1. **Context**

Across both the City of London Corporation (CoLC) and the City of London Police (CoLP) there are areas where improvements could be made in setting joint strategic direction and applying consistency of process for matters relating to ‘community safety’.

In defining ‘community safety’, it can be said that it is not just about managing the risks of crime; it refers to all actions that can cause harm to communities including transport-related incidents and other environmental factors that impact on public well-being (the linkage to the work of the Health and Wellbeing Board is well recognised).

Recently a number of reviews have taken place of existing partnerships which have recommendations supporting the principles of improved working arrangements. The areas reviewed were; the Safer City Partnership, the Road Danger Reduction Partnership and the Contingency and Emergency Planning Team. This has been a catalyst for further work to look into wider functions across the two organisations and to consider where greater collaboration, at strategic and operational level, needs to be strengthened in order to achieve an improvement in community safety within the City of London.

Additionally, there have been recent legislative changes, namely the Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014; The changes in the 2014 act requires Police, Local Authorities and agencies to work together to develop processes and responses to the Community Trigger and Community Remedy. These are aimed at improving multi-agency processes to address to issues reported and ensuring that effective mechanisms are in place to respond to complaints received. The aim is to make authorities and agencies more accountable to the community they serve. By joining up more functions relating to community safety issues it would be anticipated that information will be shared better, eliminating gaps in intelligence.

To ensure we meet the requirements of the above legislation and achieve improvements in developing better joint strategic planning, tactical tasking and operational delivery for matters relating to ‘community safety’, work has started to explore options for improved ways of working. This exploration work includes opportunities for joint working, collaboration, virtual teams and where feasible co-locating teams where appropriate within a Community Safety Hub, better collaboration between teams, virtual teams and improved processes and systems of working. This builds on the already established links and principles between the Department of Built Environment and Markets and Consumer Protections within CoLC and CoLP by way of a Memorandum of Understanding.
A workshop held on 24 June 2014 was attended by twenty senior managers from both organisations. This workshop explored and identified areas of service functionality that may be considered as part of the improved collaborative working or improved processes with the aspiration of creating a Partnership ‘Community Safety Hub’.

A report was approved by Chief Officer Group on 15th October 2014 to proceed with this project as a corporate project to develop and deliver a Community Safety Hub model.

### 2. Brief description of project

Over recent years a number of unfortunate incidents have highlighted some shortcomings of how agencies deal with anti-social behaviour and share information, the Fiona Pilkington case was one of these where intelligence fell between local authority and police and may not have been responded to as well as it could have been. As a response to this the legislation has changed now in relation to ASB.

To meet the requirements of the new legislation, local authorities and partner organisations must develop mechanisms, structures or ways of working that ensures that information relating to all aspects of anti-social behaviour is shared between partner agencies to enable a response which is of the right type and timely to support the victims of ASB.

The City of London Corporation and the City of London Police propose to develop and set-up a Community Safety Hub partnership to integrate functions where appropriate which will provide joined up strategies, intelligence and engagement resulting in more effective operational delivery of ‘community safety’ activities.

The emphasis of the hub will be on information-sharing and collaboration to identify early intervention and prevention opportunities, and improve accessibility to and accountability for community safety services through a single point of contact delivered by the Joint Contact and Control Room project and joint tasking and allocation of resources to making the best use of skills across the two organisations co-locating teams where appropriate within a Community Safety Hub, better collaboration between teams and improved processes and systems of working.

The project will look at how functions that are closely linked across the CoLC and CoLP and deal with issues relating to ASB are currently resourced and delivered and try to establish if these functions could be better delivered through better joint working, collaboration, virtual teams and where feasible co-locating teams where appropriate within a Community Safety Hub. Processes and systems will be reviewed to see if improved communications and information sharing can be achieved and resource tasking will be reviewed to establish if there are any efficiencies to be made through more joined up working.

This proposal sets out an opportunity to explore further into how CoLC & CoLP could establish a “Community Safety Hub” that works jointly to provide “fit for purpose” services to deliver the right outcomes to customers. This would be achieved through breaking down the traditional barriers that exist between the organisations whether they be security, process, governance or physical location.

### 3. Consequences if

These include:
If the Community Safety Hub project is not approved, the risks associated with the above consequences will be mitigated to some degree through the JCCR programme and the Customer Contact Strategy, a workstream of the City Futures Programme.

### 4. Success criteria

As a result of creating a Community Safety Hub a list of possible benefits to be explored are anticipated to be:

- Co-location of the management team and some service departments or representatives (open plan accommodation where appropriate)
- Single point of contact for customers and joint operational processes
- Management of budgets through a joint governance process
- Data gathering, analysis and information-sharing arrangements
- Processes for accessing technical expertise outside of the hub (i.e. other departments and agencies)
- Joint tasking processes across both organisations
- Integrated ICT and case management system
- Methodologies for measuring and analysing community safety outcomes and return on investment
- Formalised joint working arrangements with other agencies and partnerships (e.g. Victim Support, Neighbourhood Watch, Business Crime Reduction Partnerships, homelessness and substance misuse charities etc.)
- Both organisations have a clear business and resident engagement strategies with outcomes delivered through the Community Safety Hub
- A reduction in the number of meetings
- Opportunities to review resources and operational costs
- An increase in customer services’ satisfaction levels
- Improvements in service processing

### 5. Notable exclusions

Scoping of the project’s business requirements is underway and once refined, technology workshops will be held to clarify IT exclusions.

### 6. Governance arrangements

**Spending Committee:** Capital Programme Board  
**Senior Responsible Officer:** Cmdr. Wayne Chance and Peter Lisley, Assistant Town Clerk  
**Project Board:** A proposed Project Board membership was agreed on 2 September 2014 (Refer to Appendix 2.)
## Prioritisation

### 7. Link to Strategic Aims

2. To provide modern, efficient and high quality local services and policing within the Square Mile for workers, residents and visitors with a view to delivering sustainable outcomes.

*To support and promote ‘The City’ as the world leader in international finance and business services*

*To provide modern, efficient and high quality local services and policing within the Square Mile for workers, residents and visitors with a view to delivering sustainable outcomes*

*To provide valued services to London and the nation*

Identify which of the Force’s strategic priorities this project addresses.

- The City of London is protected against the threat from terrorism and remains a safe place for businesses, residents, workers and visitors
- Roads in the City of London are safer for all road users
- We provide an effective and proportionate response to spontaneous and pre-planned events
- Crime levels in the City of London remain low
- The City is a safe place in which to live, work, visit or spend leisure time, with low levels of antisocial behaviour
- We have the capability and capacity to deliver our obligations under the Strategic Policing Requirement

### 8. Links to existing strategies, programmes and projects

- Policing Plan 2013-2015
- Chief Constables’ business crime definition (agreed on 14 January 2014)
- Serious Organised Crime Strategy
- Cyber Crime Strategy
- MOPAC Crime Strategy
- Safer City Partnership Priority Plan
- City of London Corporation’s Departmental Plan
- Department of Built Environment Business Plan
- Crime Survey for England and Wales

### 9. Project category

6. Improvements in productivity/efficiency

### 10. Project priority

B. Advisable

## Options Appraisal

### 11. Overview of options

1. Co-location
2. Improved collaboration
3. Improved communications’ systems
4. Good national practice
5. Improved intelligence sharing
6. Resourcing
7. Tasking
8. Capturing good practice
## Project Planning

### 12. Programme and key dates

**Overall programme:** before October 2015  
**Key dates:** Refer to Appendix 1  
**Other project dates to coordinate:**

The scope of the Community Safety Hub project will be closely related to the work of the JCCR programme. The ambition of the JCCR programme is defined in section 2.

The JCCR programme is currently in an early discovery phase. However, it is anticipated that there will be the potential for overlap in the areas of emergency planning and business continuity, street environment, transport, technology, and civil contingencies. The interdependencies between both projects will, therefore, be closely monitored as part of the overall risk management approach [see 26].

The Community Safety Hub may have an impact on the accommodation review/strategy and therefore the City Surveyor has been engaged as part of the development of this project to align outcomes.

### 13. Risk implications

**Overall project risk:** Green  
As the project is developed there may be interdependencies on other projects such as the Police Accommodation Review and maybe the JCCR Project.

HR issues may arise and therefore HR will be part of the project team.

IS development/ Mobile Working may impact on the development of the project and will also be part of the project team.

### 14. Stakeholders and consultees

City of London residents, businesses and transient population.  
Staff from both organisations, City Surveyor.  
ACPO and City of London Corporation Members.

## Resource Implications

### 15. Total estimated cost

1. Under £250k

### 16. Funding strategy

An application has been submitted to the Department for Communities and Local Government Transformation Challenge Award—in progress

### 17. On-going revenue implications

One of the objectives of the Community Safety Hub project is to ensure that there is no increase in the overall revenue budget and to clearly identify some areas of savings.

### 18. Investment appraisal

None.

### 19. Procurement strategy

The project Manager, through the project team will establish what, if any, services or goods are required to develop the Community Safety Hub Concept and in consultation with appropriate Departments will work with CLPS to ensure compliance with procurement regulations and value for money.

### 20. Legal implications

There is a legal requirement under the Crime and Disorder Act 1988
to have a community safety partnership. In addition, the Civil Contingencies Act 1988 requires agencies to work and collaborate and the Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014, Reform of anti-social behaviour powers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>21. Corporate property implications</th>
<th>None identified at this stage, however if co-location is developed there may be a requirement to consider appropriate accommodation. The City Surveyor and officer responsible for the accommodation strategy are engaged in the development of this project.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22. Traffic implications</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Sustainability and energy implications</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. IS implications</td>
<td>There will be a need for the IS Department to be involved to ensure that both organisations’ systems are capable of exchanging information across the security measures and accesses that IS deem necessary. As part of the privacy impact assessment requirement, a consultation phase will be completed. IS have been engaged in the development of this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Equality Impact Assessment</td>
<td>An equality impact assessment will be undertaken</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommended Course of Action**

| 26. Next steps                     | • A Business Analyst will be engaged in order to complete an internal review, customer journey mapping and stakeholder consultation to verify where both organisations would benefit from a Community Safety Hub.  
• Project Board to be agreed and inaugurated.  
• Project outcomes to be agreed by the Project Board.  
• A RAID (risks, assumptions, issues and dependencies) log to be produced to capture the initial areas requiring project control.  
• The above project outcomes to be cross-referenced by the Project Manager against the potential scope of the JCCR programme  
• Gateway 3, 4 & 5 Report |

| 27. Approval track and next Gateway | **Approval track**: 2. Regular  
**Next Gateway**: Gateway 3/4 - Options Appraisal (Regular) |
### Resource requirements to reach next Gateway

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Cost (£)</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Project Manager</td>
<td>Control of project</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local Risk Budget within existing resources - City of London Police (Links with Accommodation Review and JCCR Project)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Business Analyst</td>
<td>Complete key stages of review, process mapping and consultation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local Risk Budget within existing resources - City of London Corporation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If any additional spend is incurred it has been agreed with the Chamberlain that this would be split 50/50 between the Department of Built Environment and the City Police to get the project to the next stages.

### Contact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Authors</th>
<th>Deborah Delacroix—Project Management Consultant Hector McKoy—Chief Inspector (CoLP) Doug Wilkinson—Assistant Director (CoLC)</th>
<th><a href="mailto:Deborah.Delacroix@cityoflondon.police.uk">Deborah.Delacroix@cityoflondon.police.uk</a> <a href="mailto:Hector.McKoy@cityoflondon.gov.uk">Hector.McKoy@cityoflondon.gov.uk</a> <a href="mailto:Doug.Wilkinson@cityoflondon.gov.uk">Doug.Wilkinson@cityoflondon.gov.uk</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact number</td>
<td>Deborah Delacroix 0207 601 2529</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 1: Community Safety Hub: project initiation timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Task Name</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Finish Date</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Project mandate set out by Commissioner Legal/ID</td>
<td>02/09/2014</td>
<td>02/09/2014</td>
<td>1d</td>
<td>Jun 2014</td>
<td>Jun 2014</td>
<td>1d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Community Safety Hub concept workshop</td>
<td>24/9/2014</td>
<td>24/09/2014</td>
<td>1d</td>
<td>Dec 2014</td>
<td>Dec 2014</td>
<td>1d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>GH2 presented to Commissioner Ceppardi &amp; Town Clerk</td>
<td>24/9/2014</td>
<td>24/09/2014</td>
<td>1d</td>
<td>Apr 2015</td>
<td>Apr 2015</td>
<td>1d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>CEC assigned Business Analyst to project</td>
<td>15/9/2014</td>
<td>15/09/2014</td>
<td>1d</td>
<td>May 2015</td>
<td>May 2015</td>
<td>1d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Stakeholder consultation</td>
<td>02/06/2015</td>
<td>13/08/2015</td>
<td>35d</td>
<td>Sep 2015</td>
<td>Sep 2015</td>
<td>35d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Agree desired outcomes</td>
<td>16/08/2015</td>
<td>27/03/2015</td>
<td>110d</td>
<td>Oct 2015</td>
<td>Oct 2015</td>
<td>110d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Submit GH2 to Forrester Change Board Committee (meeting date 09/10/14)</td>
<td>23/9/2014</td>
<td>23/9/2014</td>
<td>1d</td>
<td>Dec 2014</td>
<td>Dec 2014</td>
<td>1d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Submit GH2 to Chief Officer Group Committee (meeting date 15/10/14)</td>
<td>06/10/2014</td>
<td>09/10/2014</td>
<td>1d</td>
<td>Jan 2015</td>
<td>Jan 2015</td>
<td>1d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Submit GH2 to Corporate Projects Board Committee (meeting date 09/10/14)</td>
<td>30/10/2014</td>
<td>30/10/2014</td>
<td>1d</td>
<td>Feb 2015</td>
<td>Feb 2015</td>
<td>1d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Submit Gateway 2 to Projects Sub Committee (meeting date 09/10/14)</td>
<td>27/4/2015</td>
<td>27/4/2015</td>
<td>1d</td>
<td>Mar 2015</td>
<td>Mar 2015</td>
<td>1d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Project budget provided (potentially)</td>
<td>26/5/2015</td>
<td>26/5/2015</td>
<td>1d</td>
<td>Apr 2015</td>
<td>Apr 2015</td>
<td>1d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Identify and implement data-sharing arrangements and protocols</td>
<td>11/6/2015</td>
<td>31/7/2015</td>
<td>45d</td>
<td>May 2015</td>
<td>May 2015</td>
<td>45d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Implement changes to internal processes and staffing models</td>
<td>16/8/2015</td>
<td>08/09/2015</td>
<td>85d</td>
<td>Jul 2015</td>
<td>Jul 2015</td>
<td>85d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Evaluate outcomes and return on investment</td>
<td>03/6/2015</td>
<td>25/9/2015</td>
<td>45d</td>
<td>Aug 2015</td>
<td>Aug 2015</td>
<td>45d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: Community Safety Hub: project governance