

Community Safety Partnerships Consultation

The Government has committed to freeing up and improving Community Safety Partnerships.

In July 2010 the Government outlined its proposals for police reform in the consultation document, 'Policing in the 21st Century: Reconnecting police and the people'.

Chapter 5, 'Tackling crime together', sets out the Government's commitment to improving the partnership between the police and the public and to helping partners work together to solve local issues.

The Government identifies that Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) have been effective in preventing crime but that they need to have more freedom and flexibility. While the core statutory duty for key partners to work together will be retained, unnecessary prescription and bureaucracy should be removed so that partners can develop the structures best suited for their own circumstances and priorities.

To do this we intend to reduce the regulations which prescribe the way Community Safety Partnerships operate

Details of regulations we propose to repeal / retain are set out on pages 2 to 5.

We would like your views on the proposals for repealing / retaining certain regulations, including:

- Any risks associated with repealing regulations as proposed
- Any other regulations you think could / should be repealed without having a detrimental impact on local partnership working

We will be consulting separately in Wales as some of these regulations are separate or apply differently in Wales.

Please send your responses to paula.milner@gowm.gsi.gov.uk by **close, 8th September 2010.**

Regulations to be repealed / retained

1. Purpose of regulations: Prescribes list of bodies CSPs must cooperate with and invite to participate	
Summary	These regulations prescribe descriptions of persons or bodies with whom the responsible authorities are required to cooperate in the formulation and implementation of strategies for the reduction of crime and disorder within local government areas. The list includes parish councils, governing bodies of schools, social landlords and voluntary organisations.
Statutory Instruments	2452/1998 , 2513/1998 & 483/1999 (hyperlinks to Statutory Instruments on www.opsi.gov.uk)
Recommendation	Repeal all These regulations are unnecessarily prescriptive and partners are best placed to decide which persons or bodies they should involve in the formulation and implementation of strategies.
Q. Do you agree with the recommendation above?	
Q. What, if any, are the risks associated with repealing these regulations?	
2. Purpose of regulations: Requires CSPs to complete strategic assessments, produce partnership plans, consult the community, share information and have in place arrangements for appointing a chair	
Statutory Instruments	1830/2007 & 647/2010 (England)
Recommendation	Repeal <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requirement for the strategy group to have arrangements in place for the functions of the chair (Regulation 3: subsection 4) • Requirement for the strategy group to meet from time to time (Regulation 3: subsection 5)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requirement for strategy group to consider whether the group have the right skills and knowledge (Regulation 3: subsection 7) • Requirement for the county strategy group to have arrangements in place for the functions of the chair (Regulation 8: subsection 3) • Requirement for the county strategy group to meet from time to time (Regulation 8: subsection) • Requirement for strategy group to hold public meetings, that the meetings should be attended by certain people and that the public should be informed about the meetings (Regulation 12: subsection 4) • Requirement for the strategy group to consider the extent to which local people might assist them in preparing the partnership plan (Regulation 13) <p>We consider that these regulations are overly prescriptive.</p> <p>Retain</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requirement for strategic assessments • Requirement for partnership plans • Requirement for CSPs to consult the community <p>We consider that regulations that set out a need for CSPs to formulate and implement strategies and that support the role of CSPs in engaging with the community are still helpful to ensure a level of consistency of approach.</p>
<p>Q. Do you agree with the recommendations above?</p>	
<p>Q. What, if any, are the risks associated with repealing these regulations? (please specify which regulation the risk is associated with)</p>	
<p>3. Purpose of regulations: Requires named authorities to share depersonalised information each quarter</p>	
<p>Statutory Instruments</p>	<p>1831/2007, 1406/2008 & 656/2010</p>
<p>Recommendation</p>	<p>Retain</p>

	<p>We consider that these regulations are necessary to ensure information is shared between partners. Please note that we will be carrying out a separate, more detailed piece of work on information sharing to determine whether current powers and guidance are sufficient and appropriate.</p>
<p>Q. Do you agree with the recommendation above? Please provide any further thoughts on these regulations that will help us in developing the more detailed piece of work on information sharing.</p>	
<p>4. Purpose of regulations: Prescribes how the Crime and Disorder Overview and Scrutiny committee should operate</p>	
Statutory Instruments	<p>942/2009 & 616/2010</p>
Recommendation	<p>Repeal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regulation for how the committee may co-opt additional members to serve on the committee (Regulation 3) • Requirement to meet annually (Regulation 4) • Requirement that any responses to the committee’s reports/recommendations should be in writing and submitted within 28 days (Regulation 7) <p>We consider that these regulations are overly prescriptive and that committees should be free to decide how they should operate.</p> <p>Retain</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requirement to share information • Regulation to allow committee to require an officer of a responsible authority to attend a committee meeting <p>We consider these regulations are still helpful to ensure effective scrutiny and a level of consistency of approach.</p>
<p>Q. Do you agree with the recommendation above?</p>	
<p>Q. What, if any, are the risks associated with repealing these regulations?</p>	

Q. Are there any other regulations that you think hinder the effective working of CSPs and should be repealed?