



SaferMK Partnership Discussion and Decision Report

Subject: SaferMK Partnership Review

Report Author:

Colin Wilderspin (Head of Community Safety) Tel: (01908) 254533

1. **Purpose of report – Please mark (X) the boxes that are relevant to the report**

SAFERMK PRIORITIES

- | | |
|---|--------------------------|
| Improving road safety by reducing the number of accidents and the severity of the collisions to individuals | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Reducing the number of violent incidences | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Tackling and enforcing substance misuse | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Enhance community engagement to reduce fear of crime | <input type="checkbox"/> |

OTHER STATUTORY RESPONSIBILITIES

- | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Anti-Social Behaviour | <input type="checkbox"/> | Reducing Re-offending | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Prevent | <input type="checkbox"/> | Police and Crime Commissioner | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| An item under Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 that supports the delivery of crime reduction and addressing community safety concerns (please state below) | | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Review of Partnership and Structure

2. Brief introduction

- 2.1 The changing landscape in which community safety partnerships and its partners operate to deliver community safety functions over recent years, coupled with significant changes to and reductions in funding, both for Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) and its partners more widely, has prompted the Partnership to consider how best to deliver its community safety responsibilities.

- 2.2 This paper and subsequent presentation sets out proposals following a review in the context of the current and future frameworks within which CSPs operate, and seeks the Board's views on key issues and operating models.

3. Recommendations

- 3.1 That consideration be given to the options presented and that the Partnership decide on the best delivery model moving forward.
- 3.2 That consideration be given to Partnership resources and personnel support to Partnership activity.
- 3.3 That the wider Partnership cross working and how SaferMK Partnership is represented be agreed.
- 3.4 That the Board Membership of SaferMK Partnership be agreed.

4. Comments/Recommendations from the Scrutiny Management Committee

There are no specific comments in relation this report. However it is a statutory obligation for the Committee to hold the activities and performance of the Partnership to account.

5. Background

- 5.1 The SaferMK Partnership as a Responsible Authorities Group and is responsible for the compliance with the statutory duties and responsibilities set out in the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 and subsequently the Police and Justice Act 2006, Policing and Crime Act 2009 and the Health and Social Care Act 2012.
- 5.2 The Crime & Disorder Act 1998 provided the framework for the establishment of Community Safety Partnerships. It gave the lead responsibility for crime and disorder reduction to the Police and Local Authorities, as well as a duty to consider crime and disorder in all of their activities. This duty is what is referred to as 'Section 17'
- 5.3 In 2004 the Fire Service and Primary Care Trusts also became responsible authorities along with the Police and Local Authorities with the addition of Probation Trusts in April 2010. 2013 saw further change with the membership changing from Primary Care Trusts to Clinical Commissioning Groups and most recently the National Probation Service and the Community Rehabilitation Company. The Statutory members are known as responsible authorities.
- 5.4 In 2012 with the cessation of the Police Authorities and the election of the Police and Crime Commissioners (PCC) the membership of the partnership evolved even further. Previously the Executive membership included a representative from the Police Authority. This ended and the

requirement changed to stipulate that the CSP and PCC should cooperate with each other.

- 5.5 Since 1998 the explanation of Section 17 has evolved to state that it is the duty of each authority to which section 17 applies to exercise its various functions with due regard to the likely effect of those functions on, and the need to do all it reasonably can prevent: Crime and disorder in its area (including anti-social behaviour and other behaviour adversely affecting the local environment) and, the misuse of drugs, alcohol and other substances in its area' including the reduction of reoffending.
- 5.6 This means that the CSP and its authorities should take account of the community safety dimension in all of its work, and to do all that it can within its core business to prevent crime and disorder occurring. All policies, strategies, plans and budgets should therefore consider the potential contribution to the reduction of crime and disorder.
- 5.7 The SaferMK Partnership has had a number of successes in reducing crime and improving community safety issues in Milton Keynes. This has been achieved not just through the work of partner staff and officers but with the support of others such as non-statutory agencies, businesses and residents.
- 5.8 Whilst the SaferMK Partnership has had successes with traditional crime types, over recent times there has been increasing expectations on partner responses to protecting the public including addressing issues like domestic abuse, child sexual exploitation and safeguarding vulnerable people.
- 5.9 Whilst there remains a number of a statutory responsibility on CSPs, recent central government strategies have identified the key role they can play in contributing to or leading responses to a range of different issues, including violence against women and girls, modern slavery, serious and organised crime, radicalisation and counter-extremism, and ending gang and youth violence.
- 5.10 The recent local review of safeguarding responsibilities and restructures of both the Children and Adult Boards provides a good opportunity to ensure that cross partnership working addressing a number of emerging themes that are overarching to these and the Health and Wellbeing Board can be defined and ensure closer working relationships.
- 5.11 The current operating SaferMK Partnership model is not fit for purpose and has struggled to deliver its intended aims. Partners were given lead areas but both clear responsibility for action planning and accountability for these has been minimal.

- 5.12 The SaferMK Support Team based at Milton Keynes Council requires support from Partners in supporting the coordination and delivery of priorities and work streams.
- 5.13 There is no set structure and other areas have developed a number of delivery models to best suit local circumstances, with partner community safety functions and partnerships operating very differently in different places.
- 5.14 Flexibility in both strategic and operational delivery is crucial for designing a local model and responses to particular issues.

6. Other considerations / Key Partnership Involvement

- 6.1 SaferMK and its authorities should take account of the community safety dimension in all of its work, and to do all that it can within core business to prevent crime and disorder occurring.
- 6.2 All policies, strategies, plans and budgets are therefore considered with the potential contribution to the reduction of crime and disorder. The statutory duty imposed by Section 17 all officers, staff and members of the responsible authorities are required to consider the impact of crime and disorder whether direct or indirect in all of their day to day work. It is the legal responsibility of every individual, every service area and everyone who acts in a decision-making capacity to consider crime and disorder and to undertake reasonable action to improve community safety.
- 6.3 Strong and effective leadership are vital for responding to current and future challenges, and will be integral to driving forward further changes and delivery of the Partnership.

7. Options

- 7.1 The options outline a number of discussion points to consider and therefore may not be isolated to just one option.
- 7.2 Option 1: No Change: SaferMK Partnership continues with the current operating structure
- 7.3 Option 2: Outline the need for a Business Management Group and if the group should remain. Additionally define how some work streams are delivered and consideration of amalgamating meetings
- 7.4 Option 3: Review structure of partnership, including frequency of meetings and relevant membership. This could also consider a high level strategy group meeting and a separate wider partnership meeting.

- 7.5 Option 4: Review the frequency of meetings
- 7.6 Option 5: To consider the SaferMK support team requirements and future working including the sharing of resources and/or co-location.

8. Attachments/Background Papers

- 8.1 Current Strategy delivering model (Annex A)
- 8.2 SaferMK Partnership Review presentation - 6 July 2017 (Annex B)
- 8.3 Summary of notes following discussion of SaferMK Partnership 20 April 2017 (Annex C).