



Partnership and Place Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Thursday, 24 February 2011 at 7.30 pm
Committee Room 4, Brent Town Hall, Forty Lane,
Wembley, HA9 9HD

Membership:

Members

Councillors:

Van Kalwala (Chair)
Clues (Vice-Chair)
Brown
A Choudry
Hirani
Naheerathan
Ogunro
HB Patel

first alternates

Councillors:

Mistry
Matthews
Lorber
Oladapo
Aden
Al-Ebadi
Chohan
Colwill

Second alternates

Councillors:

Daly
Allie
Leaman
Sheth
Adeyeye
Beckman
S Choudhary
HM Patel

For further information contact: Toby Howes, Senior Democratic Services Officer
020 8937 1307, toby.howes@brent.gov.uk

For electronic copies of minutes, reports and agendas, and to be alerted when the minutes of this meeting have been published visit:

www.brent.gov.uk/committees

The press and public are welcome to attend this meeting

Agenda

Introductions, if appropriate.

Apologies for absence and clarification of alternate members

Item	Page
1 Declarations of personal and prejudicial interests	
Members are invited to declare at this stage of the meeting, any relevant financial or other interest in the items on the agenda.	
2 Deputations	
3 Minutes of the previous meeting held on 14 December 2010	1 - 8
The minutes are attached.	
4 Matters arising	
5 Impact of budget changes on policing and crime prevention in Brent	9 - 20
A report briefly explains the development of community safety focusing on how the work is financed. Genny Renard (Interim Head of Community Safety, Strategy, Partnerships and Improvement) and Superintendent Stuart Smith (Brent Metropolitan Police Service) will be presenting further information at the meeting.	
6 London Fire Brigade Brent - overview and partnership working	
The committee will receive a presentation from Sean Bennett, the Borough Commander of London Fire Brigade Brent. The presentation will provide an overview of the service in Brent and provide examples of the way the fire service works in partnership on issues such as the links between domestic violence and fire and homelessness and fire.	
7 Partners for Brent - Partnership achievements 2010/11	21 - 24
This report sets out the highlights and achievements of Partners for Brent 2010/11.	

8 Date of next meeting

The next meeting of the Partnership and Place Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting is scheduled to take place on Tuesday, 5 April 2011 at 7.30 pm.

9 Any other urgent business

Notice of items raised under this heading must be given in writing to the Democratic Services Manager or his representative before the meeting in accordance with Standing Order 64.



- Please remember to **SWITCH OFF** your mobile phone during the meeting.
- The meeting room is accessible by lift and seats will be provided for members of the public.
 - Toilets are available on the second floor.
 - Catering facilities can be found on the first floor near the Paul Daisley Hall.
 - A public telephone is located in the foyer on the ground floor, opposite the Porters' Lodge

This page is intentionally left blank



**MINUTES OF THE PARTNERSHIP AND PLACE
OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
Tuesday, 14 December 2010 at 7.30 pm**

PRESENT: Councillor Van Kalwala (Chair), Councillor Clues (Vice-Chair) and Councillors A Choudry and Hirani

Also Present: Councillor Jones (Lead Member for Human Resources and Diversity, Local Democracy and Consultation)

An apology for absence was received from: Councillor HB Patel

1. Declarations of personal and prejudicial interests

None declared.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting held on 19 October 2010

RESOLVED:-

that the minutes of the previous meeting held on 19 October 2010 be approved as an accurate record of the meeting.

3. Matters arising

None.

4. Progress on a Voluntary Sector strategy

Joanna McCormick (Partnerships Coordinator, Strategy, Partnerships and Improvement) introduced the report and explained that the Voluntary Sector Strategy focused on the main themes of communication and coordination of services. A draft strategy document would be consulted upon with the wider voluntary sector once the implications of the Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) had been identified. Members heard that work on the Strategy had begun in 2009 and discussions to date had recognised a number of objectives and aims shared by partners. A number of factors had been identified that affected the ability to improve the relationships between the public, voluntary and community sectors and key themes included commissioning, engaging and consulting - especially with the hard to reach groups. It was noted that a number of issues had been raised at the One Community, Many Voices Event which were being fed into the development of the strategy. The issues raised included giving organisations a better understanding of what funding is available from external sources, promoting volunteering and volunteer responsibilities, what 'Big Society' means for Brent and places for small voluntary organisations to meet. Joanna McCormick advised that

'Brent – Our Future' Strategy was committed to building a Voluntary Sector Resource Centre and the availability of other Local Strategic Partners (LSP) buildings could also be explored. The council had a strong relationship with the Brent Multi-Faith Forum and the Corporate Diversity Team had successfully implemented a Building Stronger Communities Programme.

During discussion by Members, Councillor Clues commented that more importance may be placed on the voluntary sector because of the 'Big Society'. He sought further clarification with regard to Brent Association for Voluntary Action's (BrAVA) role and had an audit been undertaken with regard to their effectiveness. He sought assurance that there was sufficient confidence that BrAVA could deliver its objectives effectively. Councillor A Choudry also expressed concern about BrAVA's ability to function effectively and felt that they needed to provide a more professional service and take the initiative more often in asking voluntary organisations what they wanted. He asked for details of what monitoring of BrAVA's performance was undertaken and who set BrAVA's agenda and whether the council had any influence over the role of BrAVA. Councillor A Choudry asked whether a study of what each voluntary organisation in Brent had been undertaken and commented that the information could be used for organisations to share services and resources or even to merge and the information could also be used as a basis to determine whether organisations were eligible for funding. Councillor Hirani stressed the importance of BrAVA in achieving the outcomes set.

The Chair sought details regarding BrAVA's funding arrangements, its future as a partner and the council's view of the organisation. He asked if the council's efficiency savings would impact upon the voluntary sector, had funding been identified for the Voluntary Sector Resource Centre and when was it likely to open.

In reply, Joanna McCormick advised that BrAVA's role was to act as a Community and Voluntary Service (CVS), an umbrella organisation representing the voluntary and community sector in Brent. BrAVA had received funding under the Local Area Agreement (LAA) and the councils' Main Programme Grant to deliver particular projects. The effectiveness of BrAVA in achieving its outcomes as set by LAA targets and Main Programme Grant Requirements was monitored. Discussions relating to the development of the voluntary sector strategy would include the role of a CVS in the borough. Voluntary sectors representatives had stated they would discuss improvements to a CVS within the voluntary sector. Members noted that the Strategy would set out what was expected of a CVS and seek to address concerns that had been raised in respect of this. Joanna McCormick added that it was important to have an effective CVS. The council could monitor an organisation where it had provided funding or been commissioned to provide a service. Members noted that a decision was yet to be made with regard to the Main Grant Programme funding for next year, however there would be a need for efficiencies to be built in and this could have a number of implications, such as the way services were commissioned.

Joanna McCormick advised that discussions were taking place with voluntary organisations with regard to identifying an appropriate site for a Voluntary Sector Resource Centre and whether any organisations' buildings could be used for this purpose. Although BrAVA and voluntary organisations had identified some funding for the Resource Centre, more funding was still required and a number of options were being considered. Members heard that BrAVA collected basic information on

voluntary organisations in Brent, such as the overall role of the organisation, however voluntary organisations were working together to learn more about what each other does. However, because of the wide and fragmented nature of voluntary organisations in Brent, there were a number of practical obstacles in collating such information. It was intended to build upon the information obtained by BrAVA and this would assist in identifying what organisations were best placed to provide a particular service, however Joanna McCormick added that gathering information was a costly exercise. Members heard that there were also a large number of voluntary organisations in Brent that were not funded by the council.

Fiona Hill (Voluntary and Community Sector Representative, Local Strategic Partnership) advised that Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) voluntary sector representatives were due to meet with BrAVA to discuss its future role and BrAVA was holding a meeting with voluntary organisations this week to seek their views on what they require from BrAVA.

Phil Newby (Director of Strategy, Partnerships and Improvement) advised that it was for the voluntary sector to decide on the CVS and what they would want from it. Whilst the council monitored and safeguarded outcomes where it had provided funding, it was also seeking views from the voluntary sector to develop the Strategy. BrAVA's role was ultimately determined by its own Board of Trustees. Members heard that the council would only continue to provide funding to BrAVA if it felt reassured that BrAVA could achieve the intended outcomes.

The Chair acknowledged the importance of the role of the CVS in effective communication with voluntary organisations and partners. He requested that an update on the draft Strategy and progress on the Voluntary Sector Resource Centre be provided at a future meeting.

RESOLVED:-

that the work undertaken to date to develop a Voluntary Sector Strategy be noted.

5. The Local Economic Assessment

Jo Francis (Head of Regeneration Policy, Regeneration and Major Projects) gave a presentation on the Local Economic Assessment. Jo Francis advised that the council was required to prepare the assessment and had received a one-off grant to fund this work. CLES Consulting and Shared Intelligence had been commissioned to undertake the assessment to help the council identify the challenges and opportunities that needed to be addressed to deliver sustainable economic growth. This was also to be seen in a London wide context, including consideration of what are Brent's selling points compared to other London boroughs. Jo Francis commented that India's anticipated Gross Domestic Product (GPD) growth may offer Brent opportunities as there was a significant Indian population in the borough. However, projections also indicated that the GVA performance gap in Brent would widen in the next few years because of the recession. Members noted that the majority of residents commuted to Central London or worked within Brent, with only a fraction commuting to other parts of West London.

In terms of overall employment rates, Jo Francis advised that Brent was closing the gap relative to the rest of London, however rates were lower for women and black

and minority ethnic groups. The recession had caused a rise in unemployed claimants, particularly in the south of the Borough and while there had been significant improvements in young people's educational attainment, there were still a relatively high proportion of residents with no qualifications which could be attributable to language issues or foreign qualifications not being recognised. It was noted that more than a third of children in Brent lived in poverty. With regard to Brent's economic qualities, whilst the number of new businesses starting up was quite high, their long term business survival prospects lagged behind the regional and national averages. Jo Francis advised that the largest increase in employment growth rates was forecast for business services, including a number of back office functions.

During Members' discussion, Councillor A Choudry noted the significance of statistics related to black and minority ethnic groups in view of the borough's diversity and requested further information on this. He also asked if there was any information available on the number of residents having to leave Brent as a result of changes to housing benefit. With regard to Park Royal, he enquired whether there was any more capacity for more businesses to be located there. Councillor Hirani requested a breakdown of figures regarding affordability of housing, employment and housing benefit. Councillor Clues acknowledged the regeneration schemes for Park Royal and the Wembley Stadium area, however he also noted the low workforce productivity rates for Church End and Kilburn and asked whether regeneration schemes were planned for these areas too.

The Chair asked what the next steps would be in view of the findings of the assessment, including how to engage with small minority ethnic businesses and improve transport links. He also enquired on the future of apprenticeships in the borough and commented that there was a shortage of three-bedroom properties in Brent and this needed to be addressed in order to house families.

In reply, Jo Francis advised that the report was being considered by Strategy, Partnerships and Improvement to see what the next steps should be to address the issues raised. A meeting was due to take place with the National Apprenticeship Service on 16 December to discuss the future of apprenticeships in Brent. Efforts were being made to involve more local businesses with regard to the building of the Civic Centre and the regeneration of Wembley. Members noted that Employer Partnership was the main vehicle used to engage with small minority ethnic businesses which involved explaining to them what opportunities were available. There was also training provided by Supply London to help local organisations be fit to tender through a series of workshops. Jo Francis advised that Park Royal had been identified as a key growth area in the Local Development Framework and it was intended to improve transport routes in this area and others through working with Transport for London. Park Royal Partnership was seeking funding for a Business Improvement District. Jo Francis explained that a significant proportion of Brent residents were in low paid employment which was a key factor to consider in terms of affordability of housing. However, the council's new structure would facilitate in bringing useful information together. Jo Francis stated that a breakdown of figures linking affordability of housing, employment and housing benefit could be provided at a future meeting and also further information with regard to black and minority ethnic statistics.

Phil Newby (Director of Strategy, Partnerships and Improvement) advised that a project had been commissioned as part of the One Council Programme to investigate the effects of the Housing Benefit cap, whilst the impact of the Local Government Settlement as a result of the CSR was also being analysed. Members heard that the council's Mosaic information collection system was collecting data such as income in Brent and a sizeable difference in income within the south of the borough had been identified due to there being a large influx of young, higher income earners in this part of Brent. This population trend could affect property prices and lead to the less well off seeking social housing or displacing them elsewhere. Phil Newby also commented that polarisation of particular groups was a factor that needed to be addressed. He suggested that Members could invite the Head of Planning to a future meeting to discuss planning implications with regard to housing needs if they so wished.

The Chair commented that there were a number of employment skills and transport issues that needed to be addressed and he asked that information on the future of apprenticeships be included in a future report to the committee.

6. Policing priorities in Brent

Genny Renard (Head of Integrated Community Safety - Strategy, Partnerships and Improvement) updated Members on policing priorities in Brent. She began by explaining that 83% of offenders in the borough had re-offended and this could be partly attributed to the fact that after being prosecuted for an offence, it affected offenders' ability to gain employment. The Crime Prevention Strategy Group (CPSG) was presently undertaking an assessment of issues to be addressed and looking at long term solutions to current trends in Brent such as the rise in robberies, particularly street robberies and the impact of crime upon communities. An assessment of why anti-social behaviour occurred was also being undertaken. Genny Renard advised that knife crime in Brent had fallen to the extent that it now had borderline status as a trident borough. Gun crime figures were influenced by the fact that incidences recorded included those where there was a perception that a gun was involved. Another priority area was encouraging betting shops to improve their own security arrangements. Of the most serious violent crimes committed, approximately 60-70% of these were domestic violence related and of those victims murdered, none had been known to the council and this was an area that needed to be focused on. Genny Renard advised that changes to Safer Neighbourhood Teams (SNT) meant that although every ward would still have an SNT, the formula applied for the composition of the SNTs had changed. It was felt that there was not a requirement for a police sergeant for SNTs in every ward and consultation was taking place with regard to this. Genny Renard commented that one possibility was that a police sergeant may cover more than one ward in areas where crime was relatively low. It was also intended to improve the mobility of SNTs to respond to incidents based on the information that had been collected for each area.

During Members' discussion, Councillor Clues enquired whether the savings required would impact upon the court service and stated that additional pressure both on courts and the police could occur as the defendant could call on a number of witnesses, including police officers. Councillor Hirani enquired whether reductions in the performance area grant with regard to domestic violence would affect services.

The Chair enquired what the council's recommendation was with regard to SNT arrangements and sought opinion on what other changes were being considered, were there any specific proposals for Stonebridge ward and when the consultation period on this would finish. He also asked if there was any further update with regard to funding of the CPSG and the police and whether there was a lot of natural wastage in the police concerning staff reductions.

In reply, Genny Renard advised that the council was considering recommending that an SNT police sergeant cover two to three wards in areas of lower crime, whilst each ward would still have a police constable and two police community safety officers. She felt that Stonebridge would require three SNTs in view of the size of the area and its crime levels. She stressed the need for SNTs to operate smarter and work effectively with other groups. The council was currently funding 16 police community safety officers and consideration of how to make more effective use of them was being considered. Specific proposals would follow upon the conclusion of the consultation on 17 December and Genny Renard asked that councillors participate through the council's website. Members noted that an update on SNT arrangements would be presented at the next meeting. Genny Renard advised that every effort was being made to retain the domestic violence courts as conviction rates were 30% higher than other courts. This was due to judges receiving specific training in this area and the victims feeling more relaxed in these courts. Members heard that a data officer position had been lost in the domestic violence service due to performance award grant cuts, which meant less information was being collated. Bridging arrangements had been made for the service to continue to function and some funding had also been obtained from a charity. Genny Renard advised that overall there was 20% less funding available for domestic violence services and that discussion was also taking place with other West London boroughs with regard to joint commissioning of domestic violence services.

Genny Renard stated that further details were awaited in respect of funding for the CPSG and added that funding for this had not been ring-fenced. However, consideration of what changes could be made in respect of the savings required was taking place, including the possibility of selling some services to registered social landlords. Members heard that the police were reducing the number of administrative staff and were not presently recruiting. Genny Renard advised that staff reductions in the police being achieved through natural wastage was high, with a number of police staff recruited in the 1970s due to retire soon. Members noted that further details with regard to police staffing would be provided at the next meeting.

7. Services for women in and exiting prostitution - six month update on task group recommendations

Jacqueline Casson (Senior Policy Officer, Strategy, Partnerships and Improvement) introduced a report updating the committee on progress on the recommendations made by the Services for women in and exiting prostitution task group. She drew Members' attention to sections in the report detailing the response to each recommendation to date, including timescales for implementation.

Councillor Hirani enquired if newspapers had been approached with regard to the task group's recommendation that they be encouraged to ensure that none of the

sex industry related advertisements included photographs or information on ethnicity and age. He commented that if Brent Magazine was to be circulated less frequently, local newspapers would have an even greater impact upon the image of Brent and therefore such advertisements would have a greater negative effect on the borough. Councillor Hirani also suggested that it would be desirable if the UK signed up to an EU agreement to curb opportunities for human trafficking. Councillor Clues spoke of the increasing urgency in addressing prostitution, human trafficking and organised crime in view that the 2012 Olympics was taking place in seven months' time and he asked whether this issue had been discussed with the Mayor of London's office.

The Chair asked for an update on the recommendation that there be an article on the task group's report in the Brent Magazine.

In reply, Jacqueline Casson advised that local newspapers had been contacted with regard to the task group recommendation in respect of sex industry related advertisements, however this was now being addressed at a national level. She confirmed that the task group recommendation for an article of their work to appear in Brent Magazine was being pursued. Members heard that the CPSG were considering ways of tackling opportunities for organised crime, human trafficking and prostitution in relation to the forthcoming 2012 Olympics and that this was being discussed with the Mayor of London's office.

Genny Renard commented on the difficulties in preventing newspapers allowing sex industry related advertisements from including such details as photographs and references to ethnicity and age and this was an issue which needed to be tackled at a national level. Members noted that an application for funding from The Body Shop to tackle human trafficking had been made and Genny Renard agreed that it would be helpful for the UK to sign up to the EU agreement in relation to this.

Phil Newby advised the committee that there had been a significant reduction in 2012 Olympic funding because of the Local Government Settlement following the CSR.

The Chair advised Members that a further update on the task group's recommendations would be presented to the committee in six to 12 months' time.

RESOLVED:-

that the progress on the task group's recommendations to date be noted.

8. Date of next meeting

It was noted that the next meeting of the Partnership and Place Overview and Scrutiny Committee was scheduled to take place on Thursday, 17 February 2010 at 7.30 pm.

9. Any other urgent business

None.

The meeting closed at 9.15 pm

Z VAN KALWALA
Chair



Partnership & Place Overview & Scrutiny Committee

24th February 2011

Report from the Director of Strategy, Partnership and Improvement

For Action

Wards Affected:
ALL

Repercussions of the Abolition of Ring Fenced Grants for Community Safety Work in Brent

1.0 Summary

- 1.1 This report explains in brief the development of community safety focusing on how the work is financed. It looks in more depth at the recent changes brought about by the cuts in funding as it affects the Crime Prevention Strategy Group and the partnership work we deliver in Brent. Council finances and the former ring fenced grants are detailed. At the time of writing this report the borough Police do not have details of how the reductions in their funding and the inputs from the Mayor of London will affect services. A presentation will be given to the Committee to update them.

2.0 Recommendations

- 2.1 That members of the committee note the report and that updates are given as the new structure comes into place in April 2011
- 2.2 That members of the committee are updated regularly regarding the satisfaction survey conducted for the Police.
- 2.3 That a small set of key performance indicators are selected for crime and Anti Social Behaviour and monitored by the committee.

3.0 Detail

Background

- 3.1 Crime and community confidence is an extremely complex area of work touching on all departments within local authorities and interacts with a wide range of statutory and voluntary sector partners. Over time, to coordinate these functions, provide expert advice and underpin the required formal partnerships, Community Safety Units have become the norm. Reflective of the pivotal and highly political role of these departments, overwhelmingly they form part of central services or Chief Executives' departments in councils.
- 3.2 Brent Council's Community Safety Partnership Unit (BCSPU) was created following the Morgan Report of the mid 1990s, this report recognised that Crime and Disorder could not be tackled by the Police alone.
- 3.3 The Report proposed that Local Authorities work together with the Police in designing strategies to impact and reduce crime and disorder. The creation of a Community Safety team saw the development of a partnership between Brent Borough Council and Brent Police.
- 3.4 In 1998 central government took the principles of the Morgan Report forward and released the Crime and Disorder Act 1998. This Act sets out statutory requirements for local authorities, Police and other key partners & agencies to work together to tackle crime and disorder in their area.
- 3.5 In response to the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 and in recognition of the benefits of multi-agency partnership working brought, the Brent Community Safety Partnership was established in this borough, this is called the Crime Prevention Strategy Group (CPSG). Community Safety Partnerships are legally required to produce a three year strategy setting out objectives and targets which aim to reduce levels of crime and disorder and improve community safety.
- 3.6 The Partnership Community Safety team focuses on issues of crime and disorder and anti-social behaviour and works with other Brent Council departments as well as local agencies/organisations and the Brent Community Safety Partnership to try and address the issues by developing and implementing effective solutions.

The clear aim of this Partnership is:-

"To provide and promote a safe environment for people who live, work or visit Brent by reducing crime and the fear of crime and disorder."

Key areas of work include:

- coordinating actions to tackle antisocial behaviour
- coordinating action to address domestic violence, sexual violence and exploitation
- work to reduce drug and alcohol related crime and disorder through the Drug Intervention Programme (DIP), Prolific and Priority Offender Scheme (PPO) and Integrated Offender management Scheme (IOM)
- work to reduce hate crimes and keep victims safe
- physical works to the homes of victims of crime and vulnerable residents, including victims of domestic violence, to keep them safe in their homes and reduce burglary
- work with a range of partners to address issues of young people and antisocial behaviour and crime
- undertake analysis of crime and antisocial behaviour to direct the partnership's strategic and operational responses to tackling crime and antisocial behaviour
- undertake media and advertising activity on behalf of the partnership to keep residents and visitors informed and advise on how to stay safe
- use a range of partnership funds to commission services that reduce crime and keep victims safe.

Context

- 3.7 The work of the Brent Community Safety Partnership Unit has been adversely affected during the financial year 2010 -2011 with just over £135,000 having been withdrawn by central government. The cuts hit the unit's work predominantly around domestic violence. Actions taken to deal with this loss of income include: not recruiting to vacant posts, stopping non vital areas of work and asking one member of staff to "act-up" to cope with the capacity gap.
- 3.7 The landscape in all public sector organisations is changing rapidly; community safety is no exception. Academics are predicting changes in the patterns of both crime and disorder. Overall demand is expected to rise with the most pertinent change anticipated in localised Antisocial Behaviour and lower level crime and predicted increase in Domestic Violence related crime as financial stresses in families rise.

- 3.8 Concurrently, over the last year there has been a remarkable strengthening in operational level partnership working between the key partners and this proposal has been developed with input from the key partners.
- 3.9 All of the agencies the BCSPU and CPSG work with are also experiencing the same pressures of reductions in funding and the cessation of grants. All of the agencies are keen to embrace the wider Government agenda of the Big Society by commissioning some services currently delivered by the statutory sector.

The Big Society

- 3.10 At the end of January, the Home Office was due to publish a new crime strategy: when it is released this will include a more localised, participative approach to tackling crime and disorder.

The **two** core challenges face local borough and town councils in the near future are:

- Ensuring central co-ordination and strategy development with fewer resources
- Ensuring mechanisms for engaging and empowering local people to contribute more to determining priorities and in some cases to the delivery of services.

Home Office Letter to Heads of Community Safety January 4th 2011

Planning for the New Future

- 3.11 The need to meet changing demand with fewer resources in all agencies led to three interlinked strands of work.
- Review of CPSG and its delivery structure
 - One Council Programme, an internal Council review to be undertaken as part of the programme to investigate where there are gaps, overlaps and ineffective working practices
 - The “Looking Local Joint Working Programme” looked at how to deliver effectively within current anticipated resources; focusing on customer service and reducing waste.
- 3.12 The review of CPSG itself was prompted by the Chair, aware the group had been in existence for over ten years and both it and the reporting/delivery structure had grown, as in other boroughs rather ad-hoc. Reports coming to the board showed that there is considerable overlap and duplication. Part of

this work was carried out by an independent consultant financed the Home Office funding.

- 3.13 As part of the Local Authority's "One Council Programme" there has been a broad brush look at community safety functions that currently sit in other departments. Best Practice from elsewhere has been reviewed and partners invited to comment.
- 3.14 A concept paper has been accepted, that proposes drawing in other community safety functions to the BCSPU. A business case has been submitted for approval or amendment to the One Council Programme. This impacts on this restructure and it is vital to be delivering the core work as well as possible, making best use of internal and external resources to make the rationalisation of community safety functions work.
- 3.15 Additionally, the work around the One Council project provided more information for this proposal.
- 3.16 The Council Directorate Strategy, Partnership and Improvement (SP&I) and in particular BCSPU and the Police started planning for the anticipated reductions in grant funding.
- 3.17 At an operational management level, between partners there was recognition that the delivery mechanism had grown in response to funding offers from various Government Departments, and what should have been short term projects have become embedded in the structure. It was also evident that there was duplication in a number of areas that not only sapped precious resources it caused considerable confusion to residents and professional partners alike.
- 3.18 A study was undertaken, to make the service ready that looked at:
- Current service delivery design – focusing on the logical and effective placing of roles and responsibilities and reducing duplication
 - 15 Beacon and/or Green Flag¹ boroughs plus three others that closely resembled in crime, disorder and demographic terms the London Borough of Brent.

¹ Beacon and Green Flag status are given to high performing boroughs and/or departments by the Audit Commission and IDEA. Other non governmental awards were taken into account when deciding which teams to review.

3.19 This resulted in:

- The Local Government and Improvement Agency funding a fact finding training visit to a high performing Council who have given support through the planning process and will continue to do so as (subject to consultation) the plan is implemented
- The proposed new staffing structure for BCSPU and enmeshes with changes already implemented in the Police Service to deliver a more effective service within the resources available. The change in the Police structure to deliver this programme has yielded an additional Sergeant currently placed in the Antisocial Behaviour Team and part-time use of another to help coordinate local level working.

Funding Community Safety

- 3.20 A statutory obligation was imposed by the 1998 act to have a multi-agency partnership. It should be noted that local authorities are the lead agency and the responsible authority for all grant funding.
- 3.21 A core group of participants were defined in the legislation with other agencies invited at the discretion of the group itself. However, no financial provision was made for this new statutory duty in the annual local Government settlement.
- 3.22 Until the financial year 2011-12 rafts of ring fenced funding had been provided by various Government departments, predominantly the Home Office and the Metropolitan Police Authority.
- 3.23 The vast majority of this funding has been on a year by year basis. Information about the ongoing provision and amounts, for the last five years, reached Heads of Community Safety and the Police at best in February and often in March for the following financial year, making planning and retention of good staff extremely difficult.
- 3.24 In Brent, in line with all other authorities, the Police and local Authority pooled their funding and distributed it through and with the approval of the CPSG.
- 3.25 All Local Authorities to date have differed in the amount of general fund they devote to Community Safety, but all used the additional ring fenced funds to finance posts.

	BCU	ABG	ABG (cap)	MPA	LAA	DV MARAC c/f	DAAT	Total
Partnership Budget 2010/11 Including £30,000. C/F Allocation	£ 265,000	£ 342,000	£ 56,000	£ 50,000	£ 71,000	£ 30,000	£ 50,000	£ 864,000
	2010/11					Allocation		834,00

3.26 Please note there was in financial year 2010/11 a carry-over of £30,000. In the light of better planning and in year cuts in funding there will be no under-spend in the current financial year.

3.27 Appendix one shows how this funding was allocated among the partners.

The 2011 -2012 Picture

3.28 Because of the low level of funding there is not going to be any formal pooling of funding streams as was the practice previously. However, there is constant dialogue between partners and a constant search to use what is available more effectively and garner any additional money.

3.29 This table gives a broad outline as to what is happening in the upcoming financial year.

Fund	2010/11 Allocation	2011/12 Allocation	Notes
Borough Command Unit	£265,000	£72,000	Police posts previously funded via partnership
Area Based Grant Revenue	£342,000 cut in year by £35,000. Leaving £307,000	None, incorporated to Local Government settlement	
Area Based Grant Capital	£56,000.	None, incorporated to Local Government	

		settlement	
Metropolitan Police Authority	£50,000.	None incorporated in core Police funding	
Local Area Agreement	£71,000. In year cut of £71,000.	None	This funded DV provision
Primary Care Trust Drug and Alcohol Team Funding	£50, 000	None	

Outcomes and Changes

- 3.30 Improved partnership working has allowed what funding is available to be used effectively, however, there will have to be a renewed focus on risk, ensuring that work is centred around vulnerable individuals and groups in the community.
- 3.31 Five posts have been lost from the Community Safety Partnership Unit, compensated for in part by bringing in the two housing crime officers transferring to the unit and the additional Police officer in the ASB unit.
- 3.32 We are also proposing to radically change how we deliver community safety subject to CPSG approval. This will focus work in the communities.
- 3.33 We are moving towards generic job descriptions this will allow resources to follow problems, and work to be planned.
- 3.34 The structure of CPSG has been reviewed and streamlined with six meetings being removed. Data collection has been reviewed so that we only at really gather and analyse information that informs the work..
- 3.35 Developing the Voluntary Sector is also vital as working with them we can access additional funds. One team member is going to spend considerably more time working in this area.
- 3.36 We are also looking to offer to undertake bespoke work for RSLs bringing in additional funds to increase staff numbers.
- 3.37 Staff are currently being consulted on the new structure.

- 3.38 Currently, we are confident that we can deliver a viable service to the residents in Brent. However, inevitably some of work residents valued will be cut for example partnership days have been reduced. We are looking to the Voluntary Sector to work with us to fund events such as “Mrs Kelly’s” where older or vulnerable people (those with learning disabilities and/or mental health needs) see a play and do drama work to gain or remind them of the skills needed to not let in bogus callers.

4.0 Financial Implications

- 4.1 None

5.0 Legal Implications

- 5.1 None

6.0 Diversity Implications

- 6.1 None

7.0 Staffing/Accommodation Implications (if appropriate)

- 7.1 None

Background Papers

Contact Officers

Genny Renard, Head of Integrated Community Safety & Development
Genny.renard@brent.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

			BCU	ABG	ABG (cap)	MPA	LAA	DV MARAC c/f	DAAT	Original Total	Post ABG cut
			£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	
			265,000	342,000	56,000	50,000	71,000	30,000	50,000	864,000	
Project/Post		Allocation								£	
1	Gun, Gangs and Knife Coordinator	Post	£ 54,406	£ 29,406		£ 25,000				£ 54,406	
Revised allocation following in year ABG cut											25,000
2	NAD projects	Project	£ 10,000	£ 10,000						£ 10,000	10,000
3	CS project officer	Post	£ 46,910	£ 46,910						£ 46,910	46,910
4	DV advocacy / SDVC coordination	Contract	£ 197,923			£ 25,000	£ 71,000		£ 26,923	£ 197,923	
Revised allocation following in year ABG cut											126,923
5	MARAC coordinator	Post	£ 30,924	£ 924				£ 30,000		£ 30,924	30,924
6	ASB casework support	Post	£ 40,636	£ 40,636						£ 40,636	40,636
7	CPSG Part funding	Project	£ 62,362	£ 62,362						£ 62,362	
Funds re allocated to cover some of ABG cut 30K to JAG + 25K GGK Post											2,956
8	CPSG support	Post	£ 32,910	£ 14,000						£ 32,910	
Revised allocation following in year ABG cut											18,910
9	YOS	TBC	£ 79,000	£ 79,000						£ 79,000	79,000
10		Post	£	£						£	30,000

	Probation offenders		30,000	30,000	30,000	
			£	£	£	
11	PPO support	Post	33,500	33,500	33,500	33,500
		Part	£	£	£	
12	Analytical functions	Post	13,000	13,000	13,000	13,000
			£	£	£	
13	Kickz Project	Project	27,500	27,500	27,500	27,500



Partnership and Place Committee 24th February 2011

Report from the Director of Strategy, Partnership and Improvement

For Information

Wards Affected:
ALL

Report Title: 'Partners for Brent' Highlights 2010/11

Forward Plan Ref:

1.0 Summary

1.1 This report sets out the highlights from partnership projects in 2010/11.

2.0 Recommendations

2.1 The committee is asked to note the report.

3.0 Summary

3.1 Brent Council has a strong history of effective partnership working to ensure the best outcomes for residents in the borough. This year saw enhanced governance arrangements for our partnership groups, the launch of the Community Plan – 'Brent – Our Future' setting out the priorities for the years ahead and improved outcomes for residents as a result of the joint work undertaken during the year.

4.0 Introduction

4.1 'Partners for Brent' is a set of partnership groups delivering projects to achieve outcomes set out in our Community Plan: 'Brent- Our Future 2010 -2014.' Some of the groups focused on engaging a wide set of public, private and voluntary sector representatives with new strategies and key issues affecting the borough. Others are responsible for using this feedback to inform the delivery of partnership projects they have been tasked with.

4.2 This year has seen changes in political leadership both locally and nationally, the announcement of unprecedented cuts to the public sector and vast waves of central government policy announcements. The sheer pace and scale of change in public and voluntary sector organisations as a result of CSR is challenging, particularly with the shifts in the structure and responsibilities of some public services. Partners are

aware that this context cannot fail to impact on our relationships and some of our partnership projects.

- 4.3 This paper highlights some of the partnership achievements in 2010/11, many of which have been funded by grants which were removed by central government during 2010/11 or are due to cease from 2011/12. This changing financial context will impact partnership projects in future. Partners will need to make better use of existing resources and have a more detailed understanding of the impact of changes each organisation makes, on the other organisations in the borough and ultimately the overall provision of services to residents.

5.0 Changes to partnership working

- 5.1 Brent has changed its approach to partnership separating the engagement with strategic issues from the delivery of projects to improve outcomes for residents as a result of this insight. The new structure for the partnership has allowed us to consolidate our partnership working and prioritise what works based on what we have learnt in the past.
- 5.2 This year saw work on a 'total place' project (an approach which seeks to identify and avoid overlap and duplication between organisations – delivering a step change in both service improvement and efficiency at the local level, as well as across Whitehall). Partners for Brent made an initial assessment of spend related to joint priorities by some of the key partners in the borough. The next steps, drawing on this initial work are now being considered in light of the public sector cuts and the shift in central government focus to community based budgets (an approach which seeks to reconsider the way in which the total public sector spend is allocated to deliver joint priorities locally).
- 5.3 We have enhanced engagement between sectors, the local community and local politicians through events like the 'One Community, Many Voices' event which drew together partners, elected politicians and members of the public to inform Overview and Scrutiny of partnership projects. Our Employer Partnership breakfast meetings with the business sector and the approach to engaging a range of interested parties at the Sustainability Forum also illustrate this improvement.

6.0 Achievements this year

- 6.1 We have produced high quality analysis of the state of the borough drawing on a range of statistics to enhance the evidence base for our partnership strategies. The local economic assessment, children and young people's assessment and latest update to the main borough profile are examples of the work carried out this year. Based on our evidence base and feedback from each of our organisations and residents and we have developed and agreed the strategic direction for the borough. The Leader set out our joint priorities when launching 'Brent – Our Future,' our Community Plan. This year also saw the launch of two other strategies – the Cultural Strategy and the Climate Change Strategy, with the Regeneration Strategy due to be launched soon.
- 6.2 Regenerating the borough
Work is now underway on the construction of the Civic Centre and the council has worked closely with the contractor to identify and support local businesses through the employer partnership to access supply chain opportunities. In South Kilburn planning permission had been secured for 500 homes in South Kilburn with a further 200 currently submitted to planning and we are delivering a programme of public art initiatives. We have also continued to deliver the Language2Work programme and

completed delivery of the Personal Best programme, preparing some of our unemployed residents for 2012 volunteering opportunities. Brent is on track to achieve or beat the target for the number of affordable and net additional homes in borough; having also reduced the number of households living in temporary accommodation

6.3 Reducing crime

We informed and reassured residents through partnership days; raising the confidence level in Brent to well above the London average (38% to 68%). Satisfaction with the way the police and council deal with antisocial behaviour in the borough was at 94% this quarter. We have reduced the number of accidental and deliberate fires in residential properties in the borough. We are on track to see improvement in the number of first time entrants into the youth justice system and have ensured improved numbers of drug users in effective treatment. We also developed a Somali Women's Collective to tackle youth, ASB and DV issues in Chalk Hill.

6.4 Health inequalities and social care

Health and social care partners developed and implemented integrated models of care for children and adults. We have carefully considered and responded to changes required in the Health White Paper as preparations begin for a shift to a GP commissioning model and public health based in the local authority. We launched the anti-obesity, physical activity and tobacco control strategies this year; improved the completion levels of treatment for TB in the borough and were successful in increasing the numbers of children participating in sport.

6.5 Supporting children and families

Brent was one of top performing boroughs in the country for reducing the number of young people not in education, employment and training. Nineteen-year-olds are increasingly better qualified and we have done particularly well in supporting learning and achievement. We are rated as offering 'good' looked after children, fostering and adoption services. The achievement of children and young people from low income families and those with special educational needs has improved. Also the numbers of young women under the age of 18 who become pregnant have reduced faster than in similar authorities and nationally. Overall we have been developing integrated models of care and have agreed new governance arrangements for future partnership working aligning the work of the Children's Partnership with Brent Local Children's Safeguarding Board.

6.6 Sustainability

The Sustainability Forum members created a community 'Sustainable Brent' website as a place for information sharing for residents, community groups and businesses. This year we put in place the structures to enable us to reach level 3 in the implementation of our plans to adapt to climate change by March 2011.

6.7 Culture

Following the launch of the Cultural Strategy, the forum developed a new map of key cultural venues in the borough and was successful in obtaining funding to develop a website to support us all in selling what Brent has to offer.

7.0 Conclusion

- 7.1 This report highlights just some of the achievements this year. At the Partners for Brent conference, partners articulated some of the impacts of recent national changes and the extent of the challenges ahead. So far in planning for 2011/12 partners have agreed to thematic partnership projects to deliver the community plan, establishing more formal partnership principles, developing an intelligence hub, assessing ways to align customer service, making intelligent use of staff and looking at options for sharing assets and procuring together.

8.0 Financial Implications

- 8.1 None arising from this report

9.0 Legal Implications

- 9.1 None arising from this report

10.0 Diversity Implications

- 10.1 The agreed joint priorities for partners are set out in 'Brent Our Future', our community plan, which has been developed with a commitment to reducing poverty, redressing inequality and preventing exclusion being at the heart of all our actions.

Background Papers

Brent – Our Future 2010 - 2014
Partnership working in Brent

Contact Officers

Joanna McCormick, Partnerships Coordinator

Phil Newby, Director of Strategy Partnerships and Improvement