

APPENDIX 1

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This business case outlines how the formalising of Hyndburn and Pendle Local Authorities engagement with the Pennine Lancashire Community Safety Partnership will further strengthen partnership working, investment and delivery across the region with some further recommendations to improve governance, support, democratic engagement, and increase the pace of board directed activity.

- Currently Blackburn with Darwen, Burnley & Rossendale have a formal combined Community Safety Partnership arrangement; an agreement signed by the Police and Crime Commissioner for Lancashire in 2016. To date, the group has retained strategic engagement and support for Hyndburn and Pendle while both areas retained their own partnership infrastructure.
- As the new partnership has developed to include producing its own strategy and revised delivery arrangements it is now in a position to take forward a fully collaborative approach to Community Safety to which the responsible bodies will exclusively focus their engagement and investment.
- The group has also looked at the concerns raised by Hyndburn and Pendle with regards their previous reluctance to join reflected in changes proposed to the governance, attendance and meeting structures over and above the wider benefits available detailed below.

Background:

- In March 2015 the then Lancashire Community Safety Steering Group set up a small task group to develop a more streamlined, simplified and connected community safety landscape across Lancashire. This was to be aligned to the delivery of sub-regional Community Safety arrangements. The aim was to have greater influence over delivery of outcomes and to mitigate the shrinking ability of a number of responsible bodies, particularly the constabulary, probation and health colleagues whom operate over large footprints to service localised partnership arrangements.
- The combining of CSP's however has only been partially adopted, and only in Central and East Lancashire to date with the Lancashire wide community safety landscape remaining a complex one. While the vast array of partnership meetings across Lancashire have been rationalised there remains over 20 'task and finish' type groups to which each agencies arguably need to attend to benefit from.
- The Pennine arrangements have been operated over the last 2 years with varying success, restricted somewhat by the retention of wider partnership arrangements, not having the collective voice of a unified Pennine area and limited resources retained by the higher tier authorities central to this. That said where representation has been made from Pennine, particularly in relation to CCTV, Organised Crime and Domestic Abuse Refuge, significant investment and tangible delivery has been achieved.

- Progress has been slower in relation to priority areas where people services are a key contributor – violent crime prevention and intervention to include Domestic Abuse outside of refuge services, and Reducing Reoffending in particular have been areas where partners have shared their frustration in not being able to deliver tangibly. Meaningful engagement with the commissioners of services has been difficult, as has carrying influence over policy and practice as noted above. Bids however in these areas have been more successful and more recent progress with the reducing reoffending board has seen the OPCC investing in an independent chair for sub regional areas to drive improved engagement and outcomes.

Key Future Benefits

Benefits of operating as a combined area for the full Pennine region can be grouped in 3 areas:

- **Partnership Engagement:**
 - To date the group has operated with an interim strategy covering all local authority areas. The new one (attached) covers the 3 combined CSP areas having jointly undertaken partner engagement, consultation and assessment of available data. With all agencies signed up to its delivery there should be greater appetite to co-ordinate, scrutinise and develop policy and practice to deliver its outcomes with greater consistency. As it's a legal requirement Pendle and Hyndburn currently will have to do their own.
 - Partner attendance, representation and access – Probation, CRC, Police, Health (CCG) have all agreed they are not able to service multiple boards but have committed to senior representation at the Pennine board. To have influence on resources, policy and practice, membership is beneficial.
 - Cross area support infrastructure has significant benefits able to co-ordinate a regional offer with unique specialisms provided geographically we can develop with a greater degree of economies of scale. With less resource available it is important to work collectively to deliver shared outcomes given many of the challenges for each borough are replicated across wider Pennine Lancashire.
- **Funding:**
 - The OPCC provides funding for districts separate to that of the upper tier authorities with an equivocal allocation going to the County pro rata to what the unitary areas get. As context BwD received £220k of OPCC funding in 17/18 comparing to under £40k for the district areas combined. As a full Pennine area a strong case can be made to create a pooled budget to include the LCC element of this, with BwD willing to contribute its allocation. While the OPCC office will not push areas into combination agreements they see the benefit and are willing to consider this if there is greater consistency in engagement and ownership and consensus.
 - Regional and or collaborative bids from existing and proven partnership arrangements are increasingly the focus of government departmental funding. Vulnerable adults are the latest example with funding agreed for Burnley and Blackburn for Street Reach and MEAM programmes supported by the CSP alongside a bid to the Homelessness pathfinder awaiting feedback from government which could bring investment of £500k over 2 years. There are further opportunities for

this work which can only be delivered through strong multi-area governance arrangements.

- Across Full Lancashire areas there are opportunities to emphasis the resource to risk requirments. For the last 2 Domestic Abuse applications while all areas obtained some funding, Pennine received over 40% of the Lancashire allocation, of which 70% went to BwD and Burnley given we were able to support the development of the bid proactively between us.
- **Efficiency**
 - There remain opportunities for future integrated working flexing around need across Pennine with several already in place. This includes ASB enforcement where Burnley, BwD and Rossendale have shared legal service support around breaches and summons using ASB tools and powers, outreach services for vulnerable adults in Blackburn and Burnley Town Centre and CCTV services which when operated wider achieve collective financial benefit. This fits with Public service reform agenda with Pennine a potential pilot for greater integration.
 - There is also the opportunity to integrate the work of the Pennine board with that of transforming lives arrangements, a central tenant within the refreshed strategy, rationalising governance and bringing greater alignment to areas of business with similar aims.
- **Further requirements:**
 - Member engagement - The majority of local authorities have requested member attendance at the Pennine board to support democratic engagement. This has been agreed by wider partners. The proposal is to alternate member engagement to every other meeting and increase their frequency to Bi Monthly.
 - Meeting Frequency – Partners have requested increased frequency of meetings to speed progress on the board’s key priorities. The proposal is to move to bi-monthly meetings with thematic groups meeting on the same frequency where possible with strengthened attendance and delivery. It is proposed to allow the member representative to chair every other meeting in rotation while retaining the officer chair for the remaining meetings – 6 meetings annually with 3 meetings attended and lead by members and 3 officer meetings to focus on strategy, policy and delivery.
 - This can only be achieved with suitable support provided by agencies for both the board and thematic meetings detailed in appendix A.

Recommendations:

- That Executive Members and or Leaders are invited to be board members from each area.
- That the meetings are increased in frequency to Bi Monthly.
- That agreement is reach on one of the two ways of addressing the business support needs of the board and its thematic groups and agrees a lead representative to take forward a formal request as detailed in appendix A.

- That Hyndburn and Pendle formally sign up to the Combination agreement and the Strategy is updated to reflect this.
- That the attached appendix B, Meeting structure and terms of reference are adopted and the board agrees chairs for each represented at the board.
- Those representatives of the Transforming Lives board meet with nominated representatives of the Community Safety Pennine Board to review areas of responsibility serviced through a Memorandum of Agreement and/or opportunities for streamlining governance and delivery.

Appendix A:

- In order to service the Pennine Lancashire Community Safety Partnership board effectively and its thematic groups there needs to be greater alignment or investment in dedicated staff time to support it. In particular there needs to be closer alignment between the core policy and business support functions required by the board to operate efficiently and effectively in the following areas:
 - Stakeholder engagement
 - Thematic and strategic business support arrangements
 - Policy scanning
 - Scrutiny and performance management
- Improvements in our collaborative working arrangements in these areas will enable us to deliver tangible outcomes from the work of the board both tactically and strategically. It will also allow a better distribution of demand amongst partners without placing significant pressure on staff time spent administering meetings, providing greater resilience which is proving a challenge in some areas.
- A number of options were reviewed in January 2017, with the option of split functions between board representatives agreed. This has proved challenging to sustain given the changes in personnel, representatives core roles developing over time, mitigating their availability to co-ordinate and administer partnership arrangements.
- The alternative Joint investment was rejected in 2017 due to cost implications estimated at the time at £48k. Given demand, scale and current investment from partner agencies we would suggest this is re-visited with a view to slimming down the financial requirements in one of two ways to achieve a similar outcome:
 - By aligning it to developing arrangements across the Adults and Children's Social Care domains where a 3 area footprint is in the process of being developed. While still to be agreed, in such an arrangement; alongside Adult and Children's Safeguarding governance, Community Safety governance could be supported as a further critical partnership arrangement, contributing to the cost of the staff that service it. Split 3 ways an indicative estimate would be £12k per annum, or £1500 per responsible body.
 - By redefining the role of the LCC Community Safety Support officer so their focus is on the business support needs of the board and its activity alongside their engagement. LCC representative at a more senior level could then take up the remit of policy and practice from a county perspective.

Appendix B

