In conclusion the partnership as a whole is experiencing a pace of change with ever increasing budget constraints not witnessed for a generation. Whilst this is one of the most difficult times to deliver core business and ensure partnership delivery the review found ownership, leadership, communication, community involvement and focused actions were key to achieving effective outcomes.

4. Comments of the Chief Finance Officer and financial implications

5. Head of Legal Services and legal implications

6. Equalities and Community Cohesion Comments

7. Head of Procurement Comments

8. Policy Implication

9. Use of Appendices

The Community Safety Partnership Terms of Reference

10. Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

Background Papers

Haringey's Community Safety Strategy 2011- 2014
Strategic Assessment 2010-2011
Joint Strategic Needs Assessment

Plans and action plans from across the partnership
: CSP Annual Delivery Plan (currently 3 year) - statutory
: Drug Treatment Plan (2 year)
: Annual Borough Youth Justice Plan - statutory



Haringey Council

- : Reducing Re-offending Plan (3 year)
- : ASB partnership plan (annual)
- : Gang Delivery Plan (annual)
- : Property Crime Plan (annual)
- : DV partnership plan
- : Hate crime action plan (in draft)

Citizens' Inquiry into the Tottenham Riots

Taking Tottenham Forward –February 2012

Councils Corporate Plan 2011 -2014

Future of Neighbourhood Management Services 25th January 2011

Community Safety Delivery in Haringey May 2012

Proposals for a new Single Frontline Service January 2011

After the riots (MPS report)

New Proposed Operating Model – Haringey (MPS February 2012)