

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY REVIEW GROUP

Review Group	
Neighbourhood Action Group Review Group	
Parent Scrutiny Committee	Lead Member / Review Group Membership
Community Safety, Crime and Policing Select Committee	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cllr Chris Williams 2. Cllr Steve Coventry 3. Cllr Denise Brunning
Overview & Scrutiny Officer	
Zahra Dhamani	
1. Purpose / High Level Aim / Objective(s) / Outcome(s)	
To look at the role of Neighbourhood Action Groups (NAGs) and how they assist with the reduction in crime and anti-social behaviour and to review the structure and effectiveness of NAGs across Milton Keynes.	
2. Rationale / Terms of Reference	
<p>The Review is taking place as the Select Committee identified that the establishment of a Review Group was important in order to scrutinise the role, responsibilities and effectiveness of Neighbourhood Action Groups (NAGs), their relationship with Town and Parish Councils and the need to encourage the establishment of effective NAGs in areas identified.</p> <p>NAGs relates to the following Corporate Plan points:</p> <p>Theme: Cleaner, Greener, Safer, Healthier MK Outcome: communities being safe and with a low fear of crime Priority: reduce crime and the fear of crime</p> <p>Theme: Working in MK Outcomes: High levels of inward investment and business growth High levels of employment opportunities for current and potential residents Priority: Encourage inward investment in target sectors and provide support and advice to businesses moving/recently established in Milton Keynes</p> <p>Community views:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Would need to ascertain this from current/recent consultation/feedback <p>Gap between current provision and need:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Number of effective NAGs ○ Areas without effective NAGs ○ The structure of the division of NAGs across MK 	

Environmental impacts:

- No environmental impacts as a direct result of this review
- Individual NAGs may implement plans which may have an effect on the environment but this will be for them to manage

Social impacts:

- Increased community awareness and social responsibility
- Joint working and improved relationships between police, residents, schools and partners
- Links to the Localism Act and the Big Society and empowering communities and to define society

Terms of Reference:

- To review the roles of NAGs across Milton Keynes and identify if the structure is fit for purpose
- To identify alternative options if deemed not fit for purpose in the current environment
- To look at areas without NAGs and without effective NAGs and investigate the reasons why they are not effective
- To review the partnership links including those with Parish and Town councils, MKC and TVP
- To ensure NAGs are meeting the priorities of the community as a whole
- To look at the process for identifying priorities
- To review the support provided by MKC for, and to, NAGs, including co-ordination support
- To review the link between priorities set by NAGs and the influence they have on MKC and Partner policies
- To review how NAGs assist vulnerable members of the community

Context for consideration of outcomes listed above:

- Police Reform – the new neighbourhood structure and Police and Crime Commissioners
- MKC transformation – Regulatory Unit and Neighbourhood Management
- The Social Behaviour Strategy
- Localism Agenda

Benefit to the community

The benefit to the community is an increased sense of community; improved partnership working across the NAG area; a reduction in crime and the fear of crime; and an increased sense of the ability to influence change in their community.

3. Timetable

Date of first meeting: 22 August

Items for first agenda of meeting:

Agree Terms of Reference
Agree Roles and Responsibilities
Actions for next meeting
Invitations of witnesses
Agree frequency of meetings

As part of the timetable it is suggested that the Review Group attends the meetings of the Safer Neighbourhood Delivery Group which meet the first Tuesday of the month.

Date of last meeting: TBC w/c14 Jan with a view to have final report for Committee meeting on 6 Feb 2013

Items to include:

Lessons learnt from the Review Group Process

4. Methodology / Approach

The review will take a varied approach.

There will need to be some analyses of consultations and feedback from residents and partners. There may be the need to attend NAG meetings and/or discussions with the Chairs of NAGs to gain insight to the current issues they currently have.

There will be close working with the Safer Neighbourhoods Delivery Group as they have begun to undertake work inline with the points outlined in this document and have an established relationship with the current NAG Chairs.

5. Evidence Sources

What types of evidence will be needed to write any report

- Government guidance / legislation
- Service plans
- Performance Indicators
- Evidence from other reviews
- Independent research articles and papers

Are there any stakeholders or interest groups the Review Group want to hear from in addition to inviting them to the meeting

- Consultation
- Focus group
- Questionnaire

Ensure there is a balance in the evidence collected e.g. views of activist groups weighed in consideration of an independent audit report.

6. Witnesses

A potential witness list might include:

- Chair and members of the Safer Neighbourhood Delivery Group
- Parish and town council representatives
- NAG representatives
- Residents
- Police
- Schools representative
- Officers/Members from neighbouring authorities
-

7. Site Visits / Observations

Attend meetings of the Safer Neighbourhood Delivery Group

Attend NAG meetings, meet with the Chair of NAGs, and speak with residents

8. Publicity

- Public Meetings
- CMIS
- [Safer MK](#) web page
- Front page of web
- Library – information available
- Workshops with NAGs

9. Officer Support

Zahra Dhamani	Overview and Scrutiny Officer
Richard Solly	Head of Community Safety
Colin Wilderspin	Deputy Head of Community Safety
Auzra Flynn	Head Of Neighbourhood Management

10. Resource Requirements

MKC Officers
O&S Officers
Members

11. Risk Assessment

Identify potential obstacles to an effective Review.

- That the Review doesn't meet the January deadline
- PCC Elections may impact on time available to complete tasks in the allotted time
- Input from existing NAGs
- Engagement with residents could prolong the review if there are many issues they raise

Impact on MKC Officer time – dependant on other work streams as to time allowed to commit to the Review Group

12. Indicators of Success

Indicators of Success will be:

Identifying the need for areas to have effective NAGs and a plan to implement these; a refresh of current NAGs if new priorities for communities have been realised; feedback from residents. One of the priorities highlighted by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee was to look at how we engage with communities.

- What impact on Council's approach to this – legal, Economic, Contractual,
- End of meetings: ensure that the Review Group is following the Terms of Reference outlined to assist the Review with staying on topic and nominate an Officer or Member to be responsible
- Report to Select Committee with findings and formulate recommendations to Cabinet

13. Evaluation

One Member to be nominated to have special responsibility to help the Committee keep track of how the Review Group's conclusions and recommendations are being progressed.

A date should be set for an evaluation of the Review once it is completed. This may be a two-stage process – first evaluating how the Review went and later evaluating what outcomes arose from it.
This would typically be done 12 months after the Review was first published.