



NOTTINGHAMSHIRE
Fire & Rescue Service
Creating Safer Communities

Nottinghamshire and City of Nottingham
Fire and Rescue Authority
Community Safety Committee

MERGER OF THE BROXTOWE, GEDLING AND RUSHCLIFFE CRIME AND DISORDER REDUCTION PARTNERSHIPS

Report of the Chief Fire Officer

Agenda Item No: **4**

Date: 15 April 2008

Purpose of Report:

To inform the Community Safety Committee of the South Nottinghamshire (Interim) Merged Strategic Partnership's application, as submitted to the Government Office for the East Midlands, to formalise the partnership and officially merge the audit and strategy functions of Gedling, Rushcliffe and Broxtowe Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership areas.

CONTACT OFFICER

Name : David Horton
Assistant Chief Fire Officer

Tel : 0115 967 0880

Email : david.horton@notts-fire.gov.uk

Media Enquiries Elisabeth Reeson
Contact : (0115) 967 5889 elisabeth.reeson@notts-fire.gov.uk

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 The Crime and Disorder Act 1998, amended by the Police Reform Act 2002 compelled Local Authorities to create Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRPs) involving all statutory partners at a local level. The Fire and Rescue Authority is one of those statutory partners.
- 1.2 The Service has engaged locally with all CDRPs and this has enabled promotion of the Service's desire to drive down risk in communities and demonstrate our ability to prevent incidents, as well as react to them.
- 1.3 Through partnership, the Service has been able to pursue objectives in terms of reducing secondary fires, car fires and incidents of arson, as well as provide support to other organisations to pursue their aims. It has also provided the opportunity to engage directly with the community. This has been demonstrated through the recent Local Area Based Initiatives (Weeks of Action) taking place across the County and City areas.
- 1.4 For a number of years Gedling, Broxtowe and Rushcliffe each had their own independent CDRP structures in place, to which the Service were providing representation at strategic and tactical levels for all three.
- 1.5 It was clear that duplication of effort was ongoing as each Borough had similar problems, and were designing similar solutions. To address this, the three individual CDRPs decided to trial an interim merger with affect from April 2007.

2. REPORT

- 2.1 In 2007, the creation of the South Nottinghamshire (Interim) Merged Strategic Partnership drew together the strategic partners working across the area. The overall aim of the trial was to develop the sharing of best practice, generate efficiencies through collective working, enable the sharing of data, and ultimately increase the overall effectiveness of the crime and risk reduction strategies.
- 2.2 During the trial period the partnership has undergone a joint self-assessment, in conjunction with the Home Office, through the Partnership Support Programme.
- 2.3 This assessment has identified positive outcomes from the trial and also other areas where the partnership can increase its effectiveness by confirming the merger and pooling resources which have enabled a greater impact on community safety.
- 2.4 In view of the assessment, and with the full support of the Government Office for the East Midlands (GOEM), the Officers of the Strategic Group have decided to pursue a formal application to the Secretary of State for the permanent merger of the three CDRPs.

- 2.5 The merger will ensure that the strategic planning and audit activities will continue to be co-ordinated across the South Nottinghamshire area, and that local tactical delivery teams will remain in place in each of the three constituent Boroughs to ensure that the local needs of communities are satisfied.
- 2.6 The merger brings positive benefits for the Fire and Rescue Service-
- 2.6.1 Increased co-ordination of activities across the South Nottinghamshire area, which also mirrors existing internal divisional structures.
- 2.6.2 Internal data sets are already produced for the South Area, and these can be freely shared with partners without the need for further analysis.
- 2.6.3 A consistent approach and methodology in how the Service undertakes its involvement in partnership activities, which in turn removes confusion from staff who work across Borough boundaries.
- 2.6.4 The ability to focus effort in one area to strengthen partnership relations and further the agenda of the Service.
- 2.6.5 Reduction in the bureaucracy and associated administrative costs of satisfying the needs of three different partnerships.
- 2.7 The formal application to the Home Office to seek approval of the merger must be supported by the Chief Fire Officer, and signed by the Chair of the Fire and Rescue Authority.
- 2.8 The original paper, as submitted to the meeting of the South Nottinghamshire (Interim) Merged Strategic Partnership of 3 March 2008, is attached as Appendix A, to provide further background information.

3. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no direct financial implications arising from this report, other than the continued efficiencies gained from satisfying the needs of one partnership attendance, as opposed to three.

4. HUMAN RESOURCES AND LEARNING AND DEVELOPMENT IMPLICATIONS

There are no human resources or learning and development implications arising from this report.

5. EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

The initial equality impact assessment is attached at Appendix B.

6. CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

There will be enhancements in service delivery that will have a direct impact on driving down the instances of crime and disorder across the South Nottinghamshire area.

7. RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

Not supporting the merger of the three Borough Partnerships would have an impact on the reputation of the Service, and damage the extensive and successful activities undertaken through partnership work.

8. RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Community Safety Committee approves the application to merge and forwards relevant papers to the Chair of the Fire and Rescue Authority for signature.

9. BACKGROUND PAPERS FOR INSPECTION (OTHER THAN PUBLISHED DOCUMENTS)

None.

Frank Swann
CHIEF FIRE OFFICER

AGENDA ITEM 7 - APPLICATION TO MERGE

SOUTH NOTTINGHAMSHIRE (INTERIM) MERGED STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP

This application to GOEM is a formal request from the South Nottinghamshire (Interim) Merged Strategic Partnership for consideration to merge the audit and strategy functions of Gedling, Rushcliffe and Broxtowe CDRP areas. This application is made under Section 5 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, as amended by section 97(3) of the Police Reform Act 2002.

As specified in the Home Office guidance this application includes:

- Evidence from a joint self assessment completed by the informally merged partnership during the pilot phase and joint improvement planning
- Evidence of performance improvement during the pilot period
- A number of benefits already gained or expected to be achieved and how these impact on reducing crime and disorder or combating the misuse of drugs
- Signatures from all of the responsible authorities for all relevant areas showing they are in agreement with the merger.

EVIDENCE OF JOINT SELF-ASSESSMENT

The partnership is currently working on its Self Assessment, a draft copy is attached at Appendix A, it is still a work in progress.

The Home Office Police and Crime Standards Directorate in partnership with GOEM conducted a Partnership Support Programme (PSP) with the South Nottinghamshire Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership in September 2007. The PSP was part of a wider Programme of work, agreed between PCSD, GOEM, Nottinghamshire County Council and Community Safety Board and the Nottinghamshire District Councils' Chief Executives/Managing Directors, to review and assess Community Safety structures and processes across Nottinghamshire.

The PSP assessment suggested 9 key recommendations with considerations, which the partnership is currently addressing. The recommendations are shown below, the full report is attached at Appendix B.

1. That the Strategic Group should strengthen its identity as the senior Group jointly responsible for delivering community safety ensuring that all key partners, especially responsible authorities and portfolio holders, play their part as required. This could be demonstrated in the first instance by the Group's joint delivery and communication of the partnership's vision, priorities and targets as it develops its strategic assessment and partnership plan and agrees local targets and contributions to the LAA.
2. That the Joint Strategic Group should develop a clear statement about its intentions in relation to the merger of the three partnerships, giving reasons, acknowledging risks and opportunities, setting out a potential timetable and action plan and confirming its joint commitment to put this into effect.
3. That the South Nottinghamshire Partnership reviews its overall structure to ensure it is actively facilitating delivery, has appropriate representation at meetings at every level and consistent, or at least complementary, structures

in all three constituent parts, beneath the Joint Strategic Group, to enable effective cross-border working.

4. That the Partnership formalises its relationship with Nottingham City CDP through an agreed structure for raising issues, collating and analysing data and developing joint action plans when appropriate.
5. That the partnership uses the current requirement to develop its strategic assessment as the driver for beginning to establish a more intelligence-led approach to its business planning and delivery, including the urgent introduction of information sharing protocols and practice and a clear definition of the analyst's role being agreed across the partnership.
6. That the partnership develops a cohesive community engagement strategy, building on the good work already in place and ensuring it meets the requirement to engage with the community in all its diversity.
7. That new or revised structures embed clear lines of accountability between the different layers of the partnership and that the Chief Executives or Chief Officers of all responsible authorities send a clear message down through their organisations about the importance of community safety, partnership working and Section 17, with consideration being given to including partnership-related objectives in annual appraisals of senior and middle managers.
8. That the partnership builds on the current individual pieces of work being carried out across the three areas to create a cohesive and comprehensive communications strategy, including meeting the requirement that the partnership plan should be shared with the community and developing an identity for the South Nottinghamshire Partnership.
9. That the partnership develops a partnership-wide development strategy, and individual personal development plans for key players to meet the gaps identified above and to ensure resilience in the Community Safety teams, including:
 - an induction programme for partners, including elected members, (drawing on the NCSN induction pack available from the crime reduction website)
 - community engagement skills
 - project management and evaluation
 - problem solving
 - performance management and
 - awareness raising/partnership development events where all explore and define what contribution they can make to the partnership

In addition to the above South Nottinghamshire Crime and Disorder partnership has a Partnership Improvement Plan, a copy of which is attached at Appendix C.

EVIDENCE OF PERFORMANCE

South Nottinghamshire Division has seen exceptional and significant reductions in crime this year compared to last. A table with reductions per LAC for the period April to September is shown below (left) with the percentage and volume change on the same period last year. South Nottinghamshire LACs are highlighted in blue.

This table has been updated to show the year to date performance (April to December) compared to last year (right), again with South Nottinghamshire Division LACs highlighted in blue. This shows quite clearly that performance has continued to

improve throughout the last 3 months. The improvement in performance is reflected on all LACs with 5 of the 6 having the greatest reductions across the whole Force Area. This is incredibly good news that should be communicated to all staff.

Reductions April - September 2007				
LAC	2006	2007	Diff	% Change
Gedling South	2707	2189	-518	-19.1%
Broxtowe North	2136	1748	-388	-18.2%
City West	7838	6778	-1060	-13.5%
City North	6006	5280	-726	-12.1%
Gedling North	2672	2352	-320	-12.0%
Broxtowe South	2910	2600	-310	-10.7%
Rushcliffe North	2168	1979	-189	-8.7%
City Central	9448	8701	-747	-7.9%
City South	6407	6086	-321	-5.0%
Ashfield South	1837	1757	-80	-4.4%
Newark	2468	2398	-70	-2.8%
Ashfield North	4128	4090	-38	-0.9%
Rushcliffe South	1688	1674	-14	-0.8%
Sherwood	2071	2089	18	0.9%
East Bassetlaw	2526	2552	26	1.0%
Mansfield South	4083	4160	77	1.9%
Mansfield North	2495	2712	217	8.7%
West Bassetlaw	3452	4040	588	17.0%
Total	67040	63185	-3855	-5.8%

Reductions April - December 2007				
LAC	2006	2007	Diff	% Change
Gedling South	4046	3199	-847	-20.9%
Broxtowe North	3256	2601	-655	-20.1%
Gedling North	4143	3386	-757	-18.3%
Broxtowe South	4568	3851	-717	-15.7%
Rushcliffe North	3392	2931	-461	-13.6%
City West	11745	10204	-1541	-13.1%
City North	9037	7917	-1120	-12.4%
Newark	4071	3611	-460	-11.3%
City Central	14794	13560	-1234	-8.3%
City South	9715	9039	-676	-7.0%
Rushcliffe South	2575	2495	-80	-3.1%
Ashfield North	6363	6196	-167	-2.6%
Sherwood	3115	3054	-61	-2.0%
Mansfield South	6271	6235	-36	-0.6%
Ashfield South	2724	2726	2	0.1%
East Bassetlaw	3832	3879	47	1.2%
Mansfield North	3801	3948	147	3.9%
West Bassetlaw	5147	6247	1100	21.4%
Total	102595	95079	-7516	-7.3%

Of the 79 beats on the Division 66 have seen a reduction in crime, albeit to varying degrees. The table below show firstly the beats with the highest volume reduction. It is pleasing to see these closely mirror our ABI areas where partnership effort has been concentrated.

Beat Name	2006	2007	Difference	% change
TRENT BRIDGE	766	566	-200	-26%
EASTWOOD SOUTH	998	819	-179	-18%
GREASLEY (GILTBROOK AND NEWTHORPE)	412	233	-179	-43%
NETHERFIELD	647	503	-144	-22%
WOODTHORPE	341	204	-137	-40%
PORCHESTER	448	313	-135	-30%
AWSWORTH	226	114	-112	-50%
DAYBROOK	577	465	-112	-19%
GEDLING	491	382	-109	-22%
ST. MARYS	359	258	-101	-28%
VALLEY	351	251	-100	-28%

The headline target for both Most Serious Violence and Serious Acquisitive Crime is to reduce the number of crimes per 1000 population. South Notts fares quite well in comparison to our family BCUs in relation to both reported and detected violent crime, but this is not the case with Serious Acquisitive Crime.

Below is a table of crime per 1000 population (or household in the case of burglary). This shows the crimes rates for each Division and the D Division BCUs family average. This shows that with the exception of Dwelling Burglary and Robbery, we have the lowest crime rates across the Force area.

Crime Group	A	B	C	D	D Family Average
Dwelling Burglary	4.866	2.714	10.337	4.447	2.148
Autocrime	4.134	4.073	6.708	2.709	1.787
Robbery	0.232	0.085	1.247	0.281	0.132
Serious Acquisitive Crime	6.413	5.292	12.298	4.867	2.804
Most Serious Violence	0.116	0.099	0.283	0.061	No comparison available
Assault with Injury	2.538	2.039	3.956	1.317	No comparison available
All Crime	29.631	25.594	48.450	17.921	16.453

Below are tables that detail our performance against the original PSA1 targets.

PSA Reduction Requirement				
2003-4	Broxtowe	Gedling	Rushcliffe	Total
Common Assault	5%	5%	10%	6.3%
Criminal Damage	8%	5%	7.50%	6.7%
Dwelling Burglary	31%	40%	30%	33.7%
Robbery of Personal Property	5%	15%	10%	10.9%
Theft from Person				0.0%
Theft from Vehicle	33%	35%	30%	32.9%
Theft of Vehicle	34%	40%	30%	35.8%
Theft of Cycle				0.0%
Vehicle Interference	34%	35%	30%	33.4%
Wounding	5%	5%	10%	6.3%
BCS Comparator Crime	22.50%	22.50%	20%	21.8%

Broxtowe	2003-4	2004-5	2005-6	2006-7	End figure required by 2007-8	Reduction still required on 2006-7 figures	Apr-Dec 2006	Apr-Dec 2007	Reduction achieved YTD	Projected year end based on 9 months data	Projected year end change on 2003-4 baseline	Reduction required on 2003-4 baseline
Common Assault	178	162	203	267	169	-37%	204	221	8%	295	66%	-5%
Criminal Damage	1731	1959	2433	2351	1593	-32%	1733	1362	-21%	1816	5%	-8%
Dwelling Burglary	1499	1178	854	894	1034	16%	623	566	-9%	755	-50%	-31%
Robbery of Personal Property	90	68	94	128	86	-33%	90	75	-17%	100	11%	-5%
Theft from Person	98	98	110	103	98	-5%	69	70	1%	93	-5%	
Theft from Vehicle	2028	1773	1818	1687	1359	-19%	1307	989	-24%	1319	-35%	-33%
Theft of Vehicle	616	487	396	380	407	7%	294	218	-26%	291	-53%	-34%
Theft of Cycle	266	185	271	225	266	18%	183	130	-29%	173	-35%	
Vehicle Interference	772	600	538	452	510	13%	323	186	-42%	248	-68%	-34%
Wounding	685	785	811	752	651	-13%	563	491	-13%	655	-4%	-5%
BCS Comparator Crime	7963	7295	7528	7239	6171	-15%	5389	4308	-20.1%	5744	-27.9%	-22.5%

Gedling	2003-4	2004-5	2005-6	2006-7	End figure required by 2007-8	Reduction still required on 2006-7 figures	Apr-Dec 2006	Apr-Dec 2007	Reductions achieved YTD	Projected year end based on 9 months data	Projected year end change on 2003-4 baseline	Reduction required on 2003-4 baseline
Common Assault	219	197	170	248	236	-5%	188	201	7%	268	22%	-5%
Criminal Damage	2115	2486	2817	2830	2689	-5%	2122	1650	-22%	2200	4%	-5%
Dwelling Burglary	1211	891	845	989	593	-40%	693	654	-6%	872	-28%	-40%
Robbery of Personal Property	150	92	139	204	173	-15%	161	108	-33%	144	-4%	-15%
Theft from Person	128	105	99	107	107	0%	82	81	-1%	108	-16%	
Theft from Vehicle	1846	1455	1632	1299	844	-35%	958	615	-36%	820	-56%	-35%
Theft of Vehicle	788	477	421	382	229	-40%	293	233	-20%	311	-61%	-40%
Theft of Cycle	165	155	141	184	184	0%	142	140	-1%	187	13%	
Vehicle Interference	722	503	337	324	211	-35%	247	124	-50%	165	-77%	-35%
Wounding	790	839	949	876	832	-5%	688	472	-31%	629	-20%	-5%
BCS Comparator Crime	8134	7200	7550	7443	5768	-23%	5574	4278	-23.3%	5704	-30%	-22.5%

Rushcliffe	2003-4	2004-5	2005-6	2006-7	End figure required by 2007-8	Reduction still required on 2006-7 figures	Apr-Dec 2006	Apr-Dec 2007	Reductions achieved YTD	Projected year end based on 9 months data	Projected year end change on 2003-4 baseline	Reduction required on 2003-4 baseline
Common Assault	139	130	153	158	142	-10%	126	173	37%	231	66%	-10%
Criminal Damage	1483	1636	1561	1700	1573	-8%	1314	1152	-12%	1536	4%	-7.5%
Dwelling Burglary	974	813	641	685	480	-30%	512	477	-7%	636	-35%	-30%
Robbery of Personal Property	90	89	71	82	74	-10%	66	68	3%	91	1%	-10%
Theft from Person	100	60	47	55	55	0%	45	48	7%	64	-36%	
Theft from Vehicle	1384	939	1206	1236	865	-30%	909	887	-2%	1183	-15%	-30%
Theft of Vehicle	385	385	202	213	149	-30%	162	128	-21%	171	-56%	-30%
Theft of Cycle	184	236	212	236	236	0%	194	173	-11%	231	25%	
Vehicle Interference	496	378	352	351	246	-30%	247	183	-26%	244	-51%	-30%
Wounding	542	490	686	521	469	-10%	418	373	-11%	497	-8%	-10%
BCS Comparator Crime	5777	5156	5131	5237	4190	-20%	3993	3662	-8.3%	4883	-15%	-20.0%

South Notts Merged Partnership	2003-4	2004-5	2005-6	2006-7	End figure required by 2007-8	Reduction still required on 2006-7 figures	Apr-Dec 2006	Apr-Dec 2007	Reductions achieved YTD	Projected year end based on 9 months data	Projected year end change on 2003-4 baseline	Reduction required on 2003-4 baseline
Common Assault	536	489	526	673	631	-6%	518	595	15%	793	48%	-6.3%
Criminal Damage	5329	6081	6811	6881	6422	-7%	5169	4164	-19%	5552	4%	-6.7%
Dwelling Burglary	3684	2882	2340	2568	1702	-34%	1828	1697	-7%	2263	-39%	-33.7%
Robbery of Personal Property	330	249	304	414	369	-11%	317	251	-21%	335	1%	-10.9%
Theft from Person	326	263	256	265	265	0%	196	199	2%	265	-19%	0%
Theft from Vehicle	5258	4167	4656	4222	2832	-33%	3174	2491	-22%	3321	-37%	-32.9%
Theft of Vehicle	1789	1349	1019	975	626	-36%	749	579	-23%	772	-57%	-35.8%
Theft of Cycle	615	576	624	645	645	0%	519	443	-15%	591	-4%	0%
Vehicle Interference	1990	1481	1227	1127	751	-33%	817	493	-40%	657	-67%	-33.4%
Wounding	2017	2114	2446	2149	2013	-6%	1669	1336	-20%	1781	-12%	-6.3%
BCS Comparator Crime	21874	19651	20209	19919	15568	-22%	14956	12248	-18.1%	16331	-25%	-21.8%

BENEFITS GAINED OR EXPECTED

1. ACORN INITIATIVE

The Acorn target hardening initiative has been supported by the three CDRPs for some time and is co-ordinated by Notts Police. Broxtowe and Rushcliffe had allocated their year's funding for 2007/08 for acorn. Gedling had an under spend and agreed to allow Broxtowe and Rushcliffe to use that funding for urgent cases for Acorn lock fit.

2. DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

The South Nottinghamshire Domestic Strategic Partnership is a multi-agency partnership which co-ordinates publicity campaigns, training and delivers support the Community Volunteer Services.

3. POLICE OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES

Whilst each of the boroughs supports policing activities, the support offered differs across the three CDRP areas. It is proposed to co-ordinate a single bid for the South Notts area. However, specific allocations will still be made for each CDRP area. Cost efficiency savings are envisaged by cutting down the number of applications required for this grant aid from the Police.

4. DRUGS EDUCATION

The DAAT is currently piloting a drugs educational programme in Gedling and Rushcliffe, whilst Broxtowe has traditionally provided this service through a dedicated worker post. Subject to a successful evaluation of this project, it is proposed to commission the DAAT to provide this service across the South Notts area.

5. NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH

For several years the CDRPs have supported part-time posts that provide an administration/co-ordination service for the voluntary Neighbourhood Watch schemes in each CDRP area. Currently there are variations in the time and resources dedicated to the service in each area and it is proposed that a more co-ordinated and unified service, with appropriate funding contributions from relevant partners, can be achieved during the next financial year. The Interim Merged Strategic Partnership has agreed further funding for 6 months pending a review of the options for change.

6. CRIME PREVENTION CAMPAIGNS

Each CDRP promotes seasonal and targeted crime prevention campaigns throughout the year. It is proposed that cost efficiency savings can be made by combining resources and a greater impact in the South Notts area can be made through using the same campaign literature. An example of this is Operation Mutual, where the South Notts CDRPs worked with the City CDP on tackling vehicle crime.

7. YOUTH DIVERSIONARY ACTIVITIES

All 3 CDRPs have provided significant investment in youth diversionary activities to address ASB issues. It is proposed to explore a co-ordinated approach to providing this service with potential suppliers for example including Notts CC and Groundwork Greater Nottingham.

8. SHARING BEST PRACTICE

Joint spend plan profiles were shared which enabled the three districts to identify good practice across South Nottinghamshire and implement according to local need. Examples of this are the Youth Reparation delivered by the Youth Service and Youth Community Mediation delivered by the Crime Reduction Team.

9. TACTICAL DELIVERY STRUCTURES

There are plans in place for the 3 Community Safety Officers, together with the police, to review the 3 CDRP tactical delivery structures. This will still include 3 borough based Tactical Groups, ASB Groups and Internal Agency Tasking with a view to replicating best practice across South Notts, and to streamline processes. Each borough will, therefore, have its own locally based delivery plan, which will operate within the overall South Notts framework.

10. PROJECT PERFORMANCE MONITORING

Amalgamations of Project Performance Monitoring to ensure effective management of CDRP commissioned projects. These will be delivered according to identified local needs, egg standardising project application and monitoring documents.

11. JOINTLY COMMISSIONED PROJECTS

On jointly commissioned projects efficiencies are gained through the identified CSO lead who co-ordinates effective delivery across all 3 districts.

12. COLLECTIVE INFLUENCE

The collective influence of 3 South Notts Boroughs over policies and developments countywide is much more effective than before. It is expected that this can be replicated in future with the three CDRPs working closer with the City CDP.

The undersigned certify that the application for merger is supported by all of the appropriate responsible authorities concerned in the combined area.

Chief Executive
Broxtowe Borough Council

Chief Executive
Gedling Borough Council

Chief Executive
Rushcliffe Borough Council

Chief Executive
Nottinghamshire County Council

Chair/Chief Executive
Primary Care Trust

Chief Superintendent Police BCU or
Chief Officer, Police Force

Chair
Police Authority

Chair
Fire and Rescue Authority

Date

INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

<i>Section</i>	<i>Manager</i>	<i>Date of Assessment</i>	<i>New or Existing</i>
RISK RESPONSE	JOHN BUCKLEY	MARCH 2008	N/A
Name of Report to be assessed		MERGER OF THE BROXTOWE, GEDLING AND RUSHCLIFFE CRIME AND DISORDER REDUCTION PARTNERSHIPS	
1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the report.	To inform the Community Safety Committee of the South Nottinghamshire (Interim) Merged Strategic Partnership's application, as submitted to GOEM, to formalise the partnership and officially merge the audit and strategy functions of Gedling, Rushcliffe and Broxtowe CDRP areas.		
2. Who is intended to benefit from this report and what are the outcomes?	The community will benefit through the better use of resources to enhance community safety, and drive down the instances of Crime and Disorder.		
3. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the report?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gedling, Broxtowe and Rushcliffe Borough Councils; • Nottinghamshire County Council; • Primary Care Trust; • Nottinghamshire Police; • Government Office for the East Midlands. 		
4. Who implements and who is responsible for the report?	Head of Response is responsible, with the implementation falling to the Area Managers within the department.		

5. Please identify the differential impact in the terms of the six strands below. Please tick yes if you have identified any differential impacts. Please state evidence of negative or positive impacts below.

<i>STRAND</i>	Y	N	<i>NEGATIVE IMPACT</i>	<i>POSITIVE IMPACT</i>
Race		X		
Gender		X		
Disability		X		
Religion or Belief		X		
Sexuality		X		
Age		X		

6. Can this adverse impact be justified on the grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group?	Y	N	7. Should the policy/service proceed to a full impact assessment?	Y	N
					x

I am satisfied that this policy has been successfully impact assessed. I understand the impact assessment of this policy is a statutory obligation and that, as owners of this policy, we take responsibility for the completion and quality of this process.

Signed (completing person)AM John Buckley.....

Date ... March 2008.....