

SCRUTINY REVIEW ON RESOURCING OF SAFER AND STRONGER COMMUNITIES LAA TARGETS

27 NOVEMBER 2007

ISSUES PAPER

1. Introduction

1.1 The review has so far received evidence from a number of sources:

- Wayne Mawson, Deputy Police Commander for Haringey
- Shaun Sweeney, Police Projects Officer
- Helen Brown, Acting Deputy Chief Executive, Haringey Teaching Primary Care Trust
- Christina Gradowski, Director of Corporate Services and Partnerships
- Paul Head, Principal, College of North East London (CoNEL)
- Valerie Jones and Maureen Flannery, Community Safety Unit, London Borough of Brent
- Claire Kowalska, Community Safety Strategic Manager
- Councillor Nilgun Canver, Cabinet Member for Enforcement and Safer Communities,
- Jean Croot, the Head of Safer Communities,
- Carolyn Sullivan, Regional Crime and Drug Manager, Government Office for London (GoL)
- Frances Palopoli, Head of Finance

1.2 Documentary evidence has also been provided. In addition, Members of the Panel will be visiting the London Borough of Camden on 26 November.

1.3 The purpose of this paper is to highlight key issues from all of the evidence received for discussion at the concluding meeting of the review in order to assist in reaching conclusions and recommendations.

2. Background

2.1 Community safety has been described as being a 'wicked issue' for local areas. These are longstanding issues which are important but difficult to tackle in a planned and consistent fashion. This is because:

- It is a consistent priority for local people
- It comes out in the top three issues in most local consultation (e.g. top priority for Haringey residents according to the latest residents survey)
- It is the general responsibility of a range of agencies but the specific responsibility of none.
- It cuts across the prevailing service planning and structures
- It has limited direct access to mainstream expenditure streams, which are the standard means of building and sustaining a service within an organisation.

- 2.2 Although it requires joint action, the changes in working practices which make meaningful joint action possible can be difficult to achieve.
- 2.3 The Crime and Disorder Act 1998 promoted the practice of partnership working to reduce crime and disorder and placed a statutory duty on police and local authorities to develop and implement a strategy to tackle problems in their area. In doing so, the responsible authorities were required to work in partnership with a range of other local public, private, community and voluntary groups, as well as the community itself. Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships were required to be set up in each locality which included all of these partners. In Haringey, this is the Haringey Safer Communities Partnership, which is co-ordinated by the Safer Communities Executive Board (SCEB).
- 2.4 According to Home Office guidance, Section 17 of the Act means that *“each local authority should take account of the community safety dimension in all of its work. All policies, strategies, plans and budgets need to be considered from the standpoint of their potential contribution to the reduction of crime and disorder. ”*
- 2.5 There were three possible levels of implementation of Section 17 that were proposed by Crime Concern in their report on the issue. These are:
- Corporate approach – developing a “whole organisation” approach.
 - Individual service areas – building crime and disorder reduction into the regular activities of Council departments
 - Committee decisions – considering the crime and disorder implications of Council decisions
- 2.6 One or more of these approaches can be adopted. The Police and Justice Act 2006 increased the scope of Section 17 of the 1998 Act (the 'mainstreaming' crime reduction requirement) to include anti-social behaviour, substance misuse and behaviour that adversely affects the environment.

3. The Local Area Agreement and Safer and Stronger Communities Targets

- 3.1 The requirement for partnerships to produce a specific three year strategy is now linked into the safer and stronger communities requirements within Local Area Agreements. These are three year agreements between key partners that set out the priorities for a local area. These are agreed via the Sustainable Community Strategy, which is approved by the government. Haringey's LAA started in June 2007 and comprises of indicators and targets, some which are mandatory and others which are optional.

3.2 The LAA is made up of four blocks:

- Children and Young People
- Safer and Stronger Communities
- Healthier Communities and older people
- Economic Development

3.3 The targets within the Safer and Stronger Communities block cover a wide range of very important issues for local residents including reducing robberies, the level of youth offending, fear of crime, burglaries, motor vehicle thefts and violent crime. The finance used to fund the activities necessary to achieve these targets comes from a range of sources, the vast majority (89%) of which are short to medium term time limited grants. Concern has been expressed about the sustainability of action to achieve these targets in the light of current uncertainty about future funding.

3.4 The government's White Paper '*Strong and Prosperous Communities*' (October 2006), the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Bill and the Communities and Local Government department paper '*Developing the future arrangements for Local Area Agreements*' have led to significant changes to LAAs. These new arrangements will come into effect from June 2008.

3.5 The changes to LAAs will put them on a statutory footing. They will constitute a binding agreement between central government and local authorities and their partners about improving performance against specified national priorities and local place shaping objectives. There is an expectation on named partners to co-operate in the agreement of the targets and to have regard to those targets in their work.

3.6 The key changes to the LAAs are as follows:

- LAAs will be the only place where central government will agree targets with local authorities and their partners. There will be up to 35 locally negotiated targets drawn from a national set of 200 indicators and a set of 18 pre-existing statutory educational and early years' targets.
- LAAs will no longer be about specific funding for specific targets. There will be an expectation that delivery of the targets will be supported by all resources in the area concerned.
- There will be a new unringfenced area based 'LAA' grant.

3.7 The timescale for the transition to the new LAA arrangements is as follows:

- By June 2008, all LAAs will have 35 improvement targets and 18 statutory early years/education targets based on the indicators in the national indicator set which are ready and on any existing indicators and targets for some service areas, plus any additional local targets from the Sustainable Community Strategy for the years 08/09, 09/10 and 10/11;

- By April 2009 all LAAs will have up to 35 improvement targets and 18 statutory early years/education targets agreed against the 200 indicators in the new national indicator set plus any additional local targets from Sustainable Community Strategies for the years 09/10 and 10/11.

3.8 In the meantime, the current set of targets will continue to be in operation. Until the new LAA improvement targets have been finalised, it will not be possible to assess the resources that will be necessary to achieve the safer and stronger communities targets in future years. In addition, the overall level of resources that will be available will not be known until after the government's Comprehensive Spending Review has been completed. This may lead to uncertainty and compromise the capacity of partners to deliver against the targets.

4. Resourcing Safer and Stronger Communities Targets within Haringey

5.1 Many of the grants which fund current activities within Haringey are due to expire in March 2008. The Community Safety Business Unit receives 89% of its funding from such grants and is therefore very vulnerable to such a loss of funding. The Unit includes several areas which are of key strategic importance in addressing targets, including:

- The Youth Offending Service (YOS),
- The Drugs and Alcohol Action Team (DAAT)
- The Community Safety Team
- The Anti Social Behaviour and Action Team (ASBAT)

5.2 Due to these grants being utilised for salaries of key officers within the Community Safety Business Unit, any reduction in these grants will incur redundancies. If there are significant reductions in these grants, redundancy notices will need to be served by the end of December 2007 and redundancy costs will need to be found within the 2007/08 budgets.

5.3 The Panel noted that both the Neighbourhood Renewal Fund and the Basic Command Unit Fund have terminated this year. In addition, the National Treatment Agency grant for drug treatment had been reducing year on year and further cuts have been announced. Some grants that have provided youth crime prevention work and drug treatment work end in March 2008. The view was expressed that if there is no change in core funding, no safeguarding of funds that are currently ring-fenced and no commitment to mainstreaming community safety duties, the Borough might not be able to deliver on the Government's national community safety strategies, such as cutting crime, drugs and alcohol, reducing youth crime etc. The Borough might also struggle to implement the new requirements in the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership reform for more strategic analysis, more community engagement and the implementation of national standards in community safety.

5.4 The Panel noted the effects of core budget cuts had had on the YOS when it had still been in Social Services. This had resulted in 6 posts being lost. The YOS went from being one of the top performing to falling into the bottom quartile in the space of one year. Although funding was re-allocated to the YOS the year after this drop in performance, it

took two years before performance picked up again. This period also saw an increase in re-offending – an indication that young offenders were not adequately supported and helped during the period of reduced funding. It was possible that the drop that might be seen in funding for safer communities work next year might well have a similar impact and vital services would be severely affected.

- 5.5 The youth prevention work of the YOS, which is currently funded from the Children's Fund, is particularly at risk this time, along with work in schools, prevention and critical casework work of the Anti Social Behaviour Action Team (ASBAT). In addition, skilled staff may leave, cases may be left unattended, complaints might rise and it will become harder to recruit good staff to low performing teams. The Borough risks some of the policing successes of the past few years not being maintained, such as Q cars, Operation Butler, the Safer Schools Project and the highest sanctioned detection rates for domestic violence in the Metropolitan Police area. Some of these are unavoidably resource intensive and could not be met through core funding.
- 5.6 It was noted that only those grants that were felt to be appropriate to the Borough's needs were applied for. In any case, it is now much tougher to obtain external funding and making applications is very time consuming. Such funding that is available now tends to be directed at the "third sector". The current strategy is to consider the problem rather than focussing on potential sources of funding.
- 5.7 Reliance on time limited grants has a number of disadvantages;
- The delivery of initiatives often requires considerably high levels of skill from staff and consequently high quality personnel are required. The time limited nature of funding does not assist recruitment and retention. It can deter suitably qualified people from applying and inhibit the development of staff as the skills required to undertake the work are complex and take time to learn. The threat of redundancy may also have a detrimental effect on performance of relevant staff.
 - Long term planning is difficult as funding decisions on changes to grant regimes are often taken at short notice and inconvenient times.
 - Making applications for grants and monitoring them once they have been received is a very time consuming process. If commissioning is undertaken over a longer period of time, economies of scale could be made.
- 5.8 Many community safety initiatives and responsibilities are now statutory. They also cover areas of key concern for local residents – crime is consistently high in the list of residents concern and was top in the 2007 survey. The strategic planning function is also very important. Its work involves working on targets and national standards, analysing data and capacity building.
- 5.9 Workload within specific teams has increased markedly. For example, the Youth Offending Service and the Anti Social Behaviour Action Team has seen a significant increase in demand for their services. Police successes in apprehending young offenders is a factor in increasing pressure on the Youth Offending Service, who are

required to undertake work with such young people in order to assist in their rehabilitation. In addition, reporting of crime and anti social behaviour is being more actively encouraged and this is likely to increase workload further.

- 5.10 There will still be government funding from April 2008 to deliver safer and stronger communities LAA targets but it was noted that this is likely to be, in real terms, a reduced overall grant, although it is not yet known by how much. It will be up to the Haringey Strategic Partnership (HSP) to decide how the money was allocated. A strategic approach that was based on clear long term priorities would be welcome.
- 5.11 It was suggested that partners could give consideration to looking collectively at the range of current activity and deciding what was critical and therefore could be considered for mainstreaming. In such circumstances, LAA delivery funding could be used to fund anything additional that was considered to be necessary by partners. A proportion of funding obtained through external sources by Haringey currently is spent on staffing whilst the remainder goes to the particular programme associated with the money. An increase in the number of mainstream funded posts would not necessarily mean foregoing the opportunity to bring in external funds. It would mean that, when such funds were obtained, more would be available for the specific programmes rather than the staff required delivering them.
- 5.12 The concerns of residents do not always replicate what crime data suggests. Whilst street crime, burglary and car theft are the key issues for law enforcement agencies, local people are more concerned about young people, violence and drugs. In particular, people are frightened by yobbish behaviour. There is a lack of recreational opportunities for young people. However, there were organisations and people with the potential to provide such opportunities who, with appropriate support and development, would be able to deliver them. If less LAA money was spent on funding posts, there would be more available to undertake this type of work.
- 5.13 The Head of Finance commented that the high dependency on external grant funding to support the Community Safety team has been recognised as an issue for a number of years and ideally should be replaced by core funding. However, there are high demands on resources across the authority which has meant that this has not been possible to date. There is a wider issue over potential grant loss across the authority as a whole as a result of the CSR07 and grant settlement announcements (the later due in late Nov/early Dec), particularly as more grants move from specific to the non-ring-fenced Area Based Grant which have the potential to lead to a re-direction of resources away from this type of activity. Officers are in the process of reviewing the impact of loss of grant funding across the authority (not only for Community Safety) as part of the budget process, which should provide more information however, until we receive grant settlement figures for 0809 onwards in December, we are not in a position to understand the actual impact.
- 5.14 Councillor Nilgun Canver felt that greater sustainability in the arrangements for addressing community safety issues could be achieved through a package of measures:

- Improvements could be made in policy coordination so that opportunities for collaborative work were identified at an earlier stage and appropriate resources and commitment agreed. The LAA grant will come to the Borough in a lump sum from 2008 and it was vital that the Haringey Strategic Partnership ensured that the key priorities in the Community Strategy as well as residents' top concerns – which also included crime - were fairly and adequately prioritised.
- Serious consideration needed to be given to core funding for areas of priority which were statutory and ongoing. Examples of this were youth offending work, dealing with anti-social behaviour, reducing volume crime, reducing the harm caused by drug and alcohol misuse and addressing the fear of crime through consistent and professional communications work
- There were already some good examples of aligned funding and joint delivery of priorities. The Supporting People Programme, for example, helped to deliver outcomes relating to drug and alcohol harm reduction, domestic violence and housing for vulnerable people. This year, the Summer University was delivered as a joint programme by Neighbourhoods, Safer Communities and the Youth Service. There were also good examples of services and partners working together to deliver key priorities, such as partnership efforts to address worklessness and well being and the co-ordination of structured crime prevention work in schools. Further opportunities should also be explored for joint delivery on LAA work. These could include victim programmes, designing out crime and providing more effective services for ex-offenders.

5.15 The view of Paul Head, the Principal of CoNEL, was that the key to this is to see crime and disorder issues as core to the work of organisations not see it as a bolt on requiring additional monies. The pump priming monies had been useful and supportive but it must be an aid to mainstreaming. He felt that these issues should be made part of service agreements.

5. Section 17 and Mainstreaming within Haringey

- 5.1 The Panel noted that community safety is a partnership and there is a statutory responsibility for partners to actively participate and contribute. The Police Service and Council currently tend to assume a large part of the responsibility. It could be argued that other partners should take a more active and equal role. However, some of the other partners are constrained by limited resources.
- 5.2 The main drivers for crime are linked closely linked to health, well being, education and housing and therefore mainstream activity by relevant partners in these areas is a considerable source of influence. The view was expressed that consideration needed to be given to how these responsibilities could be developed and given proper recognition amongst all services. In particular, more active participation by a wider range of partners within the Safer Communities Partnership would be welcome.
- 5.3 The Panel received evidence that some partners were better engaged than others. The Police Service and Probation were particularly well engaged as community safety was

part of their “core business”. In addition, the Primary Care Trust and schools were also well engaged. Some concern expressed as to the engagement and involvement of the Mental Health Trust (MHT) in the Safer Communities Executive Board. There was a need to engage the MHT but, by the same token, the MHT had also expressed its concern that those who it appeared should be charged with offences were sometimes not charged by the Police. Improved communication and collaborative working was required between the MHT and Police.

- 5.4 There are no private companies involved directly in the partnership. This is mainly due to the lack of large companies within the Borough. However, some companies, such as Barclays Bank and Sainsbury’s, were about to provide work experience opportunities for young people as part of their involvement with the Peace Alliance. Victim Support recently required further development and partners were currently working to improve its performance.
- 5.5 Councillor Canver was of the view that there were some good examples of how crime prevention programmes and activity were being delivered by partners as additional to their ‘normal work’. Examples of this included the Fire Service led Prison Me No Way programme and the use of forensic nursing assessments in custody suites. Other work and programmes had become mainstream crime prevention work, such as Operation Tailgate – a regular joint Police and Council enforcement operation involving a range of external partners – and the embedding of programmes to address youth employment opportunities for those at most risk.
- 5.6 She felt, however, that the mainstreaming of crime and disorder prevention work was not yet happening systematically in Haringey. This requirement should ideally be part of standard business planning and policy making in a way that equalities considerations were. Some boroughs, such as Lambeth, had undertaken a fuller discussion amongst partners on how to meet their statutory responsibilities.
- 5.7 The Panel noted that Lambeth had recently agreed a three year strategic approach to mainstreaming, which aims to ensure that Council services have community safety embedded within their planning, policy and operational day-to-day activities. The strategy is based on three objectives:
- Ownership – to ensure that all staff understand how they can contribute to making Lambeth a safer place and that all staff make a meaningful contribution
 - Corporate Planning – to ensure that the responsibility for crime and disorder reduction becomes fully integrated into the working environment of all Directorates
 - Co-ordination and Accountability – to ensure corporate responsibility for crime and disorder reduction.
- 5.8 Councillor Canver felt that partners on the Safer Communities Partnership could make a greater contribution to addressing community safety issues through a number of ways:

- Dissemination of partnership working principles and practices throughout their own organisations
- Reviewing of areas of joint concern and how delivery might be reinforced through better co-ordination across the partnership. An example of good practice was the work that was done on the health/community safety overlap a few years ago but which was never taken forward.
- Encouraging more investment in – and better outcomes from - higher level strategic analysis, training staff to examine correlations between areas of work and for this to be reflected in policy making across the partnership. An example might be the correlation between stolen cars/joy riders and abandoned vehicles. Another might be the link between sustainable housing and re-offending etc.
- Through regeneration and planning project officers to be made aware of crime prevention and reduction principles and techniques, such as designing out crime/anti-social behaviour.
- Agreeing a robust project management and evaluation model that asked the question of who else might contribute to delivery from around the partnership at the outset of any new project/programme or policy.
- Actively participating in the delivery of the partnership communications strategy

5.9 The Panel also received evidence from Helen Brown and Christina Gradowski from Haringey Teaching Primary Care Trust (TPCT). They had a key commissioning role in delivering the Well Being agenda and the Health Improvement Plan for the Borough. Improving health was not incompatible with reducing crime. Substance misuse and mental health was particularly relevant to safer and stronger communities. It was nevertheless acknowledged that, on a strategic level, the TPCT could do more. In terms of alcohol abuse, cheapness was a big issue.

5.10 There was now lots of research that showed that raising the price of alcohol was effective and a range of medical, voluntary and charitable organisations were campaigning for an increase in duty. As part of their public health duty, the TPCT did a lot of work with the Council on licensing issues but this was on a strategic and policy basis rather than in relation to individual applications. However, the TPCT would be interested in working more proactively with partners on drugs and alcohol issues. It was noted that the TPCT had employed a nurse who was based at the North Middlesex Hospital to assess issues relating to alcohol in patients who presented at Accident and Emergency.

5.11 There was a need for more interventions that were carried out on a multi agency basis and were effective. Partnership activity should also be more focussed on joint action rather than just being “meetings” based. The TPCT was keen to work with the Head of Safer Communities Unit on some targeted work around alcohol abuse and to look at the commissioning of alcohol services. A meeting would be set up to progress targeted work and would involve public health.

- 5.12 There were several other areas where the responsibilities of agencies overlapped, such as child protection, and domestic violence. In general, the partnership worked well and was moving toward an approach that was more based on prevention.
- 5.13 The Panel received evidence from Paul Head, the Principal of CoNEL, who reported that CoNEL had incorporated the need to reduce crime and disorder within their mainstream work through:
- Developing a focus on safety issues over the last few years on two tracks. Firstly relating to creating a self and secure environment and secondly through work with students on issues related to respect for each other, conflict resolution, social cohesion and awareness of crime and safety issues.
 - Strand 1 on a safe and secure environment has been focussed on working with our local community police offices and then targeted work on knife and gun crime and on drug related issues. The Partnership work with the Borough police, who have been very effective and supportive,
 - Strand 2 has addressed the issues through student enrichment activities, for example work on gun crime, awareness raising on drug issues etc.
- 5.14 He felt that partners needed to find a simpler way of explaining each others targets and then look for how working together can address a range of targets. The Families into Work project in Northumberland Park was an example that pointed the way forward.

6. Case Study – Brent

- 6.1 The issues facing Haringey are being faced, to a greater or lesser degree, by most other authorities. The Panel undertook a visit to the London Borough of Brent to see how they dealt with similar issues. They did not have a combined safer and stronger communities team - there was a Council team that worked together with the Police Service. The Anti Social Behaviour Team was based on police premises and included two police officers. The Council was not charged for the premises. If it had been located in Council premises, the service would have been charged for the premises. The service also had to pay for advice from their Legal Service. Domestic Violence and Advocacy was based at Kilburn police station, also without cost. The Youth Offending Service was based within the Council's Children and Families Service. In respect of drugs, their DAAT team was funded and housed by the PCT.
- 6.2 Around 50% of the funding for relevant activity was from mainstream sources with the remainder – including that for the Anti Social Behaviour Team – being external funding. They felt that the key to retaining staff in such situations of uncertainty was to build confidence in the continuity of service. However, it was not possible to guarantee that people would still definitely have jobs when funding expired. The service had tried to develop structures so that that staff were confident that all would be done to get the necessary funding to provide an excellent service. A lot of their current activities did not currently have stable funding but this was no different to last year. Bearing in mind the funding issues, staff retention was relatively good.

- 6.3 Brent were currently looking at LAA priorities. However, they knew what the key issues for the Borough were e.g. domestic violence, knives, guns crime, long term prevention and anti social behaviour. Crime was a key local priority and they felt that the service was in a strong position to negotiate.
- 6.4 The Anti Social Behaviour Team was entirely funded by grants and had a high caseload, including cases referred by the Police Service. There was a lack of targets for addressing low level anti social behaviour. Prevention needed to be made a higher priority than enforcement. They had managed to get other services to contribute to initiatives – for instance, the Environment Service funded a post dedicated to addressing graffiti.
- 6.5 They had undertaken an audit on Section 17 activity. This was driven by their CPA assessment. Brent had taken the example of Bexley, whose practice they had found out about through a Beacon Open Day, and had also undertaken an audit. This had helped to get a complete picture of everything that people were doing that contributed to addressing crime and disorder. The intention was to promote a “whole Council” approach. Incentives had been given to managers to co-operate. The service had undertaken interviews with relevant managers and had found that the process of undertaking this exercise was just as important as the end product as it had increased overall awareness and understanding. The idea was to promote the idea that addressing crime and disorder should underpin everything that the Council does. Reference should be made to the issue in all committee reports. In addition, the issue was being included in learning and development plans for staff and there were champions in each department. Work was still needed to make improvements – some staff were still not aware of how they contributed.
- 6.6 They had their own communications officer whose role was to provide positive messages and reassure the local community. They had a partnership newsletter which sent around by e-mail.

Suggested Issues for Discussion:

- **How should actions to achieve Safer and Stronger Communities LAA targets be resourced?**
- **How can a greater level of stability and sustainability be achieved?**
- **How can mainstreaming of community safety be improved:**
 - **Within the Council?**
 - **With Partners?**