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Safer communities are important to the public and to the Government...

- Community safety determines how local people see their neighbourhood, with 56 per cent of people stating that a low crime rate is their priority for a good place to live. Public demand for improved community safety remains very strong, despite falls in crime rates.
- Under the 1998 Crime and Disorder Act, 376 statutory local community safety partnerships were established, and the Government has targeted an additional £8.7 billion for community safety and related issues since 1999.

The performance of community safety partnerships is difficult to assess...

- Many organisations are involved in assessment, each with their own remit and methods, so no rounded performance picture exists to reassure the public.
- Performance is not always assessed against outputs from partnerships – so although total recorded crime has fallen in recent years, the contribution that community safety partnerships made to this reduction is not clear.

The combined findings from audit, inspection and research show that community safety partnerships need to focus on three areas for improvement...

- Ownership and organisational behaviour – in particular leadership, maximising the role of councillors and members, senior personnel and other local agencies, and making community safety a part of core business.
- A sustained focus on a limited number of priorities – balancing local needs with national policy, setting action plans and targets, and engaging local communities.
- Effectively using their capacity and systems to deliver community safety – improving performance management, prioritising resources, using and sharing experiences to improve delivery.

The Government needs to focus on...

- Extending national ownership of community safety beyond the Home Office, to incorporate education, health, environment, transport and local government departments in particular.
- Clarifying its expectations of partnerships and simplifying its guidance to them.
- Making the allocation of funds more straightforward and flexible.
- Clarifying and simplifying the performance assessment framework.
- Facilitating joint inspections of community safety partnerships, on an area rather than a service basis.

Local partnerships have not made an obvious impact on community safety between 1999 and 2000. The Government and regulators need to work with the partner agencies to maximise their impact and to make neighbourhoods safer for local people.
1. This report is part of the AC Knowledge – Learning from Audit, Inspection and Research series. It is intended primarily for local authority chief executives and police commanders. The Commission has also produced a separate briefing that summarises the main messages from this report and highlights the key issues for councillors and senior managers of local community safety partnerships, together with other stakeholders in the wider world of government and related bodies.

2. The project was undertaken in collaboration with external auditors, inspectors from the Audit Commission Inspection Service and HM Inspectorate of Constabulary. Expert advice was provided by an advisory group that incorporated both partnership auditors, inspectors and practitioners (APPENDIX 1).

3. The concept of community safety covers people, places and risks. For the purposes of this report, the term ‘community safety’ should be taken to incorporate crime and disorder reduction within the broader aim of establishing greater cohesion and feelings of well-being and safety in local communities.

‘The term ‘community safety’ is seen as being concerned with people, communities and organisations, including families, victims and risk groups, as well as with attempting to reduce particular types of crime and the fear of crime. Community safety should be seen as the legitimate concern of all in the local community.’ Audit Commission (Ref. 1)

‘…[it] is a subjective condition [and] a dynamic concept…best understood in a local context.’ HM Inspectorate of Constabulary (Ref. 2)

4. Achieving community safety became a statutory requirement under the Crime and Disorder Act 1998. This sponsored the creation in 1999 of 376 statutory local community safety partnerships throughout England and Wales. Each partnership is required to conduct a triennial audit of crime and disorder within its area, consult the local community on the findings, and then deliver a strategic response. Organisation of this work is a specific responsibility of councils and the police. The first community safety strategies covered the period 1999-2002. A second crime and disorder audit took place during 2001, in preparation for new strategies covering the period 2002-05.

5. Previous research by the Commission and HM Inspectorate of Constabulary identified a set of key challenges for partnerships (Refs. 1 and 2):

- establishing strong and effective leadership, vision and purpose;
- engaging with communities, agencies and others to maximise the local impact;
- establishing accountable and delivery-focused partnerships;
- adopting an investment approach to acquiring and using resources efficiently; and
- integrating community safety into mainstream basic service delivery.
6. This research also identified a number of challenges for Government:
   - supporting performance and encouraging learning about ‘what works’;
   - providing incentives that develop community safety both nationally and locally; and
   - providing leadership and a corporate approach across central government.

7. The purpose of this report is to review the performance of those local agencies that have been engaged in delivering community safety since 1999. It also explores the key issues facing community safety partnerships as they develop and implement strategies for the period 2002-05.

8. Between November 2001 and May 2002 the Commission reviewed the implementation of community safety by local partnerships, using evidence from audits, inspections and research. This report is based upon evidence drawn from:
   - community safety value-for-money audits in 1999 and 2000 covering most councils in England and Wales;
   - Audit Commission inspections of community safety in 23 English and Welsh councils;
   - HM Inspectorate of Constabulary inspections of 16 police basic command units;
   - ten community safety beacon council applications to the Department for Transport, Local Government and the Regions; and
   - Audit Commission fieldwork in 19 local partnership areas, selected on the basis of Audit Commission inspection scores, crime rates between 2000-2001 and entry to the beacon council scheme.

9. This study was conducted by Sean Quiggin under the direction of Irene Payne. Valuable assistance was received from Audit Commission auditors, inspectors and Helen Goulding. The Commission is grateful to Paul Barlow, Gillian Dent, Catherine Mangan and the New Policy Institute (NPI) for additional research.
1. COMMUNITY SAFETY IN CONTEXT

10. Community safety is a complex issue. It is an outcome rather than a service, although it is strongly influenced by the quality of service delivery. Community safety relates to people’s sense of personal security and to their feelings of ease in the places that they live, work or spend leisure time. It affects how people value their neighbourhood, and is a major part of what makes a neighbourhood a good or a bad place to live.

PUBLIC CONCERNS

11. There is strong demand from the public for action to improve community safety. In October 2001 MORI tested the public response to the question ‘Thinking generally, what would you say is the most important thing in making somewhere a good place to live?’ (Ref. 3). Over one-half of the public (56 per cent) said that a low level of crime was the most important thing, and nearly one-third (29 per cent) said that the key need for their area was reducing crime levels. The strength of public opinion on the importance of community safety differs from place to place. In MORI’s 2001 survey, over one-third (36 per cent) of urban dwellers said that reducing crime levels was important, compared with only 15 per cent of rural dwellers.

12. The public’s sense of safety in their neighbourhood is linked to their beliefs about their chances of becoming a victim of crime and what they feel about the consequences of being a victim. Levels of concern are often higher among those who are recent victims, those who consider it likely that they will be a victim and those who are socially or economically vulnerable (Ref. 4). A public perception of rising local crime rates has been recorded since 1998, with 50 per cent of people believing that local crime rates are rising (Ref. 4). Victims’ assessment of the seriousness of crimes against them has also increased. Influencing perceptions is therefore an important aspect of community safety.

13. Despite preconceptions about the risk of becoming a victim of crime, the reality is lower than expected for most people. Young men aged 16–24 are most at risk of being a victim of violent crime, based on figures for 1999 and 2000 (Ref. 4). They are four times more likely than others to be a victim of violent crime – an 18.8 per cent risk in any one year against the England and Wales average of 3.9 per cent for all age groups and genders.

14. Although young people are most at risk of becoming victims, older people tend to think of young people as the perpetrators of crime, rather than as victims. Action to assure the well-being of young people figured prominently in MORI’s survey, with many respondents saying that better activities for teenagers was the most important improvement needed in their area (Ref. 3). Reducing levels of both offending and victimisation involving young people is a key issue for community safety partnerships.
15. To improve the public's concerns about safety, tackling crime and concern about crime is clearly very important. However, a range of other issues also contribute to public concern, including vandalism, racial harassment and graffiti – so crime is the ‘tip of the iceberg’ (EXHIBIT 1). Many of the ‘below the waterline’ factors are covered by existing council services, and so the performance of these services is crucial to the way that people judge levels of community safety.

**EXHIBIT 1** Factors that affect people’s sense of ‘community safety’

Crime is just the ‘tip of the iceberg’.

---

**CRIME RATES**

16. The social and economic cost of crime and disorder is high. Recent estimates suggest that the annual cost of crime to the UK is in excess of £50 billion (Ref. 2). The Government has made reducing crime and disorder a major target of both parliaments since 1997.

17. The 2001 British Crime Survey showed that the crime rate in 2000 was about 17 per cent higher than in 1981 (EXHIBIT 2, overleaf). Between 1991 and 2000 there was an overall 12 per cent fall in nearly all of the offences measured (Ref. 4). Between 1995 and 2000 there was an impressive 33 per cent fall (around 6 per cent per annum). Despite the fall over this period, public concerns about crime do not seem to have lessened. Concern about crime increased in the most recent British Crime Survey. The 2002 survey shows that since 2000, nearly two-thirds (30 per cent) believe that crime has risen. This is despite the fact that the total number of crimes reported to the British Crime Survey fell by 14 per cent between 1999 and 2002.

---

I The British Crime Survey measures both reported and unreported incidents.
II http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/
18. The distribution of recorded crime is not spread evenly across England and Wales. Local crime rates tend to increase as deprivation and urbanisation rises. For example, crime rates are significantly higher in the 88 Neighbourhood Renewal Areas (Ref. 7). Between 1999 and 2000 in North Manchester:
   - the domestic burglary rate was 24.8 per 1,000 people, compared with 8.7 nationally; and
   - the violent crime rate was 37.8 per 1,000 people, compared with 11.4 nationally.

Local activity to deal with local crime rates is therefore very important, and community safety partnerships are well placed to lead this.

GOVERNMENT ACTION

19. Improving community safety is the responsibility of a number of local agencies, in particular councils, police and social care services. The 376 local community safety partnerships created by the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 aim to reduce crime and anti-social behaviour in order to make communities safer. The provisions of the Act require that local agencies work together to achieve this goal, and that councils and police together shoulder the responsibility for
achieving community safety. The provisions of the Local Government Act 2000 built on this responsibility by requiring councils to achieve the social, economic and environmental well-being of communities.

20. At present, responsibility for community safety policy lies solely with the Home Office. However, community safety is also inherent in the work of other departments, such as the Department for Education and Skills (DfES), the Department of Health (DH), the former Department for Transport, Local Government and the Regions (DTLR), and the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA). However, at present they do not share ‘ownership’ with the Home Office, and community safety is not an explicit theme in their policies or expenditure.

21. A number of government funding sources have been established that contribute to improvements in community safety. Since 1999, the Government has targeted an additional £2.36 billion specifically at implementing crime reduction and community safety (EXHIBIT 3).

**EXHIBIT 3** Targeted government funding supporting community safety

Since 1999, the Government has targeted an additional £2.36 billion specifically at implementing crime reduction and community safety.
For the period 1999-2002, £1.6 billion has been targeted at improving policing through the Crime Fighting Fund, available only to the police. Other funds were made available through the Crime Reduction Programme and, since April 2002, its successor Safer Communities, as well as Communities Against Drugs, Business and Retail Crime Reduction and Smaller Retailers in Deprived Areas.

Clearly, additional government funding for community safety is not provided in one pot, but it arrives locally in various streams. The police and other agencies involved in local community safety partnerships play a key role in influencing how this government funding is spent. At present, government funding for community safety partnerships is weighted towards higher crime areas, and to how much local funding partnerships can raise themselves. The distribution processes for funds are not uniform, and this increases the cost and effort required by partnerships to obtain funding. This disincentive is sufficient to prevent some partnerships from seeking external funding. However, this does not detract from the fact that government has committed significant funds to delivering community safety.

For the public, the most visible indication of the Crime Reduction Programme funding is closed circuit television (CCTV) systems in city centres. CCTV systems can act as a deterrent to certain forms of crime, and ‘street crime’ levels have fallen as the CCTV funding has been expended (Ref. 8). The CCTV Challenge Fund supported the installation of systems in 78 per cent of community safety partnership areas. The median value of grants to local community safety partnerships to support CCTV installation was slightly under £300,000, within a range of £13,500 to £5 million.

The Partnership Development Fund is another key component of the Crime Reduction Programme and is aimed at improving the capacity of local community safety partnerships to deliver community safety in higher crime areas. During 2001/02, over £17 million was distributed to local partnerships by the Crime Reduction Directors located in the regional Government Offices and the Welsh Assembly Government (EXHIBIT 4).

**EXHIBIT 4**  Total Partnership Development Fund distribution, 2001/02

Over £17 million was distributed to local partnerships – north-east England had the highest allocation and south-east England the lowest.

Source: Audit Commission
26. In addition to the targeted Crime Reduction Programme, £5.46 billion of government funding has also been available to many community safety partnerships through the Single Regeneration Budget. Between 2001 and 2004, a further £900 million is being provided through the Neighbourhood Renewal Fund to the 88 most deprived council areas in England and Wales. A proportion of each grant is to support the reduction of crime and disorder, in the latter case specific support for achieving local implementation of the national burglary reduction ‘floor target’\(^1\). With the £2.36 million for crime reduction described earlier, this means that the Government has contributed a total of £8.7 billion to community safety and related issues since 1999.

27. As well as providing a broad spectrum of funding for community safety, the Government has produced 22 sets of comprehensive guidance for local partnerships. This guidance covers a variety of crime reduction topics, from alcohol-related crime to vehicle crime (Ref. 9). However, while the guidance is freely available on the internet, its size and detail make it very complex and, in fact, some partnerships report that they find it overwhelming. The guidance also tends to focus on how to reduce crime, rather than on why crime reduction is important in the broader context of community safety and social cohesion. This approach fails to engage non-police agencies, such as health, social services and education.

28. There is potential for the Government’s public service reform programme to have a significant impact on community safety partnerships. Local councils and the police need to be aware of, and take full account of, ongoing change and reform to public service provision. Some of the major changes facing local partnerships are:

- Local Strategic Partnerships – particularly in the 88 Neighbourhood Renewal Areas, where receipt of additional government funding depends upon the creation of the Strategic Partnership;
- local Public Service Agreements – where agreement on the choice and focus of performance covering community safety should include all local agencies;
- Community Safety Officers/Accredited Organisations and the need to reduce anti-social behaviour;
- mergers of community safety partnerships and drug action teams; and
- change in healthcare provision – especially drugs and alcohol-related crime and treatment.

29. The background against which community safety partnerships have been operating since 1999 has been evolving quickly and continues to evolve as public demand increases.

**SUMMARY**

30. Making communities and neighbourhoods safer is very important to the public. Despite changes in national crime rates, the public does not perceive that enough is being done locally. Community safety is also an important area for the Government, which, since 1999, has targeted £8.7 billion in additional funding. The Crime and Disorder Act 1998 set a clear framework for community safety partnerships to take forward action in this area, although some of the guidance is confusing. The next chapter examines the impact of these partnerships in making communities safer.

\(^1\) The Government aims to reduce the level of crime in deprived areas so that by 2005 no council area has a domestic burglary rate more than three times the national average – while at the same time reducing the national rate by 25 per cent (Home Office National Public Service Agreement performance target with HM Treasury).
2. HOW WELL ARE COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIPS PERFORMING?

31. The statutory framework for achieving community safety in local neighbourhoods is now three years old. Local community safety partnerships have come to the end of the first round of their community safety strategies, covering the period 1999-2002. This chapter examines how well local partnerships have performed during this time, considering first the performance assessment framework and then the evidence for performance.

THE PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK

32. The aim of local partnerships is to bring together relevant agencies to focus on the common outcome of safer communities for local people. Assessing performance against this aim is complex. Currently, a broad range of different assessing organisations and assessment methods have been set up by statute, and no one organisation has an overview covering every local participant. The remit and accountability of each organisation also differs (TABLE 1).

33. The list of assessing organisations shown in Table 1 excludes government fundholders who review performance in the course of determining partnership funding applications, such as the Neighbourhood Renewal Fund held by the former Department for Transport, Local Government and the Regions.

34. Defining performance is also complex. There is no single measure – it is determined by progress against one or more of the following:
   - national best value performance indicators (BVPIs);
   - the British Crime Survey;
   - notifiable offences recorded by the police;
   - local triennial crime and disorder audits;
   - stretch performance targets in local public service agreements; and
   - local partnership performance indicators.

35. The remit and focus of both the Audit Commission and HM Inspectorate of Constabulary in assessing performance is limited to councils and police services respectively. Both began assessing the quality of local delivery arrangements only midway through the first three-year community safety strategies. Before this, the Commission’s appointed external auditors made local assessments alone, based on a mix of value for money and risk. In hindsight, the absence of partnership level performance data and an early bias toward procedural assessments sent a message to local partnership agencies – some partnerships are still focusing much of their work on process issues, rather than on outcomes.

---

1 Targets requiring performance above that necessary to meet best value performance indicators, agreed between councils and the Government as part of a local Public Service Agreement.
### TABLE 1  Organisations that assess community safety performance

The role, perspective and accountability of each assessor is different.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Local agencies covered</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Line of accountability</th>
<th>Community safety perspective included?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Audit Commission</td>
<td>External audit</td>
<td>Councils, police and health services</td>
<td>England and Wales</td>
<td>Independent agency</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inspection</td>
<td>Councils¹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM Inspectorate of Constabulary</td>
<td>Inspection</td>
<td>Police services only</td>
<td>England and Wales</td>
<td>Home Secretary</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Crime Reduction Teams</td>
<td>General performance – 2002 onwards</td>
<td>Councils and police services</td>
<td>English regions</td>
<td>Home Secretary</td>
<td>Yes Wales Assembly Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Standards Unit</td>
<td>Defining service standards – 2002 onwards</td>
<td>Police services only</td>
<td>England and Wales</td>
<td>Home Secretary</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM Inspectorate of Probation</td>
<td>Inspection</td>
<td>Probation services only</td>
<td>England and Wales</td>
<td>Home Secretary</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services Inspectorate Wales</td>
<td>Inspection</td>
<td>Council social services only¹</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Secretary of State for Health</td>
<td>Yes Wales Assembly Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services Inspectorate Wales</td>
<td>Inspection</td>
<td>Council social services only²</td>
<td>Wales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office for Standards in Education</td>
<td>Inspection</td>
<td>Schools and education services only³</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Independent agency</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estyn</td>
<td>Inspection</td>
<td>Schools and education services only³</td>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>Independent agency</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission for Health Improvement</td>
<td>Inspection</td>
<td>Health services only</td>
<td>England and Wales</td>
<td>Secretary of State for Health</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Audit Commission

36. The role of the regional crime reduction teams in improving partnership performance should be increased. Many partnerships speak highly of the support provided by the regional teams in co-ordinating access to government funding, but their current role in stimulating better performance is largely passive. The regional teams are well placed to co-ordinate more effective intervention and support for individual partnerships.

---

¹ Local education authorities and social services jointly with other inspectorates.
² Jointly with the Audit Commission.
³ Local education authorities jointly with the Audit Commission.
EVIDENCE FOR PERFORMANCE

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

37. Individual national performance indicators do not immediately provide a clear measure of community safety because:
   - they tend to focus on single issues, for example, process efficiency;
   - continual refinement in their definition makes measurement of trends difficult; and
   - their application can vary between agencies. For example, prior to April 2001, crime related performance indicators applied to police forces but not to councils; similarly, wider community safety indicators, such as defective street lighting, applies to councils and not to the police.

38. Most partnerships (88 per cent) have developed a crime reduction strategy and are also supporting community legal partnerships (85 per cent). However, national best value performance indicators show a mixed picture of performance (APPENDIX 2). For the period 1997-2000, some individual indicators suggest large increases in total crime that are not borne out by the British Crime Survey data for the same period. The debate about how to record crime levels accurately led to the introduction of standard methods for recording crime in 2002 (Ref. 6).

39. The Government’s suite of community safety BVPIs, as set for police and councils from 2001 onwards, extends the responsibility for community safety to councils as well the police. While wider ownership by council, police and health services is crucial, the focus of national performance indicators is on crime reduction and not on community safety. To aid local partnerships in forming a more rounded view of performance, the Audit Commission is piloting a suite of community safety performance indicators. This suite comprises a mix of national and locally used indicators and provides a basis for forming a more comprehensive view of community safety delivery (APPENDIX 3).

40. The focus of many partnership agencies is compliance with national performance indicators. Inevitably, there is a tension between the national performance indicators relating to crime reduction and the broader delivery of community safety. Partnerships that focus too narrowly on national issues alone will fail to attend to local priorities and will not serve local people well. A broader picture of community safety was well described in many partnerships’ first strategies, and partnerships need to set national targets in this wider context.

41. Falls in crime rates are welcome, and, for many people, will be an indication of improved community safety. However, the police service area recording base makes it difficult to relate this information to the impact of any individual community safety partnership. This will improve as a result of partnership-based crime recording, established since 2000.
KEY NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES RECORDED BY POLICE AT PARTNERSHIP LEVEL

42. Recording crime at community safety partnership level began in 2000, although, as described earlier, this is only one measure of how safe a community appears to local people. While these data are a measure of the safety of a community, they do not include unreported incidents in the same way as British Crime Survey data do. However, they do give a clearer indication of changes in local (as opposed to national) crime rates.

43. All partnerships are allocated to one of 13 ‘families’ on the basis of similar local circumstances. To compare performance, it is useful to look at how partnership crime levels compare between family members. Compared with the family average, between 2000 and 2001, the number of robberies rose in two-thirds (65 per cent) of partnerships (EXHIBIT 5). However, 72 per cent of partnerships saw a fall in the number of burglaries and car-related crimes in relation to the family average. This shows good progress against the Government’s burglary reduction target, but only limited progress against the target for reducing robbery. Further increases in robbery, reported in the British Crime Survey 2002, underscore the need for those partnerships with high robbery rates to focus on action to reduce offending levels.

EXHIBIT 5  Significant changes in key notifiable offences 2000-2001

While robberies rose in two-thirds of partnerships, burglaries and car crime fell.

Source: NPI analysis commissioned by the Audit Commission, 2002

http://neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk
EXTERNAL AUDITS

44. External audits conducted in 1999 and 2000 by Audit Commission appointed external auditors found a mixed picture of how well community safety partnerships were implementing their strategies (EXHIBIT 6). The main findings were that:

- many community safety partnerships were characterised by high aspirations but weak delivery;
- many partnerships were focusing on procedural issues rather than on delivering better outcomes; and
- performance management was generally poor, with insufficient performance information and inadequate information sharing protocols.

EXHIBIT 6 Auditors’ assessment of early community safety delivery

External audits conducted in 1999 and 2000 found a mixed performance picture affecting early implementation of community safety.

**Strengths**
- Increasing representation by the private sector and a high level of representation by Victim Support.
- Strategies express a commitment to partnership working.
- Promising starts in making community safety a routine service delivery consideration.
- A strong, broad focus.
- Some good community engagement using partnership ‘brand image’.
- Regular performance reviews by some partnerships.

**Weaknesses**
- Patchy involvement at a strategic level by some key agencies, for example, probation, education, health and fire services.
- A limited number of staff dedicated to co-ordinating community safety activity.
- Achievement, but poorly expressed, targets making evaluation difficult.
- Poor use of problem solving techniques and a weak focus on crime ‘hotspots’.
- A lack of focus and co-ordination creating too many ‘talking shops’.
- Poor communication and engagement with local people.
- Poor information sharing and little willingness to develop a protocol.
- Weak performance monitoring systems and insufficient information.

*Source: Audit Commission*
BEST VALUE INSPECTIONS

45. More recently, inspections by the Audit Commission have found similar problems to those identified by the external audits. Inspections in themselves do not provide a complete picture of a partnership’s performance for two main reasons:

- the scope of an inspection has been, up to now, affected by the council’s best value review. Many reviews focus more on national target performance than on community safety as a mainstream issue in basic service delivery; and
- inspections assess the council’s performance, and only indirectly include the other agencies in the community safety partnership.

46. However, inspections are still useful. They give an indication of how one key side of the partnership is performing and, in some cases, of how effective the partnership is.

47. Many councils have yet to complete community safety best value reviews. At the time of analysis, 23 best value inspection reports of community safety had been published by the Audit Commission. The findings confirm a mixed picture of current performance, with just 40 per cent of the councils inspected providing a good service (EXHIBIT 7). Of those inspected, English district councils and English and Welsh unitary councils appeared to be performing better. Encouragingly, 61 per cent of all the councils inspected were judged as having promising or good prospects for improvement.

EXHIBIT 7  Audit Commission published inspection judgements

A mixed picture of current performance, but promising prospects for improvement.

Source: Audit Commission – 23 inspections
The most common recommendations arising from inspections relate to weaknesses in performance management, particularly aims, plans and targets (EXHIBIT 8).

EXHIBIT 8  Audit Commission inspections – top seven recommendations

The most common recommendations arose from weaknesses in aims, plans and targets, and performance management.

Source: Audit Commission – 23 inspections

Key strengths and weaknesses can also be extracted from the inspection reports (EXHIBIT 9). The clear main strength related to engaging partners. However, a number of partnerships are falling down on basics, such as target setting and performance management – the simple things.

HM INSPECTORATE OF CONSTABULARY INSPECTIONS

The findings of HM Inspectorate of Constabulary following inspections of local police services are consistent with other evidence for performance. The main messages to emerge from these inspections are:

- the commitment of some local agencies to delivering community safety is variable, for example, probation, social services, local education and healthcare providers;
- too many local partnership agencies rely on the police to lead the community safety agenda and to set performance targets;
- where police and council boundaries do not coincide, delivering community safety is more problematic and less effective;
- there is a tension between ‘bottom-up’ local community safety priorities and ‘top-down’ national performance indicators and police service objectives;
- partnership working is more effective where senior police and council personnel are clearly directing the work of the partnership agencies and are visibly involved in leading it; and
- employing people with competent community safety skills is a critical success factor for delivery.
EXHIBIT 9  Criteria supporting inspection judgements about service quality

Local partners are working well together, but a much greater commitment to community safety and to managing performance on behalf of local people is needed.

Source: Audit Commission – 23 inspections

AUDIT COMMISSION FIELDWORK

51. Emerging findings from fieldwork suggest a set of common factors in successful delivery (BOX A).

BOX A  Emerging factors common to partnerships demonstrating success

- A clear and specific focus that responds to public concern.
- Effective leadership, with ownership by councillors, the council’s chief executive and the local police commander.
- A balance between competing national targets and local priorities.
- Analysis of problems using sufficient data to generate appropriate solutions.
- Action tailored to fit the problem, with flexibility to enable a quick response.
- Clear lines of accountability, clear targets and progress monitoring.
- Pooling of resources (financial and staff).
- Effective communication with all internal and external stakeholders.
- Experimentation and evaluation built in at the outset.
- Realistic sustainability built in at the outset.

Source: Audit Commission project fieldwork
An interesting finding from fieldwork, backed up by inspection judgements, is that some smaller district and unitary councils appear to be delivering community safety more effectively than larger councils. It is not clear why; however, evidence from fieldwork suggests that smaller district councils have recognised that they must rise to the challenge relatively unsupported (they do not have the time or resources to prevaricate), and so they have gone on to do exactly this. Fieldwork evidence also suggests that unitary authorities are relatively unhampered by the historical constraints of previous issues relating to community safety, and so are free to take a more innovative approach. There is, however, patchy evidence of good practice in other councils.

The complex mix of players involved in assessing community safety partnerships leads to a fragmented picture of performance. A joined-up, rounded assessment of all local agencies involved in delivering community safety outcomes is essential to reassure local people and to stimulate higher performance.

Although in some partnership areas the Government’s national crime reduction targets have been achieved, local partnerships’ contribution to achieving this is unclear; data that are currently available do not give a complete picture of partnership performance, nor do they correlate to crime rates.

There are some serious concerns about the partnerships’ performance, in particular:

- local agencies not truly owning the responsibility to deliver community safety, and not changing organisational behaviour accordingly;
- partnerships not focusing on the real priorities, especially in long-term planning; and
- partnerships not using their capacity to deliver community safety as an integral part of basic services.

Chapter 3 looks in more detail at these areas and suggests ways to improve performance.
3. DELIVERING IMPROVEMENTS IN COMMUNITY SAFETY

Key areas for improvement identified at the end of Chapter 2 were:

- ownership of community safety and a willingness to change behaviour;
- a sustained focus on the real local priorities; and
- capacity to deliver improved community safety as part of basic service delivery.

This chapter examines each of these areas and suggests ways to improve performance.

OWNERSHIP AND ORGANISATIONAL BEHAVIOUR

The extent to which local partnership agencies work together is the critical success factor, as shown by recently published research into the effectiveness of collaboration and co-ordination in area-based initiatives (Ref. 10): "Working together is complex, dependant both on the history, geography, identity of the area and on the vision, skills and behaviour of key individuals. It is through collaborative working and shared experience that partners learn to work together."

The biggest barrier to delivering better community safety is not national government or local politicians, the law or local people; it is the difficulty of changing organisational values and the culture in councils, the police and other local partnership agencies. However, this barrier is surmountable where there is ownership of the issue and a clear willingness to change, as exemplified by some small district councils and new unitary authorities.

The extent to which councils, the police and other partners own the responsibility to deliver community safety is fundamental to improvement, as is the behaviour of councillors, police authority members, and senior council and police personnel.

THE ROLE OF COUNCILLORS AND POLICE AUTHORITY MEMBERS

Councillors are elected by local people. Police authority members are appointed by either the Government or by the local council. Councillors and police authority members must own the responsibility for community safety, set a focus on local priorities and manage performance. In general, police authority members are not routinely involved in local community safety partnerships, although occasionally a councillor on the partnership may also be a police authority representative. Both inspections and fieldwork identified a tension over the inclusion of local councillors or police authority members in partnerships. A number of council chief executives were concerned about the ‘politicisation’ of relationships between police and councils. Councillors spoke of feeling disengaged from community safety, despite activity to reduce crime and anti-social behaviour occuring in the wards that they are elected to represent.
However, councillors see community safety as a key cabinet role under the new democratic arrangements currently being implemented (CASE STUDY 1). A recent Local Government Association survey of councils showed that over one-half (58 per cent) now manage community safety in this way (Ref. 11). County and district councils were the least likely to do so, with London and metropolitan councils most likely. Fieldwork identified the delivery of community safety as a key electoral commitment among mayoral candidates.

### CASE STUDY 1
The pivotal role of councillors in community safety

Telford & Wrekin and Southampton Councils have a history of community safety activity that predates the 1998 Crime and Disorder Act. In both councils, councillors play a pivotal role in overseeing delivery. The Audit Commission's inspection of community safety in Telford & Wrekin identified that councillors were involved at all key stages and rated it to be a good service that was likely to improve.

Salford Metropolitan District Council councillors are significantly involved in best value reviews – in line with the council's own guidance. The driving force behind the community safety review was the Crime and Disorder Reduction Panel. Councillors on the Panel work closely with both the Cabinet Leader and Deputy Leader for Crime Reduction.

St. Helens Metropolitan District Council councillors are active in their ward communities and are aware of community safety issues. Local people and community representatives spoke positively about their involvement and knowledge of local issues.

Source: Audit Commission inspections and project fieldwork

By 2000, an agreed definition of partnership working existed in 96 per cent of police and 88 per cent of councils surveyed by external auditors. By 2001, a Local Government Association survey showed that while three-quarters of councils will have a corporate community safety strategy by 2004, a significant minority (81 councils) have no intention to make this commitment (Ref. 11). This survey also showed community safety to be a corporate priority in 90 per cent of councils. Councillors and police authority members have a key role to play in ensuring that community safety is part of the organisational culture of councils and police authorities. Without their support it is unlikely that this will happen.

### THE ROLE OF SENIOR COUNCIL AND POLICE PERSONNEL

Commitment from, and action by, senior council and police personnel is key to delivering community safety. In particular, they are responsible for bringing leadership, co-ordination and commitment to the partnerships, as well as for supporting councillors and police authority members.

The Audit Commission’s report, A Fruitful Partnership, highlighted the importance of leaders’ roles in partnerships (Ref. 12), and noted that:

- leadership style should strike a balance between developing partnership working and focusing on hard-edged objectives; and
- building trust between partners is the most important ingredient of success.
66. Inspection and fieldwork show the critical role that effective leadership plays in achieving community safety success. Weak leadership among senior personnel is a problem identified by auditors and inspectors in a number of councils and police services, and it can be a barrier to improvement. However, overbearing leadership can also hamper performance, as it can strain relationships between local agencies. Partnership agencies need to take account of cultural differences in leadership styles when working together.

67. The situation is improving, with greater trust and co-operation between partner agencies. Some councils and police services now actively work alongside each other to deliver community safety, building on the confidence arising from successful activity. However, in many cases senior council and police personnel need to work hard on the trust element of successful partnerships. Once these key personnel set the direction and demonstrate their commitment, partnerships can move community safety to the heart of basic service delivery. And by demonstrating strong ownership and a willingness to change organisational behaviour, councils and police services are more likely to gain support and commitment from other local agencies.

THE ROLE OF OTHER LOCAL AGENCIES

68. A few partnerships involve only the council and police at a strategic level. Auditors have judged these to be at risk of becoming too inwardly focused. At the other end of the spectrum, some partnerships have over 20 representatives from business, voluntary organisations and universities. However, partnerships of this size risk confusing roles and responsibilities and being difficult to manage. Partnerships must fit local needs, and so there needs to be a balance between keeping the partnership to a manageable size and having sufficient partners to be outward looking. Co-ordinating and directing action between everyone involved is complex, but it is essential. The delivery of community safety cannot be achieved by any one local agency in isolation.

69. Working together requires all local agencies to share information and to collaborate in planning basic service delivery in the interests of the community (CASE STUDY 2, overleaf). It does not require local agencies to be ‘in a partnership’ in a quasi-legal sense, although co-ordination and collaboration is essential. Many partnerships have small executive groups, and these could usefully focus on maximising co-ordination and monitoring partners’ performance.
CASE STUDY 2  Working in partnership with local agencies

Local partnership agencies spoke of Telford & Wrekin Council as being a strong partner that had set clear aims with challenging targets. By working in partnership, the Council and other local agencies have implemented a variety of initiatives to reduce crime and concern about crime. The Council has limited resources for community safety work, but is striving to build closer relationships with other local agencies delivering similar services. To improve co-ordination and to maximise resource use, the community safety, drug action and youth offending teams are to be co-located in a local police station.

At Ceredigion County Borough Council, the community safety partnership enables better operational networking among local agencies. Police and Council managers share information in joint problem solving groups. New links between Council and police managers have enabled them to take joint action over potential disorder at late-night food outlets. Networks include local voluntary organisations, with joint action between the police, the council and the citizens advice bureau to support people who are reporting racial or homophobic incidents.

Newport County Borough Council’s estate management service and voluntary sector organisations work in partnership. For example, the Council works with the local race equality council and women’s aid group over cases of racial harassment and domestic violence. Victims are quickly rehoused following serious incidents.

In Torbay, the police strongly support the Council’s security service because it helps them to detect crime and secure arrests. Joint working has saved both police and criminal justice system resources, with defendants being more likely to plead guilty when confronted with the Council’s CCTV evidence.

Source: Audit Commission

70. Given the wide range of agencies that could be involved in any partnership, each agency’s role needs to be clearly defined. For example, health services, social services, probation and education services deliver significant benefits when fully involved in local partnerships, yet they are often not full participants. The situation has been exacerbated by an audit and inspection focus on process, combined with the lack of a clear national policy that includes the important role of non-police agencies in community safety.

71. Fire services are becoming increasingly involved (71 per cent of partnerships). Arson is a growing problem and it adds to concerns about crime. The social cost of arson is estimated by the Government to have reached over £1.3 billion a year and, in an average week, 3,500 fires are deliberately started resulting in 50 injuries and two deaths (Ref. 13).

72. Victim support representation on partnerships is high (86 per cent). However, criminal justice system representation by local courts is low (44 per cent), as is representation from the Crown Prosecution Service (34 per cent). In one partnership visited during the study, the local criminal justice agencies excluded themselves from the partnership at its first meeting due to concerns about a conflict of interest. The exclusion of the group unhelpfully separated the two key components of the local criminal justice system and aggravated weaknesses in performance. To avoid conflicting objectives and targets, and to maximise emphasis on the needs of victims, witnesses and offenders, it is essential that the two groups work together closely.

73. Vulnerable group representation on community safety partnerships is increasing, including representation from black and minority ethnic communities (71 per cent), older people (66 per cent), women’s and domestic violence groups (57 per cent) and anti-homophobia groups (44 per cent). However, youth offending team and drug action team involvement remains patchy, particularly in district council areas. Involvement of these teams in specific, localised
projects has been generally good. By contrast, district councils need the tactical support of county councils (which organise the teams in non-unitary areas) to ensure these teams' involvement. This is particularly important in light of the proposed merger of drug action teams with community safety partnerships.

74. The engagement of health services is also improving. Chief executives of primary care trusts are joining partnerships, especially where boundaries coincide. One example is Southwark, where the council’s social services director is the primary care trust’s chief executive.

75. The range of local agencies needed to implement community safety locally makes organising delivery a complex issue. The mix of assessment agencies further aggravates the situation. By acting as community advocates under the Local Government Act 2000, councils are well placed to lead and co-ordinate delivery. Effective delivery of safer communities depends upon how well councils and police ensure that relevant local agencies are engaged, share a responsibility to deliver, and work together with a high degree of co-ordination (CHECKLIST 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHECKLIST 1 – Ownership and organisational behaviour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Do councillors and police authority members set a clear organisational focus for community safety, for example, a shared vision and small number of aims?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is community safety a corporate aim, at a level appropriate to achieving the shared vision and aims?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are councillors and police authority members fully involved in overseeing delivery through the partnership?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Do councillors and police authority members scrutinise and challenge the partnership’s performance in delivering community safety?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Do councillors and police authority members ensure that a community safety perspective influences all decisions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are corporate community safety aims and targets cascaded down through partner agencies to form individual aims and targets for senior personnel?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Do senior council and police personnel effectively lead and co-ordinate the work of local partner agencies towards achieving the shared vision?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Do senior council and police personnel build trust between local partner agencies?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are all relevant local partner agencies engaged and contributing to delivering community safety?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are all local partner agencies’ roles and responsibilities appropriate and clearly defined?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A SUSTAINED FOCUS ON PRIORITIES

A SHARED VISION AND AIMS

76. For many partnerships, the first community safety strategies for 1999-2002 had an extremely broad focus, with aims that did not take into account:
   - the outcome of the first community safety audits;
   - local agencies’ capacity to respond; and
   - tensions between local issues and national targets.

77. Community safety partnerships need to be clear about what they are setting out to achieve and about why these achievements are important to local people. The vision and aims must balance competing priorities, and fit the local capacity to deliver (CASE STUDY 3).

CASE STUDY 3 Clear vision, aims and priorities

At Knowsley Metropolitan District Council, corporate strategies and aims actively inform basic services. For example, the Council’s aim to promote ‘a safe community and a feeling of safety in the community’ drives its ‘Schools First’ anti-bullying project for young people.

In Telford & Wrekin Council, community safety is a corporate priority. A clear structure embeds the community safety agenda in both service plans and service delivery. The Council sees community safety as being ‘central to the council’, for example:
   - ‘Designing out crime’, that is, reducing crime through better designs, forms part of the Local Plan and recipients of grant aid must incorporate this aspect in new developments.
   - The Local Transport Plan includes ‘safe school zones’ with slow-moving traffic and safe pedestrian routes to school, resulting in a 50 per cent reduction in incidents between 1999 and 2001. The council has closed 11 subways and increased the percentage of working streetlights to above the average performance of all unitary councils.
   - Road safety measures have led to a near 40 per cent decrease in road accidents.
   - The ‘schools at the heart of community safety’ initiative covers 58 schools.

Source: Audit Commission

78. Councils and the police face many competing priorities, and few can devote enough resources to satisfy them all. Fortunately, there is generally a good fit between national and local policies. The top community safety priorities noted by the Local Government Association’s survey of councils closely reflect the proposed national policing priorities for 2002/03 (Ref. 11); (TABLE 2).

TABLE 2 Top national and local community safety priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Government Association survey</th>
<th>Draft ministerial policing priorities 2002-03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reducing anti-social behaviour (53 per cent of councils)</td>
<td>Reducing anti-social behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing youth crime (37 per cent of councils)</td>
<td>Reducing robbery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing domestic burglary (36 per cent of councils)</td>
<td>Reducing domestic burglary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Local Government Association and Home Office
79. However, national priorities alone cannot drive local partnerships—local priorities are key. Local political priorities are often determined by an area’s problems. For example, partnerships that cover areas of high unemployment, poverty, social deprivation or crime may need to focus on tackling crime hotspots, providing support to vulnerable people or drawing in investment to regenerate run-down areas. Alternatively, in a rural district council where crime is low but concern is disproportionately high, managing communications to dispel concern may be a high priority.

80. Irrespective of local circumstances, all partnerships need to engage and consult their local communities, gathering and sharing information that helps to determine that partnership’s priorities.

81. A common public priority is reducing concern about crime. This is strongly affected by experience, deprivation levels and by the environmental quality of people’s neighbourhoods. For example, in 2000 the risk of becoming a victim of household crime (including burglary) ranged between 10 and 30 per cent, which closely matched the number of people with strong concerns about disorder (EXHIBIT 10). Therefore, partnerships that reduce household crime rates should also benefit from reduced concerns about crime.

EXHIBIT 10  Concerns about disorder compared with the risk of household crime

The number of incidents of household crime correlates to levels of concern about disorder.

82. Similarly, rates of personal crime, such as robbery or assault, affect levels of neighbourhood concern about crime. In 2000 the risk of becoming a victim was much lower than the risk of household crime, ranging from 3 to 10 per cent, but concern started at 11 per cent and rose to 35 per cent (EXHIBIT 11, overleaf).
83. Public priorities vary by region – where people live has a marked difference on levels of concern. Based on data for 2000, there is an interesting north-south divide between incidences of crime and concern about crime:

- in general, and with the exception of Lancashire, people with the highest concerns about crime live mostly in rural areas of southern England (Hertfordshire, Lancashire, Suffolk, Surrey and Wiltshire), which have a generally lower risk of crime; and

- in general, people with the lowest concerns about crime live mostly in urban, northern England and south Wales (Cleveland, Northumbria, Merseyside, South Wales, and West Midlands), which have a generally higher risk of crime.

84. Community safety partnerships need to be aware of regional variations when deciding on priorities. However, these variations are not covered in any of the guidance available to community safety partnerships.

**Exhibit 11** Concerns about violent crime compared with the risk of personal crime

People’s concern about personal crime is between three and six times greater than the risk of violent crime.

85. Community safety partnerships will have to work hard to clarify, and then balance, a range of competing policy and community priorities. Part of this process is learning to recognise areas of common ground. For example, the public thinks that improved activities for teenagers are a top priority and, at the same time, both national and local government are seeking a reduction in anti-social behaviour. Joining up priorities such as these is a key task for community safety partnerships. A local focus will need to shape priorities, as there is no ‘one size fits all’ model that can be applied to all partnerships.
ACTION PLANS AND TARGETS

86. It may be helpful for partnerships to map out a pathway toward achieving the shared vision. This will help to crystallise local aims and provide a basis for shaping action plans. Local aims should be defined as clear and hard-edged objectives if they are to be effective in keeping delivery on track. Action plans should be designed to advance the partnership along the chosen pathway, and should include both preventative work (such as reducing pupil truancy or supporting at-risk families) and responsive work (such as targeting burglary or robbery).

87. Challenging targets can help to improve the pace of delivery. Auditors found that community safety strategies for partnerships in London, metropolitan and unitary councils generally had more complete and challenging targets and action plans than those for district councils. All partnership agencies should ensure that their targets are specific, measurable, attainable, realistic and time-bound (‘SMART’). Targets should also be much broader than crime and disorder issues – they should cover all of the basic services that have a high impact on people’s sense of safety, such as street lighting, building repairs and street cleaning.

ENGAGING LOCAL COMMUNITIES

88. To sustain a focus on what matters, partnerships must maintain an ongoing dialogue with local people. This is particularly important in the context of persisting concerns about crime. Community safety partnerships are increasingly consulting their communities, in a variety of ways. These range from simple postal contact to imaginative community engagement, such as the stakeholder conference run by Eastleigh Borough Council (CASE STUDY 4). The best examples of community engagement tended to be from unitary, London and metropolitan council areas. However, in general, consultation was not co-ordinated within or between partnership agencies.

CASE STUDY 4 Stakeholder conference for community consultation

Eastleigh Borough Council hosted a ‘Stakeholders’ Conference’ to discuss the 2001 crime audit and proposed action. Conference delegates included young people and schools, as well as older people and representatives such as Age Concern, together with all members of the community safety partnership. The conference proved to be an effective method of consultation, helping to build a clear view of local priorities based upon the views and concerns of a wide variety of community groups, including some that are hard to reach by other means.

Source: Eastleigh Borough Council

89. Engagement of hard-to-reach groups needs greatest impetus, especially black and minority ethnic groups, anti-homophobia groups, women who are vulnerable to domestic violence, and young crime victims. The provisions of the Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000 apply to councils and police as public authorities under the Act. According to an auditors’ survey in 2000, communication with black and minority ethnic communities was slowly improving, although communication remained difficult in areas with low or widely dispersed populations. By 2001 nearly four-fifths (79 per cent) of community safety partnerships included black and minority ethnic community representatives. But although more than two-thirds (69 per cent) of partnerships are seeking black and minority ethnic community views, nearly one-third (31 per cent) reported low success rates.
90. Communication with anti-homophobia groups (representing gay men, lesbians, bi- and trans-sexual people) to improve under-reporting of incidents is difficult for many partnerships. However, there are examples of successful activities, for example in Milton Keynes, which has an effective relationship built on easier reporting and thorough investigations. Southampton is targeting assaults outside gay clubs in the city. Hambleton’s ‘Gay Men Talking’ project has improved incident reporting. Racial and homophobic incidents in Birmingham are co-ordinated by a single group, the Race Partnership. However, overcoming cultural barriers towards homophobia remains a difficult challenge facing many partnerships.

91. Giving young people a part in local decisions, for example, through youth councils or youth parliaments, can be an effective way of gaining support and commitment to community safety. Young people are most at risk of being both the perpetrator and the victim of crime, with juvenile upon juvenile offences a particular problem. In some councils, inspectors reported reductions in youth services while residents voiced concerns about the lack of facilities for young people. In one council, although a developer had included provision for young people’s facilities in its planning brief for a site, they were not mentioned in the actual plan, and the council did not follow this up. Despite such problems, a number of councils are making good progress in giving young people a stake in their neighbourhood through creative activities (CASE STUDY 5).

---

**CASE STUDY 5**  
**Involving young people**

Milton Keynes Council recruited artists to help local children to design a mural for a play area that was often vandalised. The children painted the mural themselves and subsequent vandalism rates fell to zero for five years. Also, young villagers attended a meeting on youth facilities and, with the aid of a facilitator, persuaded everyone that a skateboard park would be a greater asset to young people than a proposed youth club. The Council subsequently drew in £20,000 of external regeneration grant to top up local funding for the project. Initial worries about the skate park have been faced and overcome. The project is strongly supported by the young villagers, the police, the parish council and Milton Keynes Council.

Telford & Wrekin Council helped a local youth club to paint a 65 foot mural on a boundary wall between the club and a school, with the aim of reducing vandalism. The children designed and painted the wall and the council provided the equipment. There has been virtually no subsequent graffiti or criminal damage because the children feel strong ownership for their work and see the wall as ‘theirs’.

North Shropshire District Council has substantially improved sports development and arts-related activities, such as sculpture projects, over the last two years. It has also enabled over 100 younger teenagers to join a rural youth club by providing transport in some of the more remote villages. A local school operates a mentoring scheme for pupils who need extra help, using skilled mentors from the local community to coach and encourage the pupils. The district council supports the scheme through placement grants to the local education authority.

*Source: Audit Commission*

92. An opportunity to engage more local people in discussion about neighbourhood issues is provided by the move in many areas toward area-based service delivery. For example, to improve community consultation Birmingham is forming 11 neighbourhood areas out of its 39 wards, and Tewkesbury uses area-based initiatives (CASE STUDY 6).
CASE STUDY 6  Engaging local people

Tewkesbury Borough Council organises ‘planning for real’ events to engage local communities under its neighbourhood renewal strategy. The most recent event involved Council tenants on a local estate. One hundred and seventy eight people from 1,200 households attended. After debating the Council’s proposals to regenerate the estate, the key issues for the tenants emerged as:

- demolishing and replacing the current low-rise accommodation (48 per cent);
- action to tackle concerns about crime (36 per cent);
- targeting and removing drug dealers (26 per cent);
- tackling anti-social behaviour (15 per cent);
- improving flats’ security (12 per cent);
- removing illegal flytips (5 per cent);
- tackling alcohol-related issues (4 per cent); and
- providing a needle exchange service (1 per cent).

Telford & Wrekin’s Education Service was persuaded to reduce the £150,000 repair bill caused by vandalism and criminal damage to school premises during holiday periods by spending a proportion of the repair budget on a new School Watch programme. School Watch works on the same principles as the now well-known Neighbourhood Watch schemes – schools help to keep an eye on each others’ premises. The benefit of the School Watch programme has been quick, with an immediate reduction in repair costs of nearly 50 per cent, plus releasing senior teaching staff in schools from administering insurance claims.

In North Shropshire District Council, the community safety partnership co-ordinates groups of local people who, with the help of the police, work to prevent crime and disorder through:

- Neighbourhood Watch – covering small groups of homes in mostly urban areas;
- Farm Watch – covering small groups of homes and farms in mostly rural areas; and
- Shop Watch – covering small retailers.

Source: Audit Commission

93. Local community safety partnerships must establish close connections with the communities, neighbourhoods and vulnerable people that they represent. Communication with local people must take place throughout the three years between community safety audits. To maximise available local capacity, community safety partnerships may find it helpful to nominate one agency to lead on communication. For example, since all councils are under a statutory duty to consult under best value, partnerships could co-ordinate their consultation with the council’s efforts to obtain better value for money.

94. A shared vision and clear aims that are owned by all local agencies will improve local partnerships’ impact on community safety (CHECKLIST 2). In addition, challenging performance targets will form useful staging points along the pathway toward achieving local aims. Engaging local people in dialogue is important for maintaining a close connection between partnerships and communities.
**CHECKLIST 2 – A sustained focus on priorities**

- Are local partner agencies clear about what they need to achieve, and about how working together will enable this?
- Are local political priorities clearly reflected in the shared vision and aims?
- In setting local aims, has an appropriate balance been struck between local issues and national targets?
- Has a pathway towards achieving the shared vision been mapped out?
- Are the aims and performance targets for all partner agencies clearly defined?
- Does the work of partner agencies include an appropriate balance between preventative and responsive issues?
- Are all performance targets challenging, and do they cover all of the basic services that impact on people’s sense of safety?
- Is there an ongoing dialogue with local people?
- Is communication and consultation co-ordinated within and between partner agencies, perhaps by one agency?
- Are vulnerable, hard-to-reach groups, for example, young people, being engaged locally, perhaps through area-based service delivery?
CAPACITY AND SYSTEMS FOR BASIC SERVICE DELIVERY

95. Auditors and inspectors identified three key elements that determine a community safety partnership’s capacity to deliver improvement:
   - performance management;
   - use of resources; and
   - learning from experience.

PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT

96. A major concern of inspectors and auditors is performance management in community safety partnerships. Improved performance management is one of the top inspection recommendations (EXHIBIT 8).

97. Some councils are managing their performance better than others. In these councils, community safety may not be an explicit priority in itself, but forms an essential part of a broader key objective. As a consequence, mainstream basic services in these councils include a community safety perspective. Examples include:
   - Milton Keynes and Thurrock, where community safety outcomes support a successful regional leisure economy;
   - Telford & Wrekin, where community safety outcomes support action to tackle urban planning defects; and
   - Eastleigh and Stroud, where community safety outcomes support local commerce and trade against strong competition.

98. Irrespective of the objective, better performing councils have a number of common characteristics (BOX B).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOX B</th>
<th>Characteristics of a strong approach to managing performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some councils have a strong approach to managing performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The rationale for all community safety activity is clearly defined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Each action contributes directly to meeting one or more corporate aims.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Each aim is cascaded down from the community safety strategy to the local agency best placed to lead action to achieve it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Progress against challenging performance targets is measured from an accepted baseline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The progress achieved is scrutinised regularly to understand the barriers and opportunities affecting the pace of delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The rationale for each activity is periodically reviewed to determine its continuing fitness for purpose.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Audit Commission project fieldwork

99. In terms of the national performance management framework, current BVPIs tend to focus on a single service and on the efficiency of its processes. Improved national indicators are important to ensure that minimum standards are provided and that poorer performing services improve. The Audit Commission is currently piloting a suite of local community
safety performance indicators (APPENDIX 3). This suite seeks to measure community safety, not just crime reduction. The Government should seek to adopt the same approach nationally as it uses locally, by incorporating relevant aspects of health, education and environmental policy within a broader suite of community safety BVPIs. A broader focus by national and local performance indicators would help local partnership agencies to focus on, and allocate resources to, priority issues.

100. Information sharing is an essential part of performance management – however, in some community safety partnerships, data gathering and analysis has become an end in itself, rather than a means to an end. Many partnerships have still to agree an information-sharing protocol, although a model protocol is available from the Home Office (http://www.crimereduction.gov.uk/infosharing21-00.htm). Action by partnerships to correct this situation is urgent.

101. Auditors found that nearly one-half (43 per cent) of partnerships in 2000 did not have an information-sharing strategy. All of the partnerships surveyed relied primarily on police or council information, and reported difficulties in obtaining information from healthcare providers (EXHIBIT 12). A key aim of community safety partnerships is sharing information to enable more effective hotspot analysis, so the slow progress on information sharing made by nearly one-half of community safety partnerships is a concern. Even among the one-half with successful information sharing, there is continuing concern about the problem of merging disparate data types. For example, police data is recorded by location, whereas local authority and healthcare data is recorded by individual.

EXHIBIT 12  Agencies that present data capture difficulties for partnerships

Problems in information sharing continues to hinder effective problem analysis.

Source: Audit Commission survey of 83 partnerships, 2000

I  Health information affected by changes in the health economy.
102. All community safety partnerships reported the police to be the least problematic information source. It is good that the police are able to provide this information, but at the same time it is worrying that partnerships’ action may be being driven by information from just one source, and that one in five partnerships still has problems with police data.

103. The main barriers to information sharing quoted in 2000 and 2002 by partnerships are listed below, ranked in order of perceived importance (BOX C).

**BOX C** Perceived barriers to information sharing

- Restricted information disclosure under the Data Protection Act 1998, cited by education, social services and healthcare providers to the police and vice versa. This is despite the provisions of section 115 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, permitting councils, police, probation and health services to share personal information when fulfilling any of the Act’s obligations.
- Difficulties in merging local police and healthcare data sets that reflect different geographic boundaries – sub-division requires considerable extra work.
- Difficulties encountered by district councils in obtaining county council education and social service information.
- Poor information quality and integrity, particularly from voluntary sector agencies – for example, information about incidents of domestic violence.
- Lack of understanding of what information is available and how to gain access to it, particularly in relation to local healthcare providers.

*Source: Audit Commission*

104. Despite these barriers, the situation is improving. Over two-thirds of community safety partnerships (69 per cent) have used government funds to build their crime information analysis capacity. County councils are most likely to have built capacity, and district councils and councils in Wales are least likely. County councils and police headquarters can play a key role in supporting district councils and local police.

**USE OF RESOURCES**

105. Delivering community safety is seen as an additional responsibility by many local agencies. This means that many councils and police have committed scarce resources to the process of applying for additional government grant to cover the perceived extra costs. Strong perceptions of additionality have allowed many councils and police to avoid changing their organisational culture and avoid reshaping existing spending to reflect a community safety perspective.

106. Resource needs will be clearly shaped by a focus on priorities and challenging targets. Where resources are scarce, partnerships will need to share resources (funds, staff, information and experience) to boost delivery of community safety. For councils and police subject to a duty of best value, the effectiveness of resource management remains a key aspect of audit and inspection.

107. Appropriately skilled and experienced staff are vital if community safety partnerships are to deliver their objectives. The provision of staff should be on a scale proportionate to local priorities and available capacity. Ten per cent of community safety partnerships have yet to appoint a community safety co-ordinator. The tendency is to appoint half-time posts in district
councils, although some have two staff, one each from the police and the council. District councils and councils in Wales are the least likely to have dedicated, corporate support teams, whereas London, metropolitan and county councils are the most likely (Ref. 10).

108. There are a number of key competencies that local partnership agencies need to acquire (BOX D). Secondment of staff between police, councils and other local agencies can help to develop these competencies, as can training involving all partnership agencies.

**BOX D**  
**Key competencies for local partnership agencies**

- A thorough understanding of crime prevention and reduction, that is, policing strategy and tactics in a social policy context.
- A cross-service focus.
- Inter-agency networking skills.
- Co-ordination skills, given the range of agencies involved.
- Community engagement skills.
- Funding acquisition skills.
- Performance management skills, including data analysis and interpretation.

*Source: Audit Commission.*

109. Better use of financial resources is essential for partnerships to deliver sustainable outcomes. Eighty one per cent of partnerships have identified a dedicated community safety implementation budget, but the typical value of just £10,000 is low in comparison with the cross-service nature of community safety (Ref. 10). Some councils have been successful in drawing in additional funds to maximise use of the financial resources at their disposal (CASE STUDY 7).

**CASE STUDY 7**  
**Effective use of financial resources**

Peterborough Council is investing significantly in community safety through:

- successfully attracting external public and private sector funding, for example, Single Regeneration Budget, Crime Reduction Programme;
- its own significant resources, for example, an estimated 106 full-time staff, costing £4.5 million per annum;
- establishing an additional, dedicated unit to co-ordinate crime reduction work; and
- dedicating specific funds to community safety developments, for example, £12,000 to develop a ‘Safer Spaces’ initiative.

In Manchester, to stimulate new business relocation into regeneration areas, the City Council uses EU funding to provide free security assessments. The council will also bear the cost of installing security measures specified in the assessments, up to a maximum value of £2,000. Local businesses in receipt of security grants said the initiative was worthwhile and had reduced crime.

*Source: Peterborough Council and Manchester City Council.*

110. Worryingly few partnerships have clear financial plans. Auditors noted in 2000 that ‘...some councils were unsure of their powers to fund community safety partnership work’, and HM Inspectorate of Constabulary noted that ‘No examples of fully costed community safety plans
were found in any of the partnerships visited by the inspection team’ (Ref. 2). The weakness of partnership financial planning highlights that the short-term, grant-led perspective of community safety has little changed since 1999.

111. Additional government funding plays a decisive part in enabling community safety, but its impact is not always maximised. Where additional funding is used to meet priorities by filling gaps in local spending plans, the public gain a direct benefit. Examples include the installation of CCTV, gates to stop access to alleyways behind houses, and the introduction of activities that divert young people away from crime. Delivering effective community safety requires local partnership agencies to make changes to education, environment and health spending. These changes should reflect local aims, for example, better street patrols, cleaning and lighting, or better support for vulnerable people, and should be clearly expressed in each agency’s resource plan. There is little evidence to show that these changes are occurring.

112. The absence of performance targets attached to government community safety funding reinforces the view that short-term business planning is acceptable. For example, the CCTV fund is the second largest strand to the Government’s Crime Reduction Programme and CCTV systems exist in nearly four-fifths of all partnerships. The Government’s capital investment is £171 million, excluding local matched funding. The presence of cameras in the local street scene is a significant deterrent to certain forms of crime and appears to be a success. However, emerging evidence confirms the weakness of financial planning, in particular to cover recurring revenue costs (BOX E). The long-term cost of maintaining, extending and upgrading CCTV systems is considerable, and so a revenue cost contribution should form part of each agency’s financial plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOX E</th>
<th>Weak financial planning for CCTV systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

One CCTV bid led by a town council involved the police but excluded the local district council. The resulting installation covers a small town centre, but cannot be connected to the police network until the district council provides extra funds. The system is unmonitored outside the day time opening hours of the town centre police station, although this is when most crimes are committed.

A CCTV system installed in an urban town centre monitors a regular influx of daytime shoppers and young people going to the local pubs and clubs. The crime rate is higher than the surrounding suburban areas, and installing the CCTV system has resulted in a significant reduction in street crime. The cost of monitoring is shared between the district council, the police and local businesses. Although local businesses were content to make initial contributions to the running costs, there is increasing resistance towards annual payments. This eventuality was not considered during pre-installation financial planning. The council and the police have taken steps to ensure that monitoring continues in the short term, but the long-term sustainability is unclear.

Another community safety partnership received CCTV grants worth nearly £1.8 million but the installed system is hardly monitored. The local police provided resources to ensure system monitoring in the short term, but no long-term resourcing was considered at the planning stage, and now the issue requires urgent attention.

Source: Audit Commission and HM Inspectorate of Constabulary.
At the time of bidding for funds, a sound business plan covering the useful working life of the proposed activity should be in place. The Government, as fundholder, should ensure that the sustainability of each bid is sound before awarding a grant.

The sustainability of capital assets need to be properly managed. Inspectors found several examples of a disconnected approach to managing CCTV:

- one council’s CCTV system operates independently of extensive commercial systems covering a number of large shopping malls and open spaces;
- in one town centre, trees originally planted to disguise CCTV camera columns are now so large that they obstruct the camera’s view;
- schools that failed to seek advice from the police or from the council before buying CCTV equipment, have installed systems that provide a picture quality that is inadequate for use in detection or evidence in prosecutions; and
- a mobile CCTV camera installed in one shopping centre failed to record a robbery because it did not work after installation, but was never checked. The camera was itself stolen a month later.

The Government took a decision to provide some grant with pre-set capital and revenue elements, and this is currently causing difficulties. For example, Communities Against Drugs grant is allocated on the basis of a pre-set ratio of capital to revenue. Studies show a need for drug treatment services that meet the needs of local drug misusers and that are co-ordinated between key local partnerships and agencies. The merger of community safety partnerships and drug action teams potentially offers new opportunities, but these are limited by difficulties in meeting the spending ratios. To provide better treatment services for people, there needs to be more revenue and less capital expenditure. The Government needs to re-examine the limitations of pre-determined ratios in successful delivery of its policies.

The problems with pre-determined funding ratios are symptomatic of a bigger problem – the lack of co-ordination in funding the implementation of community safety policy. To improve this co-ordination, the Government must:

- link additional funding to performance criteria that achieve more sustainable community safety (while allowing for partnerships to address local issues); and
- stimulate change in local block grant allocations, such as environment, housing, education and health, to incorporate a community safety perspective.

Considerable experience exists in many partnerships, although few systematically analyse their actions to draw out the learning. Both the beacon council scheme and the Government’s Crime Reduction Programme aim to help individual community safety agencies to develop solutions to problems. It is important that agencies learn about what makes a difference to delivery, using the research that evaluates beacon councils and the Crime Reduction Programme.
118. Inspections and project fieldwork identified a set of common factors that affected whether community safety activities made a difference (TABLE 3). Being clear about the task, researching the problem and tailoring solutions accordingly, all increase the chance of community safety action making a difference.

TABLE 3  
Factors affecting the success of community safety activities

Being clear about the task, researching the problem and tailoring solutions to solve it increase the chance of community safety action making a difference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors enabling community safety activities to make a difference</th>
<th>Factors inhibiting community safety activities from making a difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Effective leadership and direction</td>
<td>• Ignoring issues beyond your control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A clear focus on the issue</td>
<td>• Excluding key stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A thorough analysis of the issue</td>
<td>• Ineffective planning, for example, omitting exit strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Solutions tailored to fit the issue and local circumstances</td>
<td>• Misunderstanding available capacity or organisational capability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adequate capacity and resources to deliver</td>
<td>• Ineffective communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Effective communication and consultation with all affected people</td>
<td>• A focus on processes, not outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Flexibility and a willingness to experiment</td>
<td>• Ineffective project management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evaluation built in at the outset</td>
<td>• Searching for the ‘perfect’ solution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sustainability/maintenance built in at the outset</td>
<td>• A risk-averse culture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Audit Commission

119. As shown above, leadership and a clear focus support the effective delivery of community safety. It is further enhanced by avoiding standard ‘one size fits all’ approaches to problem solving. The closer a solution is tailored to fit the problem, the greater the chance of success. Moving towards a tailored solution service means changing the management of basic services – devolving greater freedom to managers, but also setting clear operational frameworks.

120. Examples of good practice tend to be fragmented, as they are not systematically collected and valued by all partnerships. In addition, the impact of partnerships on local crime rates or crime concerns is unclear. Despite this, a number of examples of good practice were identified during this study (CASE STUDIES 8-12). During performance reviews, all community safety partnerships should evaluate the extent to which their activities achieved the desired result.
CASE STUDY 8  Tackling anti-social behaviour

Tackling anti-social behaviour is a key aim for Peterborough Council, which targets resources at action to achieve this. The Council allocated £74,000 from its current budget, a sum matched by the police. It granted a further £28,000 to a local mediation service. An information exchange protocol covers a multi-agency, problem-solving group that seeks to resolve problems, as court orders are not always an ideal solution. The courts have issued two anti-social behaviour orders, one restraining order and one injunction, but most problems are successfully resolved before court action becomes necessary.

Liverpool City Council and Merseyside Police collaborated to establish the ‘Gold Zone’ in Liverpool city centre from November 2000. Its objective is to create a safer city, with 12 extra constables, managed by a sergeant funded by Merseyside Police. The cost to Liverpool City Council in 2002/03 is expected to be £400,000. The Gold Zone Police Team has reduced begging and rough sleeping and has targeted truancy and anti-social behaviour. Vandalism of parking meters has ceased, ending an annual repair bill of over £100,000. The police team has also supported the implementation of ‘Crystal Clear’ to end alcohol consumption on city centre streets. Since the Gold Zone was introduced, reported crime in the city centre has reduced by 8 per cent, compared with a 5 per cent fall in Liverpool as a whole. Public recognition and support is strong, and concerns about crime have been reduced.

Source: Audit Commission

CASE STUDY 9  Domestic violence

In North Shropshire, the recently introduced safe houses for victims of domestic violence is a positive initiative. The houses are well appointed, difficult to find by aggressors and secure for victims. The accommodation includes modern conveniences and specific family areas. Families using the safe houses all said that they had received a good service, with excellent advice and support from the Council’s staff. The public and a range of local agencies support the service. For example, one victim’s partner approached local shopkeepers to locate a safe house. They did not divulge the locations, and contacted the police. The police intervention prevented a potentially difficult situation.

The service also covers situations where houses are full, or where a location is unsuitable. Social services and housing work in partnership to use unoccupied council dwellings on a temporary basis. For example, the council’s ‘home is where the hurt is’ scheme provides safe houses for young victims of domestic violence for an interim period, while a permanent home is arranged, and a full out-of-hours service supplies help and advice to victims.

Source: Audit Commission
CASE STUDY 10  Cleaning up the environment

Peterborough Council spends approximately £55,000 annually on removing graffiti from public property. To reduce this highly visible and persistent problem the Council developed a multi-agency approach, set performance targets and monitored performance. The approach is co-ordinated by the Waste Management Division but ‘cleaners’ are recruited from the community, including convicted offenders and local residents, who use graffiti cleaning kits supplied by the Council. The approach has been a success and the Council has allocated a further £30,000 to fund anti-graffiti initiatives.

Under the guidance of a Graffiti Action Group, a schools programme raises awareness in young people of the damaging effect of graffiti on the community. Graffiti art projects provide a complementary and diversionary outlet for the artistic talents of some past and potential offenders.

Some areas of Peterborough suffer significant deprivation and are in need of social and environmental improvement. The Council successfully attracted substantial government funds (£4.3 million in 1996/97 and £5.8 million in 1999/2001 – each for seven year programmes) to carry out improvements. The improvements will have an indirect impact on community safety, through building in crime deterrents in refurbished housing in some of the most deprived areas, and through funds for neighbourhood watch and other crime prevention schemes.

Source: Audit Commission

CASE STUDY 11  Reducing burglary

Using a £70,000 grant under the Government’s reducing burglary initiative, Peterborough Council implemented a four-phase programme called Positive Action for Community Trust in high burglary areas. The four phases addressed:

- offender substance abuse;
- upgrading home security for vulnerable people, such as past burglary victims;
- early intervention in the ‘crime career’ of offenders; and
- extending neighbourhood watch schemes to offer visible patrolling.

During the 12 months of operation, burglary within the project areas fell by 59 per cent and repeat burglary fell by 67 per cent. Peterborough Council has now extended the home security upgrade to other areas of the city, at a cost in 2000/01 of £65,000.

Telford & Wrekin’s community safety partnership established a comprehensive business watch scheme on three local industrial estates where the burglary rate ran at 1,000 incidents per year. The scheme has reduced the burglary rate to between 150 and 200 incidents per year.

In Stroud District Council, the Safer Estates initiative aims to make properties less attractive to burglary and criminal damage. This helps to reduce burglary repair and insurance costs. A steady reduction in offences has been recorded, creating an improved sense of community safety, as well as cutting the Council’s costs.

Source: Audit Commission
CASE STUDY 12  Dealing with hotspots

Telford has 105 pedestrian underpasses, all of which were theft and robbery hotspots. Despite the rurality of the area, the number of underpasses in Telford equals that for the whole of the Greater Manchester Police area. The local community safety partnership, in conjunction with Telford & Wrekin Council, has modified three underpasses; closing eleven and reducing the soft landscaping around two to improve sightlines and remove potential hiding places. The £125,000 investment has produced the predicted reduction in offences and crime concerns. The cost to the Council of modifying the remaining underpasses is considerable, but it is regarded by the partnership as a priority.

In Southampton, operation ‘Cleansweep’ removes abandoned vehicles from predetermined zones in the city. It involves representation from the Driver and Vehicle Licensing Agency, the Benefits Agency, local police, and the council. The cost of the operation is high, but the results are tangible and very visible to the public, so support for the action is strong.

Source: Audit Commission

121. The pace of delivery needs to improve and partnership performance needs to focus on removing barriers to improvement. Partnership agencies need to share information, prioritise resources, and systematically evaluate and learn from their experiences (CHECKLIST 3). Specific recommendations to help individual council departments to mainstream community safety in basic service delivery are included in this report (APPENDIX 4).

CHECKLIST 3 – Capacity and systems for basic service delivery

- Is the rationale for each community safety activity clearly defined in the context of the aim(s) it is contributing to?
- Is a partner agency clearly accountable for leading action relating to each aim?
- Is progress against targets measured and scrutinised so that barriers to delivery are identified and appropriate remedial action taken?
- Do the partner agencies have an information-sharing protocol?
- Does information sharing between agencies work in practice; what are the barriers and how will they be overcome?
- Are local partner agencies’ resources (people, money, assets, experience) being used to best effect?
- Are local partner agency personnel sufficiently competent to deliver against their objectives?
- Is there a comprehensive partnership resource plan that links to contributing local agencies’ resource plans?
- Are resources, including external funding, being used effectively to maximise the impact of community safety?
- Do partner agencies systematically evaluate their actions and experiences to identify the key learning points?
- Do partner agencies continually seek information about good practice?
4. BRINGING IT ALL TOGETHER

122. High levels of community safety yield more cohesive communities as well as better places to live. The public’s demand for safer neighbourhoods sets a clear challenge to all local agencies, particularly the police and councils, to:
   - recognise and co-ordinate the essential contribution that non-police agencies can make to community safety;
   - provide leadership and take tough decisions about priorities (for example, whether to tackle crime reduction or concerns about crime first);
   - maintain a clear focus on what matters, with objectives, action plans and targets that flow from agreed priorities;
   - engage and communicate with local communities and other stakeholders;
   - manage performance effectively, pooling information to identify and analyse problems;
   - use resources efficiently via sound financial planning; and
   - learn from experience, seeking out examples of good practice.

123. A recent Audit Commission study of neighbourhood renewal and the implementation of Local Strategic Partnerships produced findings in common with much of this study (Ref. 14). In particular, it found that Local Strategic Partnership members:
   - think that the Government’s message is unclear (in one-third of all partnerships);
   - see additional government funding, not mainstream service budgets, as supporting local activity;
   - are uncertain about local roles and responsibilities with regard to priority and the delivery of basic services;
   - find it difficult to link neighbourhood renewal to wider service delivery improvements;
   - have little experience of incorporating successful changes into mainstream services once short-term funding ends; and
   - have not established performance monitoring arrangements (in one-half of partnerships).

Nevertheless, these key players are demonstrating commitment and making headway in identifying and tackling local barriers to improvement.

124. There is considerable synergy to be gained from councils, police, healthcare providers, probation and other local agencies working together to deliver community safety. Failure to act now means that many community safety partnerships may fail to deliver tangible improvements between now and 2005.
125. The Government has a key role to play in enabling and driving improvement in partnerships’ performance, in particular in:
    * extending national ownership of community safety beyond the Home Office, to incorporate education, health, environment, transport and local government departments in particular, to set a lead for action by local agencies;
    * clarifying its expectations of partnerships and simplifying the guidance;
    * simplifying and making the allocation of funds more flexible;
    * clarifying and simplifying the performance assessment framework; and
    * facilitating the co-ordination of joint inspections of community safety partnerships, on an area rather than a service basis.

126. The Audit Commission’s recommendations for the Government, inspectorates and local community safety agencies are set out opposite. For its part, the Audit Commission and its auditors and inspectors will continue to work closely with other regulators and assessment agencies to improve the delivery of safer communities for local people.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action required by:</th>
<th>Councils</th>
<th>Police services</th>
<th>Other local agencies</th>
<th>Government inspectorates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To reassure the public, local assessments should provide a rounded view by...</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Co-ordinated, joint inspections of community safety.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Having a simple, clear performance assessment framework.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local agencies involved in community safety partnerships need to focus on...</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maximising the role of councillors, police authority members and senior personnel to lead and oversee delivery performance.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Making community safety central to their organisational culture and values.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Making community safety a corporate priority for performance monitoring and resource planning.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A limited number of local priorities, balancing local issues with national targets.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Setting action plans and challenging performance targets to raise the pace of delivery.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Engaging local communities effectively, especially vulnerable and hard-to-reach groups.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improving how they manage performance.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prioritising resources at basic services that impact most on community safety.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sharing information and experiences to improve delivery.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Government needs to focus on...

• Extending national ownership of community safety beyond the Home Office, to incorporate education, health, environment, transport and local government departments in particular. ✓
• Clarifying its expectations of partnerships and simplifying its guidance to them. ✓
• Making the allocation of funds more straightforward and flexible. ✓
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The Audit Commission also drew on reports of councils inspected during the study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Best value reference number</th>
<th>Performance indicator</th>
<th>Applies to councils</th>
<th>Applies to police services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Number of pupils permanently excluded during the year from all schools maintained by the local education authority, per 1,000 pupils at all maintained schools.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Percentage of half days missed due to unauthorised absence in secondary schools maintained by the local education authority.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Percentage of half days missed due to unauthorised absence in primary schools maintained by the local education authority.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Stability of placements of children looked after by the authority by reference to the percentage of children looked after on 31 March in any year with three or more placements during the year.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Number of road accident casualties per 100,000 people, broken down by: (i) nature of casualties; and (ii) road user type.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Level of crime (using British Crime Survey).</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Fear of crime (using British Crime Survey).</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Total recorded crimes per 1,000 people and percentage detected.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Domestic burglaries per 1,000 people and percentage detected.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Robberies per 1,000 people and percentage detected.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Vehicle crimes per 1,000 people and percentage detected.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>a) Number of offenders charged, reported for summons or cautioned for supply offences in respect of Class A drugs per 10,000 people.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Of the overall figure, the number which related to cocaine.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Of the overall figure, the number which related to heroin.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Number of public disorder incidents per 1,000 people.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Percentage of all full files and percentage of full youth files provided to the Crown Prosecution Service both within pre-trial issue time guidelines and which are fully satisfactory or sufficient to proceed. Percentage of all expedited/remand files and percentage of expedited/remand youth files which are fully satisfactory or sufficient to proceed.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Number of road traffic collisions involving death or serious injury per 1,000 people.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>Percentage of responses to incidents requiring immediate response within local target response times (appropriate to rural and urban areas).</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best value reference number</td>
<td>Performance indicator</td>
<td>Applies to councils</td>
<td>Applies to police services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Percentage of 999 calls answered within local target response time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Percentage of notifiable offences that were detected where a person has been charged, reported for summons or cautioned, or the offence has been taken into consideration by a court.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Percentage of adults arrested referred to drug treatment programmes as a result of arrest referral schemes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>Number of Police and Criminal Evidence Act stop/searches of white persons per 1,000 people and percentage leading to arrest.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Number of Police and Criminal Evidence Act stop/searches of minority ethnic persons per 1,000 people and percentage leading to arrest.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>Percentage of reported racist incidents where further investigative action is taken and percentage of recorded racially aggravated crimes detected.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Number of calls to fire attended:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(i) total calls (excluding false alarms) per 10,000 people;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) primary fires per 10,000 people;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) accidental fires in dwellings per 10,000 dwellings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>Number of (i) deaths and (ii) injuries arising from accidental fires in dwellings per 100,000 people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144a</td>
<td>Accidental fire in dwellings confined to room of origin in major cities and classified as ‘A Risk’.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144b</td>
<td>Accidental fire in dwellings confined to room of origin in smaller cities/larger towns and classified as ‘B Risk’.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144c</td>
<td>Accidental fire in dwellings confined to room of origin in smaller towns and urban residential areas and classified as ‘C Risk’.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144d</td>
<td>Accidental fire in dwellings confined to room of origin in rural village areas and classified as ‘D Risk’.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>Percentage of calls to fire at which national standards for attendance were met.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>Number of calls to malicious false alarms per 1,000 people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>Average time taken by fire authorities to issue fire safety certificates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>False alarms caused by automatic fire detection apparatus per 1,000 non-domestic properties.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>Expenditure per head of population on the provision of fire and rescue services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>a) Percentage of reported domestic violence incidents where there was a power of arrest, in which an arrest was made relating to the incident.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Of these, the percentage that involved partner-on-partner violence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>Percentage of reported domestic violence incidents that involved victims of a reported domestic violence incident in the previous 12 months.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Percentage of domestic burglaries where the property had been burgled in the previous 12 months.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best value reference number</td>
<td>Performance indicator</td>
<td>Applies to councils</td>
<td>Applies to police services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 159                         | The percentage of permanently excluded pupils attending alternative tuition of:  
  a) under 10 hours;  
  b) 10-24 hours; or  
  c) 25 hours or more.                                                                                                                                                                                                       | ✅                   |                          |
| 173                         | Has the council established a corporate strategy to reduce crime and disorder in their area, yes or no?  
If no – has the council established a timetable for doing so?  
If yes – the council must be able to answer yes to the following:  
  a) Has the strategy been developed in consultation with local bodies, organisations and the local public?  
  b) Is the strategy consistent with the Crime and Disorder Reduction Strategy and Policing Plan for the area?  
  c) Has the council developed Departmental Service Plans outlining targets on reducing crime and disorder which are consistent with the corporate strategy?  
  d) Has the council nominated officers in each service department responsible for achieving the targets on reducing crime and disorder?  
  e) Has the council determined milestones and built in systems for monitoring and evaluating departmental targets and initiatives that have been developed to reduce crime and disorder?  
  f) Has the council developed an ongoing consultative process for assessing needs and demands in relation to crime and disorder reduction within the local community? | ✅                   |                          |
| 174                         | The number of racial incidents recorded by the council per 100,000 people.                                                                                                                                                  | ✅                   |                          |
| 175                         | The percentage of racial incidents that resulted in further action.                                                                                                                                                        | ✅                   |                          |
| 176                         | The number of domestic violence refuge places per 10,000 people that are provided or supported by the council.                                                                                                            | ✅                   |                          |
Community safety partnerships need a comprehensive view to ensure that they are addressing all of the issues that impact on the public’s view of community safety. The list below aims to provide a broad framework of performance indicators representing a comprehensive view of local community safety.

The content is indicative. Partnerships are strongly urged to refer to the Audit Commission/IDeA Library of Local Performance Indicators (http://www.local-pi-library.gov.uk/index.shtml) to ensure that they compile a suite of performance indicators that best reflects local issues and national targets.

To avoid unnecessary data collection, each community safety partnership should test the fitness for purpose of each indicator before adopting it:

- What indicators most effectively measure the partnership’s progress in achieving its aims?
- What indicators most effectively challenge partnerships to improve performance?

The performance indicators shown below are grouped in sets under two themes that express what could be a local shared vision. Under each theme is a set of possible local aims, with a list of performance indicators. National BVPIs that fall within a theme and group are shown in bold italics.

The indicators are referenced as follows:

- BVxxx – a national BVPI;
- LIBxxx – a local performance indicator contained in the Library of Local Performance Indicators; and
- ACxxx – a past Audit Commission performance indicator.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator reference</th>
<th>Theme: Making communities safer places to be</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aim:</strong> Reducing concerns about crime.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BV120</strong></td>
<td>Level of crime.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BV121</strong></td>
<td>Fear of crime.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BV122</strong></td>
<td>Feelings of public safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIB001</td>
<td>Percentage of residents surveyed who said that they feel 'fairly safe' or 'very safe' during the day while outside in x (council's name).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIB002</td>
<td>Percentage of residents surveyed who said that they feel 'fairly safe' or 'very safe' after dark while outside in x (council's name).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BV173</strong></td>
<td>Has the local authority established a corporate strategy to reduce crime and disorder?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aim:</strong> Protecting vulnerable people: Child protection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIB025 / ACC5a</td>
<td>Number of children on the child protection register per 1,000 children as at 31 March 200x.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIB028</td>
<td>Percentage of children entered on the child protection register who had previously been on the register.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIB027 / ACC5c</td>
<td>Percentage of children on the child protection register for the year who had been visited at least once every six weeks by their social worker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BV162</strong></td>
<td>Percentage of child protection cases that should have been reviewed that were reviewed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aim:</strong> Protecting vulnerable people: Children looked after</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC4a</td>
<td>Number of children being looked after by the council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC4bi</td>
<td>Percentage of children looked after who are in residential accommodation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC4bii</td>
<td>Percentage of children looked after who are in foster care and adoption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BV163</strong></td>
<td>Adoptions of children looked after.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BV49</strong></td>
<td>Stability of placements of children looked after.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BV51</strong></td>
<td>Costs of services of children looked after.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BV50</strong></td>
<td>Educational qualifications of children looked after.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aim:</strong> Protecting vulnerable people: Absences and exclusions from school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BV45</strong></td>
<td>Percentage of half days missed due to unauthorised absence in secondary schools maintained by the authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACB6</td>
<td>Percentage of absences in secondary schools that are unauthorised absences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BV44</strong></td>
<td>Number of pupils permanently excluded from all schools maintained by the local education authority per 1,000 pupils in all maintained schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator reference</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BVPI44b</td>
<td>Number of pupils permanently excluded during the year from secondary schools maintained by the local education authority per 1,000 pupils at secondary schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BVPI44c</td>
<td>Number of pupils permanently excluded during the year from special schools maintained by the local education authority per 1,000 pupils at special schools.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Aim: Protecting vulnerable people: Adults and older people**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACC1</td>
<td>Number of adults whom the authority helps to live at home per 1,000 adults under 65.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC3b</td>
<td>Number of people whom the local authority supports in residential care, Adults under 65 per 1,000 people aged under 65.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC2</td>
<td>Number of nights of respite care provided or funded by the authority per 1,000 adults.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BV52</td>
<td>Cost of intensive social care for adults.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC3a</td>
<td>Number of people whom the local authority supports in residential care, Adults 65 and over per 1,000 people aged 65 and over.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BV54</td>
<td>Number of older people helped to live at home per 1,000 population aged 65 or over.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BV53</td>
<td>Intensive home care per 1,000 population aged 65 or over.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Aim: Improving road safety**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LIB018</td>
<td>Percentage of streetlights not working as planned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BV95</td>
<td>Average cost of a working streetlight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIB019</td>
<td>Average cost of maintaining a streetlight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIB011</td>
<td>Percentage of primary school pupils receiving road safety advice during the year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIB008</td>
<td>Percentage of primary schools pupils who are covered by an adopted school travel plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BV132</td>
<td>Number of road traffic collisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BV99</td>
<td>Road accident casualties – all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIB006</td>
<td>Number of adult road accident casualties per 1,000 adult population broken down by (i) nature of casualties and (ii) road user type.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIB005</td>
<td>Number of child road casualties per 1,000 population of 0-15 year olds broken down by (i) nature of casualties and (ii) road user type.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIB007</td>
<td>Percentage of road traffic accidents involving death or personal injury in which at least one driver tested positive for alcohol.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THEME: CREATING A PLEASANT NEIGHBOURHOOD ENVIRONMENT**

**Aim: Improving use and availability of recreational facilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BV178</td>
<td>Percentage of total length of footpaths and other rights of way that were easy to use by members of the public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACF2a</td>
<td>Percentage of links of footpaths and other rights of way that were signposted where they leave the road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIB039</td>
<td>Area of parks and green spaces per 1,000 head of population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIB036</td>
<td>Percentage area of the authority's parks and open spaces that are accredited with a Green Flag Park Award.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIB040</td>
<td>Total net spending per head on parks and open spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIB037</td>
<td>Number of playgrounds and play areas provided by the council per 1,000 children under 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIB038</td>
<td>Number of sports pitches available to the public per 1,000 population.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Indicator reference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BV116</td>
<td><em>Cost per head on cultural and recreational facilities and activities.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIB047</td>
<td>Number of public convenience sites provided by the authority normally throughout the year, per 100,000 residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIB049</td>
<td>Number of public convenience sites provided by the authority normally throughout the year that provide baby-changing facilities accessible to both sexes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIB050</td>
<td>Spend per 1,000 population on provision of public conveniences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIB048</td>
<td>Percentage of public convenience sites provided by the authority normally throughout the year that provide access for people with disabilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Aim: Improving the quality of the natural environment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LIB031</td>
<td>Percentage of rivers and canals rated as good or fair quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIB030</td>
<td>Number of days per year when air pollution is moderate or higher for NO2, SO2, O3, CO and PM10.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Aim: Improving the cleanliness of the local environment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LIB041</td>
<td>Percentage of highways that are either of a high or acceptable level of cleanliness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIB042</td>
<td>Average time taken to remove fly tips.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIB023</td>
<td>Percentage of visits to collect syringes and needles discarded in public places undertaken within target time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIB046</td>
<td>Number of dog waste bins provided per km² of relevant land and highways for which the authority is responsible for keeping clear of litter and refuse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIB043</td>
<td>Percentage of pavements inspected containing dog fouling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIB044</td>
<td>Number of prosecutions for dog fouling per 10,000 population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIB045</td>
<td>Percentage of prosecutions for dog fouling that were successful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BV85</td>
<td><em>Cost per square kilometre of keeping relevant land and highways for which the authority is responsible clear of litter and refuse.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 4 – CHECKLIST OF ACTIONS THAT COUNCILS CAN TAKE TO MAINSTREAM COMMUNITY SAFETY IN BASIC SERVICES

CHIEF EXECUTIVE’S OFFICES

- Ensure that funding is available to meet the cost of implementing community safety.
- Secure external funding to fill gaps in local funding plans.
- Provide grant-aid to community organisations that are delivering community safety outcomes.
- Enable information sharing and analysis under Section 115 of the Crime and Disorder Act, 1998.
- Ensure that all relevant agencies participate in the triennial community safety audit and strategy development cycles.
- Provide support for the community safety partnership.
- Provide support and information for those councillors overseeing community safety implementation.
- Promote community safety within the council, for example, incorporate impact assessments into service plans, reviews and committee/cabinet papers.
- Integrate and promote joint working of the community safety partnership with relevant national, regional and local bodies, for example, Home Office, regional Government Offices, Regional Development Agency, local Youth Offending and Drug Action Teams, voluntary and business sectors, local communities.
- Link community safety to other strategic planning issues, for example, neighbourhood renewal/regeneration, town/city centre management, policy research, media liaison/public relations/marketing, best value, equalities, customer relationship management, human resources and emergency planning.
- Support local community safety activities and projects.
- Raise the profile of community safety in local publications and media channels.
- Ensure that local people receive accurate information about the true risk of becoming a victim of crime.
- Challenge stigmatising images of high-crime neighbourhoods.
- Develop safer, more attractive environments that generate increased tourism, employment and inward investment.

LEGAL SERVICES

- Support activities to reduce crime, anti-social behaviour, nuisance and harassment.
- Ensure that contracts incorporate appropriate community safety measures.
HUMAN RESOURCE SERVICES

- Implement corporate policies that provide fair access to services by reducing violence, and racial and sexual harassment to both personnel and the public.
- Provide appropriate support to personnel who are victims of crime.
- Implement corporate policies that reduce substance misuse in the workplace.
- Incorporate appropriate community safety perspectives into recruitment procedures and performance appraisal.
- Provide appropriate support to personnel who are working in situations where their safety may be at risk.

FINANCIAL SERVICES

- Establish systems that reduce the risk of the council’s exposure to crime, for example, fraud and theft.
- Track the cost of crime, including petty theft, across the council and implement measures to reduce it.
- Pool all possible information to reduce benefit fraud with other council departments and other local agencies under an information-sharing protocol.
- Maximise benefit take up within deprived areas and communities.

DEMOCRATIC SERVICES

- Incorporate community safety issues into community consultation and market research.
- Integrate community safety consultation with best value consultation.
- Identify and achieve communication with vulnerable and hard-to-reach communities.
- Devise youth-specific consultation and communication arrangements.
- Establish local community consultative forums that address community safety and other local issues.

HOUSING SERVICES

- Ensure that allocation policies are sufficiently sensitive to create balanced communities.
- Provide neighbourhood-based management, offices and wardens and access to services.
- Raise the profile of community safety with tenant and resident groups.
- Implement neighbourhood watch schemes.
- Establish ‘safer estate’ agreements.
- Implement ‘secured by design’ schemes covering residential areas.
- Increase the safety of vulnerable people’s homes by installing better security measures.
- Increase the security of empty homes by installing better security measures.
- Support repeat victims of crime.
- Seek to provide housing for those most at risk of becoming a victim of crime, for example, homeless people, refugees and asylum seekers.
• Refer victims of crime to appropriate sources of support.
• Establish and implement anti-harassment policies relating to domestic violence, race and homophobia.
• Share information with the police and other local agencies under an information-sharing protocol.
• Support and manage the behaviour of tenants who are at risk of eviction.
• Enforce injunctions, introductory tenancies, tenancy agreements, noise abatement policies and civil law remedies.
• Use acceptable behaviour contracts and anti-social behaviour orders where necessary.
• Record incidents and costs of crime, vandalism, anti-social behaviour and harassment.
• Conduct personal safety audits of housing estates.
• Implement professional witness schemes to gain evidence of crime and harassment.
• Provide witness support schemes.
• Support and use mediation approaches to resolve neighbour disputes.
• Tackle housing fraud.
• Provide support, training and guidance to managers and frontline staff dealing with crime, disorder and anti-social behaviour.

**PLANNING SERVICES**

• Develop community safety guidelines for developers, builders, and statutory local plans, to design out crime in new developments and refurbishments.
• Ensure that a crime impact analysis forms part of development control and planning applications.
• Consider community consultation feedback on community safety issues.
• Apply ‘secured by design’ schemes and principles to create safer neighbourhoods.
• Work with police architectural liaison and crime prevention officers to prevent crime through better environmental design.
• Promote mixed developments of housing, cultural, retailing, business and leisure that support community activity and natural surveillance in local areas both day and night.
• Exploit planning gain and Section 106 opportunities to attract funding from developers for community safety improvements.

**ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES**

• Use licensing and regulatory powers to control alcohol-related crime and disorder.
• Develop registration and training schemes for door staff in licensed premises.
• Maintain and clean all public spaces to improve public perception of neighbourhood value.
• Encourage reporting of, and speed up the removal of, graffiti and fly-posting.
• Efficiently collect and fine against rubbish dumping and littering and provide adequate numbers of litter bins.
- Efficiently collect and fine against dog fouling and provide adequate numbers of collection bins.
- Clear and dispose of discarded drug and alcohol-related paraphernalia rapidly and safely.
- Improve street lighting levels, maintenance and repair.
- Control growth of trees and vegetation to ensure visibility and surveillance levels on streets and in public open spaces.
- Ensure highway and road safety through cleaner road signage.
- Improve traffic calming to reduce speeding and road accidents.
- Increase safety and security in car parks through CCTV surveillance, radio security, regular patrolling by car park attendants and environmental measures.
- Work with public transport providers to promote safer travel.
- Develop ‘home-zone areas’ and safe routes to schools.
- Encourage reporting of and speed up the removal of abandoned vehicles.
- Regulate use of houses in multiple occupation.
- Enforce noise control legislation.
- Support emergency and contingency planning, for example, in dealing with floods.

**TRADING STANDARDS AND CONSUMER PROTECTION SERVICES**

- Reduce under-age sales of alcohol, cigarettes, solvents and fireworks by implementing and inspecting ‘proof of age’ schemes.
- Combat sales of counterfeit goods.
- Regulate the car salvage trade in second-hand vehicles.

**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT/LEISURE/RECREATION/TOURISM SERVICES**

- Provide affordable access to facilities for vulnerable groups, for example, young people.
- Ensure that services are influenced by community consultation and are available in disadvantaged areas.
- Support SPLASH (Schools and Police Liaison for Activity in Summer Holidays) by providing staff, premises or funding resources.
- Provide playschemes for younger children.
- Provide staff training in crime prevention and management of disruptive behaviour.
- Promote and provide a mix of activities that meet the needs of different groups and ages.
- Provide accurate, accessible high-quality service information.
- Maintain clean and safe public toilet facilities.
- Provide warden services that cover parks and open spaces.
EDUCATION SERVICES

- Reduce truancy and school exclusion.
- Develop the work of the education welfare service.
- Provide a special needs service for young people with emotional and behavioural difficulties.
- Provide an alternative curriculum in mainstream schools for children with special needs.
- Develop full-time education services that are based in facilities other than mainstream schools.
- Run young people’s mentoring schemes.
- Develop youth citizenship schemes.
- Develop youth action approaches that consult, empower and work with young people to reduce crime and disorder.
- Develop safe driving programmes in schools.
- Tackle bullying and racial and homophobic harassment.
- Identify and support children who are at risk of abuse or harassment.
- Improve school security against crime, arson and vandalism.
- Provide drug and alcohol education that aims to reduce use and abuse.
- Provide breakfast, homework and out-of-school clubs and encourage attendance.
- Provide early years development, prioritising disadvantaged families and those at risk of domestic violence.

YOUTH SERVICES

- Increase the profile of young people’s services.
- Focus on disadvantaged young people.
- Provide detached and outreach street-based youth work.
- Provide youth work during the holidays and at weekends.
- Develop youth consultation forums and panels.
- Provide peer education activities.

SOCIAL SERVICES

- Support families in need.
- Provide family support services.
- Support individuals and families affected by domestic violence.
- Develop early years work.
- Seek to ensure better child protection services.
- Work with young offenders via Youth Offending Teams to reduce re-offending behaviour.
- Develop assessment and care management services for drug and alcohol users.
• Provide a service that supports people with mental health problems.
• Support ‘looked after’ children.
• Inspect residential establishments and boarding schools.
• Provide crime prevention training and advice to staff and vulnerable clients.
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