

## *Research Report 31*

Joining up for Safer Neighbourhoods:  
A Theme Report from the Neighbourhood Management  
Pathfinder Programme National Evaluation



## *Research Report 31*

Joining up for Safer Neighbourhoods:  
A Theme Report from the Neighbourhood Management  
Pathfinder Programme National Evaluation



This report has been produced by SQW as part of a contract placed by DCLG. Any views or proposed policies expressed in it are not necessarily those of DCLG.

The National Evaluation of the Pathfinder Programme is being undertaken by a consortium of organisations, led by SQW Ltd:

- **SQW Ltd**
- GFA Consulting
- European Institute for Urban Affairs, Liverpool John Moores University
- Cities Research Centre, University of West of England, Bristol
- Cambridge Economic Associates
- Local Government Centre, Warwick Business School, Warwick University
- MORI
- NOP

On 5th May 2006 the responsibilities of the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) transferred to the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG)

Department for Communities and Local Government  
Eland House  
Bressenden Place  
London  
SW1E 5DU  
Telephone: 020 7944 4400  
Website: [www.communities.gov.uk](http://www.communities.gov.uk)

© Crown Copyright, 2006

*Copyright in the typographical arrangement rests with the Crown.*

*This publication, excluding logos, may be reproduced free of charge in any format or medium for research, private study or for internal circulation within an organisation. This is subject to it being reproduced accurately and not used in a misleading context. The material must be acknowledged as Crown copyright and the title of the publication specified.*

Any other use of the contents of this publication would require a copyright licence. Please apply for a Click-Use Licence for core material at [www.opsi.gov.uk/click-use/system/online/pLogin.asp](http://www.opsi.gov.uk/click-use/system/online/pLogin.asp), or by writing to the Office of Public Sector Information, Information Policy Team, St Clements House, 2-16 Colegate, Norwich, NR3 1BQ.  
Fax: 01603 723000 or email: [HMSOlicensing@cabinet-office.x.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:HMSOlicensing@cabinet-office.x.gsi.gov.uk)

If you require this publication in an alternative format please email [alternativeformats@communities.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:alternativeformats@communities.gsi.gov.uk)

DCLG Publications  
PO Box 236  
Wetherby  
West Yorkshire  
LS23 7NB  
Tel: 08701 226 236  
Fax: 08701 226 237  
Textphone: 08701 207 405  
Email: [communities@twoten.com](mailto:communities@twoten.com)  
or online via the DCLG website: [www.communities.gov.uk](http://www.communities.gov.uk)

August 2006

Product Code: 06SEV04108

# Contents

	<b>Page</b>
1 Introduction	5
2 Policy briefing	6
3 Neighbourhood management activities	9
4 Multi-agency and joint working	11
5 Improving neighbourhood safety in Pathfinder areas	15
6 Lessons	18
<b>Annex 1:</b>	
<b>Case Study 1:</b> Multi-agency approach to anti social behaviour: Greater Hollington, Hastings	20
<b>Annex 2:</b>	
<b>Case Study 2:</b> Joined-up for safer neighbourhoods: Heart of Burton, Burton	35
<b>Annex 3:</b>	
<b>Case Study 3:</b> Community Safety Resource Centre: Hattersley, Tameside	45

# 1. Introduction

The aim of this report is to explore how Neighbourhood Management Pathfinders have added value to the process of promoting safer neighbourhoods through preventing crime, solving crimes, reducing the fear of crime and tackling anti-social behaviour in their neighbourhoods. In particular, it will consider the degree to which Pathfinders have been able to promote better local service performance through securing more joined up services between the Police and other agencies. The objective is to draw out any lessons that may help us to improve our understanding of how neighbourhood management might work, and how it could be undertaken more effectively.

This report draws on research in all 35 Pathfinders (summarised in the 2005 Annual Review)<sup>1</sup> and the findings of three case studies conducted in late 2005. The full case studies are presented in the annex to this report. The research involved reviews of documents, and a series of interviews with a variety of people involved in the Pathfinders.

We would like to thank the participating Pathfinders for their co-operation in helping us to undertake this work, and would like to thank the authors of each case study:

- **Case Study 1 – Multi-Agency Approach to Anti-Social Behaviour;** Greater Hollington; Hastings; targeted primarily on tackling anti-social behaviour but also provided a focus for all community safety activities designed to reduce crime and the fear of crime. *(Prepared by Elizabeth Dean, GFA Consulting)*
- **Case Study 2 – Joined-Up for Safer Neighbourhoods;** Heart of Burton; East Staffordshire; targeted on reducing crime and fear of crime and improving community safety particularly in relation to the incidence of fire. *(Prepared by Dr. Peter Tyler, of CEA Ltd)*
- **Case Study 3 – Community Safety Resource Centre;** Hattersley; Tameside; targeted on providing a community safety ‘one-stop-shop’ giving residents access to a range of services and providing them with a signposting facility and venue on community safety issues. *(Prepared by Richard Meegan, of EIUA)*

Note that further research and data collation on the impact of neighbourhood management upon community safety is presently underway, and is due to be published later in the year.

<sup>1</sup> ODPM (2006) *Research Report 23 Neighbourhood Management at the Turning Point? Programme Review 2005-06*, London, ODPM.

## 2. Policy briefing<sup>2</sup>

The Crime and Disorder Act 1998 (as amended by the Police Reform Act 2002) requires public services to work with other local organisations through statutory Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRPs). Public services are required under the Act either to take a leading role (responsible authorities) or to provide support (cooperating bodies) for the 351 English CDRPs in pursuit of the government's aim to address problems not previously classified as crime but which adversely affect people's quality of life. The CDRPs operate at the spatial level of the Local Authority District although these are not always coterminous with Police Basic Command Units (BCUs)<sup>3</sup>.

The responsible authorities are required to work together to identify how crime, anti-social behaviour, substance misuse and fear of crime affect the local district and to use this information to develop a community safety strategy. The process of strategy development must take account of the views of the cooperating bodies and encourage participation from the public and local, private, voluntary and community organisations.

Neighbourhood level policing trials were initiated in 2003 through the National Reassurance Policing Programme (NRPP). This was then rolled out in support of the government's commitment to ensure a neighbourhood policing team in every community by April 2008. The approach is based on dedicated police teams working in neighbourhoods, community participation and more spatially focused information provision and analysis through the police National Intelligence Model (NIM).

In view of the considerable changes that have taken place in the partnership landscape over the last five years, reviews were recently carried out of the likely effect on the operation of the CDRPs and of the progress being made in neighbourhood policing. The most notable of these changes have been the introduction of Local Area Agreements – LAAs, the changed CPA corporate assessment framework for Local Authorities with regard to safer and stronger communities and a range of neighbourhood initiatives.

The **CDRP review** offered the following conclusions:

- **Structure:** There should be a separation of the strategic and operational functions with the former resting at the Local Strategic Partnership level.
- **Delivery:** NIM principles and practice should be adapted to a partnership setting; strategic intelligence assessments should be carried out on a six monthly basis and inform the annual rolling three year community safety plans; and partnerships should have more effective information sharing protocols.

<sup>2</sup> This policy briefing draws heavily on the Audit Commission report, *Neighbourhood crime and anti-social behaviour, Community Safety National Report, May 2006* and on the Home Office, *Neighbourhood Policing: Progress Report, May 2006* and *Review of the partnership provisions of the Crime & Disorder Act 1998 – Report of findings, January 2006*.

<sup>3</sup> The government is seeking powers through provisions in the Police and Justice Bill to reorganise boundaries to make them coterminous.

- **Governance and accountability:** The NIM framework should be used to provide regular opportunities for local people to raise concerns and provide community intelligence; CDRPs should be required to provide annual reports to their communities (rather than to the Home Secretary); the powers of the local authority overview and scrutiny committees should be extended to cover the work of the CDRPs; and the ward councillors should play a key role in triggering action where community safety issues are felt by the community to have been inadequately addressed.
- **Mainstreaming and national standards:** The provisions of the Act should be broadened in terms of the requirements on agencies to take account of anti social behaviour, substance misuse and behaviour adversely affecting the environment and the range of agencies to which this requirement applies. Mandatory national standards should be established that set out what is expected of the partnerships and individual partners (without being prescriptive as to how they are to be met).

The **neighbourhood policing progress report** provided the following observations on the progress so far achieved through the initiative:

- The neighbourhood police teams comprise uniformed police officers, PCSOs, special constables, neighbourhood wardens and other “authority” figures (e.g. security guards, environmental officers, housing association employees).
- The scope of the neighbourhood area needs to be decided by local communities, police forces, police authorities and partners – but typically would expect to cover one or two local authority wards.
- Its key principles are the provision of visible and accessible policing, influence by local communities over their safety priorities, interventions jointly designed and/or delivered with partners and communities, and sustainable solutions relevant to local people.
- There are now 6,000 neighbourhoods that have dedicated neighbourhood policing with over 50% of BCUs covered. PCSO numbers have increased from a standing start in 2002 to 6,300 now and planned to reach 16,000 in 2007.
- The results from the 16 ward level sites of the NRPP have now been evaluated and show that crime fell by nearly a quarter in the pilot areas – almost twice the fall in wards without neighbourhood policing and that the public’s confidence in the police increased by a third – five times more than in the control areas.

These conclusions are supported by the 2006 **Audit Commission** report on CDRPs which makes clear that, for a majority of people, it is their daily experience of anti-social behaviour in their streets and neighbourhoods – as much if not more so than crime rates per se – that fuel their fears and perceptions of personal and community safety. It recommends a way forward based on:

- Knowing and understanding the wards and neighbourhoods and their safety issues
- Finding out what concerns local people

- Analysing the local problems – for which the Audit Commission provides a guide for compiling neighbourhood profiles
- Taking action – on the basis of shared information and allocation of roles and responsibilities, applauding success and learning from experience
- Reassuring local people through feedback and reporting processes that are fit for purpose and engage front-line workers and the communities they serve.



Finally, attention should be drawn to recently published findings from a literature review on community engagement in policing<sup>4</sup> and to the Home Office/APA Community Engagement in Policing web-site which, amongst other things, provides a good practice guide<sup>5</sup>. The broad conclusions of the literature review were that there was evidence to support the theoretical benefits of community engagement in policing. However, much of the evidence (mainly from the US) suggests that “all major evaluations of community policing in the US have recognised some degree of implementation failure. The ability of police agencies to implement effective, sustained engagement at an organisational level remains unproven”.

4 Andy Myhill for the Home Office, *Community Engagement in Policing; Lessons from the Literature*, February 2006 – [http://police.homeoffice.gov.uk/news-and-publications/publication/community-policing/Community\\_engagement\\_lit\\_rev.pdf?view=Binary](http://police.homeoffice.gov.uk/news-and-publications/publication/community-policing/Community_engagement_lit_rev.pdf?view=Binary)

5 Home Office and Association of Police Authorities, *Community Engagement in Policing Web-site* – <http://www.communityengagement.police.uk/> – and the *Guide to Community Engagement* – <http://www.communityengagement.police.uk/workspace/guide/index.htm>

### 3. Neighbourhood management activities

Tackling crime, the fear of crime and anti-social behaviour has been by far the largest area of intervention for both rounds of Pathfinders. It was cited as one of the main concerns of local residents in the household surveys in most Pathfinder areas, and most have crime rates significantly above that of their local authority areas<sup>6</sup>.



<sup>6</sup> Neighbourhood Management Pathfinder Programme Baseline Report, Social Disadvantage Research Centre, 2005 and Pathfinder Household Surveys, NOP/MORI, 2003 & 2004.

As Figures 1 and 2 demonstrate, there was a very similar pattern in the responses to the household surveys between the Pathfinders Rounds 1 and 2 with regard to community safety issues. The latter were clearly high on the agenda of identified problems and higher on all aspects (bar one) than the households in the comparator areas. But, in both cases, the apparent concern with community safety issues was not matched by equivalently lower satisfaction levels with police services in the Pathfinder areas. However, all those reporting satisfaction with these services only represented about half those surveyed. This might suggest that, whilst satisfaction levels with the police needed to be increased, the solution to the community safety problems were not necessarily seen in the Pathfinder areas as exclusively within the policing domain.

All Pathfinders have worked closely with the Police and in most areas they have been one of the most involved service providers. But, perhaps reflective of the above point, the Pathfinders have sought to tackle the issues by also working with other community safety organisations such as neighbourhood and street warden teams, youth services, Drug Action Teams and community safety partnerships and also local housing and environmental service departments in relation to environmental crime.

The Pathfinders have been designing and delivering their interventions in this area over the same period as the CRDP and the neighbourhood policing initiatives were being implemented by the Police and the Home Office and their partners. It should not, therefore, come as a surprise that the approaches resonate one with the other.

The most common types of changes to community safety and policing services that have been sought by the Pathfinders have been:

- Increasing the level of beat policing
- Provision of a new local base for policing within the neighbourhood and stronger links with the local community
- Improved joint working between the Police and other agencies to deal more effectively with a range of community safety problems
- Specific innovations to test out improved targeting of resources and activities

In this report we will focus on the initiatives prompted by the Pathfinders that have involved joint working between the Police and other agencies.

## 4. Multi-agency and joint working

Most of the initiatives prompted and/or facilitated by the Pathfinders to increase community safety and reduce crime rates and the fear of crime have involved some degree of joint working between the Police and other agencies. In some cases this has been relatively modest and reflects an extension of the policing “family” to include neighbourhood wardens and other safety officers. However, in other cases, the joint working has been both more holistic and intensive in terms of the nature of the engagement of other service providers (e.g. youth, environmental, fire and housing services).

Whilst the need to take a holistic approach to securing community safety has been acknowledged in the CDRP, neighbourhood policing and some Pathfinder initiatives, it is quite another matter to translate this into agreed, joined-up priorities and operations. This requires a champion to initiate, support and sustain partnerships between the relevant agencies. Where joined up approaches have been adopted in Pathfinder neighbourhoods, the Pathfinders have usually played an important role in prompting and facilitating them.

This championing role was played by the NM Partnerships in two of the case studies and by the Greater Manchester Police in the case of Hattersley. Even though the champions were working with the grain of national and local policy agendas (e.g. neighbourhood policing, fire and rescue services’ community safety work, and Home Office community warden pilots), they were still necessary to create the conditions for multi-agency working and to galvanise action at senior levels amongst the providers to bring about the step-change required in crime and community safety.

The following are the main issues that the Pathfinders and their partners have had to contend with and tackle if joint working arrangements are to be effective and sustainable.

### Analysis-learning-action

The evidence from the Pathfinder experience is that, for effective joint working between agencies, it was necessary – but not easy – to reach an agreed understanding amongst service providers of the crime and safety problems that faced the neighbourhood (and their causes) and to articulate a coherent pattern of intervention based on good practice at the outset. This required a holistic approach that acknowledged the contribution that factors other than policing could make to levels of crime and anti-social behaviour – even if, as pointed out in the Heart of Burton case study, *“the pathways are not fully understood”*.

The potential contribution of public realm improvements and more effective housing management to increased community safety was recognised explicitly in two of the case studies and all three emphasised the need to build community trust and networks through, for example, neighbourhood wardens and community safety workers. The broader scope of the initiatives (as compared with conventional policing methods) meant that careful attention had to be given to establishing a baseline across a range of factors, monitoring outputs and evaluating outcomes in order to learn from experience about what works and sharing the information with relevant partners. Each of the three case studies placed great store on this learning process.

## Formal structures and procedures

The three case studies represent different degrees of formality in the mechanisms for delivering joined-up thinking and working. Coherence of approach and focus was provided in the Heart of Burton case study by bringing together the statutory providers through the action of the NM Pathfinder working closely with the Community Safety Partnership in the area. Moreover, a Service Level Agreement (SLA) was agreed between the Police, Neighbourhood Wardens and the Partnership which has since developed into an SLA for a Safer, Cleaner, Greener Heart of Burton incorporating the Police, the fire and rescue service, environmental health and street cleansing service, and the highways and housing authorities.

The approach in Greater Hollington was formalised through the establishment of a Multi-Agency Team (MAT) which provided a structure within which agencies agreed and set objectives and performance targets, shared information and agreed actions, and disseminated good practice. The agencies included the Police, housing, youth and family support services. Formalisation of structure was taken a step further in Hattersley where joint working was delivered through the Community Safety Resource Centre – a “bricks and mortar” facility in the neighbourhood from which residents were provided with access to police and community safety services, town patrollers and road safety services and fire and rescue services.

Regardless of the nature of the formal structures, each case study – and other examples from the Pathfinders – featured the use of formal protocols or service level agreements between some of the agencies involved in the delivery of the services.

- In Heart of Burton, the neighbourhood wardens have information/intelligence sharing protocol agreements with the police. Service level agreements are in place committing the police to mainstreaming multi-agency working on demonstration of evidence of success and subject to funding being available.
- The Greater Hollington Partnership sets targets for and monitors the performance of those MAT agencies that delivers its ‘leverage interventions’. The police team in the area is line-managed by Sussex Police but it formally reports to the NM Partnership’s Intervention Management Group that sets targets and priorities and monitors its performance.
- The Hattersley case study report concluded that *“the process of preparing service level agreements – or variants of them – is important for understanding the constraints operating on individual service providers, and for better clarifying the concept being developed”*.
- Community tasking – now described as neighbourhood management groups – was introduced in West Dewsbury in response to specific “hot spots” where the input of other agencies was required to develop a coordinated approach to problem solving. The partners involved as well as the Police are community wardens, housing and environmental services and tenants associations.
- The MAP Group in Blacon is a group of professionals that meets every 2/3 weeks to share information, identify problems and devise solutions in cooperation. The group membership works according to agreed protocols on information sharing and involves community wardens and the housing trust as well as the Police.

- A neighbourhood policing agreement is in place in Manton and operates through a multi-agency process that involves the Police, the ASB Unit, housing providers, residents and voluntary organisations.
- A policing coordinator has been established in Woolwich Common whose role is to improve the flow of information each day between different sections of the Police, other local service providers and residents. The coordinator is located in the safer neighbourhood team in the community shop and has access to the police crime database.

## Engagement of service providers

Only one case study report (Greater Hollington) made explicit reference to the general difficulties associated with engaging service providers – their initial apprehensions about sharing information and the pressure they felt to meet their specific targets. However, it can be inferred from the other case study reports that they may have had to work hard to address similar problems. For example, the Heart of Burton team emphasised the need for *“negotiation, participation, meaningful partnership working, compromise, monitoring and review and ensuring that there is transparency throughout”*. One of the conclusions of the Hattersley case study report was that *“the commitment of key service providers to the principles of neighbourhood management needs to be secured and sustained”*.

The Greater Hollington case study report was also the only one that mentioned the failure to engage a specific provider as being a factor that hindered progress. But, it can also be inferred from the other case study reports that there were categories of providers that had not been engaged – whether by design or not.

As will be evident from earlier observations about the formal structures and procedures that have been put operated in some Pathfinders, it seems clear that the following services were typically included in the joined-up thinking and working initiatives – the police, public realm and environmental services, youth and family support services, fire and rescue services, community development and housing/RSL services. On the other hand, education, health and social service providers are rarely mentioned as being engaged in any joined up approach to community safety.

This suggests that the scope of the joined-up safer neighbourhood initiatives represented by the Pathfinders have been constrained to the range of services most likely to be directly involved in improving community safety and reducing crime rates and the fear of crime. This is not a point of criticism – it makes sense to develop and test innovative approaches by engaging those agencies most directly involved before considering whether the net should be widened. However, it is not clear why other agencies within the criminal justice system do not appear to have been engaged in multi-agency working – e.g. probation services, magistrates courts and prison services.

## Engagement of communities

The multi-agency and joint working approaches that have been described have not necessarily involved engagement of neighbourhood residents and the communities in which they are located. But, such joint working clearly presents an opportunity to share the costs and benefits of such engagement.

The following aspects of community engagement featured in the case studies and elsewhere in the experience of the Pathfinders:

- A variety of mechanisms were in place to engage residents in the identification of priorities for crime and community safety initiatives, to provide them with better awareness of and access to services and to provide feedback on service quality. For example, the primary source of evidence used by the Greater Hollington Partnership for shaping its community safety priorities is the annual community consultation with residents which is also used to monitor progress.
- The building of community trust and networks through a ‘non-police’ presence on the ground also featured in each of the case studies. The Hattersley initiative brought together community safety activity with neighbourhood policing; the wardens were central to the Heart of Burton Partnership approach providing strong links between the community and service providers; and in Greater Hollington the dedicated neighbourhood police team comprised neighbourhood constables and police community safety officers and was complemented by a team of community wardens. These, and other Pathfinder examples, demonstrate that “policing” problems can be addressed and directed by the Police but with others delivering the services in ways which enhance community trust and engagement.
- Specific reference was made in both the Heart of Burton and Greater Hollington case studies to the importance that was attached to the engagement of young people in the design of initiatives to provide them with support and diversionary activities. This was also emphasised in Basildon where the youth club established by the PCSO is regularly attended by 60+ young people some of whom have now become involved in the Youth Council and other Partnership activities. Similarly, in Kendray the Youth Inclusion Project has facilitated the engagement of young people as well as youth services to address problems of anti-social behaviour.

The extent and nature of resident and community engagement is not as pronounced as might have been expected. It does not feature as prominently in the case studies or elsewhere amongst the Pathfinders as does consideration of the opportunities and benefits from joint working between service providers. Moreover, when it does feature, the kind of engagement seems to be of a relatively passive kind – e.g. through surveys, consultations and “surgeries”. There does not appear to be much emphasis on more participative and deliberative forms of engagement – e.g. in determining community safety priorities and solutions (although the youth projects in a number of Pathfinder areas may be an exception to this general observation).

## 5. Improving neighbourhood safety in Pathfinder areas

The Pathfinder Programme Review<sup>7</sup> reported some headline indicators to show whether crime rates declined in the Pathfinder areas and whether they did so to a greater extent than in the local authority in which they were located. The complexities and difficulties of drawing conclusions about trends and attributing changes to Pathfinder interventions are rehearsed in the review and no further evidence has since become available from secondary data sources that could throw more light on this question. Clearly, it would be even more difficult to draw out any conclusions on the extent to which the kind of multi-agency and joint working considered in this thematic report may have contributed to reduced crime relative to other initiatives by the Pathfinders (e.g. in encouraging greater allocation of policing resources to their neighbourhoods). It is clear though from the case studies that community safety has been improved in several respects in these areas – e.g. in the Heart of Burton, the fear of crime was reduced after wardens were introduced.



So, the evidence on outcomes reported here is confined to all Pathfinders and draws on available secondary data and the household survey results whilst acknowledging that this is an issue that will have to be revisited later in the evaluation. However, on the face of it, the evidence is encouraging:

- There were 11 Round 1 Pathfinders (out of the 16 that provided crime data) that were able to report an absolute reduction in crime rates<sup>8</sup> over 2001/02 – 2004/05;
- Seven Pathfinders reported a reduction in crime or a static picture and a narrowing of the gap with the relevant local authority; three reported declining crime but not relative to their local authority; and three retained the same relative position whether crime was rising or falling;
- Across all Round 1 Pathfinders, the household surveys revealed a reduction in the proportion of households claiming various crime related aspects of the neighbourhood as a problem with the area that was greater than reported for the comparator area(s) – see Figure 3;
- There was also a greater increase than in the comparator area(s) in the proportion of those seeing these aspects as problems who were satisfied with the way they were being tackled – see Figure 4; and
- The increase in satisfaction with police services was higher than for any other service except street cleaning – see Figure 5.

<sup>7</sup> ODPM (2006) *Research Report 23 Neighbourhood Management at the Turning Point? Programme Review 2005-06*, London, ODPM.


<sup>8</sup> All reported crimes per 1000 population.

The findings from the literature review on community engagement in policing<sup>9</sup> are generally supportive of the above conclusions. They suggest strong positive evidence of engagement effects on feelings of neighbourhood safety and improved police community relations and community perceptions, weaker but still positive evidence on reducing disorder, ASB and, to a lesser extent, crime rates, mixed evidence on police attitudes and behaviour and virtually no evidence as yet on its impact on community capacity building.



<sup>9</sup> Andy Myhill for the Home Office, op cit.

Figure 5: Improved satisfaction with services



## 6. Lessons

The lessons from the Home Office literature review are summarised in the box below. As will be seen, they echo many of the findings from the Neighbourhood Management experience.

### Community engagement in policing – issues to be addressed

- Mainstreaming – community engagement has to be part of core work not confined to specialist teams or one-off programmes
- Organisational commitment and culture change – evidence suggests that the police service is still some way from accepting certain aspects of community engagement
- Performance management – key performance indicators need to reward effective community engagement
- Training and capacity building – both the police and communities need to have clearly defined roles and be given the resources and skills to carry them out
- Resources – these are likely to be needed for training and capacity building and can be generated through reallocation, from partners and/or by greater use of auxiliaries
- Partnership working – the police alone cannot tackle quality of life issues that arise during problem-solving activity in the neighbourhood and with its residents
- Confidence and trust – the police should not under-estimate the effect of previous poor relations especially with minority communities
- Sharing power with communities – engagement is not something to be done ‘to’ communities – they must participate in planning and choosing approaches
- Tailoring and flexibility – decision-making needs to be devolved to neighbourhoods to allow beat officers flexibility in tailoring approaches
- Communication – partnership must involve two-way dialogue and good quality information and feedback – the police must value community input

The key lessons identified from the case studies and the wider Pathfinder experience with respect to the specific issues to be addressed in effective joining up for neighbourhood safety are as follows:

- Get the baseline agreed, track change, work with partners/ residents to identify the real problems, agree potential solutions, recognise what is not working and change tack as appropriate.
- Develop a mutual awareness of different partners’ cultures, responsibilities, constraints and powers in addressing the complexities underlying crime and anti-social behaviour – e.g. through joint training initiatives.
- Ensure that agencies are represented in multi-agency discussions at levels that enable decisions to be made on both strategic and operational matters – requiring senior management commitment and delegation.
- Promote, develop and implement joined-up ways of working with the agreement and support of all levels within the service providers – senior and middle management as well as front-line staff.

- Put in place formal structures and/or systems and procedures that can survive the passage of time, people and funding.
- Share information and performance management data and introduce bespoke monitoring and evaluation as required.
- Use Wardens and other approaches to build local trust, gain intelligence about the problems and ensure that service providers are alerted and respond.
- Engage with the residents and the communities in which they are located in a variety of ways that will appeal to their different interests and capacities and develop decision-making and management systems and procedures that can enable responses to be provided to the identified neighbourhood safety problems and priorities.
- Promote successes and analyse failures – both are useful to build ownership and capacity amongst service providers and residents.

# Annex 1

## Case Study 1

### Multi Agency Approach to Antisocial Behaviour

#### Greater Hollington Neighbourhood Management Pathfinder Hastings Borough Council

##### Summary

- Greater Hollington Partnership has pioneered an innovative multi-agency approach to deal with anti-social behaviour, which is one of the community's priority concerns in the Pathfinder area. All key agencies service providers are represented on its Multi-Agency Team (MAT), which holds regular meetings to share information, identify concerns, allocate ownership of problems and formulate actions
- The MAT initiative represents a more holistic and strategic approach by focusing on preventative as well as conventional enforcement measures for dealing with anti-social behaviour. It is also helping to foster closer, more effective working between partners. Based on its success in Greater Hollington, the MAT concept is now being applied to neighbourhood management elsewhere in Hastings.

## **(1) Aims, Objectives & Rationale**

The Multi Agency Team (MAT) was set up by the Greater Hollington Neighbourhood Management Partnership in 2003 to provide a structure for tackling anti-social behaviour. Prior to this, the police and other agencies met informally to share information and discuss responses to particular incidents. The MAT initiative facilitates a more comprehensive and strategic approach to anti-social behaviour and reflects the Partnership's commitment to fostering closer working between agencies at the neighbourhood level. The main aims of the initiative are to provide a focus for all community safety activities and to reduce the incidence of crime and the fear of crime. MAT's objectives include:

- Agreeing and setting targets, objectives and performance indicators for agencies concerned with community safety;
- Sharing information and co-ordinating actions to reduce anti-social behaviour;
- Responding to community and area safety issues and community consultations;
- Disseminating good practice, good news stories and crime prevention information through available networks and local media;
- Being a focus for consultation on overall Police, Probation, County Council and Borough Council strategies, policies and priorities in relation to community safety in the local area.

The rationale for MAT derives from the community's concern with anti-social behaviour and the perception that young people are the main protagonists. This is evident from the Annual Community Consultations, which consistently show that that residents rate community safety as their main priority (61% in 2004) and identify teenagers on the streets as the main problem in their neighbourhood (59% in 2004). By bringing all the relevant agencies together in a single forum, the MAT focus is not limited to tackling anti-social behaviour through conventional enforcement mechanisms such as Antisocial Behaviour Orders (ASBOs). Rather, a more holistic approach is evident with the inclusion of partner agencies, such, as the Youth Development Service, whose objectives are to discourage anti-social behaviour through support and diversionary programmes.

## **(2) The Neighbourhood**

The Greater Hollington Partnership (GHP) was set up in 2001 to deliver the Greater Hollington Neighbourhood Management Pathfinder (GHMNP), approved under the first round of the National Neighbourhood Management Pathfinder Programme. The Partnership is made up of key agencies including Sussex Police, Hastings Borough Council, the Primary Care Trust, all housing associations, local ward councillors, East Sussex County Council, local schools, voluntary organisations and community associations.

The Partnership is chaired by a local resident and residents form the majority on the Board. The GHP is assisted by a Support Team, based at a highly visible neighbourhood office which also acts as a One-Stop-Shop for residents. The initial focus of the GHP has been to rebuild the confidence of local people in the ability of service providers to meet their needs. At the same time, strong emphasis is being placed on ensuring that local people are at the forefront of prioritising change within their own neighbourhood.

The Pathfinder area is located in the Borough of Hastings in East Sussex and covers two wards, one of which is within the worst 10% nationally for overall deprivation. The total population is approximately 11,300 of which about 4.0% is estimated to be BME. Just under half of all homes in the area are social housing. Greater Hollington is home to three of the four main industrial estates in Hastings and 70% of new jobs in the borough were created on these estates between 2000-2001. Despite the accessibility of these local employment opportunities, unemployment during the period fell by only 15% in Greater Hollington, compared with a fall of 31% in the rest of Hastings. A number of key issues face the Greater Hollington neighbourhood, which have influenced the Partnership's approach to community safety. For example:

- It is within the worst 10% of wards nationally for income, child poverty, education and housing (Index of Multiple Deprivation 2004);
- With 1,700 children under 16, it has the highest number of children in Hastings;
- There is a large number of lone parent households where the head of the household is not in work;
- It has an increasing incidence of violent crime, which reflects the national picture, but decreasing incidences of anti-social behaviour, car crime, criminal damage and burglary from non-dwellings (Senlac Police Division 2004).

### **(3) The Process**

#### **Key Players and Structures – Who?**

##### **Greater Hollington Partnership**

MAT was brokered by GHP's Neighbourhood Manager to provide a focus for community safety and to create the conditions for closer working between service agencies to tackle anti-social behaviour. Although recent police statistics suggest a decrease in anti-social behaviour, the Pathfinder area has traditionally been characterised by a high rate of crime and youth offending. In response to this and to community concerns, the Partnership has pioneered and provided leverage for a number of locally based interventions including a neighbourhood police team, community wardens, a youth inclusion programme and a family support programme. The MAT initiative brings together the agencies involved in delivering these and other local services to create synergy through a coordinated response to anti-social behaviour. GHP continues to play a pivotal role within MAT, acting as the contact point for agency team members and providing the facilities for meetings. The Support Team's Community Safety Programme Manager oversees and monitors the process and the three Area Support Officers ensure that local residents' safety concerns are addressed at meetings.

## **Greater Hollington Neighbourhood Police Team**

A dedicated neighbourhood based police team was the GHP's first leverage intervention to tackle crime and anti-social behaviour and provide reassurance to the community. Although the Police Team is lined-managed by Sussex Police, it reports to the Partnership's Intervention Management Group (IMB), who monitor its performance and help to set targets and priorities. The team of nine includes a Police Sergeant, three Neighbourhood Constables, a Schools Intervention and Liaison Officer and four Police Community Safety Officers (PCSOs). The PCSOs play a key roll in addressing anti-social behaviour by providing visible patrols throughout the area and at targeted hotspots and by working with partner agencies to gather evidence and intelligence. The Police Team take a lead within MAT by chairing meetings, reporting on crime and anti-social behaviour trends and by monitoring actions and outcomes, together with GHP's Community Safety Programme Manager.

## **Community Wardens**

The introduction of a locally based team of Community Wardens, as part of a Home Office pilot, was another early leverage intervention, contracted with Hastings Borough Council. Patrolling the Greater Hollington area, the Wardens' remit has been to engage with local residents and report on and respond to anti-social behaviour and environmental nuisance incidents. More recently, the changing role of Community Wardens in Hastings, together with local performance issues, has resulted in the disbandment of this dedicated Warden Team and a much reduced warden presence, in Greater Hollington, although the Council's Warden Service is still represented at MAT meetings.

## **Registered Social Landlords (RSLs)**

There are five RSLs operating in Greater Hollington all of whom have a vested interest in countering anti-social behaviour. The key RSL, 1066 Housing, which is responsible for 40% of the area's social housing stock, has opened a neighbourhood office in the Greater Hollington area and appointed three Neighbourhood Managers and five Community Housing Officers. This move to neighbourhood management has also seen a sharper focusing on anti-social behaviour through improved housing management practices such as pre-tenancy agreements, estate agreements and acceptable behaviour contracts. All RSLs in Greater Hollington are represented on MAT.

## **Youth Development Service (East Sussex County Council)**

The introduction of a Youth Inclusion Programme has been a more recent GHP leverage initiative and is concerned with providing support and diversionary activities for young people at risk of engaging in anti-social behaviour. This includes a One-to-One mentoring programme, youth clubs, sporting activities and detached youth work. The programme is delivered by a dedicated team of 3 youth workers based at the Hollington Youth Centre. Young people identified as being at risk of anti-social behaviour are referred by MAT agency partners as well as by local schools and the Youth Offending Team. Participating in MAT meetings enables the Youth Team to identify community issues and to exchange information on specific cases.

## Greater Hollington Family Support Team

This GHP levered intervention (provided by a Church-based voluntary organisation) aims to help families who have been identified as being in need of support by RSLs, schools and other agencies or who are self-referred. The programme offers a range of support and social activities (including a lunch club and healthy eating project) and provides opportunities for family members to participate as volunteers. Where appropriate, families are referred on to other agencies. The programme is administered by two workers based in Greater Hollington, both of whom attend the MAT meetings to identify potential families in need of support.

## Safer Hastings Partnership (Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership)

The Anti Social Behaviour Unit of the Safer Hastings Partnership is represented on MAT in its capacity as the key agency responsible for issuing and monitoring Acceptable Behaviour Agreements (ABAs) and Anti-social Behaviour Orders (ASBOS). This requires close working with other MAT members, particularly the Police and 1066 Housing Association, to identify offenders and produce the necessary evidence (including witnesses) with which to progress specific cases of anti-social behaviour.

## Activities – How?

### Formal mechanisms

#### MAT Meetings

At a formal level, MAT's activities are structured around the MAT meetings, which are held at the GHP Partnership Offices every two to three weeks. The main activities include:

- Updating team members on tasks relating to anti-social incidents allotted from previous meetings;
- Identifying new areas for concern;
- Allocating ownership of problems and formulating tasks to tackle them;
- Monitoring the progress of ABAs and ASBOs;
- Disseminating information to all interested parties.

Using this joined-up approach, the Team can tackle anti-social behaviour in a number of ways. For example:

- Identifying 'hot-spot' areas quickly;
- Increasing high visibility patrols of police and wardens where appropriate;
- Reaching and supporting potential witnesses swiftly;
- Collecting information and potential evidence swiftly;

- Monitoring incidents regularly;
- Identifying and addressing family support needs;
- Identifying and addressing youth diversionary needs.

One of the main purposes of MAT is to foster closer working between agencies by breaking down barriers and increasing the awareness of the different contributions made by partners. This is being done through the MAT meetings and, more recently, an away-day with a workshop structured around presentations from different partners on their work and contributions to reducing crime and anti-social behaviour in Greater Hollington.

### **The Greater Hollington Invention Action Group (GHIAG)**

Because of the GHP focus on young people as part of its community safety strategy, a MAT sub-group has been formed to deal specifically with those young people who have been excluded from schools and felt to be at risk of engaging in anti-social behaviour. The GHIAG sub-group is composed of the Police Schools Intervention and Liaison Officer, Inclusive Learning Tutors, Teachers, the Youth Intervention Team and the Partnership's Community Safety Programme Manager. The GHIAG meets on a monthly basis at schools in the Greater Hollington area and its members report back any relevant issues at the MAT meetings.

### **Informal Mechanisms**

MAT meetings provide the formal focus for community safety activities and the opportunity for partner agencies to share information and perspectives on anti-social behaviour. At an informal level, however, the MAT approach has encouraged greater inter-agency working between and amongst partners around specific concerns and interventions. This is outlined in more detail in the next section.

### **Funding/Costs**

There are no direct costs associated with, or budget for, MAT. Each partner agency comes voluntarily to meetings and the administration/monitoring costs are underwritten by the Police and the Pathfinder.

### **Monitoring and Evaluation Process**

MAT has its own monitoring system, undertaken by the Police and GHP's Community Safety Programme Manager. Monitoring reports are produced for each MAT meeting which record specific incidents, the actions taken in response to incidents, updates on the actions, intermediate outcomes, final outcomes and the agencies responsible for progressing these outcomes.

At a higher level, GHP monitors MAT, as one of its priority interventions for dealing with anti-social behaviour. For example, the GHP Delivery Plan sets out targets for the number of MAT meetings (10 per year).

The GHP (on behalf of MAT) also sets targets for, and monitors the performance of, those MAT agencies that deliver its leverage interventions, e.g. the Police and Youth Development Service. Each agency produces quarterly and annual monitoring reports specifying inputs, outputs, outcomes and areas for improvements. Consolidated service outcomes are evaluated through the GHP's Performance Management Framework (PMF).

## Evidence used to shape decisions/priorities and monitor progress

The primary source of evidence used by GHP for shaping its community safety priorities are the Annual Community Consultations with residents, which identify anti-social behaviour as their key concern. The Community Consultations are also used to monitor the progress of this priority, with changes in residents' perception of anti-social behaviour being monitored and evaluated through the PMF.

The criteria for measuring the impact the MAT and other related interventions are specified in the GHP's Delivery Plan and are designed to monitor changes in the number of anti-social behaviour hot spots and the number of ABAs that lead to ASBOs. Other evidence to assess the impact of the MAT strategy is provided by 1066 Housing Association, using its REACT database which records the number of complaints received from tenants and the number of complaints which are resolved both by them and through interagency working. Data provided by 1066 Housing Association on tenant turnover are also used as an indicator of community well being.

Service performance monitoring provides some indication of progress on a quarterly and annual basis, particularly as this relates to the quantity and quality of their outputs. For example, the Neighbourhood Police Team record and report on the number of anti-social incidents they deal with in Greater Hollington. Local crime statistics are also available from Sussex Police's CADDIE database, although these are not currently disaggregated to show trends in anti-social behaviour at Pathfinder level.

## Key Issues

Those factors that have helped the MAT process include:

- The willingness of agencies to engage in the process, despite some early reservations
- Partners with a neighbourhood presence or focus
- Having a dedicated police team
- Being strategic and action driven
- Providing a structure for monitoring actions and outcomes
- The quality of information and intelligence provided by partners

Some of the factors that have hindered MAT's progress are:

- Initial apprehensions by agencies about sharing information

- The pressure on individual agencies to meet their own targets
- Failure adequately to engage Social Services in the process

Greater Hollington Partnership and its Support Team have played a key role in MAT by:

- Championing the concept and enabling it to grow
- Creating a culture for collaborative work
- Providing an essential coordinating role
- Ensuring it has the capacity to continue when the Pathway has ended.

## **(4) Evidence of Results**

### **Impact on mainstream service providers' behaviour in improved services**

The GHP seeks to enhance and improve local service delivery and to foster closer, more holistic working between agencies in order to address community concerns about crime and anti-social behaviour in Greater Hollington. The analysis that follows, takes the view that the Partnership, through the MAT process, has been the main catalyst for influencing change on service providers' behaviour.

#### **Changed Corporate Policies and Practices**

There is strong evidence that being part of a multi-agency structure with a neighbourhood focus has had an influence on service providers' behaviour. Nowhere is this more apparent than in the willingness of Senior Managers of the main service providers in Greater Hollington to give their backing to MAT's principles, endorsing opportunities for inter-agency working and signing up to the GHP Delivery Plan.

This has not always come easily and the Partnership has put much effort into breaking down barriers to promote multi-agency working. For example, Sussex Police were initially sceptical about the efficacy of neighbourhood policing and cross agency working to tackle anti-social behaviour. During the three years since the introduction of neighbourhood policing in Greater Hollington, there has been a marked change in attitude. This is exemplified in the Police now taking a leading role in the MAT process and working closely with other service delivery agencies and the community to tackle anti-social behaviour in Greater Hollington.

As part its move towards neighbourhood management, another MAT partner, 1066 Housing, has adopted a more strategic approach to anti-social behaviour, through the introduction of pre-tenancy agreements, estate agreements and acceptable behaviour contacts and by working with other MAT members, including the Police and Safer Hastings Partnership to ensure greater compliance. 1066 Housing is also taking a more proactive role by developing a REACT system for reporting and monitoring complaints from tenants regarding anti-social behaviour.

The move to a more inclusive multi-agency approach to tackling anti-social behaviour has enabled service providers to take a broader view of the problem and, in particular to see the benefits of closer collaboration with agencies providing support programmes alongside more conventional enforcement mechanisms. More generally, the MAT approach has led to a greater understanding and awareness amongst service providers of each other's role, capacity and contributions. As a result, there is strong endorsement at all levels, for joint working, which is influencing neighbourhood management policies across the Borough (see below).

### **Re-shaping of mainstream services/reallocation of mainstream resources**

It is evident that GHP's approach to multi-agency working has been influential in the decision, by Hastings Borough Council to roll out its neighbourhood management model in four other areas of Hastings. Moreover, Sussex Police are currently discussing localised operations based on the proposed four areas and 1066 Housing Association and other RSLs have also expressed a wish to be involved. The intention is that this model will include multi-agency tasking groups to tackle specific issues or themes such as community safety.

More specifically, it is widely acknowledged that the success of Greater Hollington's multi-agency approach has ensured that community safety will embrace multi-agency working and not be restricted to a neighbourhood policing model. The Police Inspector responsible for Strategic Planning and Performance Management in Hastings believes that the MAT format is 'innovative' and has been a 'useful test bed for joint agency work elsewhere'. In his view, there is now greater recognition that 'policing is not just about the police service and needs to involve other public services and the community to provide a joint response to anti-social behaviour'. He also believes that GHP has demonstrated the importance of involving the community in identifying and resolving problems.

On the basis of its success in Greater Hollington, another MAT partner – The Youth Development Service – is planning to replicate its One-to-One mentoring programme elsewhere in Hastings. This programme, aimed at young people at risk of engaging in anti-social behaviour, was pioneered in partnership with the GHP. Other areas of good practice being applied in Greater Hollington, such as the focus on youth clubs and detached youth work, are also being more widely resourced across the Borough.

Re-allocation of mainstream resources has largely been in the form of matched funding for community safety interventions. For example, Police Sussex match the £100,000 resource input from GHP to cover the cost of enhanced Police presence and £15,000 has been invested by 1066 Housing to provide an improved play area.

### **Joining up of services**

Not surprisingly, it is in the joining up of services that MAT has had the greatest impact. This has been achieved by bringing the different agencies together in a single forum to share information and intelligence, thereby enabling them to formulate joint strategies and activities to address anti-social behaviour. In Greater Hollington this has typically included:

- Monitoring of hot spots by Police Community Safety Officers and Community Wardens;

- Joint visits by the Police and Youth Workers to young people engaged in anti-social behaviour;
- Collaboration between schools, Youth Workers and the Police Schools Intervention and Liaison Officer to engage with children who have been excluded and are at risk of anti-social behaviour;
- Joint visits by the Police, RSL Housing Officers and staff from the Anti-Social Behaviour Unit to tenants in serious breaches of tenancy agreements;
- Joint initiatives to identify witnesses and collect evidence;
- Inter-agency collaboration in the issuing of ABAs;
- Family support work with RSLs to help in sustaining tenancies;
- Joint working in the delivery of discrete projects. For example the YDS is working with more agencies on its One-to-One support programme than on any other programme in the Borough.

Multi-agency working is widely acknowledged to be enabling a faster and more effective response to be taken to anti-social behaviour in Greater Hollington. It is also believed to be giving a stronger message to offenders and the community that anti-social behaviour is being taken seriously.

### **Improved access to increase the take-up of services**

MAT's links with the community are maintained through the GHP's Area Support Workers, who attend the MAT meetings to report on and feed back community safety issues. Residents are also provided with opportunities to raise concerns about anti-social behaviour at regular Area Meetings and at special Anti-Social Behaviour Surgeries, which are run by GHP and the Police. More generally, the GHP is proactive in promoting the take-up of neighbourhood services through such activities such as its 'Fun Days' and through the information provided in its regular Greater Hollington Magazine, Summer Activities Programme and other publications.

Key MAT service providers have also made a keen effort to become more accessible. For example, the Greater Hollington Neighbourhood Police Team is based in premises centrally located in the Pathfinder area and operates an open door policy and direct dial access via a dedicated telephone with answer service. The 1066 Housing Association has opened up a neighbourhood office and taken a more proactive approach by appointing staff to work directly with tenants. Tenants are positively encouraged to report anti-social behaviour, with greater assurance and transparency that their concerns are being addressed. The Youth Intervention Programme also has a local presence, with staff based at the Hollington Youth Centre.

## Capacity for sustainable renewal

### Greater Hollington Partnership

The GHP has made community safety a priority and, through its programme of interventions (including MAT), is committed to having an impact on reducing crime and anti-social behaviour. The inclusion of key delivery partners (e.g. the Police and 1066 Housing Association) and residents on the Board, ensures that this focus is maintained. The Intervention Management Group, reporting to the Board, provides the structure for overseeing and monitoring this area of the Partnership's work. It is also evident, from the most recent Pathfinder Evaluation, that GHP is committed to enhancing the capacity of its Board Members and Support Team to manage and improve service performance.

At an operational level, the Partnership's Support Team provides an essential lead in overseeing the delivery of GHP's community safety interventions. The appointment of an experienced Community Safety Programme Manager (seconded from 1066 Housing Association), is further evidence of GHP's capacity to deliver its community safety strategy. MAT itself provides the key structure for engaging with service providers.

### Links with authority-wide partnerships and structures

In the context of community safety, GHP's main link is with Safer Hastings Partnership (the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership). At a practical level, the link is with the Partnership's Anti-Social Behaviour Unit, whose staff regularly attend MAT meetings and take the lead in issuing ABAs and ASBOs. This requires close working with other MAT members to identify offenders and produce evidence.

Links with the Hastings Borough Council are maintained through its representation on the Board and its role as service provider. The Council also acts as the accountable body for GHP. Links with the Council are expected to strengthen as Area Co-ordination unfolds in Hastings. More specifically, GHP sees its role as supporting the Council and its partners in improving the integration of their services and developing closer relationships with partners and local people. In particular, it aims to assist in rolling out its model of local community planning.

The GHP endeavours to be a core partner of the Local Strategic Partnership and seeks to work with other members of the LSP to co-ordinate plans, priorities and activities, including neighbourhood strategies. It is expected that the Pathfinder will provide a useful model for future community engagement in local neighbourhoods.

### Impact on community involvement in decision-making about services

The Partnership's success in engaging with the community is widely acknowledged and community involvement in decision-making has been one of its key priorities. Residents report on and have the opportunity to influence policy and programme decisions relating to community safety through several consultation mechanisms including:

- The annual community consultation process;

- Regular area group meetings and planning processes;
- Participation on the GHP Board (as the majority group).

### Impact on the neighbourhood

Measuring the impact of interventions on anti-social behaviour is notoriously difficult because of the problems of isolating the different variables at work. For example, to what extent is a fall in the incidence of anti-social behaviour attributable to more policing, more youth intervention activities or closer working between agencies? Conversely, is a rise in the incidence of reported anti-social behaviour the reflection of a greater willingness of residents to report it? Moreover, the lack of any rigorous definition of what constitutes anti-social behaviour creates difficulty in quantifying it. For this reason, assessments of impact tend to be qualitative and rely more on observations than hard data. In the context of community safety, it can be measured in terms of how strongly residents perceive the problem (e.g. their fear of crime and anti-social behaviour) and recording changes in their perceptions over time.

This is the approach used by GHP, along with other measures to record outcomes that can be linked to its community safety strategy. Data from these sources suggest that the Partnership and MAT are having a positive impact on reducing anti-social behaviour and improving morale amongst tenants. For example:

- According to the Greater Hollington Survey, residents concerns about anti-social behaviour (teenagers hanging around on the streets) fell from 63% in 2002 to 58% in 2004;
- As a result of diversionary youth activities during the summer holidays, there has been a reduction in the number of complaints received during these periods;
- 1066 Housing Association reports a reduction in turnover of its properties from 15% to 10% in the last three years and attribute this greater satisfaction amongst its tenants because anti-social behaviour is being tackled more effectively;
- The REACT database used by 1066 HA shows that since June 2003 there have been 45 complaints from tenants about anti-social behaviour of which 35 been resolved, just under half through interagency working;
- During the past 12 months only one ABA has developed into an ASBO.

Anecdotal evidence also suggests that high visibility policing by the PCSOs is helping to overcome the fear of crime and that increased contact between the Police and residents is helping to break down barriers. This in turn is restoring confidence amongst residents who are now more willing to provide information, intelligence and evidence relating to anti-social behaviour.

## (5) Conclusions

### How effective has the MAT approach been in achieving its objectives?

The GHP, by promoting the MAT approach, has provided a clear focus for its community safety activities. Although it is too early to be able to demonstrate a direct link between multi-agency working and a reduction in anti-social behaviour, available evidence suggests that by sharing information and coordinating actions, agencies (individually and collectively) are responding to anti-social behaviour incidents and hotspots faster and more effectively. Results from the most recent 2006 national evaluation household survey also show lower crime in a range of categories, including violent crime and arson. By bringing different agencies to work together, the MAT approach is more strategic and proactive. Above all, MAT and its constituent agencies are demonstrating to the community that its safety concerns are being addressed and, by doing this as a collaborative venture, the message is more powerful. This is also having the effect of raising the profile of participating agencies.

There is no question that the MAT formula is successfully fostering closer working between member agencies and that this is producing synergy by tackling anti-social behaviour in a more comprehensive way. Joined-up thinking and joined-up working are also enabling service providers to develop a greater awareness of each other's roles and contributions and of the complexities underlying anti-social behaviour. The most recent Pathfinder Evaluation has drawn attention to how the various agencies are now more aware of the holistic nature of the problems. For example:

- The connections between poverty, poor service availability and low educational aspirations and a propensity to engage in crime and anti-social behaviour;
- The connection between patterns of truancy and youth crime;
- The role that improved housing management practices, for example acceptable behaviour contracts, can play in preventing or reducing the risk of anti-social behaviour;
- The role that sports activities and after-school recreation programmes can play in achieving the same outcomes.

This greater understanding has enabled agencies to co-operate more closely in developing appropriate and cost-effective responses. In all this, the GMP has played a key role by championing and supporting MAT's development, providing the resources to ensure its continued progress and ensuring that service delivery partners meet their performance targets. The Pathfinder has added value by creating the conditions for effective multi-agency working and making service providers more responsive to residents' safety concerns. The rolling out of this model across Hastings is an explicit testimony to its success.

### Other Key Factors influencing its success

- The support given by senior and line managers to multi-agency working
- A willingness by agencies to share information and intelligence

- Building up trust with the community (particularly the police)
- Having shared ownership of issues and problems
- Being proactive as well as reactive
- Widening the focus to include youth and family support interventions.

## Lessons

Greater Hollington's experience of multi-agency working provides some useful lessons for other neighbourhood-based initiatives concerned with improving service delivery and performance. For this formula to work effectively:

- Partner agencies must be prepared to participate fully and to share information freely
- Agency officers represented on the Team should be given the powers to make decisions at a local level
- It is important that all partners understand each other's culture, responsibilities and powers. This can be aided through joint training initiatives
- The development and implementation of joint ways of working should be done at all levels involving senior and frontline staff
- It is important that inter-agency meetings are focused on action and don't become 'talking shops'
- The emphasis should be on promoting successes and analysing failures – both are useful to build ownership and capacity.
- The benefits of inter-agency working should be promoted at the local level front line staff and the strategic policy benefits should be promoted amongst senior management of all agencies
- To be effective in dealing with anti-social behaviour, improvements must be sustainable and continue to improve the quality of life for local residents.

## Case Study 1: Annex

### Key background documents

The following key documents were used in the preparation of this report

- The Greater Hollington Neighbourhood Management Pathfinder Plan for 2005-06;
- Greater Hollington Partnership Performance Management Report and Improvement Plan, November 2004;
- Greater Hollington Neighbourhood Management Partnership, 2003/2004 Second Year Evaluation Report;
- Monitoring reports for Multi Agency Team Meetings.

# Annex 2

## Case Study 2

### Joined-Up for Safer Neighbourhoods

#### Heart of Burton Neighbourhood Management Pathfinder East Staffordshire

##### Summary

- The Joined-Up for Safer Communities theme in the Heart of Burton has sought to develop an integrated approach to community safety issues by involving a number of local service providers, local residents, schools and business. The Pathfinder has deployed Neighbourhood Beat Officers, Fire Safety Officers and a substantial team of Neighbourhood Wardens to considerable effect. Recent surveys of residents point to substantial reductions in the incidence of burglary from homes, criminal damage, theft and criminal damage to motor vehicles and the level of crime as a whole in the neighbourhood compared to Burton as a whole.
- A lot has been achieved in a short time and the longer-term commitments from mainstream service providers look promising. The emphasis has been on an evidence-based approach. The Heart of Burton team also emphasise negotiation, participation, meaningful partnership working, compromise, monitoring and review and ensuring that there is transparency throughout. It is essential to get the baseline right and track change, work with partners/ residents/ to identify the real problems, agree potential solutions, recognise what is not working and change tack as appropriate. The key to success is to use Wardens and other approaches to build local trust, gain intelligence about the problems and to ensure that this is passed to the mainstream providers. It is also important to recognise that although the pathways are not fully understood there appear to be powerful interfaces between the physical, social and economic factors that contribute to community safety and policy actions have to recognise this.

## **(1) Aims, Objectives & Rationale**

The Neighbourhood Pathfinder in Burton established its priorities by consulting extensively with residents and key service providers and by analysing the results of a Neighbourhood Resident baseline survey that had been conducted in 2001. A survey of housing conditions was also undertaken in 2002 and outreach surveys in 2003/4. The evidence pointed clearly to crime and particularly drug related crime being higher in the Pathfinder area than in surrounding areas and these were the things that residents felt needed to be addressed urgently. (See the NMP Resident Survey (2001/2), Housing Survey (2002/3), Outreach Surveys (2003/4), Participatory Appraisal Surveys (2004) and the Consultation on the Inner Burton Housing and Regeneration Master Plan). Moreover, residents in the area were particularly fearful of crime relating to young people. There were also a number of other safety concerns including fire prevention. A central feature of the Partnership approach has been to see reducing crime, improving community safety and increasing the quality of the physical environment of the area as being inter-related. A further feature is to join-up the activities of the various mainstream players and this has been achieved by cooperation and integration with the activities of the Community Safety Partnership.

The Partnership were convinced that actions that could reduce crime and improve community safety should feature prominently in their work from the beginning and that they should work with the statutory mainstream providers, residents and business in the area to joining-up activity. The rationale for intervention was that there would be both direct and indirect impacts on the area. The direct, and more immediate impacts, would arise from the increased quality of life for the residents and businesses in the area as a result of reduced levels of crime, fear of crime and improved safety, particularly in relation to the incidence of fire. The more indirect impacts would be longer term in that the area would be relatively more attractive as a location for new residents and business.

## **(2) The Neighbourhood**

The Heart of Burton neighbourhood area embraces most of the former Victoria Ward and parts of Eton and Shobnall wards. It is recognised as being one of the most deprived areas in East Staffordshire containing approximately 8500 residents and 3,400 households in an area of 167 hectares. It is an ethnically mixed community with nearly 17% identified as BME residents at the time of the last census although the proportion is undoubtedly greater now. The Victoria ward has the greatest concentration of residents of Black and Minority Ethnic origin (approximately a third as compared with about 12% in the other two wards). The quality of the housing stock varies considerably and there is some quite poor housing that is worn-out and in need of substantial investment. Council housing stock was transferred to Trent and Dove Housing Ltd., and other Registered Social Landlords including Orbit, the Guinness Trust, YMCA and the Stonham Housing Association in 2001 (a transfer overall of 5,600 dwellings). The general state of the built environment varies considerably but has not yet, in general, degraded to the extent that has characterised so much of Britain's post war inner city areas. However, there is a distinct feeling that action to improve the physical environment in general must be a fairly urgent priority. Overall, there is a distinct feeling that this is an area that is at a critical stage in its development. It is experiencing problems that could combine to produce a downward spiral of relative decline. It is at a tipping point and action is urgently needed to avoid further deprivation.

The Heart of Burton had its Delivery Plan approved in March 2002 and recruited its manager in June 2002. It moved into its premises in the area in July 2003. The Partnership spent much of its first year putting in place systems. The Performance Management Assessment in October 2003 identified the need to improve the structures, procedures, and programme management of the Heart of Burton Partnership and build Community Cohesion. The Partnership has responded to these challenges by producing an Improvement Plan, one element of which was the formal appointment of a Performance and Programme Manager who has considerable expertise in community safety and Neighbourhood Wardens in particular. The Partnership has moved to a more proactive commissioning process in the use of its Leverage Funds with service providers as a way of initiating change in service provider behaviour.

### **(3) The Process**

The emphasis has been on drawing upon a strong evidence base to determine the form of intervention. This has required understanding the crime and safety problems that the area faces and articulating a coherent pattern of intervention based on Best Practice from the outset. There has been close working with others engaged with community safety through the local Community Safety Partnership. The Neighbourhood Management Pathfinder has also visited the successful Warden Schemes in Tamworth and Walsall and the Coventry Quality of Life community safety /neighbourhood warden scheme. They also recruited a member of staff experienced in the roll-out of the scheme elsewhere (a former Warden Regional Champion, now a Warden Regional Advisor) – so much so that Burton NMP was only one of three West Midlands NW schemes that were invited by the national Neighbourhood Management and Warden Team (ODPM) to participate in the production of a Good Practice video guide (and were able to promote the scheme as an integral part of delivering NMP objectives as well as how to deliver effective communication in their video contribution).

### **Key Players and Structures – Who?**

The objective of the Partnership has been to work closely with the local Community Safety Partnership (CDRP) the Community Safety Manager, Staffordshire Police Service, Neighbourhood Watch, Staffordshire Fire and Rescue Service, Probation, Connexions, Staffordshire Borough and County Councils, Trent and Dove RSL, and East Staffs Primary Care Trust.

The Partnership originally had a Crime and Safety theme group but is now developing other approaches and recognising the value of being able to commission activities to tackle identified problems. In the main the relevant boundaries have been those of the Pathfinder area but the Wardens Scheme has been extended to embrace adjoining areas-part of two adjoining Parishes in order to manage displacement effects.

The Partnership Board now has 'Theme Champions' in its membership for Community Safety (Staffordshire Police Service), Health Inequalities (Primary Care Trust), Education, Lifelong Learning, Children and Young People (Staffordshire County Council), Employment and Training (Job Centre Plus) and Housing and the Environment (East Staffordshire Borough Council).

The following strategies and delivery plans have contributed to the core objective of closing the gap in the incidence of crime in the neighbourhood relative to the rest of Burton:

- East Staffs Community Safety Partnership (CDRP);
- Staffordshire Police Service;
- Staffordshire Fire & Rescue Service;
- East Staffs Borough Council (ESBC) Corporate Plan 2003-2007;
- Staffs County Council Corporate Plan 2004-2007;
- Local Strategic Partnership Community Plan.

### **Activities – How?**

The Partnership has undertaken a number of actions that have helped to tackle crime and community safety in the neighbourhood and secure a joined-up response. Thus, they have worked with the Fire Service to support the work of two Fire Safety Wardens (May 2003). The two Fire Wardens called upon householders to give free home safety advice and provide and install (free of charge) smoke alarms and went to local schools to talk about fire related issues. Staffordshire Police Service have provided two additional Neighbourhood Police Officers (March 2003) with assistance from the NMP leverage fund, dedicated to the NMP area, with a commitment from the police to mainstream this resource, given the continuing success of this intervention, beyond the first three years of operation. In the first full year of their work the officers established links with the local community centres at St. Chad's and at Princess Street and developed effective working relationships with representatives from the BME community. The two Community Beat Officers ensured a highly visible engagement with the needs of local residents. These endeavours set the backdrop for a substantial Neighbourhood Warden Scheme in the area, planning for which began in August 2003 and they were introduced in March 2004 after a three-month training programme. The Warden team is now ten strong (6 full time and 2 part time wardens, a warden team manager and an administration officer).

The partnership has also supported the creation of a network of Neighbourhood Watch street representatives and the implementation of a scheme involving residents, Neighbourhood Watch Co-ordinator and Borough Council in enhancing the appearance of Grange Street. The Partnership has worked with the recently reorganised County Youth Service to focus on socially excluded young people and the YMCA to tackle issues around George Williams House, where supported accommodation for young people is provided. Neighbourhood Wardens, Fire Service and Police have active involvement with the YMCA team and the Partnership has supported the work of ESBC's Sports Development and Arts teams, and the work of the community-lead WRAP young people's project.

There have been a number of actions developed to 'design-out' crime and thus work with Orbit housing to improve home security and protect residents from burglars and bogus callers. Other activities include security improvements to properties owned by Trent and Dove (one of the local RSLs), the establishment of a new local policing base in part of the Trent and Dove housing stock in the area and assisting with the employment of a Anti Social Behaviour officer, appointed by the Community Safety Partnership and the Borough Council

It has been recognised that a poor physical environment can contribute to crime and considerable effort has gone into improving the quality of the public realm with an example being the cleaning of gutters that has involved co-ordinating the activities of the Wardens, District Cleaning and County Council Highways Service. Other actions by the Neighbourhood Partnership have been the funding of a Falls Prevention Service that is run by Orbit Housing Association's Care and Repair Team for all local residents. The Warden's are part of the referral process.

The Wardens are central to the Partnership approach to joined-up community safety in the area. Recruitment to the scheme was promoted through local networks in the neighbourhood. The Wardens had three months intensive training at the outset including some from the Police. They carry handheld electronic notepads that have a special HoB database installed on them. They have been tasked to deal with nuisance and anti-social behaviour, graffiti and fly tipping, supporting the elderly and more vulnerable, improving community cohesion and working positively to gain the trust and confidence of young people as well as delivering positive activities with/for young people. The Neighbourhood Wardens have made links with local schools, outreach workers and community Police Officers. The Neighbourhood Wardens and the Police service monitor the neighbourhood area across a range of community safety issues.

The Wardens share protocol agreements with the Police, provide safety and security advice to residents and local business, work with local schools to engage with, and build the trust of, local children. Staffordshire Police Service, the NMP-funded Neighbourhood Police Officers and Neighborhood Wardens have established strong communication and partnership working links, and information sharing protocols. This has enabled neighbourhood wardens to pass information and intelligence to the police service. The emphasis is on building strong links between the wardens and service providers with the wardens attending relevant briefings with the police. The neighbourhood Warden Scheme is registered with the East Staffs Information Sharing Protocol, with the warden manager being the designated officer within this protocol

They have produced young peoples positive activities programmes, supported the police in targeting known drug locations as well as assisting in lesser offences relating to vehicle taxation (Operation Ticketer (aim – to reduce the number of untaxed vehicles)) and delivering Community Service Provider Roadshows. Wardens have also undertaken surveys of local residents to acquire intelligence on key problems and the effectiveness of their intervention. They are engaging extensively with local business in the area and Police acknowledge the impact on ASB reduction. They seek to gain the trust of young people by delivering activities that young people want to get involved in. Thus, they listen rather than assume that it is known what is required. The Wardens support community events, regularly attend resident groups and parish council meetings and deliver mailshots to homes in the area.

## Key Issues

Tackling Community-Safety in the Heart of Burton has required a coherent and focused approach that has been achieved by bringing together the statutory providers through the actions of the Neighbourhood Pathfinder working closely with the Community Safety Partnership in the area. The Pathfinder recognised that if the required step-change was to be achieved then it was necessary to contribute significant resources that would eventually bring about the required improvements to the quality of life in the area and which would eventually trigger a more sustainable level of ongoing support from mainstream providers.

Thus, the Pathfinder has committed heavily from its leverage funding to the Warden scheme it being agreed that it should be supported with £500,000 for a three-year period (in practice likely to be 2.5 years) that is equivalent to one years leverage funding. On the basis of its application in other areas there might have been a team of four Wardens deployed in the area-in fact the £500,000 is funding eight, plus a manager and administration officer and an extension of the boundaries of the Pathfinder area to include two neighbouring Parish areas. The Police have signed-up to mainstreaming the beat officers (after 2005) till at least 2007. They are currently in discussion regarding whether this will be 2 beat officers or 1 beat officer and 2 PCSOs.

Service Level Agreements are in place that require a commitment to mainstreaming should there be evidence of success and subject to funding being present.

## (4) Evidence of Results

### Impact on mainstream service providers' behaviour in improved services:

The Pathfinder has been able to coordinate its activities successfully with other service providers so that a joined-up approach to policing and community safety in the neighbourhood has emerged. A Service Level Agreement has been agreed with the Police, Neighbourhood Wardens and the Partnership for Crime and Community Safety. This has now extended to a joint SLA for a Safer, Cleaner, Greener Heart of Burton and to produce a Charter for the Neighbourhood that will incorporate Staffordshire Police, Staffordshire Fire and Rescue Service, East Staffordshire Borough Council (Environmental Health and Street Cleansing) and Staffordshire County Council (Highways).

## Capacity for sustainable renewal

Staffs Police commitment to mainstream the service has been successful. In 2005/6 they will be picking-up two thirds of the cost of the Beat Officers. The commitment is now being reviewed in the light of its 'fit' with Home Office recommendations on local neighbourhood policing. There is a commitment to continue to monitor the incidence of fire in the home in the NMP area compared to the rest of the Borough and to re-deploy resources in NMP area if incidence rises above the average. Home and Fire Risk Audits will now be mainstreamed into the work of the Fire and Safety Service. East Staffordshire Borough Council Assistant Chief Executive (Community Affairs) and Environmental Health Service Management are currently seeking to secure the mainstreaming of the Neighbourhood Warden Schemes before the end of the Neighbourhood Management Pathfinder funding, with significant input to this process from the Burton NMP Management Team.

The NMP has helped East Staffordshire Borough Council to implement a pilot rural Neighbourhood Warden Scheme in a nearby ward (Stretton). The success of the Wardens and the overall evidence of joined-up working to secure improvements in community safety have been recognised by the Community Safety Partnership (CDRP) which is a sub-committee of the Local Strategic Partnership. Key lessons will thus influence the shape and form of community safety policy in the wider area.

## Impact on community involvement in decision-making services

One of the most impressive aspects of the approach has been the engagement that has been secured with the community-a step change in relations and noticeable impacts on crime reduction. Those interviewed believed that local residents were prepared to share valuable intelligence with Wardens about criminal activity that they might otherwise feel more reserved in bringing to the attention of the Police.

## Impact on the neighbourhood

The joined-up approach involving the Police, neighbourhood wardens and other services including the ESBC Enforcement Team, Neighbourhood Watch and the Fire and Rescue Service has led to a significant narrowing of the gap between the incidence of the problem in the neighbourhood and Burton as a whole. The table below shows that Burglary Dwelling is lower in the NMP area compared to Burton, Criminal Damage is lower than in Burton or East Staffs, Theft from a Motor Vehicle is lower than Burton and East Staffs, Criminal Damage to a Motor Vehicle is lower than Burton, and Overall Crime is lower in the NMP area than in Burton as a whole.

Target	The Gap at 2001/02	The Gap at April 2004	Improvement/ (Worsened)
Reduce Burglary Dwelling	18.1	2.2	15.9
Reduce Criminal Damage	2.6	-1.4	4.0
Reduce Repeat Domestic Violence	1.9	0.8	1.1
Reduce Race/Hate Crime	2.0	0.7	1.3
Reduce Theft from a Motor Vehicle	2.2	0.4	1.8
Reduce Theft of a Motor Vehicle	-0.5	1.1	(1.6)
Reduce Criminal Damage to a Motor Vehicle	3.0	0.5	2.5
Reduce Anti-social Behaviour	37.1	21.2	15.9
Reduce all Crime	33.8	14.1	19.7

Source: NM Pathfinder<sup>10</sup>

Whilst these improvements in the incidence of crime are very welcome it has been the concern of many of those involved with community safety in the area that one of the most difficult things to change is fear of crime on the part of local residents. In order to gauge what the impact of the interventions has been on this the Neighbourhood Wardens undertook a 'fear of crime survey' of some 300 local residents. This survey reflects 6 months of high visibility patrolling by wardens since their official launch in March of last year. A fully detailed analysis of this survey is available on database as evidence of the impact of the neighbourhood wardens service so far. However, in the specific fear of crime indicators within the survey the following results clearly demonstrate that neighbourhood wardens are having a positive impact on people's perceptions on the fear of crime in the NMP neighbourhood.

<sup>10</sup> All stats are presented as measurement of recorded/reported crimes per 1,000 population or per 1,000 households as below:

- Burglary Dwelling is measured per 1,000 households – so, in 2001/2 there was a 'gap' against East Staffordshire stats, demonstrating that there were 18.1 more burglaries per 1,000 households in the Heart of Burton NMP area than in the rest of East Staffs. Thus, the gap was 18.1. By April 2004 that had reduced to being 2.2 more burglaries per household than in 2001/2. This 'narrowed the gap' by 15.9 (in other words there were 15.9 fewer burglaries per 1,000 households in the NMP area than at the baseline year.
- Similarly, the same measurement, but by per 1,000 population (not households) applied to the other indicators provided, using the same measurement criteria as described above.
- Reducing ASB is recorded ASB logged by the police, and again it is year-on-year comparisons, showing a narrowing of the gap from the baseline position in Year 1 of the NMP programme.

FEAR OF CRIME SURVEY QUESTIONS – VIEWS OF RESIDENTS (All Cultures)		
Resident Opinion	Number of Responses	Percentage of Responses
My neighbourhood feels:		
Very much safer than before	50	15.65%
Much safer than before	82	27.15%
A bit safer than before	94	31.15%
No safer than before	48	15.90%
Don't know	28	9.28%

Source: NM Pathfinder

The survey demonstrates that of those who responded there was strong support for the view that the Heart of Burton NMP neighbourhood is safer than before and only 26.05% felt that there had been no change or didn't know. This view was also shared by the BME community.

## (5) Conclusions

### Effectiveness

The Joined-Up for Safer Communities theme in the Heart of Burton has sought to develop an integrated approach to community safety issues by involving a number of local service providers, local residents, schools and business. The Pathfinder has deployed Neighbourhood Beat Officers, Fire Safety Officers and a substantial team of Neighbourhood Wardens to considerable effect. Recent surveys of residents point to substantial reductions in the incidence of burglary from homes, criminal damage, theft and criminal damage to motor vehicles and the level of crime as a whole in the neighbourhood compared to Burton as a whole.

### Factors influencing success

A lot has been achieved in a short time and the longer term commitments from mainstream service providers look promising. The emphasis has been on an evidence based approach and doing your homework and ensure that lessons from elsewhere are considered and customised in relation to your local area. The Heart of Burton team also emphasise negotiation, participation, meaningful partnership working, compromise, monitoring and review and ensuring that there is transparency throughout. It is essential to get the baseline right and track change, work with partners/residents/to identify the real problems, agree potential solutions, recognise what is not working and change tack as appropriate. The key to success is to use Wardens and other approaches to build local trust, gain intelligence about the problems and to ensure that this is passed to the mainstream providers. It is also important to recognise that although the pathways are not fully understood there appear to be powerful interfaces between the physical, social and economic factors that contribute to community safety and policy actions have to recognise this.

## Case Study 2: Annex

### Key background documents

The following key documents were used in the preparation of this report:

- Making the Heart of Burton a better place to live. Annual Report to the Community and our plans for the future (2005);
- Draft Report for Comment: Mainstreaming. Heart of Burton Neighbourhood Pathfinder. (2005 Forthcoming);
- Regeneration and Good Practice: Making it a Habit in the West Midlands. A report into the Good Practice work of Regen 2004-5. Advantage West Midlands (2005);
- Neighbourhood Plan. Heart of Burton Partnership 2005-2006 (2005);
- Performance Management Report and Improvement Plan. Heart of Burton. 2005;
- Delivery Plan 2004-2005. Heart of Burton Partnership (2004);
- Heartbeat. Crime and Community Safety Special. Neighbourhood Wardens' Year of Achievements (2005);
- Heartbeat. New Children's Centre Welcomes Families (2005);
- Community Safety Strategy 2005-2008. East Staffordshire Community Safety Partnership (2005).

# Annex 3

## Case Study 3

### Community Safety Resource Centre

#### Hattersley Neighbourhood Partnership

#### Tameside MBC

##### Summary

The case study is of the Community Safety Resource Centre set up in the Hattersley Neighbourhood Management Pathfinder area in Greater Manchester. It is a 'one-stop-shop' community safety advice and resource centre that permanently houses Greater Manchester Police officers and a voluntary community safety worker. It also provides a base and drop-in point for other community safety services and agencies including Greater Manchester Fire and Rescue Service and Tameside MBC's Town Patrollers and Community Safety and Road Safety Teams. The basic rationale for the initiative was the desire to address residents' concerns, identified in household surveys, over the perceived lack of a police presence in the neighbourhood and fear of crime. It was also justified on the grounds that community safety services would be more effectively delivered from a 'one-stop' shop that facilitated both inter-agency service delivery and closer working with the local community.

A number of lessons can be learned from the experience of the CSRC to date. It is important to recognise that:

- mainstreaming neighbourhood management initiatives takes time;
- the commitment of key service providers to the principles of neighbourhood management needs to be secured and sustained;
- 'project champions' in both key service providers and the local community are crucially important;
- projects need to be connected to Borough-wide partnership structures and initiatives;
- monitoring and evaluation procedures need to be developed from the outset and to be tailored to individual projects;
- service providers need to be flexible in the provision of data;
- the process of preparing Service Level Agreements – or variants of them – is important for understanding the constraints operating on individual service providers, and for better clarifying the concept being developed.

## (1) Aims, Objectives & Rationale

Hattersley's Community Safety Resource Centre (CSRC) aims to provide a community safety 'one-stop-shop', giving local residents access to a range of "community safety" services in a local community centre. It accommodates a range of crime and safety practitioners who:

- are permanently based at it (Greater Manchester Police officers and a voluntary crime prevention/ community safety worker); or
- work or patrol from it (Tameside MBC Town Patrollers – Tameside's Town/Neighbourhood Wardens, Greater Manchester Fire and Rescue Service); or
- use it to spread information and as a signposting facility and venue to promote community safety themed activities (e.g. Tameside MBC's Community Safety and Road Safety Teams).

The Draft Service Level Agreement (SLA) between the Pathfinder and Greater Manchester Police (see Section 3 below) summarises the CSRC's objectives as:

"The Community Safety Resource Centre will change the way key services are delivered by integrating them closely, by them communicating directly with each other and being closer to the community they serve.

"The close physical proximity of the Crime and Disorder practitioners will enable improved local knowledge, improved intelligence, better targeting of key resident priorities such as Youths Causing Annoyance and assist co-ordination of activities.

"The Community Safety Resource Centre will contribute to the following target outcomes:

- Reduce domestic burglary by 25%;
- Reduce number of residents who feel lack of police presence is a problem, to less than 40% by year 3;
- Reduce number of residents who feel lack of police presence is a problem, to less than 30% by year 7;
- Reduce number of people who feel unsafe living in the area to less than 25% by end of year 3;
- Reduce number of people who feel unsafe living in the area to less than 10% by end of year 7.

"To contribute to the goals of the Hattersley Master Plan."

As the aims and objectives of the CSRC indicate, the basic rationale for the initiative was the desire to address residents' concerns over the perceived lack of a police presence in the neighbourhood and residents' fear of crime. It was also justified on the grounds that community safety services would be more effectively delivered from a 'one-stop' shop that facilitated both inter-agency service delivery and closer working with the local community.

## **(2) The Neighbourhood**

### **Hattersley**

Hattersley is located 13 miles to the east of Manchester and three miles from the High Peak town of Glossop. It is adjacent to the M67, which links the Manchester M60 orbital motorway to the main cross-Pennine road to Sheffield.

It is a mainly residential area built to facilitate housing clearance from East Manchester in the 1960's. With the recent demolition of all but one of its high-rise flats (the exception being a block housing elderly residents), its housing stock is now made up of low-rise blocks, semi-detached properties and some maisonettes. About 14% of this stock is vacant with voids concentrated in timber-framed properties that are beyond their useful life. Over the last two decades, about 25% of tenants have exercised the right to buy. Given the area's role in housing clearance from Manchester, the majority of the remaining stock remained under the control of Manchester City Council until May 2005 when tenants voted for the transfer of this stock to a Registered Social Landlord, the Contour Housing Group.

The town has a declining population which has fallen 23.5% from 9,155 to c.7,000 in the period 1991-2001 due to the lack of local job opportunities and the relative unattractiveness of social housing compared to other forms of tenure. Many residents are longstanding – almost three quarters have lived there for more than a decade with many families having lived on the estate since it was built in the 1960s. Residents are predominantly white British, with only very small numbers of black and minority ethnic residents (1.9% population). The estate contains a relatively high percentage of single person households (49%) and single parent households with children (32.6%).

Hattersley residents suffer from low incomes, poor health and low educational attainment and skill levels. Although the official rate of unemployment in Hattersley is no higher than the borough-wide or national figure, only 52% of those of working age are economically active. Significant numbers have opted out of the labour market owing to incapacity, sickness, and retirement or care responsibilities. Income levels are low with about two-thirds of households earning less than £10,000 per annum. This is partly because the majority of residents work relatively locally in low value added, low wage, occupations in manufacturing, wholesale and retailing. Many residents are caught in a vicious circle of low skilled jobs, under-investment in training, low expectations and self-esteem and educational under-achievement. 60% of respondents to the (2002) MORI/NOP household survey lacked any qualifications and only 14% of pupils gained five or more A-C grades at GCSE in 2001 compared with 50% nationally.

Preparatory work for the Pathfinder's Delivery Plan and the MORI/NOP household survey (2002) have shown that residents are mainly concerned about street maintenance and housing management services, lack of shops and community facilities, especially for young people, fear of crime and youth disorder and are confused about service provider responsibilities. The Delivery Plan also notes concerns about the poor image of the area, mainly held by those outside of Hattersley, with anecdotal evidence of "Post Code Discrimination".

In relation to the perception of crime and this case study of the CSRC, statistics show that levels of crime are unexceptional and better than the borough-wide average for most categories of crime with the notable exception of criminal damage and juvenile nuisance where the reverse is true.

The area is now facing a major transformation. The housing investment that the stock transfer will release will help to move forward the major physical redevelopment of the area set out in the Hattersley and Mottram Master Plan, which was formally adopted by Tameside MBC as Supplementary Planning Guidance in April 2004. The Master Plan aims to create by 2035, but with most of the change taking place in the next eight years, a 'Sustainable Community' with a mixed population, at least 50% of dwellings being owner-occupied, a new district centre and leisure facilities, an improved environment, better transport facilities and new job opportunities. The neighbourhood management Pathfinder has a key role to play in this transformation.

## The Neighbourhood Management Pathfinder

Hattersley was designated as a Neighbourhood Management Pathfinder area following a successful bid by Tameside MBC and Hattersley Development Trust, an independent not-for-profit community-based partnership set up in 1997 to promote the regeneration of the area. The original Delivery Plan envisaged the Trust taking on the Neighbourhood Management role but, on the advice of Government Office for the North West, a separate Neighbourhood Management Team was established in May 2001. A revised Delivery Plan was approved in November 2002 and the Neighbourhood Manager (previously Executive Director of Hattersley Development Trust and Acting Neighbourhood Manager) and Team were recruited between December 2002 and February 2003. The Neighbourhood Management Team worked alongside the Development Trust until April 2004 when it was decided to amalgamate the two organisations into the single Hattersley Neighbourhood Partnership (HNP) to minimise duplication and confusion and to establish a more sustainable Neighbourhood Management function. Hattersley Development Trust remains a Company Limited by Guarantee to retain ownership of its community assets while the Neighbourhood Partnership has continued to pursue its objective of helping the local community and local service providers work together at neighbourhood level to improve and join up local services, while taking over responsibility for managing the remaining Trust activity. The establishment of HNP was an important development, not only resolving the confusion over the roles and responsibilities of the Neighbourhood Management Partnership and Hattersley Development Trust but also more clearly positioning the Pathfinder in the wider redevelopment of the area being orchestrated by the Master Plan and recent stock transfer. Tameside MBC remains the Accountable Body for the Partnership, which uses the Council's financial systems and procedures.

HNP has a Board chaired by a local vicar and Hattersley resident, and is made up of a senior Tameside MBC officer (as Vice Chair), two local councillors, a local business representative and two representatives (one a resident and one an officer) from each of the Partnership's six Theme Groups, which bring together local residents, representatives from related groups or agencies and Partnership staff. Those Theme Groups are:

- Children and Young People (0-19);
- Community Network;
- Community Safety;
- Health and Leisure;
- Jobs, Training and Enterprise;
- Housing and Environment.

There is also a recently established Land Development Steering Group, who provide a mechanism for resident engagement in the regeneration process.

Tameside MBC employs HNP's 25 staff through a secondment agreement between itself and HNP. The staff comprises:

- the Neighbourhood Manager;
- two Assistant Neighbourhood Managers & Theme Group Coordinators;
- a Community Development Team;
- a Sports Development Officer;
- one full-time and one part-time Football Development Officer;
- a Communications Team;
- an Administration and Finance Team.

### **(3) The Process**

#### **Key Players and Structures – Who?**

Greater Manchester Police is the principal agency involved in the development and running of the CSRC. The idea was first suggested by a local police Superintendent and subsequently developed in discussions within the Pathfinder's Community Safety Theme Group (and its Environment and Community Safety predecessor). As one interviewee put it, "[the CSRC] has been a mainstreaming initiative on the part of the police from the start", and it clearly fits in with the operational restructuring introduced by Greater Manchester Police in the spring of 2004. The force's twelve divisions (including a newly created Manchester Metropolitan Division) all moved to a

'unitary structure' in which existing sub-divisions were replaced by neighbourhood-based 'Areas' with Inspectors responsible for the policing within them. This shift was seen as bringing a greater community focus to policing in line with national developments. Four 'neighbourhood areas' replaced the two existing sub-divisions in the Tameside Division that covers the Tameside MBC area with Hattersley falling within the Hyde, Longdendale and Hattersley area.

Another key individual in developing the initiative has been a local community activist who has had a longstanding involvement in crime prevention initiatives in the area. A winner of the Home Office's 'Taking A Stand' Award, she set up and ran a crime prevention centre in Hattersley Community Centre, where the CSRC is now based. Funded over time from a variety of sources including SRB, Greater Manchester Police and Neighbourhood Management, this crime prevention activity has generated significant community engagement that it is hoped will transfer into the new CSRC. The community activist also co-Chairs the Pathfinder's Community Safety Theme Group and is a member of the Advisory Group of Longdendale and Hattersley District Assembly.

Greater Manchester Fire and Rescue Service is an important partner agency and the CSRC will allow it to develop its neighbourhood-based work that has evolved from a combination of national shifts in policy emphasis and local restructuring. The Fire and Rescue Services Act (2004) formally recognised and further encouraged the gradual shift in emphasis towards hazard prevention and community safety activity. It created a new duty for fire and rescue authorities to promote fire safety and gave the service other powers to help create safer communities. At local level and partly in response to this national shift, Greater Manchester Fire and Rescue Service has restructured its operations, moving from three Territorial Commands to eleven smaller Borough Commands that align with Greater Manchester's ten local authorities (Manchester, because of workload considerations has two Borough Commands). Each Area Command has a Borough Action Plan and appointed officers to liaise with local strategic partners. Thus, Tameside now has a borough-specific Action Plan and a fire service officer sits on the Board of Tameside Strategic Partnership. The shift towards Borough focus is reinforced by increased activity at neighbourhood level. In Hattersley, for example, local Health Visitors, who sit on the Community Safety Theme Group, set up the Stay Safe scheme to reduce the number deaths and injuries to children in and around the home. A development of this scheme was the Fire and Rescue Service briefing groups of carers, housing staff, Sure Start and others on fire safety and how to identify potential fire risks in the homes that they visit. The Fire and Rescue Service provides free, professional fire risk assessments for identified clients at risk. The CSRC now provides a physical base for the delivery of this and future community safety initiatives.

The CSRC also provides a drop-in point for Tameside MBC's Town Patrollers who currently operate from Posts in eight locations in the Borough. None of these Posts are in Hattersley. The CSRC now provides a neighbourhood base for the Patrollers.

A number of Tameside MBC departments will also make increasing use of the CSRC including the Community Safety and Road Safety Teams, Youth Services and the domestic Violence and Anti-Social Behaviour Units.

## Activities – How?

The CSRC is based in premises in Hattersley Community Centre and is currently in its first full month of operation. It has a reception area immediately accessible to visitors to the Community Centre and houses the voluntary community safety worker, a police sergeant and two constables. It is currently open to the public between 9am and 5 pm, five days a week with police officers also using the facilities “out of hours” for pursuing enquiries and refreshment breaks. There is a private interview room for visitors.

The police funded the physical refurbishment of the premises and the costs of drawing up the lease for them (for five years) from Tameside MBC. The police cover the wages and associated costs of the police officers and the capital cost of a vehicle from the Neighbourhood Road Safety Initiative. The Pathfinder contributes towards the running costs of the CSRC, principally in the form of payment for utilities, maintenance of the premises, volunteer expenses and the revenue costs of community safety initiatives. The initial estimate of total capital and revenue costs for setting up the Centre and running it for eighteen months was £330,000 with the Pathfinder contributing £60,000 and the police the remaining £270,000. Although the CSRC has only been running for a few weeks it is already clear that the Pathfinder’s revenue contribution will be substantially less than that first estimated and the current provision is for a maximum of £15,000 annually. The bulk of expenditure (90 percent or more) is thus being provided by Greater Manchester Police, reflecting, as already noted, the degree to which the initiative has been effectively mainstreamed “from day one”.

Monitoring and evaluation is based on a log of visitors and key crime statistics for the neighbourhood. The log, in spreadsheet format, is kept by the community safety worker and records the date and time of calls to the centre (in person or by telephone), the nature of the enquiry and outcome (including, for example, referral to other agencies, provision of literature or other material and appointments made with police officers). It will be used, in suitably anonymised form, to provide key data for the monitoring and evaluation process.

Greater Manchester Police also provides statistics for 12 categories of key crime for the neighbourhood along with Borough-wide comparisons. The crime categories correspond broadly to the categories used in the household surveys by NOP/MORI to capture residents’ views on ‘serious problems’, which the Pathfinder has built into the monitoring process. To assist monitoring, the Neighbourhood Inspector has also agreed to provide regular updated data, from Greater Manchester Police’s Operational Policing Unit, in unedited working form (i.e. before the appearance of the official figures at year end) provided it is used with all the necessary caveats. It is recognised that there is certain information that the police cannot provide for data protection reasons but the police have agreed that “what we can provide, we do and we attempt to make the best use of it”. The Pathfinder sees this flexible approach to data provision by the police as a good example, and important outcome, of the partnership working that Neighbourhood Management has fostered.

A Steering Group for the CSRC has been formed, which reports to the Pathfinder's Community Safety Theme Group and through the Partnership Board to the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership and Neighbourhood Renewal Sub-Group of Tameside Strategic Partnership. The Steering Group currently comprises the Neighbourhood Inspector, the community safety worker and the Assistant Neighbourhood Manager who supports the Community Safety Theme Group and will expand to include another resident, perhaps a councillor and a representative from another partner agency although the Group is aware that it should not become too large or replicate the Theme Group.

The CSRC is the flagship project of the Community Safety Theme Group and is central to the achievement of all three key outcomes that the Group has identified for achievement by 2009, namely reducing:

- the proportion of residents stating that the lack of police presence is a problem to less than 30%
- fear of crime so that the proportion of people who feel safe is less than 10%
- the percentage of residents stating that 'young people hanging around' is a serious problem to less than 20%

The Pathfinder is also aware that the deliberately broad definition of community safety that it has adopted (which includes, for example, accidents in the home and mental health issues) and its community focus means that the CSRC could also contribute to achievements in both its Healthy Community and Community Development and Engagement priority areas.

## Key Issues

The CSRC became fully operational in July 2005, some fourteen months behind schedule. The delay was never the result of wavering commitment on the part of the principal partner, Greater Manchester Police, although a change in the police precept did prompt an internal review of projects that introduced a brief hiatus. Given the commitment of the police to neighbourhood policing and the momentum behind the CSRC in Hattersley, the CSRC was never really under threat in the review. Most delay has been tied to negotiating the lease and organising the necessary refurbishment work for the premises in Hattersley Community Centre. Tameside MBC owns the latter and, at the time of the first negotiations, the medium-term future of the Centre was uncertain given the major physical transformation of Hattersley proposed in the area's Masterplan. This transformation involves the relocation of the district centre in which the Community Centre is currently located and, as a consequence, it was necessary for the future of the Centre to be clarified, not least because a five-year lease for the CSRC was being sought.

Negotiations over the lease took nearly a year. Once agreed, delays over the refurbishment of the premises came first from the installation of the necessary electrical work for the CSRC's computer systems and then, perhaps appropriately for a Community Safety Resource Centre, negotiations over and works associated with fire safety standards. Sorting out the refurbishment took some eight months longer than first anticipated.

The leasehold and refurbishment delays were linked to the choice of the Community Centre for the site of the CSRC but this location was crucial to the whole initiative because of the latter's emphasis on community engagement and the need to build on the community good will and trust that the crime prevention activity based in the Community Centre had developed over time. It was important, therefore, to put up with the delays – all the result of having to deal with “the people behind us” (the Council’s Estates Department, the utilities provider etc.) and “getting them to realise that [the CSRC] has to be delivered” – to secure the preferred community location.

The initiative involved the bringing together of that community-based community safety activity with neighbourhood-based policing and that inevitably raises a number of issues relating to joint working. The Community Safety worker admitted to concerns about the degree to which a community activist and 'civilian' would be accepted by police officers in a 'day-to-day working environment'. The police officers themselves have also to adapt to working in a different environment.

There were also concerns that the police presence might put people off from using the facilities and the CSRC's proximity to the newly refurbished youth club in the Community Centre was also a concern for some youth workers given some of the historical mistrust between young people and the police. These concerns serve to underline the ambitiousness of the initiative. It is attempting to bring together community engagement and policing and, in the words of the police Inspector, to make the police presence 'normality'. In relation to youth, for example, it is attempting to build on the 'street-based' contacts that the community beat officers have been making with young people in the neighbourhood. The presence of police officers in the Community Centre is seen as another step in this community-focused policing.

It is a challenging initiative, challenging working relationships and cultures and challenging some community attitudes to policing. It is early days but the Community Safety worker already feels that her concerns about the joint working relationships were unfounded and the number of calls to the CSRC by residents have thus far been very encouraging.

#### **(4) Evidence of Results**

The National Evaluation identifies four broad types of changes to local services that Neighbourhood Management can influence and the CSRC displays elements of all of these:

## **(1) Changing corporate policies and practices**

The CSRC clearly chimes in with and benefits from the national shift in policing ethos towards 'community-based policing' and the local reorganisation associated with this in Greater Manchester's restructuring of its operations and the District-level establishment of Neighbourhood Areas for policing – “we couldn't have done it without the shift to neighbourhood policing”. The neighbourhood focus of Fire and Rescue activity and Greater Manchester Fire and Rescue Service's reorganisation of its operational areas also mirrors this change in policy and practice. What the Pathfinder has been able to do – and a key element of the added value of neighbourhood management – is to help translate these national policy shifts into an actual project at neighbourhood level. The Pathfinder has provided a multi-agency partnership structure with, importantly, community involvement that has helped to facilitate the changing corporate policies and practices of key service providers.

## **(2) Re-allocating mainstream resources**

While Greater Manchester Police was already committed to the funding of neighbourhood policing, its decision to fund the refurbishment of the CSRC's premises to pursue the approach in Hattersley did still require some re-allocation of mainstream resources. The same applies, albeit to a lesser degree, to the other community safety service providers that are making use of the Centre. While leverage funding from the Pathfinder was, as already noted, relatively limited (and certainly much less than first budgeted) its availability did act as a 'lubricant' for the re-allocation of resources, reinforcing its role in assisting the changing corporate policies and practice that underlay that re-allocation.

## **(3) Re-shaping & joining up mainstream services**

The CSRC is a real attempt to re-shape and join up mainstream service delivery with the police permanently located in the Centre liaising with Greater Manchester Fire and Rescue Service personnel and Tameside MBC's Town Patrollers Agreement and Community Safety officers.

## **(4) Improving service access to increase take-up**

The CSRC is explicitly designed to improve access to community safety services by bringing together the community-based crime prevention and community safety activity with mainstream neighbourhood community safety service providers. With the CSRC only just operational it is obviously too soon to judge just how successful it has been in achieving this but the evidence of community interest in the few weeks that it has been fully operational is encouraging.

The operational capacity of the Pathfinder has been developed through the successful encouragement and facilitation of the partnership working that was necessary to produce the CSRC. The Pathfinder provided the meeting space and administrative support for promoting the initiative, acting as a kind “of dating agency for service providers” and “mechanism for people to talk together”. It remained committed to the project throughout all the setbacks and helped to maintain the momentum of the

partnership working. The Pathfinder also showed its capacity to learn and innovate. An Assistant Neighbourhood Manager provides administrative support for the Community Safety Theme Group. This support included, importantly, the drafting of a Service Level Agreement with the police. The SLA has not been formally signed and, given the changes in dates, milestones and funding regimes caused by the delays in getting the CSRC up and running, it will need some re-editing before it can be. The Assistant Neighbourhood Manager nevertheless felt that the drafting of the SLA was an important process for the Pathfinder “helping us to understand better the constraints that the police work under” and to understand better the nature and availability of police data for monitoring and evaluation.

Discussions over the availability and interpretation of police crime statistics provided another important learning experience and discussions over monitoring and evaluation procedures resulted in the development of the spreadsheet system for logging users of the CSRC.

The CSRC is also effectively linked into Tameside-wide partnerships and structures. The Pathfinder as a whole is represented at Tameside Strategic Partnership by the Neighbourhood Manager’s membership of the Strategic Partnership’s Neighbourhood Renewal Sub-Group (which reports to the LSP Board via a standing item on the latter’s agenda). The Assistant Neighbourhood Manager who sits on the CSRC’s Steering Group is also a member of a working group of Tameside Strategic Partnership’s Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership. Links have also been made with Tameside MBC’s Community Safety Team (CST), which is responsible for coordinating and delivering the Council’s community safety activities and supporting the work of the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership.

The CSRC has also directly influenced Borough-wide community safety initiatives. The CSRC’s voluntary community safety worker has been involved in training courses organised by the CST. Evaluation of these courses identified a strong demand from community volunteers for meeting places where they would be able to access information and materials on community safety and computers linked to the Internet. The Council took up the idea and has established a number of Community Safety Resource Centres across the Borough. Hattersley’s voluntary community safety worker was invited to give a presentation on the Hattersley CSRC at an early networking event organised by the CST to help shape the Borough’s version of the Hattersley model. While this Borough-wide initiative is still very much in an early stage of development it is recognised by the CST that its Resource Centres will not be as developed as the Hattersley CSRC, with the latter’s permanent police presence. They will, however, share the same ethos of community engagement and act, like Hattersley’s CSRC, as drop-in points for community safety agencies.

The CSRC has also increased community involvement in decision-making. This engagement is embodied in the role of the voluntary community safety worker who is involved in both the day-to-day operation of the CSRC and, as a key member, of its Steering Group and of HNP’s Community Safety Theme Group, its longer-term strategic development. The community safety worker reports back to the local community through the Hattersley Forum Community Association, which is itself linked back into HNP through the Community Network Theme Group.

## (5) Conclusions

The CSRC has not been in place long enough to begin to assess its success in achieving its objectives in relation to changing residents' perceptions of police presence and lessening the fear of crime. Its successful establishment, however, is itself alone an important achievement for neighbourhood management in Hattersley. The Pathfinder provided a context for dialogue between service providers and community representatives and also administrative and, to a lesser degree, financial support, that together enabled the development of an innovative approach to the delivery of community safety services at neighbourhood level. In the case of the CSRC, the Pathfinder's aim to develop neighbourhood-based community safety services chimed in with corporate and policy changes in key service providers (namely the shift to community and neighbourhood-based service delivery). The Pathfinder's 'value added' was the local partnership context that it offered that facilitated the translation of the service providers' policy changes to neighbourhood level. The CSRC took life in the discussions in the Pathfinder's Community Safety Theme Group (and its Environment and Community Safety Group predecessor) and was eventually delivered by the partnership working underpinning the Theme group. It is difficult to imagine the CSRC happening in the way that it did or taking the form that it has outside of that neighbourhood management context.

The key factors influencing the successful creation of the CSRC lie in the coincidence between the policy shifts of key service providers and the aims of neighbourhood management, the commitment of those service providers to partnership working and to changing service delivery and the willingness of community representatives actively to engage in partnership working. As the local Neighbourhood Police Inspector, reflecting on the experience of the CSRC, argued: "It all boils down to commitment at the end of the day and a willingness to challenge people above". The community safety worker emphasised the importance of partnership working and sustaining the commitment of individual partners: "It's like a bicycle wheel. If some spokes are a bit loose then the wheel doesn't turn properly."

A test of the commitment of the partners has been the way in which it has been sustained by the largely unavoidable delays caused by negotiations over the leasehold arrangements for the premises and delays associated with the latter's refurbishment.

### Lessons

A number of lessons can be learned from the experience of the CSRC to date. It is important to recognise that:

- mainstreaming neighbourhood management initiatives takes time – it took over two years for the first discussions of the CSRC (in early 2003) to be translated into an operational facility (in July 2005)
- the commitment of key service providers to the principles of neighbourhood management needs to be secured and sustained
- 'project champions' in both key service providers and the local community are crucially important

- projects need to be connected to Borough-wide partnership structures and initiatives (in the case of the CSRC this includes the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership of Tameside Strategic Partnership and Tameside MBC's community safety services including the Town Patrollers and the developing Community Safety Resource Centres – themselves partly based on the Hattersley model)
- monitoring and evaluation procedures need to be developed from the outset and to be tailored to individual projects
- service providers need to be flexible in the provision of data
- the process of preparing Service Level Agreements – or variants of them – is important for understanding the constraints operating on individual service providers, and for better clarifying the concept being developed

## **Possible Implications**

An important implication of the case study relates to the central role within it of a local community activist. The community safety worker who has been involved in crime prevention work that has become over time embedded in the local community provides the "community element" of the CSRC. The eventual success of the CSRC will depend heavily on the degree to which the trust that this earlier work has engendered in the community is transferred to the CSRC. This community engagement cannot be quickly or easily generated. As one community safety practitioner, referring to Hattersley's community safety worker, expressed it: "We need more Elsie's but they're not easy to find". This feature of the CSRC initiative underlines the importance of community development and engagement for developing community capacity. Community development and engagement work in HNP is based around the Community Network Thematic Group. Other neighbourhood management areas considering developing initiatives like the CSRC are likely to need their own equivalent.

## Case Study 3: Annex

### Key background documents

The following key documents were used in the preparation of this report:

- Draft Service Level Agreement for the Provision of a Community Safety Resource Centre between Hattersley Neighbourhood Partnership and Greater Manchester Police, January 2004, Hattersley Neighbourhood Partnership;
- Greater Manchester Fire and Rescue Authority Community Plan 2005/2006, Greater Manchester Fire and Rescue Authority;
- Greater Manchester Fire and Rescue Authority 'Your Service – Your Safety' Integrated Risk Management Plan 2004-2007, Greater Manchester Fire and Rescue Authority;
- Greater Manchester Annual Policing Plan 2005-2006, Greater Manchester Police;
- Greater Manchester Policing Strategy 2005/8, Greater Manchester Police;
- Hattersley Neighbourhood Partnership: Annual Report 2005, Hattersley Neighbourhood Partnership;
- Hattersley Neighbourhood Partnership: Business Plan, 2004/05, Hattersley Neighbourhood Partnership;
- Hattersley Neighbourhood Partnership: Business Plan, 2005/06, Hattersley Neighbourhood Partnership;
- Hattersley Neighbourhood Partnership: Community Safety Theme Group Action Plan 2004/05, Hattersley Neighbourhood Partnership;
- Hattersley Neighbourhood Partnership: Community Safety Theme Group Action Plan 2005/06, Hattersley Neighbourhood Partnership;
- Hattersley Neighbourhood Partnership: Performance Management Report and Improvement Plan 2003/2004, Hattersley Neighbourhood Partnership;
- National Evaluation of Neighbourhood Management Pathfinder Programme: 2003/2004 Second Year Evaluation Report for Hattersley, National Evaluation Team;
- Tameside MBC Community Safety News (various editions), Tameside MBC.