

TEST VALLEY COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP

Date: 26th April 2007

Title of paper : Community Safety Partnership's 2006/07 Annual Report		
Prepared by: Jamie O'Reilly		
Present at meeting: Yes		
Leading partner/s: All		
Summary of content and issues raised: The report summarises the progress and performance of the ePartnership over the last financial year.		
Recommendations: i) That the Board note the report and comments accordingly .		
Financial and HR Implications – None .		
Promotion of Equality & Diversity – None		
Purpose of paper (tick)	Decision	
	Discussion & comment	√
	Information	

REPORT OF COMMUNITY SAFETY MANAGER

THE 2006/07 ANNUAL REPORT AND BUDGET

1 BACKGROUND

2006/07 has been a challenging year for the Test Valley Community Safety Partnership. It began with a vacant Community Safety Manager's post. This post had effectively been vacant for almost six months and had put a strain on partner resources and made substantive progress difficult.

In terms of performance, 2006/07 was the second year of the three year 17.2% (751 crimes annually) crime reduction target (against 03/04 baseline) entered into as part of the Public Service Agreement One. However, the Partnership found that instead of making a third of the progress required for this target in their first year, the relevant recorded crime had in fact risen significantly during 05/06, effectively turning the 17.2% reduction target over three years into a 25% reduction target over two years. Furthermore, by May 2006, the steady rise in recorded BSC crime in Test Valley which had begun some time around September 2005 was showing no signs of slowing down, let alone reversing.

2 THERESPONSE

In May 2006 the Partnership appointed a new Community Safety Manager. With this there was an increased focus on the performance and a review of the current approach and practises.

In August 2006 the Partnership Board approved a number of radical changes in an attempt to make a bigger impact on the crime targets in the Borough.

The first change was to revise and rationalise the Partnership's objectives, which resulted in a focus on the three biggest crime types, namely criminal damage (and associated Anti-social behaviour), wounding and theft from vehicles.

The second change was to reserve some funds to resource new projects to make a bigger impact on these objectives. This meant, to some extent limiting the amount of money which had been traditionally

distributed by way of bidding rounds and replacing this with a commissioning approach, to be conducted by a newly established Delivery group. This group would be smaller and more flexible than the Partnership Board, meeting more frequently and better placed to drive partnership performance. A new framework was introduced to improve strategic planning and to facilitate the commissioning process. This ensured an evidence-led approach to commissioning and allowed the Floor Target Action Planning methodology which had proved effective in other parts of the country.

The next development was the establishment of a hot-spot tasking group, which also met on a more frequent basis than the Partnership Board and enabled a multi-agency approach to identifying and responding to emerging and developing crime hot-spots.

The remaining key developments involved a refocusing of the work of the Neighbourhood Wardens outlined in an action plan for change which has seen a new focus on to criminal damage and associated anti-social behaviour through the establishment of patrol plans and a response management system. This was reinforced with a move towards the investment of greater authority in and high visibility of the Neighbourhood Warden through the adoption of a new uniform, radios and closer working with Police. This is being further built upon through the adoption of enforcement powers through the Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005 and with an imminent application for Accreditation with Hampshire Constabulary.

The final significant development involved a refocusing of the work around anti social behaviour. This has involved the review and relaunch of a new Boroughwide Antisocial Behaviour Panel which helps co-ordinate and performance manage work in respect of those individuals who are having the biggest impact on our communities through their anti social behaviour. It has also involved a shift in the emphasis of the work of the Anti Social Behaviour Co-ordinator from being exclusively involved in one to one work with young people involved in antisocial behaviour and their parents etc, towards a role which now involves a greater strategic element developing new schemes and projects.

Finally, the Partnership has funded a wide range of projects over the year through its Safer and Stronger Communities Fund allocation and these are detailed at Appendix 1.

3 HOW WELL HAVE THESE CHANGES WORKED?

There have been a number of notable positive developments since these changes were introduced. Firstly, iQuant charts show a slowdown in the rate of rise of recorded BCS crime in the Autumn of 2006, which was soon followed by the first reduction in force over a year. Since then iQuant charts have shown a rather hesitant but continued reduction. However the reductions which have been seen are not currently of the order or scale required to meet the April 2008 target.

In addition to the figures we have in respect of recorded crime, we have also conducted surveys in the Borough (Citizens Panels surveys and the Local Government Satisfaction survey) which help to provide an impression of the perceptions of the public in relation to fear of crime, anti social behaviour and community cohesion (results attached at Appendix 2).

These appear on balance to show a reasonably positive picture. Whilst the results of the fear of crime surveys appear to suggest a marginal worsening in people's fear of crime – although it would appear likely that these differences are so small as to fall outside of the confidence intervals for the surveys. However this contrasts sharply with the perceptions around anti social behaviour which suggest a significant improvement in almost all areas. The only area which appears to have deteriorated notably is around people's perception of drug use.

4 THE KEY SUCCESSSES AND CHALLENGES OF 2006/07

The key successes for 2006/07 appear to lie in the development of the neighbourhood wardens service, the police-led Alcohol Misuse Enforcement campaign and the joined-up initiatives which flowed from hot-spottasking meetings. These also included work led by Hampshire Fire and Rescue and Test Valley's Environment and Health Service to better prevent arson through a system of environmental auditing and fast-tracked reporting. It has also included the developments in our work to tackle anti social behaviour. In addition to this, other partners have been delivering big contributions such as Hampshire Youth Offending Team which established a Youth Inclusion and Support panel in Andover and Victim Support which has hosted an Independent Domestic Violence Advocate and the Hampton Trust which has facilitated the establishment of multi agency risk assessment meetings for domestic violence in the Borough.

Whilst there has been a lot of progress in 2006/07 there have also been frustrations. For example, the CADDIE County wide information sharing project was subject to repeated delays and is only now about to be launched publicly. There were delays in some key projects contained in the FTAP such as the appointment of our Partnership

analyst, the co-location of community safety staff from partner agencies and the development and delivery of a revitalised campaign to supersede 'CREW's'. The accreditation process for the war dens has become rather extended and a number of partnership projects which are identified in the FTAP are struggling to take off owing to the challenges involved in developing community safety projects which cut across Borough boundaries. This is particularly affecting developments in the field of domestic violence, anti social behaviour and alcohol related violence. Overcoming these challenges are key to the success of the Partnership over the next year.

APPENDIX 1

2006/07 Budget

Project	Revenue	Capital	Was it delivered?
ASB officertopup*	12,000		Yes
Pooled funds(CADDIE, DV and Alcco-ord, DIP)*	14,75	5	Yes
Local Intervention Fire Education project.		1500	Yes, but funds not needed.
9SNAP disco's	2000	500	Yes.
Testway 7's sporting activities	10000		Yes
Junior citizens scheme (transportation)	3,000		Yes
CSP chair	5850		Yes
Analyst	10000		Yes
Co-location venue (orig. wessex chambers) infrast.		10 000	Delivery continuing
Police o/t	20000		Yes
Prime	5000	5000	Yes, street lighting
Phoenix yc-activities equipment	2534		Nursling.
Eastleigh and Romsey N. watch newsletter	700		Yes
Child contact centre	4000	1000	Yes, not all funds needed.
AMEC	5000		Yes
New Env/ASBC Campaign	10000		Delivery continuing
Capture car	5000		Yes
AMEC+	4000		Yes
YISP	16000		Delivery continuing
Wardens' bikes		4000	Yes
Wardens' radios	3400		Yes
CCTV Union St		7500	Delivery continuing
IDVA	1000		Yes
Youth Club N. Badd		1500	Delivery continuing
Andover Community Day	500		Yes
Cisters Sexual Abuse Helpline equipment	710		Delivery continuing
Wellow Neighbourhood Watch	120		Delivery continuing
N. Baddesley Scout Hut CCTV + graffiti removal kit	1380	460	Delivery continuing
TOTAL 06/07 SSCF (exc. *projects)	69,194	31000	
KEY		Green	by bid
		Blue	commissioned

APPENDIX 2

Results from December 2006 (and September 2005) Citizen's Panel Survey

	Very/fairly safe	A bit/very unsafe
Walking alone during the daytime	94% (98%03/04)	6% (2%03/04)
At home in the day	96% (98%03/04)	4% (2%03/04)
Walking alone after dark	53% (57%03/04)	47% (43%03/04)
At home alone after dark	82% (89%03/04)	18% (11%03/04)

Results from the 2007 Local Government Satisfaction Survey

	High level of perceived anti-social behaviours (E4.15)	Noisy neighbours or loud parties (E4.18)	Teenagers hanging around the streets (E4.7)	Rubbish and litter lying around (E4.16)	People being drunk or rowdy in public places (E4.17)	Abandoned or burnt out cars (E4.19)	Vandalism, graffiti and other deliberate damage to property (E4.14)	People using or dealing drugs (E4.14)	% in the local area who perceive parents not taking responsibility	% in the local area who perceive people not treating anyone other with	% in the local area who feel very unfairly well informed about what the council is
Basingstoke & Deane District Council	21% (13% 03/04)	15% (9% 03/04)	51% (33% 03/04)	39% (23% 03/04)	29% (20% 03/04)	8% (22% 03/04)	35% (30% 03/04)	37% (25% 03/04)	60%	45%	27%
East Hampshire District Council	18% (26% 03/04)	10% (14% 03/04)	55% (53% 03/04)	38% (37% 03/04)	27% (44% 03/04)	5% (23% 03/04)	34% (52% 03/04)	37% (50% 03/04)	57%	42%	23%
Eastleigh District Council	19% (32% 03/04)	16% (17% 03/04)	64% (64% 03/04)	37% (40% 03/04)	29% (47% 03/04)	5% (27% 03/04)	35% (62% 03/04)	29% (55% 03/04)	65%	46%	20%
Fareham District Council	16% (34% 03/04)	11% (18% 03/04)	56% (59% 03/04)	40% (39% 03/04)	27% (50% 03/04)	5% (29% 03/04)	33% (60% 03/04)	29% (53% 03/04)	56%	40%	23%
Gosport District Council	31% (50% 03/04)	18% (21% 03/04)	64% (69% 03/04)	49% (43% 03/04)	37% (62% 03/04)	11% (38% 03/04)	51% (72% 03/04)	52% (79% 03/04)	70%	57%	23%
Hart District Council	15% (32% 03/04)	11% (17% 03/04)	58% (59% 03/04)	33% (36% 03/04)	34% (54% 03/04)	6% (34% 03/04)	28% (57% 03/04)	33% (54% 03/04)	54%	40%	18%
Havant District Council	24% (39% 03/04)	17% (21% 03/04)	59% (61% 03/04)	40% (40% 03/04)	32% (53% 03/04)	15% (39% 03/04)	45% (66% 03/04)	37% (63% 03/04)	68%	50%	19%
New Forest District Council	15% (29% 03/04)	12% (13% 03/04)	52% (58% 03/04)	35% (33% 03/04)	22% (41% 03/04)	6% (30% 03/04)	32% (59% 03/04)	35% (56% 03/04)	58%	42%	26%
Rushmoor Borough Council	27% (42% 03/04)	22% (23% 03/04)	63% (63% 03/04)	42% (43% 03/04)	35% (55% 03/04)	11% (39% 03/04)	40% (69% 03/04)	54% (67% 03/04)	69%	56%	26%
Test Valley District Council	20% (35% 03/04)	12% (19% 03/04)	56% (55% 03/04)	37% (38% 03/04)	30% (50% 03/04)	10% (29% 03/04)	36% (57% 03/04)	33% (55% 03/04)	62%	43%	23%
Winchester District Council	11% (16% 03/04)	12% (11% 03/04)	34% (36% 03/04)	30% (26% 03/04)	22% (36% 03/04)	5% (15% 03/04)	23% (35% 03/04)	27% (37% 03/04)	41%	30%	22%
Hampshire County Council	19% (24% 03/04)	16% (11% 03/04)	57% (40% 03/04)	35% (34% 03/04)	29% (33% 03/04)	7% (22% 03/04)	36% (42% 03/04)	34% (37% 03/04)	60%	42%	21%

■ Best performing authority
■ Worst performing authority

	High level of perceived anti-social behaviours (E4.15)	Noisy neighbour loud parties (E4.18)	Teenagers hanging around on the streets (E4.7)	Rubbish and littering around (E4.16)	People being drunk or rowdy in public places (E4.17)	Abandoned or burnt out cars (E4.19)	Vandalism, graffiti and other deliberate damage to property or vehicles (E4.8)	People using or dealing drugs (E4.14)	% in the local area who perceive parents not taking responsibility for the behaviour of their children as a very or fairly big problem (E4.12)	% in the local area who perceive people not treating one another with respect and consideration as a very or fairly big problem (E4.13)	% in the local area who feel very or fairly well informed about what the council is doing to tackle anti-social behaviour (E4.11)
Basings toke & Deane District Council	21% (13%/03/04)	15% (9%/03/04)	51% (33%/03/04)	39% (23%/03/04)	29% (20%/03/04)	8% (22%/03/04)	35% (30%/03/04)	37% (25%/03/04)	60%	45%	27%
East Hampshire District Council	18% (26%/03/04)	10% (14%/03/04)	55% (53%/03/04)	38% (37%/03/04)	27% (44%/03/03)	5% (23%/03/04)	34% (52%/03/04)	37% (50%/03/04)	57%	42%	23%
Eastleigh District Council	19% (32%/03/04)	16% (17%/03/04)	64% (64%/03/04)	37% (40%/03/04)	29% (47%/03/04)	5% (27%/03/04)	35% (62%/03/04)	29% (55%/03/04)	65%	46%	20%
Fareham District Council	16% (34%/03/04)	11% (18%/03/04)	56% (59%/03/04)	40% (39%/03/04)	27% (50%/03/04)	5% (29%/03/04)	33% (60%/03/04)	29% (53%/03/04)	56%	40%	23%
Gosport District Council	31% (50%/03/04)	18% (21%/03/04)	64% (69%/03/04)	49% (43%/03/04)	37% (62%/03/04)	11% (38%/03/04)	51% (72%/03/04)	52% (79%/03/04)	70%	57%	23%
Hart District Council	15% (32%/03/04)	11% (17%/03/04)	58% (59%/03/04)	33% (36%/03/04)	34% (54%/03/04)	6% (34%/03/04)	28% (57%/03/04)	33% (54%/03/04)	54%	40%	18%
Havant District Council	24% (39%/03/04)	17% (21%/03/04)	59% (61%/03/04)	40% (40%/03/04)	32% (53%/03/04)	15% (39%/03/04)	45% (66%/03/04)	37% (63%/03/04)	68%	50%	19%
New Forest District Council	15% (29%/03/04)	12% (13%/03/04)	52% (58%/03/04)	35% (33%/03/04)	22% (41%/03/04)	6% (30%/03/04)	32% (59%/03/04)	35% (56%/03/04)	58%	42%	26%
Rushmoor Borough Council	27% (42%/03/04)	22% (23%/03/04)	63% (63%/03/04)	42% (43%/03/04)	35% (55%/03/04)	11% (39%/03/04)	40% (69%/03/04)	54% (67%/03/04)	69%	56%	26%
Test Valley District Council	20% (35%/03/04)	12% (19%/03/04)	56% (55%/03/04)	37% (38%/03/04)	30% (50%/03/04)	10% (29%/03/04)	36% (57%/03/04)	33% (55%/03/04)	62%	43%	23%
Winchester District Council	11% (16%/03/04)	12% (11%/03/04)	34% (36%/03/04)	30% (26%/03/04)	22% (36%/03/04)	5% (15%/03/04)	23% (35%/03/04)	27% (37%/03/04)	41%	30%	22%
Hampshire County Council	19% (24%/03/04)	16% (11%/03/04)	57% (40%/03/04)	35% (34%/03/04)	29% (33%/03/04)	7% (22%/03/04)	36% (42%/03/04)	34% (37%/03/04)	60%	42%	21%
	Fall in perception of crime by 5%										
	Increase in perception of crimes by 5%										
	Perception results within +/-5% of 2003/04 figure or no comparative results available										

