

<b>Lead Director</b>	<b>Graham Farrant</b>
----------------------	-----------------------

### Savings Proposal

**To cease the Council's contribution to the Community Safety Partnership budget** This will include, the partnership making no contribution to the out of hours noise nuisance team, a reduction in project work designed to prevent crime, and prevent young people from engaging in risky behaviours, promoting awareness of reporting of hate crime, no further Admin support through an apprentice.

There will also no longer be funding from the CSP or council to support Domestic abuse county wide posts or the funding of the Integrated Offender Management link worker – currently employed by Family Mosaic to work alongside the probation team.

### Strategic rationale

Whilst having a statutory duty to have a community safety partnership the Local authority does not have a specific duty to fund this work which falls to the Police and Crime Commissioner.

The partnership will still exist and will continue to deliver a programme of work through collaborative working, seeking alternative funding and solutions.

### Approximate Cost Savings

£50,000

### Timescales

Activity	Timescale
Application to PCC for grant funding for priority projects	January 2015
Cessation of those projects no longer funded	1 <sup>st</sup> April 2015

### Risks /Consequences

The Council has a statutory duty under the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, amended April 2010 to have a Community Safety Partnerships (CSP) with responsibility of enabling 'responsible authorities' to develop and deliver local strategies to reduce crime and disorder and re-offending.

The responsible authorities work with 'cooperating bodies' to achieve their objectives.

The responsible authorities for Thurrock have to:

- 1) convene a strategy group of all responsible authorities in the CSP
- 2) prepare a strategic assessment of local crime and community safety priorities, using information provided by partner agencies and the community;
- 3) produce a partnership plan to meet those priorities, evaluate implementation, and conduct a skills and knowledge audit of partners;
- 4) meet minimum standards of community consultation and engagement on issues of crime and disorder, substance misuse and reducing reoffending;
- 5) have an information sharing protocol for the CSP and ensure each responsible authority has a designated information sharing officer.
- 6) The Crime and Disorder Regulations 2007 requires responsible authorities to show that their CSP offers Value For Money.

The CSP manager and analyst deliver on points 1,2, 3, 5 and 6. The funding supports crime prevention, community engagement, re-offending and in particular reduction in youth offending

Funding for external posts of Integrated Offender Management link worker, the domestic abuse support posts

around MARAC (Multi Agency Risk Assessment Conference) and IDVA (Independent Domestic Violence Advocate) will be impacted. This has the potential to lead to a domestic homicide review.

There would be no universal crime prevention provision by the CSP, impacting the majority of residents.

There would be no service for residents impacted by noise out of office hours. This would also reduce visible presence of officers at vulnerable times and locations, potentially increasing crime.

### **Mitigation**

With a reduction in funding it will be recommended to reduce our priorities. This will be agreed through the strategic assessment process, however is likely to be

1. Reduce re-offending rates
2. Hate crime
3. Crime prevention – including the strengthening community programme targeting vulnerable residents.

This will have an impact on housing, Police and children's services.

### **Next steps – Service ownership and Board Scrutiny & Challenge**

<b>Step</b>	<b>Service</b>	<b>Board Scrutiny &amp; Challenge</b>