



**10 July 2012**

**Agenda Item:5**

**REPORT OF SERVICE DIRECTOR,  
POLICY, PLANNING AND CORPORATE SERVICES**

**COMMUNITY SAFETY UPDATE**

**Purpose of the Report**

- 1 The purpose of this report is to inform Members of the Committee of community safety performance at County, District and Partnership Plus Area levels and to provide an overview of the Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB) White Paper.

**Information and Advice**

- 2 **Community Safety Performance 2011/12**

- 2.1 The Safer Nottinghamshire Board Performance Update report is attached at Appendix 1 and summarises the performance by Community Safety Partnership (CSP) for 2011/12. The four statutory Community Safety Partnerships are responsible for the delivery of local community safety strategies and action plans:

- Ashfield Community Safety Partnership (ACSP)
- Mansfield Partnership Against Crime (MPAC)
- Bassetlaw, Newark and Sherwood Community Safety Partnership (BNS)
- South Nottinghamshire Community Safety Partnership (a combined partnership of Broxtowe, Gedling and Rushcliffe).

- 2.2 The Safer Nottinghamshire Board (SNB) is the countywide strategic group that is required under Crime and Disorder Regulations 2007 to ensure the delivery of shared priorities and a community safety agreement. It supports local community safety partnerships, which were set up as statutory bodies under sections of the 1998 Crime and Disorder Act, and aims to bring together agencies and communities to tackle crime and ASB in local areas. The SNB was established in 2008 and has fulfilled the requirement for a county strategy group in Nottinghamshire since then. The main purpose of SNB is to:

- Set strategic direction for community safety and substance misuse
- Ensure effective delivery of Nottinghamshire Community Safety Strategic Plan

- Support the statutory local Community Safety Partnerships to deliver their community safety strategies
- Ensure effective use of resources for community safety and substance misuse
- Respond effectively to emerging issues
- Ensure effective strategic linkages are in place between the City and County Community Safety Partnerships
- Ensure effective performance management arrangements are in place

2.3 The key strategic objectives for SNB are:

- **Early intervention** with individuals, families and communities seen to be at risk of substance misuse or crime, with a particular focus on children and young people.
- **Prevention of offending** through the delivery of effective interventions to reduce levels of crime, disorder, and substance misuse.
- **Improved confidence** and satisfaction levels in local communities through the implementation of effective engagement strategies, which identify the issues that are most important to those communities, and work effectively with those communities to tackle those issues and reduce anti social behaviour.

2.4 Each of the CSPs completed a strategic assessment in November 2011, identifying local priorities to be addressed in 2012/13. Priorities that are common across localities have now been translated into seven priority areas and are reflected in the strategy:

1. Serious Acquisitive Crime (Burglary, Vehicle Crime, Robbery etc)
2. Violent Crime
3. Domestic Violence
4. Anti-Social Behaviour
5. Drugs and Alcohol
6. Youth Issues
7. Hate Crime

2.5 As requested at the previous Committee meeting, the 2011/12 crime statistics for each district are outlined in the table at Appendix 2, together with comparative figures for the previous year and outlining the percentage reductions/increases. The statistics show some excellent reductions in All Crime, Criminal Damage and Vehicle Crime (especially Theft of Vehicle). The one area which shows a consistent increase is Domestic Violence, which is of concern but also partly reflects the partnership work around increasing the rate of reporting of these crimes.

2.6 As the focus of SNB is now very much on the Partnership Plus Areas (PPAs), the table below outlines performance in the 15 areas which had this status in 2011/12. The PPAs were identified in the annual Strategic Assessment as

suffering from the highest levels of crime and disorder in the County. It is clear that some areas have experienced far greater reductions than others and some work is currently being undertaken through the SNB Performance Group to see why this has occurred and where possible to identify good, effective and tested practice and then ensure there is roll out to all the PPAs.

<b>SNB Partnership Plus Area</b>	<b>2010/11</b>	<b>2011/12</b>	<b>12 month rolling % reduction</b>
<b>ACSP</b> – Kirkby-in-Ashfield East – sub ward	778	690	-11.3%
<b>ACSP</b> – Stanton Hill	252	174	-31%
<b>ACSP</b> – Sutton	1,335	1,128	-15.5%
<b>MPAC</b> – Carr Bank & Newgate	689	653	-0.5%
<b>MPAC</b> – Portland & Woodland	2,338	1,921	-17.8%
<b>BNS</b> – Castle (will be merged with Devon for 2012/13)	1,251	1,222	-2.3%
<b>BNS</b> – Harworth	856	574	-32.9%
<b>BNS</b> – Worksop North West	866	906	+0.5%
<b>BNS</b> – Worksop South East	1,049	1,001	-0.5%
<b>South Notts</b> – Carlton	576	431	-25.2%
<b>South Notts</b> – Eastwood	746	627	-16%
<b>South Notts</b> – Netherfield & Colwick	813	774	-0.5%
South Notts – Trent Bridge	599	475	-20.7%
<b>All PPAs</b>	<b>12,148</b>	<b>10,576</b>	<b>-12.9%</b>

2.7 There have been some changes to the list of PPAs, based on the findings of the Strategic Assessment for 2012/13, and the areas benefiting from this approach in 2012/13 are listed as follows:

1. Portland (Mansfield)
2. Worksop South East (Bassetlaw)
3. Castle (N & S)
4. Worksop North West (Bassetlaw)
5. Hucknall East (Ashfield)
6. Sutton-in-Ashfield East (Ashfield)
7. Sutton-in-Ashfield Central (Ashfield)
8. Carr Bank (Mansfield)
9. Kirkby-in-Ashfield East (APAC)
10. Newgate (Mansfield)
11. Woodlands (Mansfield)
12. Netherfield and Colwick (Gedling)
13. Sutton-in-Ashfield North (Ashfield)
14. Eastwood South (Broxtowe)
15. Oak Tree (Mansfield)

2.8 The Safer Nottinghamshire Board is responsible for the effective use of county wide resources. In order to achieve this, clear budget reporting and procurement and commissioning processes have been put in place, based on accountable body financial regulations. The Board has overall responsibility for ensuring these processes work effectively.

- 2.9 In 2011/12 the Home Office Community Safety Fund (£775,000) was combined with the County Council contribution of £200,000 to make a pooled budget of £975,000. The SNB Commissioning Group agreed that 70% of this sum should be allocated equally between the 15 Partnership Plus Areas identified in the Strategic Assessment (£44,500 each). The remaining 30% (£292,500) was allocated to countywide initiatives focused on domestic violence and reducing re-offending.

### **3. Anti Social Behaviour White Paper**

#### **3.1 Overview**

- 3.1.1 The Government published its much awaited anti-social behaviour (ASB) White Paper on 22 May, stating that the proposals would ensure that the needs of victims and communities suffering from ASB would now be put first. 'Putting Victims First' proposes to replace "19 complex existing powers with six simple new ones". The White Paper also sets out other previously announced government policy/activity intended to tackle the "drivers of anti-social behaviour". A draft bill will shortly be published for pre-legislative scrutiny before legislation is introduced. The White Paper is structured under the following sections.

#### **3.2 Focusing on the needs of victims**

- 3.2.1 Significant emphasis is placed on measures outlined in the White Paper that will better enable agencies involved in tackling ASB to put the needs of the victims first. The role of Police and Crime Commissioners (PCC) is highlighted as being important in ensuring greater democratic accountability of police priorities. The current system for tackling ASB is seen as being top down and overly bureaucratic – focusing on narrowly defined targets rather than broader outcomes.
- 3.2.2 Worryingly, the White Paper identifies 'more than half of all Anti-Social Behaviour Orders (ASBOs) are now breached at least once and those that do get breached, are breached more than four times on average'.
- 3.2.3 The starting premise of the White Paper is that ASB will vary from area to area and it should be for local agencies involved in dealing with it to focus resources most effectively. The role identified for the government is one of enabling good practice to be shared, simplifying powers available and also identifying broader support required for victims of anti-social behaviour.
- 3.2.4 Also highlighted is the need to improve information sharing between agencies involved in the fight against ASB, in particular, the need for earlier identification of higher risk cases often repeatedly reported across a number of agencies. Trials undertaken in a number of police authority areas, in conjunction with the Home Office, have focused on agencies collecting common data of reported ASB which enables them to jointly focus on priority cases.
- 3.2.5 Police and local agencies should be categorising ASB in just three ways – environmental, public nuisance and personal threat. This, it is claimed, along with an initial risk assessment of each case, will make it easier for the focus to be on the impact on the victim. There is a recognition that ASB is likely to be experienced by young people just as much as old people.

### 3.3 Empowering communities

- 3.3.1 This section of the White Paper will be of significant interest to those in local authorities as it outlines the final proposals for 'a new community trigger ... to ensure that victims and communities are not ignored'. The proposal is simple: 'the trigger would give victims and communities the right to demand that agencies who had ignored repeated complaints about ASB take action'. This proposal enjoyed broad support during the consultation phase.
- 3.3.2 It is not prescriptive in terms of how the trigger would work, and it commits that neither will be the legislation which follows. Authorities (district council level or above) will have to publish thresholds that trigger a complaint, regarding the way an agency has dealt with an ASB case or incident. A complaint that met the criteria would need to be considered by local authorities police and health – health will be through Clinical Commissioning Groups once established. A current pilot in Manchester is cited whereby triggers are to be considered via the Community Safety Partnership.
- 3.3.3 Work undertaken to develop the crime mapping website, [www.police.uk](http://www.police.uk), is highlighted as an important resource in the fight against ASB.

### 3.4 Swift effective action

- 3.4.1 The White Paper states that current powers for agencies involved in tackling ASB are too broad, bureaucratic and unwieldy. A number of times it emphasises the goal of the act as 'cutting the existing alphabet soup of unwieldy powers'. The existing 19 powers will be slimmed down to six. The clear desire is for a broader approach to ASB to be adopted.
- 3.4.2 The proposed simplification is claimed to enjoy widespread support amongst the police, local authorities, housing associations, judiciary and voluntary sector. The six powers would fall under the three banners of People, Places and Police Powers. The new people powers outlined are **Criminal Behaviour Orders** and **Crime Prevention Injunctions**. These would replace: ASBOs, ASBO on conviction, Drink Banning Order, ASB Injunction, Individual Support Orders and Intervention Orders. Crime Prevention Injunctions would be a civil injunction available in county courts for adults or Youth Courts for 10 to 17 year olds. The benefit of this as opposed to an ASBO would be the speed and lower burden of proof required to obtain them. Proposed Criminal Behaviour Orders would be available alongside any conviction for a criminal offence.
- 3.4.3 To protect places, **Community Protection Notices**, **Community Protection Order (Public Space)** and **Community Protection Order (closure)** are outlined. Community Protection notices will be issued by a number of different agencies including the police, local authorities and social housing providers. The examples such orders could tackle include persistent dog fouling, drunk behaviour in a particular area and litter hotspots outside of certain businesses. Non-compliance with such breaches would carry fines ranging from £2,500 to £20,000. Community Protection Orders would enable local authorities to determine areas where they will focus on a particular issue. In keeping with the wider government localism agenda, this will effectively enable local areas to agree and enforce byelaws without the need for secretary of state approval.
- 3.4.4 Gating Orders would be replaced by the Community Protection Order (public space). The order would be issued by the local authority (in consultation with the police and the directly elected Police and Crime Commissioner). The local authority would be

required to consult the local community and the PCC before making the order and to publicise it. Failure to comply with the restrictions would be a criminal offence. Guidance on consultation and publication of these orders will follow legislation.

- 3.4.5 CPO (Public Spaces) and **Direction Orders** will be retained by police officers and police community support officers. This will empower the Police and Police Community Support Officers to require a person who has committed or is likely to commit ASB to leave and not return to a specified area for 48 hours. It will be a requirement for local data on such orders to be published to ensure appropriate accountability and allay civil liberties fears. CPO (Closure) would allow either the police or local authorities to issue notices to close nuisance premises (businesses or private residences) for up to 48 hours.
- 3.4.6 Proposals following the Department for Communities and Local Government consultation on evicting so called 'Nightmare Neighbours' are outlined. The proposals would extend the existing discretionary grounds for possession to cover convictions of tenants or members of their households for offences committed at the scene of a riot. They would also introduce a new mandatory route to possession, modelled on the process for bringing introductory tenancies to an end for local authority landlords and on existing mandatory grounds for possession for private registered providers and social housing.

### 3.5 **Tackling the drivers of ASB**

- 3.5.1 This section of the White Paper is essentially an overview of existing government activity and policy changes that should contribute to broader social changes and reduce overall levels of ASB. The main areas are:

- Dealing with problem drinking through the government's recently launched alcohol strategy. The strategy outlines measures to bring forward a minimum unit price for alcohol and a number of other enforcement activities to tackle ASB related to binge drinking
- Stopping illicit drug use as outlined in the drug strategy. The strategy outlines a number of programmes for example the Positive Futures programme
- Troubled Families Initiative and associated commitment to turn round the lives of the 120,000 most troubled families in England by 2015
- Addressing mental health needs and encouraging responsible dog ownership.

### 3.6 **Comment**

- 3.6.1 A significant proportion of 'Putting Victims First' is a summary of other initiatives being taken forward to tackle ASB, such as alcohol and drug strategies and the election of Police Commissioners. The White Paper underlines the change in emphasis about local areas deciding what is best in terms of dealing with ASB rather than centrally imposed targets, which fits with the broader government approach to localism.

### **Financial details**

- 4 There are no financial implications arising from this report.

## **Statutory and Policy Implications**

- 5 This report has been compiled after consideration of implications in respect of finance, equal opportunities, human resources, crime and disorder, human rights, the safeguarding of children, sustainability and the environment and those using the service and where such implications are material they are described below. Appropriate consultation has been undertaken and advice sought on these issues as required.

## **Recommendation**

- 6 Members are asked to note the report.

## **7 Background Papers Available for Inspection**

Putting Victims First. More effective responses to anti-social behaviour. Cm8367 Home Office, May 2012.

## **Martin Done, Service Director Communications and Marketing**

For any enquiries about this report please contact: Chris Walker, Community Safety Manager, Safer and Engaged Communities (0115 9774331)

## SNB Performance Update

Prepared on behalf of: ACC Paul Scarrott, Nottinghamshire Police, Chair of SNB Performance Group

### 1.0 PURPOSE OF THE REPORT:

- 1.1 To update the Board with performance issues.

### 2.0 UPDATE:

- 2.1 New 2011/12 targets have been utilised for the performance dashboard, although closer tracking to Most Similar Groups (MSG) will be utilised and reviewed every 6 months.
- 2.2 The Quarter 4 SNB performance dashboard is available for the Board meeting on 15 June and is attached in Appendix A. The table below summarises the SNB year end performance.

	Ashfield	Mansfield	BNS	South Notts
<b>Serious Acquisitive Crime</b>	On target	On target	Target not met (-5.6%)	On target
<b>Violent crime (VAP with injury)</b>	On target	On target	Target not met (-4.4%)	On target
<b>Domestic Violence</b>	On target	Target not met (-7%)	Target not met (-7%)	On target
<b>Anti-social behaviour</b>	Police changed Criminal damage target met	Police changed Criminal Damage target met	Police ASB changed Criminal Damage target met	Police ASB changed Criminal Damage target met
<b>Substance misuse</b>	Not known yet	Not known yet	Not known yet	Not known yet
<b>Youth crime</b>	On target	On target	On target	On target
<b>Hate crime</b>	On target	On target	On target	On target

- 2.3 Performance issues to highlight are as follows:

- All crime down by 9% - 4,235 fewer offences (when compared to previous year to date). Whilst this remains under-achieving against target, it is worth noting that Nottinghamshire BCU is currently 3% below the Most Similar Group average (now 8<sup>th</sup> out of 15 which is slight slip from Quarter 3). Challenges to current performance include vehicle crime, theft and violence. Bassetlaw and Newark & Sherwood remains a performance risk.
- Under-reporting of Hate crime is an ongoing concern, although in part is currently being addressed through utilisation of Stop Hate UK, for which the funding has been extended.



- Youth crime performance this year has been outstanding, with a 70% reduction in the number of First Time Entrants (FTE). It should be noted that as the FTE figure reduces, a reduction in re-offending becomes more challenging, as the cohort concentrates on more criminally active young people, which has been witnessed over the last two quarters.
- 2011/12 has seen an increase in the percentage of violent crimes which are domestic violence related, which suggests increased reporting through greater confidence. Domestic violence repeats (through the MARAC process) have increased, due to the move from three the MARAC model to a two MARAC model, which has resulted in fewer cases being dealt with. The increase was anticipated and at an acceptable level and has stabilised for Quarter 4. The 'Man Enough' campaign is ongoing and positively raising awareness.
- Substance misuse – A new model of recovery-orientated drug services has been developed. There has been a largely improved performance over the last 6 months, although representations for treatment are higher than the national average. This could be an indicator that successful completions are not being sustained.
- Reducing re-offending – There has been a change in the way in which re-offending is measured by the MoJ. The new release of 2009 data suggests Nottinghamshire is performing in line with the national average for re-offending rates. However, the offences committed per offender are better than the national average and Nottinghamshire is the 9<sup>th</sup> best performing Probation Trust out of 35 nationally. Local re-offending measures have been introduced this year, which sets a target maximum no. of offenders each month to deliver a target 10% re-offending rate of all offenders. The year end figure for Nottinghamshire Probation was 10.1%, which was only 1% off the target.

### 3.0 RECOMMENDATION:

3.1 The SNB notes the above.

## Appendix 2

Performance Comparison Table	Ashfield			Bassetlaw			Broxtowe			Gedling			Mansfield		
	2010/11	2011/12	Change	2010/11	2011/12	Change	2010/11	2011/12	Change	2010/11	2011/12	Change	2010/11	2011/12	Change
All Crime	8,670	7,872	-9.2%	7,965	7,459	-6.4%	5,720	5,295	-7.4%	6,436	6,018	-6.5%	8,354	7,231	-13.4%
Criminal Damage	2,070	1,793	-13.4%	1,504	1,352	-10.1%	1,099	963	-12.4%	1,526	1,273	-16.6%	1,614	1,396	-13.5%
Domestic Burglary	592	354	-40.2%	362	329	-9.1%	498	400	-19.7%	503	392	-22.1%	343	264	-23.0%
Domestic Violence (crimes)	783	817	4.3%	428	602	40.7%	405	452	11.6%	474	658	38.8%	773	863	11.6%
Drugs Offences	311	349	12.2%	269	244	-9.3%	297	212	-28.6%	251	265	5.6%	433	370	-14.5%
Hate Crime	161	108	-32.9%	133	86	-35.3%	88	77	-12.5%	109	88	-19.3%	161	130	-19.3%
Robbery	64	68	6.3%	36	29	-19.4%	78	59	-24.4%	140	76	-45.7%	47	41	-12.8%
Serious Acquisitive Crime	1,434	1,124	-21.6%	1,370	1,180	-13.9%	1,226	1,108	-9.6%	1,247	1,107	-11.2%	1,227	958	-21.9%
Theft from a vehicle	542	515	-5.0%	686	553	-19.4%	505	520	3.0%	466	514	10.3%	624	543	-13.0%
Theft of a vehicle	236	187	-20.8%	286	269	-5.9%	145	129	-11.0%	138	125	-9.4%	213	110	-48.4%
Vehicle Crime	778	702	-9.8%	972	822	-15.4%	650	649	-0.2%	604	639	5.8%	837	653	-22.0%
Violence Against a person (VAP)	1,768	1,591	-10.0%	1,222	1,208	-1.1%	918	913	-0.5%	1,021	1,115	9.2%	1,995	1,780	-10.8%

Source: Police Crime data provided by Management Information - Nottinghamshire Police.

Domestic Violence and Hate Crime data provided by the SAU.

Performance Comparison Table	N & S			Rushcliffe			County		
	2010/11	2011/12	Change	2010/11	2011/12	Change	2010/11	2011/12	Change
All Crime	6,103	5,928	-2.9%	4,830	4,040	16.4%	48,078	43,843	-8.8%
Criminal Damage	1,246	1,171	-6.0%	783	622	20.6%	9,842	8,570	12.9%
Domestic Burglary	282	207	-26.6%	402	316	21.4%	2,982	2,262	24.1%
Domestic Violence (crimes)	474	554	16.9%	257	277	7.8%	3,594	4,223	17.5%
Drugs Offences	208	146	-29.8%	208	123	40.9%	1,977	1,709	13.6%
Hate Crime	115	82	-28.7%	84	72	14.3%	851	643	24.4%
Robbery	25	34	36.0%	72	60	16.7%	462	367	20.6%
Serious Acquisitive Crime	856	792	-7.5%	1,203	848	29.5%	8,563	7,117	16.9%
Theft from a vehicle	379	406	7.1%	629	363	42.3%	3,831	3,414	10.9%
Theft of a vehicle	170	145	-14.7%	100	109	9.0%	1,288	1,074	16.6%
Vehicle Crime	549	551	0.4%	729	472	35.3%	5,119	4,488	12.3%
Violence Against a person (VAP)	1,048	1,057	0.9%	593	532	10.3%	8,565	8,196	-4.3%

Source: Police Crime data provided by Management Information - Nottinghamshire Police.

Domestic Violence and Hate Crime data provided by the SAU.