

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE (EXTERNAL)

4TH JUNE 2008

PRESENT	Councillor Anderson (Chair) Councillors Bowser, Buckham, Mrs. Jopling and V. Shuttleworth
APOLOGIES	
ADVISERS	R. Bowman, Scrutiny Manager and E. Baker, Community Safety Manager

21. CDRP REVIEW SCOPING DAY BRIEFING SESSION

The Chair welcomed the Community Safety Manager to the meeting.

The Community Safety Manager delivered a presentation in the Council Chamber on the subject of the Wear and Tees Community Safety Partnership. Following the presentation the Committee moved into the fourth floor committee room to discuss the content of the presentation and to fill in the scoping template.

The Community Safety Manager described the legislative background to CDRPs. The formative legislation was the Crime and Disorder Act (1998) which placed a duty on responsible authorities to cooperate with certain other organisations in improving community safety. Every year a strategic assessment had to be produced by the partnership. This included priorities, targets and how to deliver. There was also a requirement from central government to deliver against PSA targets.

It was mentioned that the Wear and Tees Community Safety Partnership would be disbanded in April 2009 with the advent of the unitary authority. At this stage exact arrangements as to what would replace it were unknown.

The full CSP met 2 times per year, but there were varying tiers of the partnership including an executive group and a tasking and coordinating group which met more frequently. The executive group was composed of the section 17 responsible authorities.

Other organisations represented on the partnership included, amongst others, LSPs, Drug and Alcohol Action Team and the County Durham Youth Engagement Service. The Management Support Group monitors performance and delivery plans and takes problems to the executive group to solve.

Questions were addressed by the Committee to the Community Safety Manager:

What role do the CDRP partners have in the partnership?

The organisations with a statutory responsibility to participate were the PCT and councils, etc. The MSG was the engine, consisting of lower ranking officials, whilst the executive group was higher level and met every two months.

How are the priorities of the partnership decided?

The priorities were decided on the basis of a risk assessment with a score given from 1-5. Services aren't commissioned; all services are provided by the constituent organisations.

How is the work of the partnership performance managed?

A performance management report is produced. Offenders get logged on the CRM. Performance data goes through the Observatory, with performance management provided by County Council.

Other questions of interest included the following, although Members were satisfied that they had been addressed during the presentation:

How does the CDRP fit into the wider partnership framework of the County?

What are the issues of CDRP working in a two tier area? For example, is there any risk of duplication?

How effective is communication between the different CDRPs of the County?

Has the CDRP reduced crime more than if it hadn't existed?

- Are the benefits delivered worth the investment in time and resources from each of the partners?

Describe the relationships between the partners comprising the CDRP.

- Are there any ongoing issues in the partners' working relationships?

Are there any bodies or sectors which should be involved which are currently absent from the partnership?

- If so, why?

How is the public currently engaged in the work of the CDRP?

How will the reorganisation of local government in Durham affect the CDRP?

In its current state, is the CDRP ready for the changes that reorganisation will bring?

- What can it do to prepare better?

Following the discussion with the Community Safety Manager, Members proceeded to complete the scoping template.

The Chair thanked the Community Safety Manager for her involvement.

CHAIR

The meeting concluded at 6:45pm