Scrutiny Review - Resourcing of Safer and Stronger Communities LAA Targets

Contents: **page**

Executive Summary

Community safety is the most important concern expressed by residents and has consistently been so for many years. A wide variety of factors impact on crime and it therefore cannot be seen as being merely the responsibility of the Police Service. Successful interventions require the active participation of a wide range of partners. It is for this reason that there is a specific duty on a range of local partners to address the issue, both individually and jointly with partners.

The actions that partners undertake to achieve local community safety targets have been incorporated into the Safer and Stronger Communities block of the Local Area Agreement. A large percentage of the funding to achieve these targets – 89% - currently comes from time limited external grants, many of which are shortly scheduled to expire. This money funds a lot of vital work such as that undertaken by the Anti Social Behaviour Action Team (ASBAT) and the Youth Offending Service (YOS). This funding will, to some extent, be replaced by LAA area based funding which will not be ring fenced and will, in real terms, be less overall then provided for by the previous funding arrangements. The different blocks within the LAA will all have to compete for these resources. The Panel believes that the Haringey Strategic Partnership should use this exercise as an opportunity to re-examine its funding priorities and ensure that they are based on those outlined within the Haringey Strategic Plan rather then merely on precedent.

The Panel notes that there are many posts within the Community Safety Business Unit that are currently under threat and that many of the functions that they undertake are statutory and crucial to the achieving of appropriate targets and addressing some of the top concerns of residents. It also notes that there are many disadvantages to short funding such work through grant funding but is mindful of the Council's current financial position. It is of the view that all funding options for the maintenance of the posts should be fully considered so that the very important work that these postholders undertake can continue.

There is potential for improvement in the mainstreaming of community safety within the Council so that awareness of the potential contribution of all services to addressing crime and disorder can be enhanced and that it is considered when all proposals are developed and decisions made. In particular, the Panel recognises the fact that planning and licensing decisions can have a significant affect on the character of an area. The Panel is also of the view that the responsibility for addressing crime and disorder should not disproportionately fall on a small number of partners for whom the issue is part of their "core business". It therefore feels that there needs to be debate within the Safer Communities Partnership on how partnership working can be further developed and joint working improved.

Recommendations:

1. That the Haringey Strategic Partnership adopt a strategic approach, rather than one based on precedent, to allocating grant funding to the specific blocks within the new LAA with specific criterion being set that relate directly to the Haringey Community Strategy and the key priorities within it. (Haringey Strategic Partnership/Leader/Assistant Chief Executive – Policy, Performance and Partnership)

2. That all potential sources of funding to secure the continuation of posts within the Community Safety Business that cover either statutory responsibilities or are of key strategic importance be investigated fully. (Cabinet Member for Enforcement and Safer Communities/ Assistant Chief Executive – Policy, Performance and Partnership).

3. That that all funding currently used by the Children's and Young People's Service to fund crime prevention work with 8 to 13 year old children and young people continue to be used specifically for these purposes. (Cabinet Members for Enforcement and Safer Communities and for Children and Young People/Director of Children and Young People's Service/Assistant Chief Executive – Policy, Performance and Partnership)

Section 17 and Mainstreaming:

4. That each business unit of the Council include community safety activities within their annual service plans. (Leader/ Assistant Chief Executive – Policy, Performance and Partnership)

5. That authors be required to draft a specific comment on all committee reports on the potential impact of proposals on crime and disorder in order to ensure that the issue is taken into account in all of the Council's policies, strategies, plans and budgets, as required by Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998. (Cabinet Members for Enforcement and Safer Communities and for Community Cohesion and Involvement/Assistant Chief Executive - People and Organisational Development Service)

6. That crime and disorder issues are included in performance appraisals for all senior management posts within the Council. (Cabinet Member for Enforcement and Safer Communities/Assistant Chief Executive - People and Organisational Development Service)

7. That the Haringey Safer Communities Partnership give specific consideration to the issue how partners can work more effectively together and mainstreaming responsibilities as part of the process for developing the new Community Safety strategy. (Haringey Strategic Partnership/Leader/Assistant Chief Executive – Policy, Performance and Partnership)

8. That the establishment of a Business Improvement District for Wood Green be reconsidered by the Haringey Strategic Partnership. (Haringey Strategic

Partnership/Cabinet Member for Enterprise and Regeneration/Assistant Director of Urban Environment – Economic Regeneration)

Background

Introduction

1.1 The review was set up in response to the challenges that have come to light concerning the future resourcing of actions to achieve targets within the Safer and Stronger Communities block of the Local Area Agreement (LAA). This was initially raised as an issue by the Cabinet Member for Enforcement and Safer Communities, Councillor Nilgun Canver and agreed as an appropriate subject for a review by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 10 September 2007.

Aims and Objectives

1.2 The following aims and objectives for the review were agreed:

- To consider the future resourcing of actions to achieve targets within the Safer and Stronger Communities block of the Local Area Agreement.

- To consider how comparable local authorities are addressing the issue and whether good practice elsewhere can be incorporated locally

- To obtain stakeholder views on the priority that should be given to potential targets within the Safer and Stronger Communities block of the LAA.

Terms of Reference

1.3 The terms of reference for the review were as follows:

"To consider the future resourcing of actions to achieve strategic targets within the Safer and Stronger Communities block of the Local Area Agreement for Haringey 2007 – 2010 and to make recommendations thereon to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee"

Members of Review Panel:

1.4 Councillors Pat Egan (Chair), Ron Aitken, Jonathan Bloch and Catherine Harris.

Sources of Evidence

1.5 In undertaking their review, the Panel received evidence from a wide range of stakeholders as well as documentary evidence. A full list of these is attached as Appendix A. In addition, Members of the Panel visited the London Boroughs of Brent and Camden to obtain the views of relevant Community Safety staff there.

Community Safety and Local Area Agreements

Introduction

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.   Community safety:

- Is a major priority for local people

- Consistently comes out in the top three issues in most local consultation (e.g. top priority for Haringey residents according to the latest residents survey)

- Is the general responsibility of a range of agencies but the specific responsibility of none

- Cuts across the prevailing service planning and structures

- 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 the Police Service 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 (CDRPs) 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   The Act also placed a responsibility on CDRPs to establish the levels of crime and disorder in their area and consult widely with the population of that area to make sure that the partnership's perception matched that of local people, especially minority groups, such as gay men and lesbians, or members of ethnic minorities. In response to this, CDRPs were required to devise a strategy containing measures to tackle those problems identified as being a priority. These were to include targets and target owners for each of the priority areas. Each strategy was to last for three years but was required to be kept under review by the partnership. The Police and Justice Act 2006 repealed the duty to produce the three yearly audits and strategies and 2005/08 will be the last audit and strategy in the current format.

The Local Area Agreement (LAA)

2.5   Local Area Agreements (LAAs) are three year agreements between key partners that set out the priorities for a local area. These are agreed via each area's 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.

2.6 The LAA is made up of four blocks:

- Children and Young People

- Safer and Stronger Communities

- Healthier Communities and Older People

- Economic Development

2.7 The targets within the CDRP's three-year strategy have been incorporated into the Safer and Stronger Communities block of this. The targets within this 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 of which are short to medium term time limited grants.

2.8 The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 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.

2.9 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.

2.10 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.

2.11 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.

Safer and Stronger Communities Targets

2.12 There are likely to be seven specific Safer and Stronger Communities targets within the 35 local improvement targets for Haringey, covering such areas as children and young people, volume crime, drugs, alcohol, terrorism, anti social behaviour and traffic accidents.

2.13 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 as part of LAA grant is not yet known. It is widely anticipated that it will be less then the amount that was previously available.

Resourcing Safer and Stronger Communities Targets within Haringey

Introduction

3.1 The Council's Community Safety Business Unit includes several areas which are of key strategic importance in addressing the Safer and Stronger Communities LAA 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)

3.2 A high percentage - 89% - of the funding that the Community Safety Business Unit receives comes from time limited short to medium term grants. The unit has been extremely successful in bringing in such funding. It has become, to some extent a victim of this success as the tacit assumption has been made that there is no need to put local resources into the service as external grants could provide necessary funding.

Current Sources of Funding

3.3 The sources of funding for 2007/08 allocated to Community Safety business unit are outlined in Appendix A. £1,053,400 has been allocated to the business unit from the Council's core funding in comparison to £6,207,750 of funding that is received from external sources. External funding sources include:

- The Neighbourhood Renewal Fund (NRF)
- Government Office for London (GOL)
- Homes for Haringey (HfH)
- Youth Justice Board (YJB)
- Haringey Primary Care Trust (HPCT)
- Learning Skills Council (LSC)
- Basic Command Unit Fund
- National Treatment Agency

3.4 Many of these grants which fund current activity within Haringey are due to expire in March 2008. 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 recently been announced. Some grants that have provided youth crime prevention work and drug treatment work also end in March 2008. As such a high level of the unit's funding comes from such grants, it is therefore very vulnerable to such a loss.

3.5 The Panel noted that only those grants that were felt to be appropriate to the Borough's needs had been applied for. It is, in any case, much more challenging now to obtain external funding and such funding that is available now tends to be directed at the voluntary sector. The current strategy is to consider the problem rather then focussing on potential sources of funding to identify work required.

3.6 The Head of Finance commented that the high dependency on external grant funding to support the Community Safety Business Unit has been recognised as

an issue for a number of years and should ideally be replaced by core funding. However, there have been high demands on resources across the Council 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 Comprehensive Spending Review 2007 and grant settlement announcements, particularly as more grants move away from specific to non-ring-fenced Area Based Grant, which have the potential to lead to a re-direction of resources away from Community Safety activities. Officers were in the process of reviewing the impact of loss of grant funding across the Council as part of the budget process. This should provide more information but the Council was not yet in a position to understand the actual impact.

Disadvantages of Grant Funding

3.7 The reliance on time limited grants has created a number of challenges:

- 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 recurring 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. Some grant allocations have been notified and received late in the year, which has had a negative impact on long term planning.

- 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.

Potential Implications of Loss of Grant Funding

3.8 If there is no change in the level of core funding or no safeguarding of funds that are currently ring-fenced, there will be an increased risk to the Borough's ability to deliver the Government's national community safety strategies, such as cutting crime and anti-social behaviour, drugs and alcohol and reducing youth crime. The Borough might also struggle to implement the new requirements in the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership review for more strategic analysis, more community engagement and the implementation of national standards in community safety.

3.9 The youth prevention work of the YOS, which is currently funded from the Children's Fund, is particularly at risk as well as work in schools, prevention and critical casework work of the Anti Social Behaviour Action Team (ASBAT). 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.

3.10 Due to grants being utilised for salaries of key officers within the Community Safety Business Unit, any reduction in them will inevitably incur redundancies. If there are significant reductions in these grants, the Council's redeployment/redundancy procedures will need to be actioned by the end of December 2007, or the impact on budgets for next year will be considerable.

3.11 The Panel noted the effects of previous core budget cuts on the YOS, when part of Social Services, which had resulted in 6 posts being lost. The YOS went from being one of the top performing in the country to falling into the bottom quartile in the space of one year. Although funding was re-allocated to the YOS, it took two years for performance to recover. This period also saw an increase in re-offending, which could be an indication that young offenders were not being adequately supported during the period of reduced funding. It is possible that the drop that might be seen in funding for Safer and Stronger Communities work next year could well have a similar impact and vital services would be severely affected.

The Case for Funding

3.12 Many community safety initiatives and responsibilities are now statutory. 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.

3.13 Community safety initiatives also cover areas of key concern for local residents – crime is always very high in the list of residents concern and was top in the 2007 survey. The strategic planning function is also very important as it has a key role in helping to guide front line services and informing the strategic decisions of the Safer Communities Partnership. Its work involves analysing and monitoring data, working on targets and national standards and capacity building.

3.14 Workload within specific teams has increased markedly. This is particularly true of the YOS and the ASBAT, who have both seen a significant increase in demand for their services. Police successes in apprehending young offenders are a factor in increasing pressure on the YOS, who are required to undertake work with such young people in order to assist in their rehabilitation. In addition, the Youth Justice Board now measures youth crime prevention work, which has increased this area of work for the YOS. Reporting of crime and anti social behaviour is now being more actively encouraged, which is also likely to increase workload further.

Future Funding Options

3.15 One particular option to resolve the funding issues that was suggested to the Panel by the Police Service was that the partners could give consideration to looking collectively at the range of current activity and deciding what is critical and therefore could be considered for core funding. 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 is currently spent on staffing, whilst the remainder goes to the particular programmes associated with the money. Increasing in the number of mainstream funded posts would not necessarily mean foregoing the opportunity to bring in external funds. It could mean instead that, when such

funds were obtained, more would be available for the specific programmes rather then the staff required to deliver them.

3.16 The concerns of residents are not always supported by crime data. Whilst street crime, burglary and theft from and of motor vehicles 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 are limited recreational opportunities for young people. However, there are organisations and people with the potential to provide 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.

3.17 The Cabinet Member for Enforcement and Safer Communities 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. It was vital that the Haringey Strategic Partnership ensured that the key priorities in the Community Strategy as well as residents' top concerns – which included crime - were fairly and adequately prioritised.

- She felt that serious consideration needed to be given to core funding for areas of priority which were statutory and ongoing

- There were already some good examples of aligned funding and joint delivery of priorities. The Supporting People Programme, for example, helps 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 are also good examples of services and partners working together to deliver key priorities, such as partnership efforts to address worklessness and domestic violence and the co-ordination of structured crime prevention work in schools. Further opportunities could 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**.**

Approach by Other Local Authorities

3.18 The Panel noted how two other London Boroughs were approaching the same issues. However, exact comparisons are difficult as the arrangements utilised by other Boroughs vary as does entitlement to external grant funding.

3.19 The London Borough of Camden had previously taken the decision to use mainstream funding for a number of key posts that had been at risk including the service head, who is now Assistant Director, and individual service managers and policy analysts. In some cases, posts were mainstream funded whilst the programmes that they supported were grant funded. They were likely to base their decisions on the allocation of funds for the first year of the new LAA on their historical position.

3.20 In Brent, 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. Officers at Brent felt that the key to retaining staff in such situations of uncertainty was to build confidence in the continuity of service. The service had tried to develop structures so 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 felt to be still relatively good.

3.21 Although there will still be government funding from April 2008 to deliver Safer and Stronger Communities LAA targets, the Panel 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 is allocated between the different blocks.

Future Funding of Safer and Stronger Communities Targets

3.22 The Panel feels that the Haringey Strategic Partnership (HSP), in making decisions on how funding is divided up for the activities within the LAA blocks, should not merely look at the historical position in relation to funding and seek to replicate this within the new structure. It feels that a strategic approach by the HSP should be adopted and specific criterion set for the allocation of funding within the area based LAA grant. This should be based upon the key priorities identified within Haringey's Community Strategy. The introduction of the new funding regime, as well as a strategic approach, will facilitate longer term planning and hence a greater level of sustainability.

Recommendation:
That the HSP adopt a strategic approach, rather then one based on precedent, to allocating grant funding to the specific blocks within the new LAA with specific criterion being set that relate directly to the Haringey Community Strategy and the key priorities within it.

3.23 The Panel is mindful of the key strategic importance and value of staff within the Community Safety Business Unit and the potentially serious consequences of their loss. It would therefore recommend that all possible sources of funding to secure their continuity be investigated fully.

Recommendation:
That all potential sources of funding to secure the continuation of posts within the Community Safety Business that cover either statutory responsibilities or are of key strategic importance be investigated fully.

3.24 It was noted by the Panel that "On Track" funding for work with 8 to 13 year old children is currently ring fenced before being given to the Children's and Young People's Service. The ring fencing is removed in April 2008. The Panel was concerned at the possibility that, in the absence of ring fencing, this money could instead be re-directed to cover shortfalls in other service areas and the preventative work with children and young people that it currently covered might be lost. This work is very valuable. Haringey had a high number of young people between 16 and 18 who are not in education, employment or training (NEET). The proportion is the second highest in London. In addition, there are

challenges arising from the influx of children and young people from newer communities into the Borough. The Panel is therefore of the view that that all monies used by the Children's and Young People's Service for crime prevention work should continue to be used specifically for these purposes.

Recommendation:
That that all funding currently used by the Children's and Young People's Service to fund   crime prevention work with 8 to 13 year old children and young people continue to be used specifically for these purposes.

Section 17 and Mainstreaming

Introduction

4.1 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 the collective responsibility to prevent crime and anti-social behaviour could be developed and given proper recognition amongst all services.

4.2 The need for a range of partners to contribute fully to the achievement of community safety targets has been recognised in legislation. According to Home Office guidance, Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 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."*

4.3 The Police and Justice Act 2006 increased the scope of Section 17 of the 1998 Act to include anti-social behaviour, substance misuse and behaviour that adversely affects the environment.

4.4 The Panel noted the view of the Cabinet Member for Enforcement and Safer Communities that the mainstreaming of crime and disorder prevention work was not yet happening systematically in Haringey. She felt that this requirement should ideally be part of standard business planning and policy making in a way that equalities considerations were.

Mainstreaming within the Council

4.5 The 2008-11 Crime Reduction Strategy for Haringey emphasises the need to make *"the most efficient and effective use of resources, including mainstream and specific grant funding available to the police, local authorities and local partnerships"*. It was suggested to the Panel that the Council could seek to lead on achieving this goal by ensuring that the responsibility of crime and disorder reduction becomes better integrated into the working environment of all directorates.

4.6 There are three possible levels of implementation of Section 17 for local authorities 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

4.7 One or more of these approaches can be adopted.

4.8 Reducing crime and disorder is a responsibility that is cross cutting and should be placed at the heart of decision making. The issue of how this should be achieved has been considered in detail by some local authorities. Lambeth have decided to follow the "corporate approach" and recently agreed a three year strategic approach to mainstreaming, which aims to ensure that all 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.

4.9 Brent has undertaken a Council wide audit on Section 17 activity in order to increase awareness and understanding of the contribution that all services can make. This was driven by their CPA assessment. They had taken the example of Bexley, who are a Beacon authority for crime and disorder partnerships and have also undertaken an audit as part of their work.   Brent's audit had helped them to get a complete picture of everything that was being done across the Council that contributed to addressing crime and disorder. The intention was to promote a "whole Council" approach. 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 aim was to promote the idea that addressing crime and disorder should underpin everything that the Council does.

4.10 The Panel noted that national research on the mainstreaming of community safety has shown that it has been much more successful where local authorities have included consideration of it within planning processes.   The Audit Commission published a report entitled "Community Safety Partnerships" in 2002, which brought together audit, inspection and research findings on CDRPs during their first three years of their existence. The report highlighted the importance of moving community safety to the heart of basic service delivery and identified a list of actions that each service within Councils could take to mainstream community safety. This list is reproduced as Appendix D to the report. The view was expressed that adopting this approach would assist local authorities in getting wider support from other agencies. The Panel would therefore recommend that each business unit within the Council be required to include community safety activities within their annual business plans.

> *Recommendation***:**
> **That each business unit of the Council include community safety activities within their annual service plans.**

4.11 The Panel also feels that there is a need for crime and disorder to be considered explicitly when important decisions are taken by the Council. Decisions on a

whole range of issues can have a significant impact on crime and disorder. In particular, planning and licensing matters can have a major affect on the character of an area and the potential for disorder. It is therefore of the view that there should be a specific comment in all committee reports on the potential impact on crime and disorder of proposals. This will help ensure that the issue is taken into account in all of the Council's policies, strategies, plans and budgets, as required by Section 17.

4.12 The Panel is, however, mindful that if adding comments onto reports becomes the sole duty of staff within the Community Safety business unit, it may detract from the development of a culture where community safety is seen as the responsibility of all services. It is therefore of the view that this requirement should follow the model adopted for equalities comments, rather then that currently used for finance and legal comments.

4.13 Equalities is also a mainstreamed activity with similar needs to ensure that all service areas take responsibility for addressing it and that it is considered fully when important decisions are taken. T*he responsibility for drafting equalities comments on committee reports rests with report authors, rather than officers from the Council's Equalities and Diversity Team, whose role is to provide advice guidance and to ensure the equalities comment accurately reflects all equalities implications. This helps to ensure that officers who are directly responsible for drafting proposals consider their impact on all equalities issues.*

4.14 The Panel is of the view that comments on the potential impact on crime and disorder of proposals within the committee reports should also be the responsibility of report authors, in consultation with officers from the Community Safety Business Unit. Such an approach will help to focus the minds of relevant officers and Members on crime and disorder issues when proposals are being considered whilst avoiding the pitfalls of it becoming merely a "tick box" exercise, which may not serve to enhance mainstreaming.

Recommendation:
That authors be required to draft a specific comment on all committee reports on the potential impact of proposals on crime and disorder in order to ensure that the issue is taken into account in all of the Council's policies, strategies, plans and budgets, as required by Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998.

4.15 The Panel noted that the London Borough of Brent had included the issue in learning and development plans for staff, including appraisals. The Panel feels that it would be appropriate to adopt a similar approach in Haringey as a way of ensuring that all staff at senior levels are fully aware of the Council's responsibilities in this area and are considering the issue as part of their day-to-day work. This will also complement the above-mentioned recommendation concerning the requirement to spell out crime and disorder implications in committee reports by increasing awareness of the issue amongst relevant staff. The Panel would therefore recommend that reference to crime and disorder is in appraisals for senior posts within the Council.

Recommendation:
That crime and disorder issues are included in performance appraisals for all senior management posts within the Council.

Partnerships

4.16 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.

4.17 The Panel received evidence that some external partners were more engaged then others. The Police Service and Probation were particularly well engaged as community safety forms part of their "core business". In addition, the Primary Care Trust and schools were also well engaged. Some concern was 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.

4.18 There are no private companies involved directly in the partnership. This is mainly due to the limited number of large companies within the Borough. However, 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.

4.19 The Cabinet Member for Enforcement and Safer Communities 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.

4.20 The Cabinet Member 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 due to competing priorities.

- 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

The Views of Partners

4.21 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 were particularly relevant to safer and stronger communities. It was nevertheless acknowledged that, on a strategic level, the TPCT could do more.

4.22 In terms of alcohol abuse, cheap alcohol was a big issue and 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 then 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 abuse in patients who presented at Accident and Emergency.

4.23 Ms. Gradowski and Ms. Brown felt that 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 then just being "meetings" based. The TPCT was particularly 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

4.24 There were several other areas where the responsibilities of agencies overlapped, such as child protection, and domestic violence. In general, they felt that the partnership worked well and was moving toward an approach that was more based on prevention.

4.25 The view of Paul Head, the Principal of CoNEL, was that the key to effective mainstreaming was 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 should be an aid to mainstreaming. He felt that these issues should be made part of service agreements.

4.26 He 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 safe and secure environment and secondly though work with students on issues relating 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 local community police offices and then targeted on knife and gun crime and on drug related issues.

- Strand 2 has addressed the issues through student enrichment activities, for example work on gun crime and awareness raising on drug issues.

4.27 He felt that partners needed to find a simpler way of explaining each others targets and then look for how working together could address a range of targets. The Families into Work project in Northumberland Park was an example that pointed the way forward.

Further Development of Joint Working

4.28 The Panel noted that the new Community Safety strategy was currently being considered by the Safer Communities Partnership. It is of the view that there needs to be more joined up working between partners in order to assist in the achievement of targets. Discussion of the new strategy could provide a valuable opportunity to discuss how partners could work more effectively together and mainstreaming responsibilities. There is a particular need for the Mental Health Trust to be more fully engaged. In addition, there is a need for more work to be undertaken with partners outside the traditional loop, such as the Street Pastors within the faith communities sector.

Recommendation:
That the Haringey Safer Communities Partnership give specific consideration to the issue how partners can work more effectively together and mainstreaming responsibilities as part of the process for developing the new Community Safety strategy.

Business Improvement Districts (BIDs)

4.29 The Panel noted that Camden has two Business Improvement Districts (BIDs) – Camden and Holborn - and that these have provided an opportunity to bring in additional resources to those areas. BIDs are locally controlled partnerships for improving the environment and economic performance of a defined area. They are created by groups of businesses to oversee and fund environmental improvements and the provision of a limited number of additional or enhanced local services. They are based on the principle of an additional levy being placed on all defined ratepayers following a majority vote. A majority of ratepayers in terms of their numbers and the proportion of their rateable value must be achieved. Once a vote has been taken in favour, the levy becomes mandatory and is treated in the same way as the Business Rate. The levy falls on the occupier rather then the owner of a property and areas that are in decline or suffer from high rates of vacancy are therefore not normally good candidates for BID status.

4.30 Consideration has been previously been given to setting a BID up for the Wood Green areas but not pursued. The Panel is of the view that the establishment of a BID for Wood Green could assist in helping to provide additional funding to bring improvement to the area. In particular, it could be used to improve security around the area by funding community safety initiatives and environmental improvements such as providing additional street cleansing, improving street furniture and quicker removal of graffiti. The Panel therefore feels that this issue should now be revisited by the Haringey Strategic Partnership.

Recommendation:
That the establishment of a Business Improvement District for Wood Green be reconsidered by the Haringey Strategic Partnership.

APPENDIX A

COMMUNITY SAFETY BUSINESS UNIT

Sources of Funding 2007/08

Service	*Core Funding	Additional Funding Source	Breakdown of Funding Source		End Date of Funding
Anti Social Behaviour Action Team	n/a	565,700	SSCF	327,000	March '08
			Homes for Haringey	153,200	on-going
			Homes for Haringey (Legal)	23,000	on-going
			NRF	12,500	March '08
			Respect Task Force- Parenting Worker	50,000	March '08
Community Safety Team	196,500	1,343,028	SSCF (Revenue)	380,000	March '08
			SSCF (Capital)	121000	March '08
			GOL Preventing Violent Extremism Pathfinder Fund	80,000	March '08
			DAAT Support Grant	67,028	on-going
			NRF Com Safety Provision	420,000	March '08
			Partnership Board	250,000	March '08
			NRF ASB	25,000	March '08
Drugs & Alcohol Action Team	n/a	1,974,511	DIP Main Grant	1,243,541	on-going
			Young People & Substance Misuse Grant	510,970	on-going
			Haringey Primary Care Trust	220,000	on-going
Emergency Planing & Business Continuity	208,900	2,500	Civil Defence Grant	2,500	on-going
Youth Offending Service	648,000	2,322,011	NRF YOS	292,000	March '08
			YOS-Reparation	42,750	March '08
			YOS-Parenting	42,750	March '08
			YP Asylum Worker	40,000	March '08
			YJB Resettlement & Aftercare Programme	222,000	March '08
			North London Intensive Supervision Surveillance Programmes	439,765	on-going
			Support Grant	285,593	on-going
			Prevention Funding	202,557	March '08
			Childrens Fund	466,400	March '08
			Other External Income London Probation Service	56,400	on-going
			BCU Metropolitan Police	34,000	March '08
			LSC Keeping Young People Engaged	29,621	March '08
			Other Council Funding Education Worker	38,475	on-going
			Education -Annual Contribution to YOS	65,700	on-going
			Childrens Service - Parenting Worker	30,000	on-going
			Supporting People - Housing Officer	34,000	March '08

BU TOTAL   £1,053,400   £6,207,750

*NB Excludes Overheads

APPENDIX B

Bibliography:

Haringey Safer Communities Strategy 2005-2008

Haringey Strategic Partnership – Local Area Agreement 2007-2010

Cutting Crime – A New Partnership 2008-11 (Home Office)

Threads of Success – A Study of Community Safety Partnerships in Scotland (The Scottish Executive)

Mainstreaming Community Safety – A Practical Guide to Implementing Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 (Crime Concern)

Mainstreaming Community Safety Strategy: Responding to Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 (London Borough of Lambeth)

Local Authority Guide to Business Improvement Districts (Association of London Government)

APPENDIX C

Participants in the Review

Wayne Mawson, Deputy Police Commander for Haringey
Shaun Sweeney, Police Projects Officer, Haringey Police
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
Tony Brooks and Donna Faye, London Borough of Camden
Claire Kowalska, Community Safety Strategic Manager, London Borough of Haringey
Councillor Nilgun Canver, Cabinet Member for Enforcement and Safer Communities, Haringey Council
Jean Croot, the Head of Safer Communities, London Borough of Haringey
Carolyn Sullivan, Regional Crime and Drug Manager, Government Office for London (GoL)
Frances Palopoli, Head of Finance, London Borough of Haringey

CHIEF EXECUTIVES OFFICE

- Ensure that funding id available to meet the cost of implementing community safety.

- Secure external funding to fill gaps in local funding plans.

- Provide grant-aid to community organisations that are delivering community safety outcomes.

- Enable information sharing and analysis under Section 115 of the Crime and Disorder Act, 1988.

- Ensure that all relevant agencies participate in the triennial community safety audit and strategy development cycles.

- Provide support for the community safety partnership.

- Provide support and information for those councillors overseeing community safety implementation.

- Promote community safety within the council; for example, incorporate impact assessments into service plans, reviews and committee/cabinet papers.

- Integrate and promote joint working of the community safety partnership with relevant national, regional and local bodies, for example, Home Office, regional Government Offices, Regional Development Agency, local Youth Offending and Drug Action Teams, voluntary and business sectors, local communities.

- Link community safety to other strategic planning issues, for example, neighbourhood renewal/regeneration, town/city centre management, policy research, media liaison/public relations/marketing, best value, equalities, customer relationship management, human resources and emergency planning.

- Support local community safety activities and projects.

- Raise the profile of community safety in local publications and media channels.

- Ensure that local people receive accurate information about the true risk of becoming a victim of crime.

- Challenge stigmatising images of high-crime neighbourhoods.

- Develop safer, more attractive environments that generate increased tourism, employment and inward investment.

LEGAL SERVICES

- Support activities to reduce crime, anti-social behaviour, nuisance and harassment.

- Ensure that contracts incorporate appropriate community safety measures.

HUMAN RESOURCE SERVICES

- Implement corporate policies that provide fair access to services by reducing violence, and racial and sexual harassment to both personnel and the public.

- Provide appropriate support to personnel who are victims of crime.

- Implement corporate policies that reduce substance misuse in the workplace.

- Incorporate appropriate community safety perspectives into recruitment procedures and performance appraisal.

- Provide appropriate support to personnel who are working in situations where their safety may be at risk.

FINANCIAL SERVICES

- Establish systems that reduce the risk of the council's exposure to crime, for example, fraud and theft.

- Track the cost of crime, including petty theft, across the council and implement measures to reduce it.

- Pool all possible information to reduce benefit fraud with other council departments and other local agencies under an information-sharing protocol.

- Maximise benefit take up within deprived areas and communities.

DEMOCRATIC SERVICES

- Incorporate community safety issues into community consultation and market research.

- Integrate community safety consultation with best value consultation.

- Identify and achieve communication with vulnerable and hard-to- reach communities.

- Devise youth-specific consultation and communication arrangements.

- Establish local community consultative forums that address community safety and other local issues.

HOUSING SERVICES

- Ensure that allocation policies are sufficiently sensitive to create balanced communities.

- Provide neighbourhood –based management, offices and wardens and access to services.

- Raise the profile of community safety with tenant and resident groups.
- Implement neighbourhood watch schemes.

- Establish 'safer estate' agreements.

- Implement 'secured by design' schemes covering residential areas.

- Increase the safety of vulnerable people's homes by installing better security measures.

- Increase the security of empty homes y installing better security measures.

- Support repeat victims of crime.

- Seek to provide housing for those most at risk of becoming a victim of crime, for example, homeless people, refugees and asylum seekers.

- Refer victims of crime to appropriate sources of support.

- Establish and implement anti- harassment policies relating to domestic violence, race and homophobia.

- Share information with the police and other local agencies under and information-haring protocol

- Support and manage the behaviour of tenants who are at risk of evictions.

- Enforcing injunctions, introductory tenancies, tenancy agreements, noise abatement policies and civil law remedies.

- Use acceptable behaviour and anti-social behaviour orders where necessary.

- Record incidents and costs of crime, vandalism, anti-social behaviour and harassment.

- Conduct personal safety audits of housing estates.

- Implement professional witness schemes to gain evidence of crime and harassment.

- Provide witness support schemes,

- Support and use mediation approaches to resolve neighbour disputes.

- Tackle using fraud.

- Provide support, training and guidance to managers and front line staff dealing with the crime, disorder and anti-social behaviour.

PLANNING SERVICES

- Develop community safety guidelines for developers, builders, and statutory local plans, to design out crime in new developments and refurbishments.

- Ensure that a crime impact analysis forms part of development control and planning applications.

- Consider community consultation feedback on community safety issues.

- Apply 'secured by design' schemes and principles to create safer neighbourhoods.

- Work with police architectural liaison and crime prevention officers to prevent crime through better environmental design.

- Promote mixed developments of housing, cultural, retailing business and leisure that support community activity and natural surveillance in local areas both day and night.

- Exploit planning gain and Section 106 opportunities to attract funding from developers for community safety improvements.

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

- Use licensing and regulatory powers to control alcohol-related crime and disorder.

- Develop registration and training schemes for door staff in licensed premises.

- Maintain and clean all public spaces to improve public perception of neighbourhood value.

- Encourage reporting of, and speed up the removal of, graffiti and fly-posting.

- Efficiently collect and fine against rubbish dumping and littering and provide adequate number of litter bins.

- Efficiently collect and fine against dog fouling and provide adequate numbers of collection bins.

- Clear and dispose of discarded drug and alcohol-related paraphernalia rapidly and safely.

- Improve street lighting levels, maintenance and repair.

- Control growth of trees and vegetation to ensure visibility and surveillance levels on streets and in public open spaces.

- Ensure highway and road safety through cleaner road signage.

- Improve traffic calming to reduce speeding and road accidents.

- Increase safety and security in car parks through CCTV surveillance, road security, regular patrolling by car park attendants and environmental measures.

- Work with public transport providers to promote safer travel.

- Develop 'home-zone areas' and safe routes to school.

- Encourage reporting of and speed up the removal of abandoned vehicles.

- Regulate use of houses in multiple occupations.

- Enforce noise control legislation.

- Support emergency and contingency planning, for example, in dealing with floods.

TRADING STANDARDS AND CONSUMER PROTECTION SERVICES

- Reduce under-age sales of alcohol, cigarettes, solvents and fireworks by implementing and inspecting 'proof of age' schemes.

- Combat sales of counterfeit goods.

- Regulate the car salvage trade in second-hand vehicles.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT/LEISURE/RECREATION/TOURISM SERVICE

- Provide affordable access to facilities for vulnerable groups, for example, young people.

- Ensure that services are influenced by community consultation and are available in disadvantaged areas.

- Support SPLASH (Schools and Police liaison for Activity in Summer Holidays) by providing staff, premises or funding resources.

- Provide play schemes for younger children.

- Provide staff training in crime prevention and management of disruptive behaviour.

- Promote and provide mix of activities that meet the needs of different groups and ages.

- Provide accurate, accessible high-quality service information.

- Maintain clean and safe public toilet facilities.

- Provide warden services that cover parks and open spaces.

EDUCATION SERVICES

- Reduce truancy and school exclusion.

- Develop the work of the education welfare service.

- Provide a special needs service for young people with emotional and behavioural difficulties.

- Provide an alternative curriculum in mainstream schools for children with special needs.

- Develop full-time education services that are based in facilities other than mainstream schools.

- Run young peoples mentoring schemes.

- Develop youth citizenship schemes.

- Develop youth action approaches that consult, empower and work with young people to reduce crime and disorder.

- Develop safe driving programmes in school.

- Tackle bullying and racial and homophobic harassment.

- Identify and support children who are at risk of abuse or harassment.

- Improve school security against crime, arson and vandalism.

- Provide drug and alcohol education that aims to reduce use and abuse.

- Provide breakfast, homework and out-of-school clubs and encourage attendance.

- Provide early year's development, prioritising disadvantaged families and those at risk of domestic violence.

YOUTH SERVICES

- Increase the profile of young people's services.

- Focus on disadvantaged young people.

- Provide detached and outreach street-based youth work.

- Provide youth work during the holidays and at weekends.

- Develop youth consultation forums and panels.

- Provide peer education activities.

SOCIAL SERVICES

- Support families in need.

- Provide family support services.

- Support individuals and families affected by domestic violence.

- Develop early years work.

- Seek to ensure better child protection services.

- Work with young offenders via Youth Offending Teams to reduce re-offending behaviour.

- Develop assessment and care management services for drug and alcohol users.

- Provide a service that supports people with mental health problems.

- Support 'looked after' children.

- Inspect residential establishments and boarding schools.

- Provide crime prevention training and advice to staff and vulnerable clients.

INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

Beacon Council
2005-2006
Getting Closer to Communities