
Meeting of The Executive

30th May 2006

Report of the Chief Executive Police and Community Safety Reform

Summary

1. The purpose of this report is to update the Executive on emerging issues in respect of police and community safety reform, seek policy guidance on these, and consider the implications for the authority and the Local Strategic Partnership (LSP).

Background

2. This paper will summarise the policy themes and recommendations resulting from the recently published Crime and Disorder Act review and the Police and Justice Bill. It will explore York's community safety partnership arrangements and consider the changes the authority will have to manage as we develop a Local Area Agreement (LAA).
3. This paper updates the Executive on recent developments in the government's intention to create strategic police forces, and informs members of the implications of the recent proposal to create a police force which encompasses the Yorkshire and Humberside region.
4. It also takes the opportunity to review specific local issues which pertain to Safer York Partnership (SYP), the city's Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership (CDRP) and uses the publication of the above bill as a timely means of responding to these within the context of a wider review.

Proposal to create Yorkshire and Humberside Strategic Police bodies

5. **The council's policy position-** In December 2005 Members decided that Home Office proposals to create a Strategic Police Force/Authority for our region were not acceptable on the grounds of: governance; accountability; standards and resources. Overall, the council was concerned that the citizens of York were at risk of 'losing out' from the proposed new arrangements.
6. The council stated it felt unable to support any changes to the policing arrangements within the region unless they met the following criteria:
 - They are introduced after a full and comprehensive consultation process
 - The City of York Council is fairly represented on any newly created police authority
 - Accountability arrangements are transparent and responsive to local decision-making procedures, with decisions about local policing made as close to BCU and neighbourhood level as possible. As a minimum, current standards of policing are maintained and services represent good value for money and are cost effective
 - The level of service provided to the City of York area is fair and proportionate and not reduced in favour of larger urban areas.

7. Since December, a number of police authorities nationwide have voluntarily agreed to create strategic police authorities, though this decision has not been taken in Yorkshire & Humberside.
8. **National policy-** The Police & Justice Bill (January 2006), covers a wide range of proposals with respect to police reform, crime and anti-social behaviour, and a single inspectorate for Justice, Community Safety & Custody. The Bill also includes the recommendations of the Crime and Disorder Act review, which this paper will also consider in detail. Included proposals designed to ensure local policing reflects the needs of residents and is accountable to local communities, including:
 - The membership of a strategic police authority will be constituted to ensure there is a seat for each upper tier local authority within the region
 - Scrutiny arrangements – CDRPs will be subject to scrutiny by local authority scrutiny committees. In addition BCU commanders and local authority Chief Executives will hold regular public briefing sessions to respond to issues raised by local communities
 - ‘Community Call for Action’ – this is a ‘trigger mechanism’ that enables intervention by ward councillors if community safety issues have not been adequately addressed by the police or their partners
 - A range of proposals to improve the effectiveness of CDRPs arising from the review of the Crime and Disorder Act (CDA), which will be considered later in this paper.
 - CDRPs should be coterminous with BCUs
 - Proposals to equalise council tax precept levels across regions as existing police areas are amalgamated.
9. Since the introduction of the Police & Justice Bill the Home Secretary has issued proposals to create a Yorkshire and Humberside Strategic Police Authority/Force and asked each of the four police authorities in the region to agree to a voluntary merger. The business case for supporting the creation of a regional force is as follows:
 - **Protective services:** None of the region’s four police authorities currently meet national standards in protective services. The merger offers the greatest potential for the region to deliver protective services to national standards across ‘Major Crime’, ‘Serious and Organised Crime’, ‘Critical Incidents’, ‘Civil Contingencies’, ‘Public Order’, ‘Roads Policing’ and ‘Counter Terrorism’.
 - **Size:** A single strategic force, policing the whole of the Yorkshire and Humber area would comprise some 12,791 police officers and a total establishment of 19,498.
 - **Mix of capability and reduction in risk:** A regional force would draw together existing expertise and reduce regular exposure to risk within all current forces.
 - **Criminal markets:** The single force option offers the greatest opportunity to reduce barriers to intelligence sharing, map criminal markets and co-ordinate operational activity across the region.
 - **Geography:** The transport infrastructure of the region would benefit from a four force merger in respect of strategic management of the criminality associated with the transport networks.
 - **Coterminosity:** This option does not split any of the existing force areas or cross Government Office boundaries.
 - **Identity:** The Yorkshire and Humber region has a strong identity and record of joint working which this new force would benefit from and build

upon. Clarity of command, control and accountability would be gained from the single command structures of the single strategic force option.

- **Performance:** The increase in capability, capacity and resilience associated with a single force offers an opportunity to improve the levels of service provided and also safeguard neighbourhood policing resources.
- **Financial assessment:** The cost of the amalgamation of North Yorkshire, South Yorkshire, West Yorkshire & Humberside police authorities is estimated at **£39 million**. This will cover, for example, integration of IT systems, investment in supplies and services, and redundancy payments. Within a few years, the merger will deliver net annual savings of approximately **£18 million**.

10. The Leader and Chief Executive of the Council have advised North Yorkshire Police Authority (NYPA) that based on the Executive's guidance in December and correspondence with both North Yorkshire Police Authority and Central Government they remain unsupportive of the proposed voluntary merger, though acknowledge that some of the council's concerns have been addressed. In a letter to NYPA they stated: *"...City of York Council believes that while some of our concerns are starting to be addressed, which we welcome, our overall position remains largely unchanged... In the circumstances we believe that we cannot support a voluntary merger and would wish to use the statutory four-month consultation period to allow full debate and resolution of the above issues..."* In respect of the council's initial concerns, the following was noted.
11. Governance – *"We are pleased to see that our initial concerns that the City of York would not have representation on the Board of a strategic police authority have been addressed. However we note that these arrangements only last for an initial two-year period and may then be revised."*
12. Accountability – *"We cautiously welcome the proposals to give local authorities statutory powers of scrutiny over BCUs and CDRPs but are concerned that the rights and responsibilities of the Executive of the Council are not being given due regard. In our view the proposals are only acceptable if the BCU commander, with the support of the regional Chief Constable, signs off a 'memorandum of understanding' about the resourcing levels and quality targets that will be achieved at Local Authority level. This must be a public document."*
13. Resources - *"We have previously identified our concerns that:*
 - *any changes to the structure of police forces will result in York cross-subsidising large urban conurbations;*
 - *the current levels of resource/investment in BCUs should be preserved;*
 - *any economies of scale realised from the creation of strategic police authorities will be invested in front line services equitably;*
 - *council tax precept levels will significantly alter as a result of the creation of strategic forces;*
 - *the local council tax payer will have to meet the costs of restructuring;*
 - *any reserves held by North Yorkshire Police will be ring fenced and only used in the North Yorkshire area in the event of any merger.**In our view the only assurance we have had in respect of these concerns is an expectation that council tax precepts in the York and North Yorkshire will reduce over a period of time as precepts equalise and that the net costs of reorganisation will be met by central government. We are not aware of any assurances that the needs of York will be protected and current investment levels maintained.*

In our letter of 13 December 2005 we suggested that if a strategic police force is created then it will be essential to put in place a service level agreement between the Chief Constable and local authorities in order to hold the police force to account in respect of : performance indicators; resource levels, customer satisfaction measures and overall local responsiveness... We are disappointed that this innovative idea has not been taken up and regard it as an important mechanism that will help address many of the concerns we have about the creation of strategic police forces."

14. It is suggested that the idea of a service level agreement (SLA) should be developed and re-submitted as a 'memorandum of understanding'. This would be signed-off by the BCU commander, with the support of the regional Chief Constable, and would confirm resourcing at local authority level and the quality targets that will be achieved there. This would be a public document which would ensure that the rights and responsibilities of the Executive of the council are given due regard.
15. The following provide illustrations of the measures a 'memorandum of understanding' could include to measure investment, resources and outcomes;
 - Proportion of police officer time available for frontline policing to remain at or above the national average (currently 63%)
 - Satisfaction of victims of crime to remain consistent with regard to
 - Making contact with the police
 - Action taken by the police
 - Being kept informed of progress
 - Their treatment by staff
 - The overall service provided
16. On 7 April 2006, 3 of the Region's 4 Police Authorities rejected the proposal to voluntarily merge the region's existing police authority/forces. North Yorkshire Police Authority (NYPA) did support the merger and in a press release stated the following:
 - *The Authority decided that the proposal would be in the best interests of policing in North Yorkshire and the City of York*
 - *Following a recent guarantee from the Home Office that any restructuring will not result in any net increase in cost to the Council tax payer and that net set up costs of restructuring would be met by the Home Office, and not by either the council tax or existing authority reserves, the Authority expressed itself satisfied that there will be no financial burden on the communities of North Yorkshire or the City of York*
 - *The Government has announced that it plans to equalise council tax precept levels across all 4 current police areas over a period of years, which should see levels in North Yorkshire reduce*
 - *NYPA wishes to see more accurate financial information from the Home Office on set-up costs and potential savings following restructuring, prior to making a final decision*
 - *In addition, NYPA wants to ensure that North Yorkshire has a meaningful say on any new police authority for the region, to protect the interests of the area in the future.*
17. The Home Secretary has now laid down orders before the House of Commons to amalgamate the North Yorkshire, South Yorkshire, West Yorkshire and Humberside police areas with effect from 1 April 2008. A four-month statutory consultation period

has now commenced and City of York Council has until 11 August to lodge any objections. All four police authorities are advised to engage in further consultation with their local communities on the proposed merger before deciding whether to submit any objections.

The Crime and Disorder Act review

18. A review of those areas of the Crime and Disorder Act which instruct the work of Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRPs) was published in January of this year. It acknowledges the significant changes that have occurred in the partnership landscape since the creation of CDRPs, and seeks to provide guidance on how they should be modelled and run in future.
19. The review establishes a framework of recommendations to inform the development of more effective partnership working, set within the context of developing a Local Area Agreement and therefore how the work of CDRPs may better link with the community safety aspirations of the Local Strategic Partnership (LSP).
20. The resulting recommendations have significant implications for the work of the council in this area, as a key player in the CDRP, (i.e. Safer York Partnership (SYP)) and as lead in the development of the LSP and LAA.
21. A number of the proposals from this review will require new, or amendments to existing, legislation. The Police and Justice Bill, will act as the vehicle for these changes. The Bill seeks to drive forward the police and CDRP reform programme and also serves to promote the Prime Minister's Respect agenda. Royal Assent is likely to be sought in the autumn of 2006.
22. In the meantime government will be working with stakeholders to develop the national standards that will allow for the changes set out in the review to be delivered by CDRPs. These will be discussed more fully later in this paper.
23. The recommendations from the review fall under the following 4 broad themes.
 - Structures
 - Delivery
 - Governance and Accountability
 - Mainstreaming
24. Where appropriate, other issues of relevance locally, but not necessarily resulting from the review have been included under these headings also.

Structures

25. The review recommends the separation of the strategic and operational functions of CDRPs (summarised as annex A), with the strategic elements increasingly residing with the LSP. This model ensures that the CDRP acts as the delivery arm for the LSP's community safety priorities whilst encouraging greater strategic planning capacity at LSP level. This latter point should be considered in conjunction with the proposals made to the WOW Board on 23rd May.
26. This will mean significant changes to the way in which future strategy is decided. Presently the CDRP sets the strategic direction, and has, in the latest Community Safety Plan established priorities with links to the Community Strategy and actions to support some, but not all, of those aspirations under the Safe City aim.

27. **Safer and Stronger-** Broadly, there presently exists a difference in tone between the 2 plans. The Community Strategy places more emphasis on inclusion, encouraging community cohesion and active participation, whereas the Community Safety Plan lends more emphasis to enforcement activities. This distinction is best summarised by a differing weighting on outcomes in respect of stronger communities, which relate to community empowerment, and outcomes in respect of safer communities, which seek to reduce the instance of specific crime types.
28. These terms have relevance in view of the Safer and Stronger Community Fund agreement (SSCF), which forms a tranche of the LAA. This agreement was recently signed-off by the council's Executive, the SYP Board and LSP, and provides for the majority of funding to address the 'safer' outcomes. This may seem appropriate in view of the fact that government considers York to be in the high crime quartile, and has established, in turn, challenging targets for the CDRP in the reduction of crime (for instance an overall reduction of 24% in the city's crime rates by 2008).
29. If it is felt that the balance between safer and stronger outcomes could be better established, then this could be addressed by future LSP planning, and translated into action by the CDRP, with the acknowledgement that government will probably continue to set challenging and prescriptive targets for the reduction of crime in York beyond the life of the latest Community Safety Plan 2005-2008.
30. The council already undertakes much good work in improving the safety of communities by addressing causal factors which underpin the incidence of crime and disorder. It is anticipated that this will be further strengthened by increased investment in this area. And that work, much of it undertaken by the Neighbourhood Pride Unit, will help inform the development of a more refined funding agreement in future. It is hoped that work to map this activity can start soon, making the SSCF agreement a living document as it shows the progression of work to build stronger communities.
31. Such work should involve increased engagement with the voluntary and community sector in development of strategy and joined-up delivery towards jointly agreed goals. It will also include pursuit of Target-Hardening activities such as the gating of alleyways, the temporary closure of snickets and work to support safety and security in residential areas and buildings inhabited by vulnerable people, such as those living in sheltered accommodation. It is recommended that further details of this work be incorporated in the SSCF agreement at its next iteration.
32. The Neighbourhood Pride Unit will continue to make a significant contribution to the council's Safe City agenda, and is well placed to respond to government's expectation that councils will pursue increased community engagement.. This will be achieved through-
- The Neighbourhood Team undertaking community development activities and projects, which support resident empowerment and involvement in the affairs of their locality, including Community Safety.
 - Ward Committees which will continue to play a leading part in the delivery of Neighbourhood Policing, as it is rolled-out by 2008. This work is progressed mainly but not exclusively through Joint Action Groups (JAGs). JAGs meet at Ward Committee level and are led by Ward Councillors. They identify crime and disorder issues in each locality and look at deploying resources in partnership to tackle the issues. SYP, VCS, relevant CYC services and the Police are represented on each JAG.

- The work of the Local Authority Liaison Officer (LALO) a senior Police officer currently seconded to the NPU to facilitate partnership working between CYC and the Police Authority especially on issues relating to neighbourhood policing.
33. **LSP Development** - The recommendation of a model which places increased emphasis on the LSP to develop strategic capability is likely to become familiar in the delivery of all of the LSP's priorities, and has previously been recommended in other government policy guidance (see 'Local Strategic Partnerships: Shaping their future'). This model suggests a role of increased maturity for the LSP, as it moves towards, as government describes it, acting as the 'partnership of partnerships'. This conception sees LSPs establishing medium-term priorities, established under the auspices of Local Area Agreements, which are in turn translated into action by the partnerships established for each strategic aim. SYP is such partnership, and is accordingly likely to have to undergo changes to the way in which it works to deliver these priorities.
 34. Whilst these issues extend to implicate all such delivery partnerships, it should be acknowledged that SYP is larger than most, has been established longer and commits more resources, both in terms of finances and employee numbers. It will also be responsible for an agenda which will continue to be highly scrutinised by government and prioritised by the council.
 35. Future work to refine the LSP; ensuring that appropriate structures are established, that it has sufficient capacity to undertake a strategic planning role and has access to relevant expertise to help inform its decision-making will be particularly important in this area. Especially given that it is likely to review the long-established structures which have informed the work of Safer York Partnership to date.
 36. Presently the SYP partnership has its own strategic board, which is likely to be replaced by the LSP as it grows in its ability to assume this new role. The current SYP Executive group of officers may well remain a useful addition to this structure to manage the day to day delivery of priorities and oversee the work of smaller partnership groups which presently co-ordinate work around a number of thematic areas. Such groups presently in existence tackle areas identified in the Community Safety Plan such as burglary and vehicle crime.
 37. These changes, it is anticipated, will provide useful context in helping the council to better appreciate and co-ordinate the contribution that it makes to the Safe City priority.
 38. **Coterminous boundaries** - Another significant recommendation of the Crime and Disorder Act review related to structures, pertains to government's desire to see CDRPs and Police Basic Command Units (BCUs) share coterminous boundaries, and to encourage (or compel?) mergers of CDRPs to achieve this. This recommendation should be viewed alongside the government's plans to create strategic Police authorities, , and are intended to provide a means to ensure that this is complemented by appropriate local representation. Whilst a viable model elsewhere in the country, this recommendation, if it were to be implemented, would make little sense for York.
 39. Presently, Central Area BCU within North Yorkshire Police, represents the area formed by York's unitary boundary and that of neighbouring Selby district. If a merger of York and Selby CDRP were to be compelled then there could be significant repercussions for the ability of this new CDRP to act effectively or adequately represent the area it serves, especially in view of the recommendation above to make LSPs responsible for setting the strategic direction of CDRPs. It is hard to envisage how this could work well if the CDRP were to have to represent the aspirations of the LSPs of York, Selby and North Yorkshire. Indeed, these 2 distinct recommendations appear to create contradictory tensions if applied in the locality.

40. The review of the Crime and Disorder Act states-
The power to merge CDRP areas already exists in statute (The Police Reform Act 2002) but we are not at this stage thinking of compelling mergers. We will, however, be asking the Government Offices for the Regions to work with local partnerships to assess the case for mergers in their areas, against some criteria that we will be developing over the coming months. In taking this work forward, we will be working closely with ODPM as well as with regional and local partners to ensure that we do not end up with merged CDRP boundaries which are out of step with the likely future structure of local government itself.
41. The Chief Executive of Selby District Council has written to David Atkinson to express his concerns at the recommendations to make CDRPs coterminous with BCUs. His letter is attached as annex B. The Executive are asked to consider the issues he outlines and provide a formal response.
42. Whilst those working within CDRPs recognise the potential benefits to be derived from cross boundary working and the economies of scale which may be realised by the joint commissioning of projects, this is unlikely to represent a sufficient basis for recommending the formal merger of the 2 CDRPs as government guidance suggests.

Delivery

43. These wider and structural considerations, are complemented by additional recommendations from the Crime and Disorder Act review to support the future delivery of community safety priorities. They complement the ones above concerned with improving the strategic input of the LSP.
44. **Intelligence-** The use of intelligence in formulating strategy and informing operational priorities is recommended, including an increased emphasis on partners to share data, and for partnerships use of this to be informed by appropriate protocols. SYP already does well in this regard, though arguably this could be broadened to better ensure that more partners have access to it. The new structural arrangements may need to make consideration, therefore, of how both strategic and operational duties are to be addressed with reference to data needs, and their associated resourcing.
45. The Crime and Disorder Act review suggests that chief officers of partner agencies consider strategic intelligence assessments on a 6 monthly basis, with this to include both crime data and also community consultation outcomes. Existing assessments completed by the police may help satisfy this requirement, though attention should be given to ensure that this is appropriately focussed on community aspirations, and consideration given to how this might be complimented by the Neighbourhood Policing project.
46. **Strategies-** To complement the new role conceived for the LSP and the part that LAAs will play in setting the strategic direction, the review suggests the abandonment of CDRPs' existing 3 year strategies (the Community Safety Plan) in favour of annual rolling three year strategies. This also acknowledges the pace at which operational priorities can change, both in terms of crime incidence and community priorities. Further work will need to be undertaken in developing York's LAA to understand how this stratification of partnerships and strategies form a coherent and co-ordinated whole.

Governance and Accountability

47. **Community engagement** - This is an emerging theme, represented across many strands of recent government policy and within the purpose of the LAA. The Crime and

Disorder Act review accordingly shares this emphasis, and places increased responsibility on partnerships to use community priorities in shaping strategy. Also, it recommends the use of regular reports to communities and for senior representatives from agencies to hold regular 'face the people' briefings, in order that local people can be clear about how the partnership is performing on their behalf and in order that they can hold key deliverers to account. Such arrangements already exist in the 5 wards presently piloting the Neighbourhood Policing project.

48. Within this framework, the Crime and Disorder Act review conceives of an enhanced role for local councillors in representing the concerns of their constituents. The review introduces the idea of the 'Community Call for Action' whereby communities can secure a response from the CDRP to an issue that they believe has not been adequately addressed, the conduit for this would usually be via a ward councillor.
49. Whilst it's expected that the 'Community Call for Action' will be a remedy of last resort, government is clear that local councillors will need to play a central role in the dialogue between local agencies and local people as they are uniquely placed to act as a conduit at neighbourhood level for relaying local concerns to community safety partner agencies. They are equally well placed to encourage local people to get involved in neighbourhood governance. In so doing they can help inform decisions over local community safety priorities and help to mobilise local action.
50. The Crime and Disorder Act review recommends the active involvement of elected members in community safety to be equally important at both neighbourhood and strategic levels. It is clear in its desire to reinforce local democratic accountability for community safety by embedding community safety arrangements firmly into local democratic processes.
51. It is worth noting that the Respect Action Plan states that 'We will place a duty on district level ward councillors to consider (community safety issues) and respond within a prescribed timescale'. It is expected that this duty will be included in the Local Government White Paper expected to be published in June 2006.
52. In implementing the detail of these recommendations, due accord should be given to the role that the Neighbourhood Policing project can play in providing sufficient community consultation, feedback and accountability. York may be ahead of the game in this regard already in that this project is already integrated with local democratic arrangements. The Joint Action Groups formed in those wards piloting Neighbourhood Policing are chaired by ward councillors and include a core membership from street environment, Neighbourhood Pride Unit, Police Ward Managers, Sergeants and PCSOs, Estate managers and detached youth workers.
53. The roll-out of the project should be monitored to ensure that, if it is the vehicle for satisfying these requirements, representation from key partners is adequate and the capacity to engage with communities is maximised.
54. **Scrutiny Plus** - The Crime and Disorder Act review provides for a renewed role for scrutiny and overview committees, in this instance it is recommended that their remit be extended to include the work of the CDRP, and therefore assist in holding to account those agencies other than the council that are engaged in its work.

Mainstreaming

55. **Section 17-** Presently the council has a legal obligation to consider promoting safety and reducing crime in all that it does. Making this a reality and ensuring that safety is a primary issue which is considered in the planning of service delivery is more difficult.

Progress to date has been slow, but incorporation of this issue within the service planning process has helped to map the breadth of contribution that the council can make. To make it a central consideration in the delivery of services is a further step will require additional work, so that, for instance, services are delivered differently in areas where there is a high incidence of crime, or where vulnerable groups are implicated.

56. This challenge is more significant still with the broadening of the Section 17 definition, which will now require the council to also take account of anti-social behaviour, behaviour adversely affecting the environment and substance misuse. These additional aspects are likely to be represented within future CPA assessments, and any future planning the authority undertakes to further mainstream Section 17 should take account of these additional responsibilities.
57. **National standards-** Government believe that in supporting the work of CDRPs a broad set of principles or standards are needed to clarify what is expected of agencies in partnership, whilst not prescribing how they should be met. These national standards will be mandatory and will cover many of the aspects discussed above, for instance-
- The benefits of engaging communities
 - Clarity around the roles and responsibilities of partner agency chief officers
 - Ensuring the organisation's compliance with section 17
 - Clarity around inter-agency, and local democratic governance and accountability
58. These National Standards will be developed in partnership with stakeholders such as practitioner bodies, Government Offices and relevant national bodies, and will set out government's minimum expectations of CDRPs, reflecting the issues discussed above and including for instance the responsibilities of individual partner agencies, their chief officers and the standards of good governance that are expected.

Corporate Objectives

59. The changes discussed within this paper will have significant implications for the Council's corporate aim 'Create a safe city through transparent partnership working with other agencies and the local community'.
60. The Crime and Disorder Act Review, establishes key recommendations for improving the effectiveness and transparency of partnership working in this sector, and implementation of these should be considered in view of the council's stated aim, above. Equally the recommendations relating to community engagement need to be considered in this context.
61. The authority also needs to consider what the implications of the strategic police merger will mean for achievement of the above aim, and what sub-regional accountability arrangements need to be put in place to ensure a maintained focus on local outcomes.

Implications

62. **Financial** - members are asked to note the suggestion that Police precept levels will be equalised for those local authority areas which will be represented by the new strategic police force. Further clarity from government is required before we can assess in detail what the implications of this proposal will be for York.
63. **Human Resources (HR)** – there are no immediate HR implications, though these may emerge as details of the structural changes discussed in this paper become clearer.

64. **Equalities** – there are no immediate equalities implications.
65. **Legal** – again, legal implications concerning these proposals may emerge as we become clearer on how the proposals discussed are to be implemented and the Police and Justice Bill becomes law.
66. **Crime and Disorder** – the crime and disorder implications of this paper are significant, full cognisance should be taken of them in planning for the future development of SYP and the LSP.
67. **Information Technology (IT)** – there are no immediate IT implications.

Recommendations

68. The Executive are asked to note and comment on the recommendations of the Police and Justice Bill/Crime and Disorder Act review and the implications for York, specifically
 1. Whether the Council's overall policy position on the creation of a strategic police authority as set out at Paragraph 6 above remains valid.
 2. How the Executive should respond to the Home Secretary's consultation on strategic policing (e.g. campaign, letter, meeting with Government).
 3. What type and level of public consultation should be carried out on this matter.
 4. Developing the LSP's capacity for the changes to delivery of Safe City by splitting the strategic planning from delivery arrangements.
 5. Proposals to create coterminous CDRPs and Police Basic Command Units. The Executive are asked to consider a response to the letter from Selby council's Chief Executive regarding this issue (per Annex B).
 6. The increasingly important role that community engagement will play in Safe City, and consider the links between community safety work and existing local democratic arrangements.
 7. The enhanced role for Scrutiny committees in holding the CDRPs contributing agencies to account.
 8. The formal broadening of the Section 17 definition, and consider how best the authority should respond to this.

Authors:
Simon Hornsby
Improvements Officer
Performance Improvement
Tel No. 1075

Chief Officer Responsible for the report:
David Atkinson
Chief Executive

Colin Mockler
Head of Performance Improvement

Nigel Burchell
Senior Policy Development
Officer
Policy and Development
Tel No. 2055

Report
Approved



Date 17th May 06

Wards Affected: *List wards or tick box to indicate all*

All



For further information please contact the author of the report

Background Papers:

The Police and Justice Bill (2006)
The Crime and Disorder Act Review (2006)
Local Strategic Partnerships: Shaping their future- a consultation paper

Annexes

A - The strategic and operational functions of Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships, as suggested in the Crime and Disorder Act Review

B - Letter from Selby District Council's Chief Executive to David Atkinson re proposals to make CDRPs coterminous with Police BCUs