

TEST VALLEY COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP

Date and Time: 16th January 2008

Title of paper : The Strategic Assessment and Partnership Priorities		
Prepared by: Jamie O'Reilly		
Present at meeting: Yes		
Leading partner/s: All		
Summary of content and issues raised: The report sets out the process for developing the new community safety plan and the draft priorities and proposed key performance indicators.		
Recommendations:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) That the Board notes the process for the development of the new community safety plan within the current context. ii) That the Board endorses the strategic assessment and proposed key priorities and performance indicators. 		
Financial and HR Implications Approved priorities will provide a strong steer for the spending of future resources both at a local and County level.		
Promotion of Equality & Diversity		
Purpose of paper (tick)	Decision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Discussion & comment	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Information	<input type="checkbox"/>

REPORT OF COMMUNITY SAFETY MANAGER

THE STRATEGIC ASSESSMENT AND COMMUNITY SAFETY PLAN 2008 TO 2011

1 BACKGROUND

This year is the final year of 2005 to 2008 Test Valley Community Safety Partnership's Community Safety Strategy. It is also the final year of the Partnership's Floor Target Action Plan which was in effect until April 2008 also represents the end of the PSA 1 targets which, in 2005 set a 17% 3 year reduction target (against a 2003/04 baseline). Disappointingly, Test Valley Community Safety Partnership are not going to meet this target and in common with the vast majority of Hampshire community safety partnerships, are on course for an increase in overall BCS crime (basket of 10 crime measures). This increase is primarily due to a corresponding rise in level of criminal damage, when compared to the 2003/04 figures.

On the positive side, there have been reductions in key acquisitive crimes such as theft from motor vehicles and there has been a significant positive shift in the Test Valley public's perceptions around their experience of anti social behaviour.

However, we are now in the process of developing a new Partnership Plan which is set to begin from April 2008. Unlike the previous plan, there is likely to be a stronger connection between local community safety priorities and 'county' level or shared priorities. This is likely to lead to increased common performance indicators, targets and delivery. This is due to two key developments, firstly the development of a county level community safety co-ordinating body and secondly, the synchronised development of a new Local Area Agreement, the budget for which now fully incorporates the former Safer Stronger Communities funds. There still remains a lack of clarity about how this money will be committed for 2008/09 which makes the development of a local community safety plan more challenging.

We are required to carry out a community safety strategic assessment to provide the evidence base to enable us to select our priorities for the next three years (revised annually). Whilst we are not obliged to choose solely from the government provided list of 198 National Performance Indicators for Local Authorities and Local Authority Partnerships (can be found at www.communities.gov.uk/publications/localgovernment/nationalindicator and an extract is provided at Appendix 2), it would seem sensible to do so for two key reasons; 1) Only these will be considered for incorporation into the Local

Area Agreement and consequently eligible for associated funded interventions, and; 2) Targets tied to approved indicators are likely to be easier to monitor through nationally established measurement and monitoring systems.

The strategic assessment has been undertaken and can be accessed with a password – which has been issued to Board members, on the Test Valley LSP's web-site.

2 PROCESS

The Community Safety Partnership Board is required to agree a Strategic Assessment and from this also agree the partnership's priorities and performance measures, in order that these can be confirmed to the County Council, and thereby assist them in the development of the Local Area Agreement, the key content of which they propose to put in place during February 2008.

Once the Community Safety Partnership has agreed the priorities and performance measures, then this provides the foundation for the negotiation of targets and development of the community safety plan which need to be in place for the new financial year.

In previous year's the planning process has been helped by having a fairly clear knowledge at the outset of the amount of resources available to the Partnership to fund the plan. This year however is different as all Safer, Stronger Communities Funds are being absorbed into the single LAA and it is not clear at present exactly how the resources will ultimately be distributed. It is proposed here however to press ahead with the development of a plan which could be broadly supported with a similar level of funding to that which we currently enjoy.

3 THE PRIORITIES AND PROPOSED INDICATORS

The strategic assessment has identified a number of areas which are of key concern. The strategic assessment was read through and key findings considered at a meeting in December between the Community Safety Manager, the Partnership Analyst and the Borough Police Commander and from this process was identified five draft priorities (see Appendix 1).

The Government has sought to simplify the system of performance monitoring in all areas which fall under the Local Area Agreement reducing the number of Performance Indicators which will be used to measure performance for the whole Local Area Agreement to 35, to be chosen by LAA Executive's from a list of 198. The Community safety theme is one of eight of the LAA themes in Hampshire and as such we anticipate having around 5 performance indicators set as the key measures of four performance. The Community Safety Manager

along with the Borough Commander and the Partnership Analyst considered the available performance indicators and the associated detailed guidance and identified a number of performance indicators (see Appendix 1) which are recommended here for approval.

4 RECOMMENDATIONS

- i. That the Board approves the strategic assessment – subject to the inclusion of the latest Delivery Performance Report and a summary of outturn against the 2005-8 Strategy.
- ii. That the Board approves the identified priorities and performance measures at Appendix 1.

Appendix 1

TEST VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL

Crime And Disorder Reduction Partnership

IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

STRATEGIC ASSESSMENT			Notes
Completed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	Draft version - Out for consultation.
Agreed by district	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Not until April 2008.

Priorities	Preferred Indicators	Escalate to County? (+ notes)
1) Domestic abuse	Repeat victimisation rates - NI32	Yes
2) Alcohol related violence (and ASB)	Alcohol related assaults - NI20 Young person's substance misuse - NI115	Yes
3) ASB	First time entrants to CJ system - NI111	Yes
	Perceptions - NI17 and NI41 (with geographic specification)	Narrowing gap (by improvement) between worst wards and the mean. Escalate if possible.
	Criminal damage rates	No
	Environmental index - NI195	No
4) Community Cohesion	NI1, NI4, NI23	No

Notes: Haven't included re-offending rates as yet as unclear as to the benefits and also limitations regarding currency of data. Haven't included hospital admissions as a proxy indicator as the draft guidance suggests that it includes all hospital admissions which are alcohol related as opposed to And Only. Unclear whether or not this might affect its suitability as a proxy indicator of alcohol related violence.

APPENDIX 2

The National Outcome and Indicator Set

Outcome	National Indicators
Stronger communities	<p>NI 1 % of people who believe people from different backgrounds get on well together in their local area PSA 21</p> <p>NI 2 % of people who feel that they belong to their neighbourhood PSA 21</p> <p>NI 3 Civic participation in the local area PSA 15</p> <p>NI 4 % of people who feel they can influence decisions in their locality PSA 21</p> <p>NI 5 Overall/general satisfaction with local area CLG DSO</p> <p>NI 6 Participation in regular volunteering CO DSO</p> <p>NI 7 Environment for a thriving third sector CO DSO</p> <p>NI 8 Adult participation in sport DCMS DSO</p> <p>NI 9 Use of public libraries DCMS DSO</p> <p>NI 10 Visits to museums or galleries DCMS DSO</p> <p>NI 11 Engagement in the arts DCMS DSO</p> <p>NI 12 Refused and deferred Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMO) license applications leading to immigration enforcement activity HO DSO</p> <p>NI 13 Migrants English language skills and knowledge HO DSO</p> <p>NI 14 Avoidable contact: The average number, of customer contacts per received customer request</p>
Safer communities	<p>NI 15 Serious violent crime rate PSA 23</p> <p>NI 16 Serious acquisitive crime rate PSA 23</p> <p>NI 17 Perceptions of anti-social behaviour PSA 23</p> <p>NI 18 Adult re-offending rates for those under probation supervision PSA 23</p> <p>NI 19 Rate of proven re-offending by young offenders PSA 23</p> <p>NI 20 Assault with injury crime rate PSA 25</p> <p>NI 21 Dealing with local concerns about anti-social behaviour and crime by the local council and police PSA 23</p> <p>NI 22 Perceptions of parents taking responsibility for the behaviour of their children in the area HO DSO</p> <p>NI 23 Perceptions that people in the area treat one another with respect and dignity HO DSO</p> <p>NI 24 Satisfaction with the way the police and local council dealt with anti-social behaviour HO DSO</p> <p>NI 25 Satisfaction of different groups with the way the police and local council dealt with anti-social behaviour HO DSO</p> <p>NI 26 Specialist support to victims of a serious sexual offence PSA 23</p> <p>NI 27 Understanding of local concerns about anti-social behaviour and crime by the local council and police HO DSO</p> <p>NI 28 Serious knife crime rate HO DSO</p> <p>NI 29 Gun crime rate PSA 23</p>

Outcome	National Indicators
Safer communities (continued)	NI 30 Re-offending rate of prolific and priority offenders HO DSO NI 31 Re-offending rate of registered sex offenders PSA 23 NI 32 Repeat incidents of domestic violence PSA 23 NI 33 Arson incidents HO DSO NI 34 Domestic violence – murder PSA 23 NI 35 Building resilience to violent extremism PSA 26 NI 36 Protection against terrorist attack PSA 26 NI 37 Awareness of civil protection arrangements in the local area CO DSO NI 38 Drug-related (Class A) offending rate PSA 25 NI 39 Alcohol-harm related hospital admission rates PSA 25 NI 40 Drug users in effective treatment PSA 25 NI 41 Perceptions of drunk or rowdy behaviour as a problem PSA 25 NI 42 Perceptions of drug use or drug dealing as a problem PSA 25 NI 43 Young people within the Youth Justice System receiving a conviction in court who are sentenced to custody MoJ DSO NI 44 Ethnic composition of offenders on Youth Justice System disposals MoJ DSO NI 45 Young offenders engagement in suitable education, employment or training MoJ DSO NI 46 Young offenders access to suitable accommodation MoJ DSO NI 47 People killed or seriously injured in road traffic accidents DfT DSO NI 48 Children killed or seriously injured in road traffic accidents DfT DSO NI 49 Number of primary fires and related fatalities and non-fatal casualties, excluding precautionary checks CLG DSO