

Community Safety**Report by Kevin Anderson, Executive Director - Place****Report for Decision****1 Recommendations**

Council is recommended to consider the options set out in this report for Community Safety services.

2 Purpose of Report/Executive Summary

This report results from a motion passed at Council on 5 October 2021 requesting a paper to the next full Council to establish a business case for investing in measures to robustly address and prevent antisocial behaviour, including an option to reinstate Community Safety Officers.

A report was submitted to Council on 16 November 2021 detailing the policy and practice in relation to antisocial behaviour in communities and our landlord duties in council housing.

Date: 3 December 2021**Report Contact:****Name:** Kevin Anderson, Executive Director - Place**Tel:** 0131 271 3102kevin.anderson@midlothian.gov.uk

3 Background

3.1 The motion approved at Council on 5 October, 2021 stated;

Midlothian Council reaffirms its belief that antisocial behaviour in our communities is wholly unacceptable. The Council also recognises that antisocial social behaviour has an impact across the community, and especially so for close neighbours of perpetrators.

Whilst appropriate enforcement action should always be pursued rigorously by all partners involved, the prevention of anti-social behaviour and de-escalation of anti-social behaviours could potentially save resources and distress to Midlothian residents.

Therefore, the Council will bring forward a paper to the next full Council to establish a business case for investing in measures to robustly address and prevent antisocial behaviour, including an option to reinstate Community Safety Officers.

Midlothian Council also notes that the role of Police Scotland is crucial to a joined up approach in tackling anti-social behaviour and asks that they are asked to contribute to the forthcoming paper.

4 Community Safety

4.1 Midlothian Council budget savings agreed in February 2018 resulted in significant changes to community safety arrangements in Midlothian. Reduction in staffing and resources of the Community Safety Team placed an even greater reliance on partnership working in order to respond to community safety issues. As a consequence, locally there has been a notable change in the relationship with communities. There has been a move away from solely safety or justice strategies to a focus on the holistic needs of communities focused on people having strong networks of support, building connections across and between communities, and empowering people in communities to support each other and to take collective action.

4.2 Since the Community Safety team was disbanded in February 2019 the role of the Community Safety and Justice Manager has focused solely on Community Justice which sits in a legislative framework. The funding for this post comes exclusively from a (temporary) Scottish Government grant so that Community Justice can be coordinated and delivered locally. In terms of current governance, there is a Community Justice Working Group (made up of statutory and voluntary agencies) that develops and implements the Community Justice Outcome Improvement Plan 2020-2023 (CJOIP). This is a 40 action plan that seeks to reduce reoffending across Midlothian. The working group reports directly to the Community Safety and Justice Partnership Board. Further, the Board is one of the thematic partners within the Community Planning Partnership. Overall accountability for Community Justice sits with the underpinning legislation and with Community Justice Scotland.

- 4.3** In relation to Community Safety specifically, all governance groups were disbanded along with the team. There were a number of previous working groups and a weekly Tasking & Coordination (TAC) meeting with Police colleagues and Council services and other partner services. Given that there was no framework to take forward actions, the Antisocial Behaviour (ASB) Strategy has not been progressed since 2019. As noted in the strategy, it was to be reviewed by the Community Safety Team. With regards to the ASB Policy, this is a Housing only policy, as previously reported to Council on 16 November 2021.
- 4.4** Community Safety in Midlothian is now contained to five actions that are reported within the Single Midlothian Plan. The actions that are reported on are single agency actions rather than partnership ones. These actions came from feedback from the Citizens Panel and are as follows:
- Work with partner agencies to prevent violent behaviours, manage violent offenders and develop a programme of interventions to reduce levels of violent crime- Police only action.
 - Undertake a range of communication and engagement activity regarding responsible alcohol consumption- Mid and East Lothian Drugs and Alcohol Partnership action
 - Develop substance misuse services to reduce immediate harm, future harm and promoting recovery- Mid and East Lothian Drugs and Alcohol Partnership action
 - Raise awareness of Violence Against Women and Girls with services and communities- Violence Against Women and Girls Partnership
 - Educate people regarding speeding, drink driving and responsibly parking- Road Safety action

5 Options Model

- 5.1** The Council's Communities, Lifelong Learning and Employability service have maintained street work with the aim of engaging with young people, building relationships, providing advice, information, promoting activities and linking to employment support. The team operate on the principles of voluntary engagement and harm reduction with resource for 8 trained street workers to be out for 4 hours covering Midlothian weekly.
- 5.2** A further focus on strategic planning will look at how we can identify and act upon delivery of the Community Safety and Justice Strategy and Plan, performance management, analytical support, planning and implementation of prevention activity and interventions related to community safety priorities (substance misuse, gender based harm, crimes of dishonesty, violent crime, ASB, home safety and unintentional harm, death and injury on Midlothian's roads, community involvement in setting and delivering outcomes and safeguarding communities) and

other topics partners see as relevant to strategic planning.

5.3 There is an opportunity to review Community Safety, to support local and national organisations to better understand, share and align their efforts with focus on operational activity. This will look at how we can continue to facilitate partnership working on ASB cases and other offending activity, tasking and coordinating of Police CAT teams, information sharing and compliancy with GDPR and other topics partners see as relevant to community safety operations and model options to cost and which elected members can consider.

5.4 In order to address ASB within our communities, in addition to what our Housing Services already provides to tenants, an option would be to adopt a Safer Communities model, similar to other neighbouring Local Authorities, whereby Antisocial Behaviour Officers work alongside housing officers and Resolution officers (mediation service) to holistically address the issues of community safety priorities such as early intervention and prevention and coordination of the joint working between council representatives and the Police CAT teams.

However, a complete reinstatement of the former Community Safety Team establishment has been costed at a minimum £419,428 as a full year effect as detailed in the table below. This does not include additional capital and revenue on-costs for digital supplies and service systems that would be required for any case management purposes.

Re-instate Community Safety Team Costing				
Internal Post Title	Grade	FTE	Bottom SCP (inc On-Costs)	Top SCP (inc On-Costs)
Community Safety Manager	Grade 11	1	68,317	74,828
Community Safety and Development Officer	Grade 7	1	42,033	46,045
Community Safety and Estates Team Leader	Grade 7	1	42,033	46,045
Community Safety Officer	Grade 6	1	36,160	39,588
Community Safety Officer	Grade 6	1	36,160	39,588
Community Safety Officer	Grade 6	1	36,160	39,588
Mediation Service Co-ordinator	Grade 6	1	36,160	39,588
Community Safety and Estates Assistant	Grade 4	1	30,445	31,799
Total Internal Posts		8	327,468	357,069
Seconded Police Posts	Estimated Grade Equivalent			
ASB Officer	Grade 8	1	47,428	47,428
Partnership Analyst	Grade 7	1	42,032	42,032

Total Seconded Posts		2	89,460	89,460
Other				
Supplies and Services/Mobiles			2,500	2,500
Total Other Costs			2,500	2,500
Total Yearly Cost			419,428	449,029

6 Report Implications (Resource, Digital and Risk)

6.1 Resource

Any options to develop or deploy an alternative Community Safety provision will incur additional costs which are not budgeted for in the current year or provided for in future years projections.

Consequently any service change will impact negatively on reserves if additional spend is incurred in this financial year. Otherwise any future costs would add to the underlying budget gap for future years and so adversely impact on the ability to balance the 2022/23 budget. Accordingly prioritising funding to this service would necessitate compensatory service reductions or saving measures.

6.2 Digital

No digital implications at present as reporting on existing policies and practice.

6.3 Risk

No risk implications at present as reporting on existing policies and practice.

6.4 Ensuring Equalities (if required a separate IIA must be completed)

No IIA required as reporting on existing policies and practice.

6.5 Additional Report Implications

APPENDIX A – Report Implications

A.1 Key Priorities within the Single Midlothian Plan

No change as reporting on existing policies and practice.

A.2 Key Drivers for Change

Key drivers addressed in this report:

- Holistic Working
- Hub and Spoke
- Modern
- Sustainable
- Transformational
- Preventative
- Asset-based
- Continuous Improvement
- One size fits one
- None of the above

A.3 Key Delivery Streams

Key delivery streams addressed in this report:

- One Council Working with you, for you
- Preventative and Sustainable
- Efficient and Modern
- Innovative and Ambitious
- None of the above

A.4 Delivering Best Value

No change as reporting on existing policies and practice.

A.5 Involving Communities and Other Stakeholders

No change as reporting on existing policies and practice.

A.6 Impact on Performance and Outcomes

The last available outcomes report for the former service effectiveness in ASB cases was recorded in 2018 and is noted below for information.

OUTCOMES	PR - PARTY REFUSED MEDIATION	S - SUCCESSFUL AGREEMENT REACHED	US - UNSUCCESSFUL NO AGREEMENT	PS - PARTIALLY SUCCESSFUL PART AGREEMENT REACHED	O - OTHER OUTCOME	% SATIS OUTCOME	Totals
JANUARY	2	8	0	0	1		11
FEBRUARY	4	6	0	0	1		11
MARCH	0	6	0	0	0	100%	6
APRIL	0	8	0	0	1	100%	9
MAY	0	6	0	0	0	100%	6
JUNE	0	9	0	0	0	100%	9
JULY	0	4	0	0	1	100%	5
AUGUST	2	3	0	0	1	50%	6
SEPTEMBER	0	3	0	0	4	100%	7
OCTOBER	3	3	1	0	1	63%	8
NOVEMBER	2	4	1		3	80%	10
DECEMBER	2	1	0	0	2		3
Totals							

A.7 Adopting a Preventative Approach

No change as reporting on existing policies and practice.

A.8 Supporting Sustainable Development

No change as reporting on existing policies and practice.