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**1. Purpose**

* 1. The purpose of this report is to inform the Panel of the work and views of the district Community Safety Partnerships and Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Committees. Updates have been received from seven of the Community Safety Partnerships and Scrutiny Committees in accordance with the protocols agreed between the Police and Crime Panel and the local bodies.
	2. It is recommended that the Panel notes the common trends and views highlighted in the report. Suggestions for future work may be included in the Panel’s forward plan and members may also wish to raise issues with the Police and Crime Commissioner.

**2. Views from Community Safety Partnerships**

2.1 Responses were received from four district Community Safety Partnerships (Bradford, Calderdale, Leeds and Wakefield).

2.2 Partnerships reiterated their feeling that local priorities were incorporated into the West Yorkshire Police and Crime Plan and that there was strong evidence that parties had ‘given regard to’ each other’s priorities. Specifically, Wakefield is revising its local Community Safety Plan and both the CSP and Scrutiny Committee feel that it is aligned with the priorities in the Police and Crime Plan.

2.3 There is strong evidence that the PCC is acting in accordance with his Police and Crime Plan. Partnerships have recognised that the PCC has acted to establish partner working groups, including the CSP Forum. These offer a good mechanism of sharing learning, whilst giving the freedom for localities to adapt approaches according to local circumstance.

2.4 The CSPs continue to examine progress against priorities. Generally performance is felt to be good in many areas, which has been attributed to the continuation of passported community safety funding. There are, however, local performance concerns. For example, in Bradford a stringent improvement plan has been developed to tackle a rise in the proportion of residents saying anti-social behaviour has got worse based on robust enforcement and restorative justice principles to improve victim services.

2.5 The Partnerships reiterate their support of the PCC’s decision to extend their funding for community safety work for a further six months to September 2014. It was also reported that the PCC’s commissioning intentions have been communicated clearly, although there is a need to maintain this during the introduction of the Delivery Plan. Other highlights include the opportunity to work with further funding, such as POCA funds.

2.6 The AWYA continues to bring CSP Managers together to act on joint opportunities. This has been widely welcomed by the Partnerships and has recently included work with the LGA on their improvement offer for community safety work.

**3. Views from Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Committees**

3.1 Responses were received from three district Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Committees (Kirklees, Leeds and Wakefield).

3.2 Committees in Kirklees and Wakefield have recently focused on strategic approaches to crime and disorder via local Community Safety Plans. The Committees felt these plans were stronger following their input.

3.3 Wakefield’s Scrutiny Committee reported that the PCC attending its December meeting in response to concerns about the future funding of community safety programmes. The PCC explained that no decisions would be made until March and following analysis of existing programmes. The PCC committed to a minimum of six months’ notice of any reduction or withdrawal of funding.

3.4 Scrutiny Committees have also acted on the number and targeting of PCSOs, illustrated by the report from Leeds (attached as appendix A).

3.5 Police and Crime Panel Members continue to be involved in local scrutiny work, including reviews of Hate Crime, Child Sexual Exploitation and Victims’ Services (Wakefield); Domestic Violence (Leeds) and oversight of performance (Kirklees).

**4. Implications for the Panel**

4.1 Common issues that may warrant further discussion with the PCC include:

* The approval process for the £1m investment in tackling domestic violence in West Yorkshire, described in the PCC’s precept decision;
* The timetable for implementing his Delivery Plan; and,
* The process he uses and actions he has taken in respect of the performance concerns identified by Partnerships and Committees.

4.2 Crucial to the success of the ‘Local Perspectives’ process is the two-way provision of information. Whilst information will be relayed back to the Partnerships and Committees that have kindly provided information for the Panel, this might be further underpinned by Panel members de-briefing colleagues in constituent areas in order to put in a firmer local context.

**5. Recommendation**

5.1 It is recommended that the Panel notes the common trends and views highlighted in the report. Suggestions for future work may be included in the Panel’s work programme and Members may also wish to raise certain issues with the PCC.