

SHP CHAIRS' 'MAPS' RESPONSE DOCUMENT

To: Cllr Stockton – Chair
Safety in Numbers
ASB Topic Group
Safer Halton PPB

From: Joint Chairs Safer Halton Partnership
Superintendent David Bertenshaw -
(Northern Area, Cheshire Constabulary)
Mr David Parr -
(Chief Executive, Halton Borough Council)

**SUBJECT: Safety in Numbers – Multi Agency Working
Developing Community Safety within Halton**

1. Introduction

1.1 This paper is submitted to form part of the considerations currently underway into the future direction of community safety within the Borough and to supplement the Safer Halton PPB Topic Group report – “Safety in Numbers”.

1.2 It builds on the recommendations within that paper and seeks to take forward the debate.

2. Drivers for delivering an improved multi-agency approach

2.1 The following drivers to **delivering an improved multi-agency approach** have been identified

- The priority placed in the community safety agenda by the communities of Halton.
- The PPB Topic Team paper – Safety in Numbers.
- A self appraisal initiated by Community Safety Team management, identifying development needs in the following areas, leadership, policy and strategy, performance management, service delivery gap analysis and critically, marketing and communication.
- The need to resolve the uncertainty presented by the temporary funding of key posts within community safety and linked financial pressures facing partnership service delivery.
- The CDRP Reform Programme especially the need for Strategic Assessments, achieving prescribed National Minimum Standards for CDRPs and the introduction of APACS – Assessment of Policing and Community Safety.
- The new National Crime Strategy requiring a differentiated approach to anti-social behaviour, volume crime, serious violent crime and organised crime and terrorism.
- The new national Alcohol Strategy and proposed developments within the national Drug Strategy.

- The new Safer Communities Public Service Agreements.
- Neighbourhood policing reforms.
- Developments in offender management.
- Meeting expectations and aspirations within the Local Government White Paper – Strong and Prosperous Communities.
- A new national delivery plan on hate crime – arriving in due course.
- The increased profile of Domestic Violence as an issue

2.2 In short, the expectations currently facing those involved in community safety have never been so widespread or challenging.

2.3 The maintenance of investment (and ideally increased investment) within this field of partnership activity is extremely challenging but must be addressed if delivery against the panoply of expectations identified above stands any chance of being achieved.

3. Current Service Delivery

3.1 An assessment of current service delivery, as identified by the Community Safety Team, is shown below broken down into the five core strands required under the new National Minimum Standards – Hallmarks of Effective Practice, that are expected from within each CDRP. An explanation of the “Hallmarks of Effective Practice is shown as **Appendix 1**.

3.2 Empowered and Effective Leadership

The current joint chairs arrangement of the CDRP provides a strategic focus and has benefit to service delivery in that it provides impetus from within the two key partner organisations; however it can also provide degrees of confusion and duplication of effort. The seniority of both chairs is important, although with Halton CDRP only being one aspect of many responsibilities within respective portfolios, the ability to dedicate time and focus must and does give cause for concern. It is felt that the strengths of this arrangement outweigh the weaknesses.

The extended absence of a dedicated senior HBC officer responsible for community safety co-ordination has been an issue for the partnership. To a degree, this has resulted in a lack of vision and clear direction of the Church Street Community Safety Team and task groups. This issue has now been addressed with the appointment of a Co-ordinator to manage the joint Church Street Community Safety Team.

The role and function of the multitude of partners is not clear in partnership leadership terms. For example, although they play a significant part in the direction and delivery of partnership objectives, the role and function of key Directors within HBC and relevant senior police officers within the Constabulary needs to be clarified. In addition, engagement with and active support of RSL senior management is not explicit, which considering the significant extent of social housing in the Borough has to be viewed as a missed opportunity and threat to effective service delivery. The same could be said of other partners such as the PCT, YOT and Probation.

The active involvement of the Portfolio Holder Cllr Wright is welcomed, as is the work of the Safer Halton PPB in scrutinising the work of the partnership. This is a great strength of the partnership.

3.3 Intelligence Led Business Processes

Performance against most of the key targets facing the partnership is currently strong, however much of that achievement appears to rely too heavily on overall police and / or DAAT performance, as opposed to explicit wider partnership activity. The preventative activity within the partnership is significant but not always obvious and is not easily measurable given the performance regime imposed by Government. The current performance framework provides comment on overarching targets to meet the requirements of KPIs required by Government. It does not however provide more detailed management information on activity, outputs and outcomes. The result is that the Partnership does not as yet completely understand “why” performance is as it is and thus take more pre-emptive action to address potential difficulties.

The quite recent appointment of a partnership analyst is making a significant difference to effective decision making, however much greater sophistication of the intelligence product is desirable in this regard. Some examples are,

- we do not capture the locations of “sharps” within the Borough by cleansing staff,
- the actual impact of diversionary schemes for young people in terms of displacement,
- the contribution of PCSOs in a locality on fear and perception,
- the results of minimal surveillance / security in many public car parks, etc.
- the early interventions in respect of Domestic Abuse etc

3.4 Effective and Responsive Delivery Structures

The partnership structure with five key task groups is broadly fit for purpose although greater attention could be provided to cross-cutting issues, which can and does result in degrees of silo working and service delivery. For example; we need to make better links between public alcohol consumption, alcohol related violent crime, alcohol treatment services, health interventions, licensing enforcement and links to evident anti-social behaviour.

The Community Safety Team housed within Church Street, was originally developed with the same aspirational goal of becoming a multi-agency service as identified within the PPB Topic Group paper. It has had some success in this respect however the aspiration has not been fully translated into reality. This goal can only be achieved through the will of partners, the will of the team members, creativity in providing the solution and the effective use of the limited resource availability.

The newly appointed Co-ordinator will be charged with the task of delivering the aspiration of the PPB and the Safer Halton Partnership SSP to create a more cohesive and integrated approach from the Community Safety Team and its partner organisations. The building blocks are already in place to achieve this.

Currently, Partnership Tasking and Co-ordination restricts itself primarily towards quality of life issues and does not embrace criminal activity – this is a shortcoming. Having one partnership T&C meeting for the borough, whilst perhaps useful in minimising meeting attendance and sharing of tactical options, does not provide the

forum for specific problem solving or localised service delivery, as expected within the Strong and Prosperous Communities white paper. Additionally it does not embrace the principles of neighbourhood working that requires activity to be driven by the communities affected by the issues identified as being in need of attention. This is another area the new Co-ordinator will be looking to improve.

The operating budget for community safety is challenging and will become more so following CSR 07 and the uncertainty about the future grant regime. It has to be recognised that there will never be sufficient resources to meet aspirations. Many posts are funded from external short term grants and this is not sustainable. This situation regularly creates problems in meeting community expectations, running a dedicated, committed team of people and taking forward initiatives. The impact of the current financial regime offers a considerable risk to service delivery.

3.5 Engaged Communities

There is no lack of consultation with the community, LSP through various processes, HBC through Area Forums and Neighbourhood Management; Neighbourhood Policing Units through CAMHS, RSLs, through residents' groups, etc. all consult and engage with communities across the Borough. This consultation should be the lifeblood of the SHP in providing the community intelligence necessary to develop service delivery plans and should be harnessed into mainstream partnership activity. At present there is insufficient sharing of this intelligence with the SHP and this is an improvement opportunity. This is critical if the partnership is to meet expectations under the Hallmarks of Effective Practice.

There appears to be a growing opportunity to embrace greater and greater numbers of volunteers into the community safety agenda. Discussion with extremely keen leads for, Community Watch, members of the Youth Cabinet, co-ordinators from HVA plus colleagues from different agencies indicates significant potential and desire to become more involved.

Greater involvement of and with, the wide-ranging number of RSLs evident within the Borough, would bring substantial benefit to community intelligence and service delivery. RSL senior management expertise, resource, commitment and time are not explicit in delivery plans.

This presents a significant opportunity for the Partnership.

3.6 Visible and Constructive Accountability

Experience from the recent Safer Halton Week has demonstrated that there is a desire for residents and groups to engage and become involved with the community safety agenda. The partnership is however substantially lacking in a co-ordinated and focused marketing and communication approach.

This issue urgently requires skilled and dedicated effort that maximises alternative methods of communication to that usually used. For example, the Press within Halton appears to repeatedly demonstrate a desire to sensationalise incidents and denigrate the work of those involved within this agenda rather than use its power to positively impact on the communities' perceptions of crime and disorder.

There is significant opportunity to use existing structures and opportunities in a more effective way. For example, the use made of Halton Direct Link, Public Information Points within community and health centres, Area Forums and the like.

3.7 Appropriate Knowledge and Skills

Only in recent times have the skills and expertise required to undertake roles required of CRDPs been identified. This requirement will become a key strand of the APACS assessment criteria in addition to being a minimum standard under the Hallmarks of Effective Practice.

The current funding regime results in a short term approach to staffing key roles within community safety which is compounded by secondments, maternity breaks, etc., where staff have not been replaced, has understandably led to severe capacity issues that have resulted in shortfalls in capability towards delivery.

Further, the development opportunities within the community safety team are limited due to funding limitations. This is an area that must be addressed as part of a skills audit of the team, individual EDRs and the staff appraisal process, individual development plans produced and delivered.

4. Future Opportunities, issues and risks.

The opportunities contained below are set against the back drop of the PPB Topic Team proposals, the drivers for improvement identified above and an over-arching appreciation of the severe financial challenges facing all members of the SHP.

4.1 Development of existing structures.

By and large the approach demonstrated through five task groups meets the needs of the partnership, although merging some responsibilities and being more specific on others would provide greater clarity. It is suggested therefore that the five groups would be:

- Quality of Life – embracing a wider remit than antisocial behaviour and including cross over licensing issues / alcohol enforcement. There is so much overlap between antisocial behaviour and alcohol linked issues that it becomes impossible to split the two in terms of activity required to address both.
- Engagement and Liveability – to take on responsibility for partnership accountability of PCSOs, much wider emphasis on volunteering and watch schemes and diversity approaches which offer huge potential for the future.
- Current and Repeat Crime – to take on wider responsibility towards offender management including Restorative Justice. Would also provide accountability for Domestic Abuse which currently, and should continue to, maintain a discrete status but as a themed sub-group.
- Drugs – as per existing arrangements.
- Alcohol Harm Reduction – emphasis of group to be directed towards prevention and treatment, with enforcement sitting more with Quality of Life. Alcohol group still maintains oversight function as necessary on enforcement issues.

There is a need to meet developments of the community safety agenda through the provision of a much more robust approach towards policy and performance, together with meeting the needs of people engaged in supporting community safety within the Borough.

Appendix 2 provides an overview of a suggested “functional” model that embraces the first three elements of this proposal. Proposed responsibilities are shown to address shortfalls and provide resilience within partnership activity, as required under the Hallmarks of Effective Practice standards.

It is critical that explicit terms of reference are developed for each business area that will form the basis of performance measurement.

4.2 This proposal does not seek to change the approach adopted by the DAAT or Alcohol Harm Reduction in managing their spheres of business, but to supplement and enhance service delivery where evident cross over arises.

The proposal seeks to introduce a consistent and continuous focus on performance and service delivery. This is a key requirement of Hallmarks of Effective Practice and an area where the partnership can improve.

4.3 The appointment of a joint Partnership Co-ordinator presents an opportunity to develop the role of the police Partnerships Inspector into one of focusing on Policy, Performance and People.

4.4 Partnership Tasking and Co-ordination will provide the operational decision making across the whole community safety agenda and chaired by the Community Safety Co-ordinator in order to maintain a cross agenda focus.

4.5 Themed sub-groups can also be established and should feed into Partnership T&C in addition to respective Task groups. Sub-groups should also be established to meet the needs of a specific issue or a geographical area, for example: Domestic Abuse, Arson control, closing the gap within neighbourhood management areas, Widnes Town Centre, Runcorn Hill etc

4.6 To meet the expectations of the Strong and Prosperous Communities white paper and ensure buy in from key agencies, Task Groups could be chaired by individuals independent of the community safety team and work streams supported by identified Elected Members. Suggestions are shown on **Appendix 2**.

4.7 Personnel and resources

The new Co-ordinator will be invited to review the current resources of the joint team with a view to addressing the matters raised in the Topic Group report and developed in this report. This review will have regard to the finance available when the funding available from mainstream resources and grant is known towards the end of 2007.

4.8 Key considerations for the Community Safety Co-ordinator in respect of resourcing will be:

- The Community Safety Co-ordinator has overall responsibility for a partnership team.

- The Police Partnership Inspector develops role into Police, Performance and People.
- Task Group Co-ordinators grades
- Funding for Co-ordinators for Quality of Life, Current & Repeat Crime, Domestic Violence, Alcohol Reduction, Parenting Officers, Analyst and some Administrative staff are all dependant upon LAA funding for their future continuance. As ambitious plans develop, administrative capacity will feature as a risk.
- Funding for Engagement and Liveability Co-ordinator dependant upon Police willingness to transfer post from “Office supervisor” position.
- ASB / Licensing Constables positions dependant upon Police willingness to provide a Constable to undertake the role in Runcorn and develop remit to embrace Licensing enforcement in addition to antisocial behaviour.
- HBC do not currently have a resource available to undertake their licensing enforcement responsibilities, apart from within the Private Hire / Hackney Carriage licensing field. This is a unique gap compared to all other Local Authorities in the region. The licensing enforcement prime responsibilities are in need of review by HBC.
- ASB Field Officers do not currently exist. The creation of an operational team to address antisocial behaviour issues is a key feature of the MAPS proposal. Creating these posts would provide that team alongside ASB/Licensing Constables to provide two teams of two people (a team each for Runcorn / Widnes) Housing Trusts could be approached for funding based on a pro-rata to relative housing stock.
- Parenting Officers are subject to short term funding initiatives. They are providing the sustainable solutions to repeat and most challenging individuals and the service should be seen as a key to MAPS type problem solving.
- Skilled and dedicated Marketing and Communication does not currently exist within community safety in any structured or co-ordinated way, having relied heavily (but piecemeal) on capability within the LSP, HBC or Police. Some limited budget remains within the LSP which may be accessible; however it does not provide a longer term solution. It is widely recognised that social marketing will assist in addressing perception and value driven issues, whether within community safety, health or housing and so forth. Investment within this field will meet joint partnership goals in key areas of community safety.
- A number of shared BCU wide posts are hosted currently within the Church Street offices. Halton as a Borough benefits greatly from hosting these posts in terms of focus and energy devoted into Halton specific issues. Police funded administrative support would also be put at risk, should these posts not be based within a partnership team as administrative officers have shared responsibilities.

4.9 Premises and problem solving.

The MAPS proposal calls for all staff to be co-located ideally within Runcorn Town Hall. Whilst ideal in principle, enquiries reveal that there would NOT be adequate space for all involved to be accommodated in that location subsequent to refurbishment being completed.

4.10 Problem solving is a process and simply locating individuals collectively, will not bring about a problem solving process. Co-location can however bring about

much greater opportunity for sharing information, joint working, problem analysis and solutions. Above all communication and understanding can be very much improved. There are however significant costs associated with co-location, especially with regard to compatibility of and the meeting of strict security standards of different IT systems.

4.11 In many other areas, partnership problem solving opportunities and gaining benefits from mutual understanding, has been achieved by part-time or incremental co-location. This requires key people responsible for an area or issue to spend part of their working week together and dedicated to addressing mutual challenges collectively. Those involved must have personal methods of accessing vital agency information effectively and would normally involve availability of mobile data and / or the use of laptop as opposed to desk top IT solutions, etc. This method of IT management is however intrinsically a more expensive option than adopting standard desktop IT infrastructure.

4.12 Benefits have been identified for representatives from the following agencies being co-located for say 1-3 days per week (dependant upon level of business requiring attention), with perhaps a rotating focus of Week One – Runcorn and Week Two – Widnes:

- Police - NPU
- HBC – Parks and public space management
- HBC – Building Control
- RSLs – Antisocial behaviour / tenancy support personnel
- Youth Offending Team
- Fire Service - Young People Engagement
- Connexions – Youth Service
- HBC – Educational Welfare
- HBC – Trading Standards
- HBC – Licensing Enforcement (with a wider remit than Taxis)
- Police – Licensing Management
- Police – Crime Reduction Advisor
- DAAT

This would require therefore additional office capacity to be generated for 10-12 people to regularly, but not full time, come together to share one facility. Although some individuals would remain constant, many of those people would be different for Widnes and Runcorn and therefore “hot-desking” would become a normal operating practice. The remainder of their working week would be spent within their home organisation.

If achieved, this approach would largely meet the key aspiration of the MAPS proposal.

4.13 This approach could effectively be adopted within Halton within a number of venues:

- Church Street has capacity (just about).
- Runcorn or Widnes police stations both offer potential.
- Housing Trust(s) venues are options.
- Other options – for example Grosvenor House when HBC vacates.

- Halton Voluntary Action (HVA) premises in Runcorn.

The HVA location presents an interesting opportunity as they are open to an approach. They not only have space to accommodate 20 – 25 people (including existing community safety staff), but also have much of the infrastructure and support services necessary for a public facing team. The particularly appealing element however, is that enhanced joint working with the voluntary sector presents substantial opportunities for taking community safety forward in the way envisaged within the sustainable communities strategy, meets expectations under the Local Government white paper, features highly within Neighbourhood Policing reform and is a key aspect of the CDRP Hallmarks of Effective Practice.

4.14 Funding issues

It is fully acknowledged that funding across all of the public sector is and will continue to be extremely tight within Halton. Whilst the MAPS proposal has ambitious goals, financially Community Safety faces uncertainty for the future as does many other aspects of public sector delivery within Halton. This paper cannot provide solutions to this dilemma, only seek to flag up key issues for further consideration and debate over the allocation of scarce resources.

Key funding issues:

- Community Safety must attract an identified operating budget (both Revenue and Capital) if it is to continue to meet expectations. Over the past 12-18 months those costs have largely been met through virement from saved salaries due to secondment and the goodwill of primarily the police and HBC. Additionally Church Street as a partnership premises incurs costs that have not been factored into historical financial planning. Those costs are subject to a further paper in the near future.
- As identified above, key posts within the community safety team rely on temporary funding, much of which has been secured either via the Safe and Stronger Communities Fund, the Basic Command Unit grant or other non-mainstream funding options. If aspirations are to be achieved both from within the MAPS proposal and / or other identified agenda that require attention, then early consideration has to be given to the priority community safety will be given from LAA funding or any “replacement” to NRF.
- A similar exercise will have to be undertaken for continued funding of Police Community Support Officer and police officer posts that focus on drug misuse enforcement when the future of NRF becomes certain.
- Within both the MAPS proposal and this paper, reference is made for growth within community safety. To achieve any of this goal there will be evident financial implications to be worked through, once a clear strategic direction has been achieved. The financial implications are broader than direct employment costs and will include office space, IT requirements, expenses and the like.

5. Conclusions

5.1 This paper seeks to contextualise the issues and recommendations contained within the ASB Topic Team proposal – “Safety in Numbers” alongside significant change facing community safety activity nationally and the current situation within Halton.

5.2 Specific conclusions identified include:

- a) There is significant impetus currently for transformation of community safety operations within Halton, not only driven by the “Safety in Numbers” but also national expectations which have to be met and financial pressures that must be faced up to.
- b) Any transformational development has however to be set against strong performance of SHP currently. This must not be lost, although a greater intelligence lead approach can be developed, alongside a more robust understanding of overall performance.
- c) Time scales are tight and any proposed developments need to be agreed by the end of January 2008 (at the latest) if they are to be implemented by (or during) the next financial year.
- d) The lead for this transformation should be the newly appointed Community Safety Co-ordinator supported by the joint chairs of the SHP.
- e) The Safety in Numbers paper provides a useful backdrop and catalyst for setting strategic direction for community safety within Halton, but there are many factors, other than antisocial behaviour, within the community safety landscape that also have to be addressed. This paper seeks to supplement the work of the Topic Group by addressing the wider agenda.
- f) The principle of co-locating different agencies together as part of a collective problem-solving team and thereby achieving more effective operating practices is sound. Delivery of this however is extremely challenging and a more incremental part-time approach is more likely to be sustainable and at the same time still be fit for purpose.
- g) A more explicit and effective process for localised partnership management and problem solving of neighbourhood quality of life issues generally and anti-social behaviour issues specifically, needs to be developed and implemented. A greater tactical / operational capability needs to be created to support this.
- h) The location of any team needs further exploration; however the opportunity of sharing premises say with Halton Voluntary Action is exciting, holds significant potential and is ground breaking in its own right. It is as radical and potentially beneficial an opportunity as was presented by the decision to co-locate many drug treatment services within Ashley House.
- i) If a suitable location could be found for a larger co-location centre, then there is the potential of finance being generated via the sale of the Church Street offices, to fund capital developments and initiatives within community safety.

- j) An operating budget for community safety needs to be agreed and in place by the next financial year. Identifying revenue funding for the Church Street offices is a critical priority.
- k) It is critical for any transformational development of mainstream community safety activity within Halton, that a sustainable funding regime is introduced within the Local Area Agreement. The short term funding of key community safety posts is dysfunctional to service development and harms actual delivery to Halton communities.
- l) A self appraisal on community safety operations within Halton has been commenced, but now requires concluding. That appraisal should follow the format expected of CDRPs within the six “Hallmarks of Effective Practice” that have been alluded to and commented on within this paper.
- m) If to be successful, partners within Safer Halton Partnership have to reaffirm their commitment to each other and the partnership. This will mean a close examination of their personal and financial commitment. For example, would RSLs be willing to commit say to chairing the Quality of Life Task Group and the pro-rata funding of ASB Field Officers? Will other agencies, most notably the Police and HBC demonstrably enhance their commitment to community safety and partnership working?
- n) Much greater emphasis has to be given to marketing and communication of SHP activity. This requires a dedicated and skilled resource (possibly 3 days per week) that will drive a social marketing campaign and support many of the requirements of the “Hallmarks of Effective Practice”.
- o) The functional approach suggestion detailed in Appendix 2 for three elements of SHP activity, will more effectively address many of the issues currently faced within Halton and alluded to within “Safety in Numbers”. Explicit terms of reference for each area of business must be developed and agreed, thereby forming the accountability framework for respective partner activity.
- p) Addressing personnel and related funding issues, is the most critical risk facing continued performance and service delivery facing SHP.
- q) HBC needs to review its approach to Licensing enforcement as it is out of line with other Local Authority areas and the position is not aiding partnership service delivery.

6. Recommendations

6.1 Strategic Recommendation One

That members forming the SHP agree to actively support transformational change within the Halton Community Safety Team following debate and acceptance of above conclusions.

6.2 Strategic Recommendation Two

That the ASB Topic Team and Policy and Performance Board acknowledges the wider operating landscape for community safety within Halton and support the need for Halton to meet the needs of the Assessment of Policing and Community Safety and the national minimum standards as identified within the Hallmarks of Effective Practice.

6.3 Strategic Recommendation Three

That Partners agree to support the enhanced need for community safety funding via mainstream resources and the Local Area Agreement, in line with proposals contained within this paper.

6.4 Strategic Recommendation Four

That the SHP commission the further exploration of options and development of costed proposals for transformational change of community safety within Halton following consultation and debate on this paper and once a subsequent strategic direction has been agreed.

David Parr
Chief Executive
Halton Council

Supt Dave Bertenshaw
Commander North Area
Cheshire Police

National Minimum Standards – Hallmarks of Effective Practice

The “Hallmarks of Effective Practice” have six core strands :

1. Empowered and Effective Leadership

Senior representatives of responsible authorities will provide strategic oversight for the CDRP through a strategy group which will:

- (1) Commission strategic assessments - at least annually
- (2) Agree a three year Partnership Plan

The Partnership Plan will need to be refreshed annually.

2. Intelligence Led Business Processes

National Standards will require each CDRP to have Information Sharing Protocols, and to ensure that they have effective information sharing and regular strategic analysis to inform both priority setting and resource allocation. This work will need to include a focus on outcomes (rather than just outputs). In two tier areas, district strategic assessments will need to be aggregated into a county-level community safety agreement that will feed into the LAA and identify county-wide priorities and opportunities for cross-border working.

3. Effective and Responsive Delivery Structures

The strategic group will meet throughout the year to fulfil the obligations described above, and to consider:

- (1) How to structure joint resources, and
- (2) Whether to set up action groups to focus on priorities identified through the strategic assessment.

4. Engaged Communities

CDRPs will need to continue to consult with a range of local agencies and people – involving them in improving the local quality of life. The Partnership Plan will need to set out how the community will be consulted and informed about community safety issues, and intelligence emanating from the community will influence the strategic assessment and partnership plan.

Partnerships will be under an obligation to recognise diversity, and to target those groups most affected by the partnership plan. They will need to take account of individual partner agencies' existing methods of engaging the community.

5. Visible and Constructive Accountability

Communities need to know what objectives CDRPs are seeking to achieve in their areas, and so the partnership plan should be brought to their attention (as deemed appropriate by the responsible authorities).

National Standards will also define face the people sessions whereby senior representatives of the responsible authorities will have to hold open public meetings regularly throughout the year to discuss community safety issues.

6. Appropriate Knowledge and Skills

The Home Office wants to ensure that practitioners have the required skills and knowledge to fulfil their partnership roles and responsibilities, and that the CDRP is equipped to deliver community safety outcomes effectively.

Responsible authorities will need to consider the CDRP's capacity to deliver both the national standards and key outcomes for CDRP and Local Area Agreement priorities and targets.

SAFER HALTON PARTNERSHIP

Chair: HBC & Police
+ Comm. Safety Co-ordinator
+ Elected Member(s)

Marketing &
Communication

Policy – Performance – People

Chair: Fire Service
+ Co-ordinator
+ Elected Member

Analyst
Finance

Quality of Life	Chair: TBC ? + Co-ordinator + E. Member
Antisocial Behaviour Alcohol management Joint Licensing issues Diversionary Schemes Arson & Fire Prevention Parenting initiatives Public space issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Void properties Housing / RSL interface Consumer Protection interface	

Engagement & Liveability	Chair: NHM + Co-ordinator + E. Member
Perceptions / Fear of crime PCSO accountability Volunteering Watch Schemes Surveys & other engagement NHM goals Diversity issues Young People issues Road Safety Public transport	

Current & Repeat Crime	Chair: Police + Co-ordinator + E. Member
Prevention & Reduction: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Burglary • Violent crime • Vehicle crime • Criminal Damage • Race / Hate Crime • Robbery Offender Management <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PPO accountability • Restorative Justice 	

Themed sub-groups
(as determined)

Themed sub-groups
(as determined)

Themed sub-groups
(as determined)

Partnership Tasking & Co-ordination

Chair: CS Co-ordinator
+ PPP Co-ordinator
+ Elected Member

