

Minutes of the meeting of the Neighbourhood Action Groups Review Group meeting held on Monday 3 December 2012, 5.30pm

Present: Councillors Brunning (Chair), Coventry and C Williams

Officers: Z Dhamani (Overview and Scrutiny Officer), A Flynn (Head of Neighbourhood Management), C Wilderspin (Deputy Head of Community Safety)

Witnesses: B Halliday (LPA Commander, TVP), E McLean (Deputy Police Commander, TVP), N Coolman (Partnership Inspector, TVP)

Welcome and Introductions

The Chair welcomed the witness to the meeting and explained where the Review was and that their feedback had been invited following the Workshop held on 5 November.

Minutes of the last meeting and the Safer Neighbourhoods Delivery Group Survey Results

The minutes of 5 November 2012 were received and agreed by the Review Group.

The Workshop was discussed and the key themes outline below:

1. People for all sectors wanted to get involved with NAGs
2. NAGs should set achievable aims and priorities – things they can directly influence/change and manage expectations
3. Milton Keynes Council officer attendance for some NAGs was thought to be an advantage to gain access to MKC services
4. Training of Chairs was key to running an effective NAG – with an effective handover process for new Chairs
5. Communication links and a central source for administrative support was key for some NAGs – and a single point of contact was of high value
6. MKC to attend every NAG meeting was thought to be of high value for the majority of NAGs
7. Partners from across Milton Keynes attending would help with ensuring issues were passed on to the relevant service
8. Sharing good practice and establishing good links between NAGs would be positive
9. The parental role of the Safer Neighbourhood Delivery Group needs a more consistent approach
10. Ensure all NAGS understand how to access funding

The Survey results were received by the Group. Nine out to the 28 NAGs requested to complete the survey had returned responses. The Chair of this Review Group, as a member of Safer Neighbourhood Delivery Group (SDNG), had worked with representatives from Thames Valley Police (TVP), who had offered their support, to phone and email people to try to get responses from people.

From the lists that SNDG was working from - out of 28 records:

15 NAG chair details were incorrect

4 NAGs have merged – with no record of this being available

2 NAGs further have disbanded - no record on the file

It was viewed that while this was a poor return it did highlight the following issues:

- Lack of central contact
- Lack of SNDG knowledge
- Lack of Resident members
- Lack of partnership attendance - mainly Parish or Town Councillors
- Lack of knowledge on budget availability
- Lack of knowing password to the NAG email box.
- (This email address is published for each NAG on the Council website)

The positive from the returned surveys was that there was good attendance at meetings from TVP and Milton Keynes Council.

SNDG would meet on 4 December where further work would be agreed on.

At this point some Members raised the point of the need for NAGS and are members of the public still interested in them. There was the issue of where the resources would come from to assist NAGs regardless of what format they operated under.

Resources for NAGs and Thames Valley Police support for NAGs

The representatives from TVP stated that it was important to look at the benefit to communities NAGs enabled. When NAGs functioned fully they were effective from a TVP perspective in addressing issues of crime and disorder.

He queried the governance structure for NAGs and where the central point of contact was. He believed after hearing the evidence gathered via the workshops and SNDG survey this was missing and would solve many of the problems that had been identified.

It was viewed that it was important for NAGS to have this central point of contact, knowledge of what was available and also where the access to funding was and how to apply for this. Once NAGs had funding they could implant projects and see tangible results. This would in turn give credibility to NAGS and stimulate further activities.

It was too early in the process to state where the resources would come from to assist with the development of NAGs.

It was viewed that NAGs were important as they identified the priorities for their areas. This assisted TVP with the coordination of their resources. Direction had been lost recently but NAGs are an important resource for TVP to access to get messages to communities.

It was viewed that a central point of contact position could be a role performed over 2-3 days per week. It would provide a person that NAGs could engage with and seek advice from.

An online resource was viewed as highly valuable in providing information and guidance for NAGS. It would also act as somewhere for NAGs to promote the work they were doing.

The point was raised that perhaps within the Thames Valley area there could be more joined up working between NAGS.

It was raised that the NAG constitution was not easy to find on the Safer MK website. It was recognised that the website did need updating with more effective signposting. The Constitution was part of the NAG Toolkit. It was viewed that it was important to make the NAG information

easily accessible and clear as possible while maintaining the balance of access to a person for support.

Officers and Members raised the issue around what the function and purpose of NAGs was and what NAGs should be aiming to achieve. Once this had been established the structure for NAGs could be identified.

It was viewed that at times there was an overlap with functions performed by NAGs and other partnerships in Milton Keynes. This issue would need to be looked at in more detailed as what solutions could be put in place.

Draft Report and Recommendations

The draft report of the Group would be circulated ahead of the next meeting where recommendations would be drafted.

This Group would take the report to the Community Safety Crime and Policing Select Committee in February and the Responsible Authorities Group in March.

THE CHAIR CLOSED THE MEETING AT 18:56PM

	Actions	Owner
1	To circulate the draft report of the Review to the Group	ZD