

CABINET

13 JANUARY 2015

REFRESHED COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP ACTION PLAN

Portfolio Holder: Councillor Peter Hicks, Community Safety and Customer Contact

Report from: Robin Cooper, Director of Regeneration, Community and Culture

Author: Neil Howlett, Community Safety Partnership Manager

Summary

Section 6 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 places obligations on Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships, also known as Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs), to produce a Community Safety Plan to formulate and implement a strategy to reduce crime and disorder, combat substance misuse, and reduce re-offending.

This report provides information on the operation of the CSP from April to October 2014, the findings of the strategic assessment and the proposed action plan for 2015/16.

1. Budget and Policy Framework

- 1.1 CSPs were set up under Sections 5-7 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998. and comprise representatives from the 'responsible authorities'. For Medway these are: Medway Council; Kent Police; Kent Fire and Rescue Service; Medway Clinical Commissioning Group and Kent, Surrey and Sussex Community Rehabilitation Company (formerly Kent Probation).
- 1.2 Sections 19 of the Police and Justice Act 2006 requires local authorities to have a crime and disorder committee with power to scrutinise the decisions and actions of the CSP in their area and to make reports and recommendations to the local authority and the Partnership. The Crime and Disorder (Overview and Scrutiny) Regulations 2009 require Local Authorities to scrutinise CSPs at least once a year. Regeneration, Communities and Culture Overview and Scrutiny Committee undertakes this scrutiny function.
- 1.3 Regulation 5 of the Formulation and Implementation of Strategy) Regulations 2007 requires the CSP to carry out an annual strategic assessment of crime and disorder. Regulation 10 requires CSPs to: prepare a partnership plan and to revise it annually in consideration of the strategic assessment. The plan's overarching aim is to reduce crime and disorder, tackle substance misuse and reduce reoffending.

- 1.4 The current Community Safety Plan covers the period 2013 to 2016 and forms part of the Council's Policy Framework.
- 1.5 The classification of this plan as a policy framework document is set out in Schedule 3 of the Local Authorities (Functions and Responsibilities) (England) Regulations 2000, and in Article 4 (The Full Council) of the Council's Constitution.

2. Background

- 2.1 Scrutiny of the CSP was undertaken twice in 2014, in June and on 18 December. It is proposed that annual scrutiny of the CSP should, in future, be in December, to enable the Regeneration, Community and Culture Overview and Scrutiny Committee to scrutinise more effectively the findings of the strategic assessment, the proposed revisions to the CSP plan and review the actions of the CSP.
- 2.2 The current Community Safety Partnership Plan, covering the years 2013 to 2016, was adopted in 2013 and identified five priorities:
 - Tackle substance and alcohol abuse;
 - Tackle anti-social behaviour (ASB) and Envirocrime;
 - Reduce re-offending;
 - Tackle domestic abuse; and
 - Reduce the number of people killed or seriously injured in Road Traffic Collisions.
- 2.3 Performance against these priorities since April 2014 is set out within the Action Plan, appended at Appendix 1 to the report.
- 2.4 The key findings of the strategic assessment are produced below.
- 2.5 The proposed action plan for financial year 2015/16 (the revised plan) is produced at Appendix 2.

3. Options

- 3.1 The Community Safety Plan is a policy framework document and has been agreed for 2013/16 and whilst Cabinet can make any amendments to the Action Plan, any proposed changes to the Community Safety Plan would need to be referred to Full Council for final approval.

4. Advice and analysis

- 4.1 The key findings of the strategic assessment are reproduced below.
- 4.2 The various community safety issues experienced in Medway were scanned to ascertain which should be priorities for the CSP in the financial year 2015/16.

- 4.3 The issues were ranked using a weighted scoring matrix. This matrix approach is widely used, including by neighbouring Kent authorities, and takes into account the following factors:
- Perception of Community Concern
 - Volume of Incidents
 - Short Term Trend
 - Trend Over Time
 - Harm
 - Partnership Contribution
- 4.4 Five community safety issues scored higher than the others. As a result, the analyst proposed that the CSP prioritises for 2015/16 should be:
- Domestic abuse
 - Road safety
 - Substance misuse
 - Envirocrime
 - ASB
- 4.5 As ASB and envirocrime are closely linked it is proposed that they form a combined priority, with a single action plan, as is currently the case.
- 4.6 Reducing reoffending is a statutory requirement placed on all CSPs and is a theme that runs through all of the priorities. It is proposed that this remains as a priority for the partnership and performance continues to be tracked through the action plan.
- 4.7 Each of these priority issues was then subjected to a deeper dive to further inform the assessment. These are summarised below.
- 4.8 Within the Action Plan 2015/16 some targets are listed only as percentage figures. This is due to these targets being dependent on outcome figures from 2014/15, which will not be available until after April 2015.
- 4.9 **Domestic Abuse**
- 4.10 The scanning phase of this strategic assessment highlighted domestic abuse as a concerning community safety issue, scoring highest of all the issues examined.
- 4.11 A breakdown of this scoring shows that Medway's population do not currently perceive this to be particularly problematic. However, the volume of incidents is of concern, especially when considered in the context of increasing short and long term trends: the number of recorded incidents has increased by 15% from 2011/12, with Kent Police recording over 5,000 domestic abuse incidents in 2013/14 in Medway. There is a Kent and Medway strategy for combating domestic abuse and a subgroup of the CSP, with an action plan for delivering the Medway elements of the strategic plan. Medway Council has appointed a domestic abuse specialist to coordinate partnership activity and deliver the action plan.

- 4.12 Analysis of incident location has highlighted Gillingham North as experiencing the highest number of domestic abuse incidents (11%). This is followed by Luton and Wayfield (10%), Gillingham South (9%), Chatham Central (9%) and River (7%). Almost half of all the recorded domestic abuse incidents (46%) are attributed to these five wards.
- 4.13 Examination of all recorded incidents in 2013/14 shows that across all days, between midnight and 1.00am is when most (16%) domestic abuse incidents took place, with the window between Saturday midnight and 1.00am on Sunday comprising the highest number of incidents (5%) It is probable that this peak is influenced by the consumption of intoxicants.
- 4.14 In consequence the action plan 2015/16 should focus on:
- Increasing the percentage of clients where risk is reduced as a result of Independent Domestic Violence Advisor (IDVA) intervention.
 - Reducing the repeat victimisation rate for those identified at higher risk of harm.
 - Delivering domestic abuse awareness training to multi agency practitioners.
- 4.15 **Road Safety**
- 4.16 The scanning phase of this strategic assessment highlighted road safety as a concerning community safety issue, scoring highly, second only to domestic abuse.
- 4.17 A breakdown of this scoring shows that Medway's population do perceive this to be an issue of significant concern with a high 'Harm' scoring. Indeed, a Road Traffic Collision (RTC) in itself can have devastating consequences both for those directly involved and on the wider community in the form of damaged infrastructure and property as well as traffic congestion. There were 620 reported personal injury collisions in 2013 (calendar year) with the trend over time showing a small decrease and short term trend remaining fairly stable (615 in 2012 and 656 in 2011). This is also an area in which most partners can contribute to addressing.
- 4.18 Analysis of the location of the RTC's in Medway during 2013 highlighted that 88% took place within an urban area. River Ward experienced the highest number of incidents with 10% of all RTC's, followed by Gillingham North (9.5%) and then Luton and Wayfield (7%).
- 4.19 77% of the vehicles involved were cars, followed by motorcycles at 8% and pedal cycles comprised 7%. The remaining 8% is composed primarily of goods vehicles, buses and taxis.
- 4.20 Of the 1,153 vehicles involved in the 620 collisions, there were almost twice as many male drivers (673) than female drivers (391).
- 4.21 The 26–35 age group had the largest amount of drivers (21%) involved in collisions. This was followed by the 36–45 age group (15%).

4.22 Overall, males between 26 and 35 accounted for the largest proportion (12%) of drivers involved in RTC's.

4.23 93% of all casualties were classified as 'slight', with 6% being serious and 1% fatal.

4.24 In consequence the action plan 2015/16 should focus on:

- Achieving a reduction in killed and seriously injured (KSI) casualties.
- Achieving a reduction in slightly injured casualties.
- Continued delivery of educational programmes to pupils in Medway attending Academies, Sixth forms and Colleges.
- Targeting nuisance vehicles/motor bikes.

4.25 **Substance Misuse**

4.26 The scanning phase of this strategic assessment highlighted substance misuse as a significant community safety issue, scoring third highest of all the issues examined.

4.27 A breakdown of this scoring shows that Medway's population perceive this to be the issue of highest concern, even though the 'Harm' score is low. The relatively stable scores for both long and short term trends indicate that this is an issue that has not been significantly affected by attempts to tackle the problem. Data, information and publications have also been sought from Public Health to provide additional context beyond the scope of that established from Kent Police data and is examined in more detail below.

4.28 **Drugs**

4.29 In 2013/14 Kent Police the peak in the highest number of drug offences as between 00:00 and 1.00am, with a steady increase throughout the evening from 17:00 onwards, before a sharp decline can be seen after 1.00am. This peak in night-time activity can likely be attributed to an overall reduction in natural surveillance and an increase in Police activity to tie in with the night-time economy (closure of bars, pubs and clubs etc). There are four other noticeable peaks in the number of recorded offences: between 6.00am and 7.00am, 10.00am and 11.00am, 1.00pm and 2.00pm and between 4.00pm and 5.00pm. The exact reasons for these peaks are currently not known, but it is believed that proactive operations carried out by Kent Police may have impacted on these figures.

4.30 May 2013 saw the highest number of recorded offences (11%), whilst September 2013 saw the lowest number.

4.31 Almost three quarters (74%) of all recorded drugs offences were for possession of a controlled substance, with 72% of these being for possession of cannabis specifically. This is followed by possession of cocaine (12%).

4.32 River Ward saw the highest number of drug offences (15%) in 2013/14. It is likely that this ward experiences higher numbers of drug offences due to the prevalence of pubs and clubs in this ward and the consequential links to the night-time economy. After River, the ward with highest number of drugs offences is Gillingham South (14%) and then Luton and Wayfield (11%).

- 4.33 These three wards experience some of Medway's most complex issues in relation to health, crime and substance misuse.
- 4.34 Applying the Public Health England prevalence estimates for Medway (3,910 adults would indicate that only 16% of the substance misusing population were engaged in effective treatment in 2013/14.
- 4.35 Medway Council's 'TellUs 6 Survey', completed anonymously by students in Years 8 and 10 at schools, showed that in the previous 4 weeks, 12% of students had used drugs, of which cannabis was the most common choice (48%), followed by solvents (30%) and then legal highs (28%).
- 4.36 **Alcohol**
- 4.37 Between 2011/12 and 2013/14, the number of alcohol admissions due to alcohol has decreased by 17%, from 734 to 608.
- 4.38 Of the 385 adults in treatment services for alcohol in 2013/14, those between the ages of 40 and 49 formed the largest proportion, in both males and females. The 30–39 age group and then the 50–59 group second this, and the trend is consistent for both males and females.
- 4.39 A project was commissioned during the time period 01/10/2010–31/10/2013 to examine alcohol misuse in Medway and the links with crime. The project ascertained that Gillingham is the area worst affected by street drinking. Furthermore, Gillingham South has the highest levels of alcohol related crime per hectare. Overall however, Rochester West ward generated the largest amount of alcohol-related crime. River ward generated 22% of the alcohol-related crime linked to the night-time economy, which peaks between 12am and 3am. River ward contains 15% of the licensed premises in Medway.
- 4.40 Concerning alcohol use amongst young people, the TellUs 6 Survey found that 40% of the 10–15 year olds questioned had consumed a whole alcoholic drink (not just a sip). This was an increase from the 35% that admitted to having an alcoholic drink in 2012.
- 4.41 Older respondents (15 year olds) were more likely (78%) to have had an alcoholic drink than younger respondents (10 years old, 16% of whom had consumed an alcoholic drink).
- 4.42 In consequence the action plan 2015/16 should focus on:
- Increasing the number of opiate users who successfully leave drug treatment.
 - Exploring opportunities to implement new licensing tools to reduce alcohol related harm.
 - Supporting young people to develop skills to reduce multiple risk taking behaviours.
 - Continued joined up working during the night-time economy with Kent Police and Medway Council's Licensing teams.

4.43 **Environmental Crime and Anti Social Behaviour**

- 4.44 Concerns around the volume of incidents and public perception have led the partnership to the decision that this should be tackled as a priority for 2015/16.
- 4.45 A breakdown of the scoring shows that Medway's population do perceive this as a significant issue, correlating with the high 'Harm' scoring that was attributed to ASB in particular. Whilst a decreasing trend can be seen in both the trend over time and in the short term, the volume of incidents under this priority is particularly concerning as both ASB and Envirocrime score highly.
- 4.46 There has been a decline in the number of ASB incidents, both in the trend over time (down by 23%, from 14,425 in 2011/12 to 11,163 in 2013/14) and in the short-term trend (down 10%, from 12,386 in 2013/14 to 11,163 in 2013/14).
- 4.47 July 2013 and August 2013 experienced the highest number of reported ASB incidents during the year, significantly above the monthly average.
- 4.48 When all police ASB reports are broken down according to ward, it can be seen that River, Luton and Wayfield, Gillingham South, Gillingham North and Chatham Central experienced the most ASB reports on an individual basis and accounted for almost half (48%) of all of Medway's ASB reports received by Kent Police in 2013/14.
- 4.49 The breakdown of different ASB types in 2013/14 highlights 'rowdy or nuisance gathering' as the most reported ASB issue. With 10% fewer reports is 'neighbour disputes or nuisance', although this is closely followed by 'drunken or rowdy behaviour'.
- 4.50 Together, the reports for rowdy behaviour and nuisance gathering account for almost half of all ASB reports highlighting this to be the most concerning issue to Medway's population.
- 4.51 Environmental crimes are offences such as fly-tipping, littering and dog-fouling.
- 4.52 There has also been a decreasing trend in the number of environmental crime incidents, both in the short term (-15%, from 5,354 in 2012/13 to 4,554 in 2013/14), and in the trend over time (-30%, from 6,548 in 2011/12 to 4,554 in 2013/14). The most problematic wards remain Gillingham North and South, Luton and Wayfield, and Chatham Central.
- 4.53 During 2013/14 403 Fixed Penalty Notices were issued for littering and dog fouling. Forty-five cases were prosecuted at Medway Magistrates Court, with fines and costs totalling £27,509.46. In addition, 7 cautions were administered, there was 1 conditional discharge and 2 warrants for arrest were issued. The Street Scene Enforcement Team dealt with 1,093 fly tips.
- 4.54 Although when compared to the previous year there has been a decreasing trend in the number of environmental crime incidents, public perception of these being a problem, remains high. For the coming year, the team will continue to focus on dealing with environmental crime, but will also

endeavour to address the public perception by way of engagement through public engagements coordinated by the CSP.

- 4.55 In consequence the action plan 2015/16 should focus on:
- A reduction on the number of repeat victims of ASB.
 - The Community Safety Unit screening repeat ASB offender's families for nomination into the Medway Action for Families programme.
 - A reduction in the number of fly-tipping incidents.
 - Work towards the majority of fly-tipping incidents cleared by the next working day.
 - Ensuring that applicants to the Community Trigger are responded as per guidelines.
- 4.56 **Re-offending**
- 4.57 Tackling reoffending was not a priority that was scored within the scanning matrix, the reason for this being that it is not a specific community safety issue such as 'domestic abuse' or 'road safety'. Instead reoffending is a common theme that runs throughout many community safety issues. CSPs have a statutory commitment to reduce reoffending and, as such, it was agreed that tackling reoffending should be considered in its own right and assigned to the fifth priority to be addressed.
- 4.58 Medway's population however, did not perceive this to be a particularly concerning issue. This could be due to their views and understanding of criminality and community safety in Medway in that they view all incidents in isolation instead of considering reoffending as a contributory issue.
- 4.59 During 2014 the Probation Service went through a period of significant change, with the creation of the National Probation Service, who is responsible for high risk offenders, advice to the courts, statutory victim liaison and approved premises. The Kent, Surrey and Sussex Community Rehabilitation Company (CRC) is responsible for managing low and medium risk offenders, programmes, such as those dealing with domestic abuse perpetrators, and Community Payback.
- 4.60 During time period October 2012–September 2013, the overall adult reoffending rate for Medway's was 10.01%. This was higher than the predicted reoffending rate of 8.60%.
- 4.61 When examining the reoffending rates of different age groups, the group with the highest reoffending rate is the 18–20 age group (14%). Second to the 18-20 age group are those between 30 and 39, with a reoffending rate of 13%.
- 4.62 Figures from 2013/14 show that the number of young people reoffending after leaving the youth justice (YJ) system is 45%. This is an increase from the 37% seen in 2012/13.
- 4.63 The same increase can be seen in the reoffending rate of those young people leaving the Medway Youth Offending Team triage service. In 2012/13, this stood at 11% but increased to 13% in 2013/14.

4.64 This is being tackled through Intensive Supervision and Surveillance (ISS) programmes. The number of young people achieving completion of their ISS program has increased, between 2010/11 and 2012/13.

- 4.65 In consequence the action plan 2015/16 should focus on:
- Ensuring that the proportion of offenders who re-offend falls in line with the Ministry of Justice predicted level of reoffending.
 - Continued use of 'triage' system, to reduce 1st time entrants into the Youth Justice system.
 - Reducing the percentage of YOT Cohort that re-offend within 6 months of completing their intervention.

5. Risk management

5.1 There are reputational, environmental, economical and legal risks to the Council for not pro-actively pursuing an improvement in crime and disorder levels. This report reflects the importance of constructive dialogue with the partner organisations comprising the CSP and also the importance of coordinated and collaborative working.

Risk	Description	Action to avoid or mitigate risk	Risk rating
Decreased Agency "buy in".	Changes in leadership, staffing or resources could reduce the involvement of key agencies	Ensure that agencies are aware of the impact of dis-engagement upon their own service delivery/performance. Ensure that strategic members of the CSP are made aware of any situation as it arises.	Low
A wide range of CSP objectives.	Means that the CSP may be spread too thin and not have the resources to deal with all aspects so there may be gaps in service.	Prioritisation based on Strategic Assessment	Low
Legislation	Government guidance could change focus for CSP	CSP to maintain strong communication with LGA/Home Office in order anticipate changes.	Low
Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) plans.	Changes in the PCC's Police and Crime Plan.	Continued engagement with the PCC.	Low

5.2 A refreshed Diversity Impact Assessment screening form has been completed and is attached at Appendix 3 to the report. This indicates that the Community Safety Plan complies with the requirements of the legislation.

6. Consultation

- 6.1 As part of the process for putting together this report, all statutory partners submitted updates on the Action Plan, and also contributed to the Strategic Assessment. Members of the public were also consulted through Community Engagement events, the results of which fed into the Strategic Assessment.
- 6.2 The Regeneration, Community and Culture Overview and Scrutiny Committee considered this report on 18 December 2014. The Chairman of the Community Safety Partnership, Councillor Hicks introduced a report on the operation of the Community Safety Partnership for the period April – October 2014, the findings of the strategic assessment and the proposed action plan for 2015/16.
- 6.3 The Committee was reminded that the scrutiny of the Community Safety Partnership was last carried out in June 2014 at which time it was agreed that the date of the annual scrutiny be moved to December each year to enable Members to scrutinise more effectively the findings of the strategic assessment, the proposed revisions to the Community Safety Partnership Plan and review the actions of the Community Safety Partnership.
- 6.4 The Chairman of the Community Safety Partnership drew specific attention to the following initiatives:
- A Domestic Abuse Conference held at the Corn Exchange, Rochester
 - The temporary provision of a Community Safety Shop in the Pentagon Centre, Chatham
 - The launch of the Medway Safer Gambling Partnership in early December and subsequent publicity in the Municipal Journal.
- 6.5 Superintendent Tom Richards provided a brief update on recent events involving Medway Police including the recent by-election and the placement of a PCSO at Medway Maritime Hospital.
- 6.6 The Committee then discussed various elements of the report and the action plan including the following:
- In response to concerns raised as to policing levels in the urban areas of Medway and, in particular those Wards referred to in paragraph 4.48 of the report, Superintendent Richards confirmed that all areas of Medway were policed and he advised that the Police had a resource allocation model used to measure demand across the Police Force based on crime, anti social behaviour (ASB) and calls from the public. He confirmed that Medway received an equitable share of overall resources. It was also confirmed that all figures and percentages stated within the report related specifically to Medway not Kent.
 - A Member referred to problems experienced by residents in the area of Rochester and Chatham, particularly late at night when there was a transition of people moving from one area to another. He expressed concern that residents were not minded to keep reporting these issues to the Police as the public perception was that no action was taken. He requested that he be afforded the opportunity of discussing this with the Police outside of the meeting.

- An incident in Balmoral Road, Gillingham on Saturday 13 December 2014 and the police response. Superintendent Richards advised that he was unable to comment specifically on this incident as enquiries were ongoing.
- In response to questions relating to PCSOs, Superintendent Richards confirmed that a number of new PCSOs were currently undergoing training and would be joining Medway in January and March 2015. Councillor Hicks confirmed that he had an up to date list of PCSOs for Medway and he agreed to circulate this to all Councillors within the next few days. It was also noted that a full list of PCSOs was available on the Kent Police website.
- A Member referred to paragraph 4 of the report and stated that he wished to have an understanding of the scoring matrix and how items were prioritised. In particular, he referred to paragraph 4.25 of the report and asked for information as to the actions that would be undertaken to achieve improved results. It was agreed that this be circulated via a Briefing Note
- In response to requests for further information on substance misuse services, Dr Alison Barnett informed that Committee that Medway had re-commissioned its substance misuse service from July 2014 and this was now an integrated service for drug and alcohol services. She outlined the services available in respect of treatment, recovery, intervention, assisting return to work and reducing consumption. She advised that the reported statistics would take time to reflect these improved services.
- A member referring to paragraphs 4.60, 4.61 and 4.62 sought clarification on the figures quoted within these paragraphs. Cynthia Allen was requested to provide further clarification on this issue.
- A member referred to the reduction in the number of people killed or seriously injured in road traffic accidents and sought information as to action taken to raise awareness of these issues. In response, Martin Adams from Kent and Medway Fire and Rescue provided information on the Police and Fire joint initiative 'Licensed to Kill'.
- A Member sought an assurance that where possible the various members of the Community Safety Partnership work strategically with other partners and charities.
- A member sought information on Police response times and Superintendent Richards agreed that this could be provided to the Member direct outside of the meeting.
- A Member requested information on the involvement of Kent Police on alcohol licensing issues and, in particular, licensing of supermarkets. In response Superintendent Richards stated that whilst he was unable to discuss individual cases at the meeting, if supplied with the relevant information he could report back to the individual Member direct. He did however confirm that Medway Police had an effective and robust

Licensing Team that assessed all licensing applications. The Chairman of the Regeneration, Community and Culture Overview and Scrutiny Committee explained that Licensing Hearing Panels were quasi-judicial bodies and, as he served on these Panels, he could confirm that the Police were actively involved in Licensing applications. However, he stressed that there were rules and regulations to be followed in the licensing process and he commended the Council's Licensing Team in their knowledge of the licensing functions.

- A Member asked for information as to the budgetary implications for Kent Police in the light of the recent announcement that there was to be a 5.1% decrease in the Police budget for 2015/16 and, in particular, whether this would result in reduced Police personnel in Medway. In response Superintendent Richards confirmed that the 5.1% decrease in budget equated to a £20 million reduction for Kent Police as a whole which would be shared equally across the Force according to resource allocation models. The level of savings equated to a reduction of 300 personnel with approximately 100 of these being police officers and 200 civilian employees. It was not possible at this stage to advise upon the potential level of reductions in Medway.
 - A Member asked for further clarification on how priorities were identified and it was agreed that this information be included in the Briefing Note to be sent to members on the scoring matrix, referred to above. A copy of this briefing note will be set out at Appendix 4 (to follow).
- 6.7 The Committee also discussed the issue of comparing Police statistics with those of previous years having regard to the Kent Police and Crime Commissioner's criticism of the past reporting statistics of Kent Police. In response, Superintendent Richards confirmed that whilst HM Inspectorate had previously given Kent Police a 90% accuracy rate for the recording of crime, following a range of improvements and a subsequent re-examination, this figure had now increased to 96%. This had placed Kent Police in the top two thirds nationally of Police accuracy in recording crime.
- 6.8 He stated that it was difficult to undertake comparisons with previous years as the way in which information had been recorded had changed. However, since June 2014, the records could be compared like for like.
- 6.9 He also reminded the Committee that the 'Saville' Investigation had been a major factor attributing to the increased levels of reported historic crime.
- 6.10 Councillor Hicks advised the Committee that arrangements were in hand for the Kent Police and Crime Commissioner to attend an all Member briefing in 2015 and Victim Support would be one of the topics covered. In addition, the Domestic Abuse Co-ordinator would be undertaking a presentation on the same evening.
- 6.11 In considering the report, some members expressed concern that the Committee was being asked to refer the proposed action plan for 2015/16 to Cabinet on 13 January 2015 without having had sight of the information requested during the debate on this item. In response, the Chairman gave a reassurance that when the item was referred to Cabinet, the Cabinet would also receive a full list of the points raised by this Committee.

6.12 The Committee made the following decisions:

- a) The Members of the Community Safety Partnership be thanked for attending the meeting and answering Members questions;
- b) The actions of the Community Safety Partnership for the half year April – September 2014 be noted;
- c) The findings of the annual strategic assessment be noted;
- d) The proposed action plan, having been considered in the light of the findings of the annual strategic assessment be referred to Cabinet on 13 January 2015, but that Cabinet be advised that this Committee has requested or noted the following:
 - That Superintendent Richards has offered to meet with Councillor Mackness outside of the meeting to discuss his concerns regarding problems for local residents when there is a transition of people moving from Rochester to Chatham late at night.
 - That all figures and statistics within the report relate to Medway and not the whole of Kent.
 - That Councillor Hicks, as Chairman of the Community Safety Partnership will circulate a list of PCSOs across Medway to all Members in the next few days.
 - A Briefing Note be provided to Members setting out further information as to the scoring matrix used to formulate the statistics in the report and how priorities are identified.
 - Future reports from the Community Safety Partnership include trajectory projections where possible.
 - A Briefing Note be provided to Members clarifying the information relating to figures provided within paragraphs 4.60 and 4.61 and 4.62 of the report.
 - It be noted that Superintendent Richards will be providing Councillor Etheridge with information on response statistics.
 - It be noted that there will be an all Member presentation from the Kent Police and Crime Commissioner in early 2015.
 - The Community Safety Partnership look to strategic working with other partners/charities where possible

7. Director's comments

7.1 The Director of Regeneration, Community and Culture welcomes the helpful observations and comments made by members of the Overview and Scrutiny

Committee of 18 December 2014 and has directed officers to provide the supplementary information requested by the committee.

8. Financial implications

- 8.1 The Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) has submitted her Police and Crime Plan, and has proposed for CSPs to be allocated a budget to use for funding activities to tackle crime, disorder, drugs and reoffending. Medway CSP allocated £100,292. In 2015/16 the amount allocated to Medway CSP is £96,782, and 2016/17 it is £93,395.

9. Legal implications

- 9.1 There are no direct legal implications arising from this report.
- 9.2 The Council's statutory powers are detailed in the report.
- 9.3 The adoption or modification of the Community Safety Plan is a decision for Full Council.

10. Recommendations

- 10.1 The Cabinet is asked to consider the comments from the Regeneration, Community and Culture Overview and Scrutiny Committee.
- 10.2 The Cabinet is asked to note the actions of the Community Safety Partnership for the half year April to September 2014.
- 10.3 The Cabinet is asked to note the findings of the annual strategic assessment.
- 10.4 The Cabinet is asked to agree the proposed action plan for 2015/16 in the light of the findings of the annual strategic assessment.

11. Suggested reasons for decision

- 11.1 The Community Safety Plan discharges the council's statutory requirement to produce a plan for community safety.

Lead officer contact

Neil Howlett,
Community Safety Partnership Manager,
Medway Police Station, Eastbridge, Purser Way, Gillingham, Kent, ME7 1NE.
01634 331183
neil.howlett@medway.gov.uk

Appendices

Appendix 1 – Community Safety Plan Action Plan Report Q1 and Q2, 2014/16.
Appendix 2 – Updated Action Plan for 2015/16.
Appendix 3 – Diversity Impact Assessment
Appendix 4 – Briefing note on the scoring matrix used to assess priorities (to follow)

Background Papers

Community Safety Plan 2013/16.
<http://democracy.medway.gov.uk/mglssueHistoryHome.aspx?Ild=10023>

Medway

Community Safety Partnership

Action Plan 2014 – 2016

Quarter 1 update: April to June 2014
Quarter 2 update: July to September 2014



Priority 1 – Tackle Substance and Alcohol Abuse

Indicators	Target	Q1 Update (April to June 2014)	Q2 Update (July to September 2014)
Retender drug and alcohol treatment services to better meet the need of the population	Contract awarded and service in place	New Service delivered by Turning Point opened on 1 July 2014. All clients transferred and staff TUPE'd successfully. Turning Point will present new recovery-focused model to CSP SEG meeting in January. TUPE - Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment). Action complete	New Service delivered by Turning Point opened on 1 July 2014. All clients transferred and staff TUPE'd successfully. Turning Point will present new recovery-focused model to CSP SEG meeting in January. TUPE - Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment). Action complete
Number of users of opiates that left drug treatment successfully (free of drug(s) of dependence) who do not then re-present to treatment again within 6 months as a percentage of all those in treatment	Maintain "similar" rate to England average (as reported by Public Health England)	Q1 data not yet available but Q4 data remained "similar" to England Average of 7.8% with Medway achieving 6.3%.	Q2 data not published, Q1 data shows a drop in the rate from 7.8% to 5.6%. It was at the beginning of Q1 that the new integrated substance misuse contract was awarded and the existing provider began the transition process across to Turning Point. It is anticipated that improvements in outcomes won't be realised for a significant period of this transition year. Turning point successfully opened the new service as planned on 1 July.
Commission alcohol liaison service at hospital	Hospital alcohol project launched with full evaluation process in place.	Two posts have been recruited to, ward in-reach post still out to advert. Meeting at end of August with all providers to finalize the evaluation.	All posts have now been recruited to. There are delays to the evaluation process due to IG restrictions on sharing data. Patient consent forms are being reviewed.
Improved early identification and prevention of alcohol related harm	IBA training delivered to 100 front line staff.	76 staff trained by the end of Q1.	130 staff trained by the end of Q2.

Indicators	Target	Q1 Update (April to June 2014)	Q2 Update (July to September 2014)
<p>Explore opportunities to implement new licensing tools such as cumulative impact areas (CIA).</p>	<p>Evidence based recommendations are carried out and overseen by CSP.</p>	<p>Safer Socialising Awards launched for Rochester Town centre.</p> <p>Scoping for Purple Flag awards to be carried out.</p> <p>Exploring opportunities for “reducing the strength” type campaign in the Gillingham area.</p> <p>New provider is engaged to provide support to Operation Impede.</p> <p>Public Health alcohol support post became vacant in June. Recruitment underway.</p>	<p>Public Health post has now been filled and new recruit due to start in November. This post can take forward investigations into Purple flag and licensing review meetings.</p>
<p>Launch ASSIST-Decipher in</p>	<p>4 Secondary schools in Medway are delivering the smoking prevention programme</p>	<p>Four schools have completed ASSIST screening and young people have been identified and trained to deliver tobacco control peer mentor program. Two more schools are currently being recruited.</p>	<p>6 schools engaged in Assist and new staff trained up to deliver the programme. Team have also developed a programme that can be delivered at the PRU.</p>

Priority 2 – Tackle ASB and Envirocrime

Indicators	Targets	Q1 Update (April to June 2014)	Q2 Update (July to September 2014)
Satisfaction of victims of ASB with actions taken by Police and partner agencies.	85%	84.3%	84.3%. Force current performance at 79%.
Reduction on the number of repeat victims of ASB.	5%	4 High Risk ASB cases opened this quarter, a reduction of 7 from the previous quarter.	9 high-risk cases this Q2 increased of 4 from the previous quarter.
Community Safety Unit to screen repeat ASB offender's families for nomination into the Troubled Families programme	100%	Maintained at 100% via JFMP (Joint Family Management Programme) referrals, Repeat Victims management and MASB.	100% - All MASB families screened for MAFF nomination. All nominated ASB repeat offenders screened for MAFF referral.
Number of fly tipping incidents NI196a	5% reduction	The Street Scene Enforcement Team dealt with 372 fly tips (13% reduction). In 75 cases, the fly tipping was gone on inspection. All of the remaining 263 fly tips were searched and evidence was retrieved in 42 cases (16%) and referred for further investigation. 77% of fly tips were removed by the team on the same day, including 120 which were dealt with proactively. Total tonnage removed by the team was 9.32 tonnes.	The Street Scene Enforcement Team dealt with 454 fly tips, (9.2% reduction on the same quarter last year) all of which were searched. Evidence was retrieved in 67 cases (15%) and referred for further investigation. 410 fly tips (90%) were removed by the team on the same day, including 219 which were dealt with proactively. Total tonnage removed by the team was 21.5 tonnes.
Number of environmental crimes reported SF1a	5% reduction	792 (25% increase). This is due to the increased number of FPN's issued for littering.	736 (7% decrease on previous quarter).

Indicators	Targets	Q1 Update (April to June 2014)	Q2 Update (July to September 2014)
Increase number of Fixed Penalty Notices (FPN's) issued SF2	10% increase	129 (148% increase)	145. This represents an increase of 12.4% on the previous quarter and 11.5% on the same quarter last year.
Percentage of people who feel Medway is safe SF15	90%	This is not collected until the year end. CSP Consultation responses by 07/08 - 116 Very or fairly safe - 69% (80) Neither safe nor unsafe - 13% (15) Fairly or very unsafe - 15% (17) Don't know - 1% (1) Form not completed - 3% (3)	See Q1 comment.

Priority 3 – Reduce Re-offending

Indicator	Targets	Q1 Update (April to June 2014)	Q2 Update (July to September 2014)
Proportion (%) of offenders who re-offend. [AU1]	To fall in line with the MoJ predicted level of re-offending. (We are not able to give a figure because this changes in each period to reflect the characteristics of each cohort)	We are currently unable to provide any probation data. Following the separation of Probation in NPS and CRC the IT systems had to be split – the management information reporting system is not fully back up and running. The Probation Service will hopefully be able to supply for quarter 2.	The Medway actual rate of adult re-offending for January 2013 to December 2013 is 10.34 %. The actual rate is higher than the predicted rate of 8.63%. Figures always show a time lag, which reflects the period required for re-offending to take place, to be proven by court conviction or caution, collation and release of the data by MoJ. Note: this data relates to the period covered by Kent Probation.
Increase the proportion of offenders in employment at termination	40%	As above.	We are currently unable to provide probation data. Kent Probation separated into two organisations, CRC and NPS on 1 st June 2014. The CRC is currently verifying data for August at County level and plans to segment the September data at team level. It is therefore anticipated that data for Medway, will become available from November.
Increase the proportion of offenders in suitable accommodation at termination	60%	As above.	As above
By use of 'Triage' system, reduction in 1st time entrants into the Youth Justice system (NI111).	5% (< 275 young people)	38 FTE	40 FTE (Likely to meet target of below 275 by the end of the year)

Indicator	Targets	Q1 Update (April to June 2014)	Q2 Update (July to September 2014)
Percentage of re-offending by use of those who have accessed the 'Triage' system.	< 50%	6% (equates to 1 out of 18 young people that went onto re-offend).	16% (4 out of 25 Young people went on to reoffend).
Reduce the number of looked After Children (LAC) within the Criminal Justice System (this fits in with a new SE wide protocol to reduce LAC, which Medway has signed up to and YOT is leading on).	Reduce the number of LAC by 10% against 2013/14 out-turn.	25% (of outcomes cohort in Q1 were LAC young people)	13% (13 of the 98 Young people with substantive outcomes in the Q2 Cohort are LAC or POLA LAC).
Percentage of YOT Cohort that re-offend within 6 months of completing their intervention.	< 50%[AU2]	36% (inline with Q4 2013/14 notes re monitored cohort for re-offending)	41.5% (inline with Q4 2013/14 notes re monitored cohort for re-offending)

** Kent Probation were replaced by the National Probation Service and the Kent, Surrey and Sussex Community Rehabilitation Company, effective from 1st June 2014.*

Priority 4 – Tackle Domestic Abuse

Indicators	Targets	Q1 Update (April to June 2014)	Q2 Update (July to September 2014)
Number of high risk clients referred for IDVA support DA06	Awaiting figure from OASIS, due in May 2014	118 Note – there are 3 IDVA's with a CAADA recommended caseload of 25 clients each.	132
Percentage of clients where risk is reduced as a result of IDVA intervention DA07	68% CAADA benchmark	100% Total 27 clients Significant reduction 17 Moderate reduction 10	97% Total 35 clients Significant reduction 23 Moderate reduction 11
Reduce the repeat victimisation rate for those identified at higher risk of harm, making victims and their families safer	Below 28% CAADA benchmark	34% Note – MARAC target below 30%.	38%
Number of referrals to Medway Specialist Domestic Violence Court (SDVC) IDVA, where victim has been supported to attend at first or second hearing	150 (Target figure from OASIS)	36	51
Percentage of non-Police Multi Agency Risk Assessment Conference (MARAC) referrals	40%	32.6%	28%
Deliver a domestic abuse awareness training to multi agency practitioners	100 practitioners	55 professionals	86

Priority 5 – Reduce the Number of People Seriously Injured in Road Traffic Collisions

Indicator	Targets	Q1 Update (April to June 2014)	Q2 Update (July to September 2014)
<p>To achieve a 40% reduction in killed and seriously injured (KSI) casualties based on the 2004/08 average of 85.2 KSI's by 2020.</p>	<p>5.71% reduction per year from 51 to 56 (+9.8%)</p>	<p>13 KSI Casualties. Predicted annual outturn - On Target.</p> <p>1,152 children received Road Safety Education during this quarter.</p>	<p>26 Killed or Seriously Injured casualties recorded during the period 01/01/2014 to 30/06/14. Predicted 2014 KSI casualties = 52. On Target.</p> <p>850 children received Road Safety Education from Safer Journeys Team (SJT) during July 2014, with 8 Road Safety education liaison visits in September 2014.</p> <p>Think! Road Safety Journey Planners issued to 44 primary schools in Medway, 2000+ pupils in July 2014. The resource is intended to assist year 6 pupils and equip them with the necessary information when making the transition into secondary school, as many will be travelling independently to and from school from September.</p> <p>Due to this quarter being across the summer term there has been no RUSH engagement delivered into schools. Local engagement through foundation and pupil referral units continue throughout the year at a local level through fire stations in Medway and Strood.</p> <p>There have been 4 car-cutting demonstrations delivered at Strood Fire Station during the last quarter engaging with 36 young people from various pupil referral units across Medway.</p>

Indicator	Targets	Q1 Update (April to June 2014)	Q2 Update (July to September 2014)
<p>To achieve a 20% reduction in slightly injured casualties based on the 2004/08 average of 705 casualties by 2020.</p>	<p>2.85% reduction per year- Slight down by 7 to 767 (-1.0%)</p>	<p>186 Slight Casualties. Predicted annual outturn - not on Target.</p> <p>1,152 children received Road Safety Education during this quarter.</p>	<p>349 Slight Injury casualties recorded during the period 01/01/2014 to 30/06/2014. Predicted 2014 Slight Injury casualties = 698. Not on Target.</p> <p>850 children received Road Safety Education during July 2014, with 8 Road Safety education liaison visits in September 2014.</p> <p>Think! Road Safety Journey Planners issued to 44 primary schools in Medway, 2000+ pupils in July 2014. The resource is intended to assist year 6 pupils and equip them with the necessary information when making the transition into secondary school, as many will be travelling independently to and from school from September.</p> <p>Due to this quarter being across the summer term there has been no RUSH engagement delivered into schools. Local engagement through foundation and pupil referral units continue throughout the year at a local level through fire stations in Medway and Strood.</p>
<p>Deliver 'Licence to Kill?' to pupils in Medway attending Academies, Sixth forms and Colleges.</p>	<p>80% of year 12 to students</p>	<p>CaRe plans to deliver L2K to schools in Kent and Medway in 2014 are underway. No action until September 2014, school / college bookings currently being finalised.</p>	<p>On target. All except one secondary school in Medway have booked onto L2K performances in November and December of 2014, to commence in mid-October through to the end of November. Four additional performances to be delivered in Mid Kent College.</p> <p>L2K will be delivered in Kent on 12th 13th 14th November at Gravesend, Margate and Maidstone in partnership.</p> <p>National RTC week is 17th – 23rd November KFRS will be delivering engagement across the county throughout the week using messages aimed at young drivers.</p>

Indicator	Targets	Q1 Update (April to June 2014)	Q2 Update (July to September 2014)
Multi-agency motor bikes/bicycle campaign to raise awareness to drivers. March - May	1 campaign delivered	<p>'Think Bike!' publicity campaign delivered during April / May. The campaign aimed to target roads users (mainly car drivers), to be more actively aware of the smaller, more vulnerable riders - both pedal and powered. The 2014 phase of the campaign sort to converse with Bikers with the addition of the 'Biker Think' roadside message that is located in Medway at junctions where there has been a KSI crash between a p2w and car. The campaign ran from 7th April until 31st May and covered Kent and Medway.</p> <p>The campaign was delivered through online platforms, social media/marketing, roadside advertising, print and radio.</p>	<p>'Think Bike!' publicity campaign delivered during April / May. The campaign aimed to target roads users (mainly car drivers), to be more actively aware of the smaller, more vulnerable riders - both pedal and powered. The 2014 phase of the campaign sort to converse with Bikers with the addition of the 'Biker Think' roadside message that is located in Medway at junctions where there has been a KSI crash between a p2w and car.</p> <p>The campaign ran from Monday 7th April until 31st May (8 weeks) approximately and covered Kent and Medway.</p> <p>The campaign was delivered through online platforms, social media/marketing, roadside advertising, print and radio. Action complete.</p> <p>Young Driver, Pedal Cyclist and P2W Casualty Reduction [CaRe] sub-groups attended by the team during the quarter.</p> <p>Bikeability Levels 1and2 continues to be delivered to primary schools in Medway.</p> <p>Action complete.</p>
Op. Enact	1 campaign	Op Enact has been running over the Summer months staffed by PC's and PCSO's. As part of their duties, the Community Policing Team are working on the Peninsula targeting nuisance motorcycles.	

Indicator	Targets	Q1 Update (April to June 2014)	Q2 Update (July to September 2014)
Working with Public Health to promote alcohol awareness sessions	Two programmes delivered	<p>The Safer Journeys Team (SJT) supported Safety events over Easter, including Deanwood Children's Centre and the Cuxton and Halling Parents Forum, engaging with a number of families to advise on various Road Safety topics, including in-car safety. Our SJT mascot, Belisha Beacon was also on hand to support the proceedings.</p> <p>The SJT supported a Summer partnership event at Mid Kent College in June, with a new Driver Simulator. The resource was well received by the students, many of whom are learning to drive. Further events planned on Medway City Estate with workplace health.</p>	<p>SJT supported 7 Housing, Youth Services and Community Safety events during August 2014, including Bligh Children's Centre, Strood and various sites in Gillingham and Rainham, engaging with a number of families to advise on various Road Safety topics, including in-car safety.</p> <p>Other sessions delivered in partnership with Public Health included the BAE Systems Open Day [5/7], Medway Mile [25/7] and three Fresher's Fayre events in Medway at the University of Greenwich, Mid Kent College and UCA during September 2014.</p> <p>KFRS are supporting Public Health on 19th November at Brompton Children's Centre with safety messages relating to drinking and cooking, in respect of the dangers of kitchen fires.</p>

Indicator	Targets	Q1 Update (April to June 2014)	Q2 Update (July to September 2014)
<p>Working collectively with partners and agencies to raise awareness of the impact of irresponsible parking outside schools in the Safer and Stronger wards.</p>	<p>On-going</p>	<p>KFRS crews attended schools in Hoo, Twydall, Walderslade and Frindsbury in partnership with Medway's Safer Journeys team to deliver safe access messages to parents during national walk to school week. Included impact and consequences of irresponsible parking.</p> <p>From Safer Journeys Team - A 'Life or Death' schools access initiative took place to coincide with National Walk to School Week in May. The SJT led the initiative, in partnership with KFRS, Kent Police, Parking Enforcement, Safer Communities and five schools in Medway. This involved a fire appliance driving past various schools unannounced during afternoon collection time to highlight the importance of maintaining clear emergency access at all times, particularly outside our local schools experiencing high levels of congestion.</p> <p>Zigzag message banner campaign is ongoing - during Q1 10 schools have taken part, with parking enforcement visits often coinciding with the initiative to help reinforce the keep clear message. PCN figures outside schools continue to be fed back to the relevant schools as a polite reminder to park responsibly, or to ideally walk the journey to and from school.</p>	<p>A 'Life or Death' schools access initiative took place to coincide with National Walk to School Week last quarter. SJT led the initiative, in partnership with KFRS, Kent Police, Parking Enforcement, Safer Communities and five schools in Medway. This involved a fire appliance driving past various schools unannounced during afternoon collection time to highlight the importance of maintaining clear emergency access at all times, particularly outside our local schools experiencing high levels of congestion.</p> <p>In Q2, SJT nominated the initiative for a national Modeshift Award. The initiative has since been short-listed under the partnership award category. Winners to be announced next quarter.</p> <p>Zigzag message banner campaign - ongoing. 20+ schools have taken part in 2013/14 to date [5 during Q2] with parking enforcement visits often coinciding with the initiative to help reinforce the keep clear message. PCN figures outside schools continue to be fed back to the relevant schools as a polite reminder to park responsibly, or to ideally walk the journey to and from school.</p>

Indicator	Targets	Q1 Update (April to June 2014)	Q2 Update (July to September 2014)
<p>Working collectively with partners and agencies to address reckless driving at key hotspot areas within Medway to reduce KSI's. KFRS Will support Kent Police and Medway Council as requested. Consider use of Predpol as a platform.</p>	<p>A quarterly discussion</p>	<p>KFRS delivered RTC interventions during the week 9th-15th June across Kent and Medway in line with their Chief Fire Officer's Association. RTC messages delivered to young drivers and riders including driver distractions, seat belts, mobile phones, peer pressures, speed and tyre maintenance.</p> <p>Potential to deliver RTC interventions with Chatham Dockside now in place.</p> <p>Medway Council's Road Safety Team have made contact made with Paul Stanbridge, a Community Engagement Officer for KFRS, who currently uses a customised car [unmarked] to engage with young drivers. Potential for Road Safety to link up and attend future site events, e.g. Medway City Estate. This may assist also with ongoing Young Driver projects.</p>	<p>Further events planned for driving simulator resource on Medway City Estate with workplace health next quarter.</p> <p>SJT supported a 'See the Hazards' campaign launch at Buckmore Park in September, led by KCC. The campaign aims to educate drivers and reduce the number of people who are killed and seriously injured on urban roads with potential for Medway to link into this in future.</p> <p>Drink Drive campaign planning between partners took place this quarter in preparation for Q3.</p> <p>KFRS continue to red route in their known hot spot areas to engage with riders and drivers around the impact of reckless driving. There will be a car cutting demonstration at Brompton Barracks on 19th November. Other cutting demos will be taking place during national RTC week 17th-23rd November across Kent and Medway. KFRS' engagement car will be at Chatham Dockside periodically over RTC week.</p>

Medway Community Safety Partnership

Action Plan 2015 – 2016

To be read in conjunction with the Community Safety Plan 2013 - 2016



Priority 1 – Tackle Substance and Alcohol Abuse

Indicators	Target	Due Date	Responsible
Percentage of opiate users that left drug treatment successfully (free of drug(s) of dependence)	Increase by 2% from 2013/14 baseline of 6.2% i.e. 8.2%	31 March 2016	Senior Public Health Manager
Develop service design options for users of New Psychoactive Substances (NPS) in Medway	Complete research which identifies the level of use of NPS in Medway as well as the profile of users and key types of NPS used in order to advise on service delivery options so as to increase access.	31 January 2016	Senior Public Health Manager
Percentage of people referred from Accident and Emergency (A&E) who receive extended alcohol brief intervention through A&E referral	40%	31 March 2016	Senior Public Health Manager
Improved early identification and prevention of alcohol related harm	Evaluate the use of online brief interventions	31 March 2016	Senior Public Health Manager
Explore opportunities to implement new licensing tools to reduce alcohol related harm.	Evidence based recommendations are carried out and overseen by CSP.	31 March 2016	Senior Public Health Manager
Support young people to develop skills to reduce multiple risk taking behaviours (e.g. smoking, drinking alcohol, drug use)	Risk Avert programme rolled out across 8 secondary schools	31 March 2016	Senior Public Health Manager

Priority 2 – Tackle ASB and Envirocrime

Indicators	Targets	Due Date	Responsible
Satisfaction of victims of ASB with actions taken by Police and partner agencies.	85%	31 March 2016	CSU Inspector
Reduction on the number of repeat victims of ASB.	5%	31 March 2016	CSU Inspector
Community Safety Unit to screen repeat ASB offender's families for nomination into the Medway Action for Families programme	95%	31 March 2016	CSU Inspector
Number of fly tipping incidents	5% reduction	31 March 2016	Environmental Services Manager
Increase number of Fixed Penalty Notices (FPN's) issued	5% increase	31 March 2016	Environmental Services Manager
Percentage of fly-tipping incidents cleared by the next working day	75%	31 March 2016	Environmental Services Manager
Percentage of people who feel Medway is safe	90%	31 March 2016	Head of Safer Communities
Ensure applicants to the Community Trigger are responded as per guidelines	95%	31 March 2016	Community Safety Partnership Manager

Priority 3 – Reduce Re-offending

Indicator	Targets	Due Date	Responsible
Percentage of offenders successfully completing Community Orders and Licences[AU1].	70%	31 March 2016	Director of Kent – Kent, Surrey and Sussex Community Rehabilitation Company
Increase the proportion of offenders in employment at termination	40%	31 March 2016	Director of Kent – Kent, Surrey and Sussex Community Rehabilitation Company
Increase the proportion of offenders in suitable accommodation at termination	60%	31 March 2016	Director of Kent – Kent, Surrey and Sussex Community Rehabilitation Company
By use of 'Triage' system, reduction in 1st time entrants into the Youth Justice system (NI111).	5% (< 275 young people)	31 March 2016	Team Manager (YOT)
Percentage of re-offending by use of those who have accessed the 'Triage' system.	< 20%	31 March 2016	Team Manager (YOT)
Reduce the number of looked After Children (LAC) within the Criminal Justice System (this fits in with a new SE wide protocol to reduce LAC, which Medway has signed up to and YOT is leading on).	Reduce the number of LAC by 10% against 2013/14 out-turn.	31 March 2016	Team Manager (YOT)
Percentage of YOT Cohort that re-offend within 6 months of completing their intervention.	< 50%[AU2]	31 March 2016	Team Manager (YOT)

Priority 4 – Tackle Domestic Abuse

Indicator	Targets	Due Date	Responsible
Number of high risk clients referred for Independent Domestic Violence Advisor (IDVA) support DA06	340	31 March 2016	Domestic Abuse Co-ordinator
Percentage of clients where risk is reduced as a result of IDVA intervention DA07	74% Coordinated Action Against Domestic Abuse (CAADA) benchmark	31 March 2016	Domestic Abuse Co-ordinator
Reduce the repeat victimisation rate for those identified at higher risk of harm, making victims and their families safer	Below 28% CAADA benchmark	31 March 2016	Domestic Abuse Co-ordinator
Number of referrals to Medway Specialist Domestic Violence Court (SDVC) IDVA, where victim has been supported to attend at first or second hearing	150 (Target figure from Kent Domestic Abuse Consortium - KDAC)	31 March 2016	Domestic Abuse Co-ordinator
Percentage of non-Police Multi Agency Risk Assessment Conference (MARAC) referrals	30%	31 March 2016	Domestic Abuse Co-ordinator
Deliver a domestic abuse awareness training to multi agency practitioners	100 practitioners	31 March 2016	Domestic Abuse Co-ordinator

Priority 5 – Reduce the Number of People Seriously Injured in Road Traffic Collisions

Indicator	Targets	Due date	Responsible
To reduce the number of killed and seriously injured casualties to 48 by 2020 (a 40% reduction based on the baseline average for the period 2005 to 2009).	A reduction of 5 casualties a year	31 March 2015	Road Safety Manager
To reduce the number of slightly injured casualties to 569 by 2020 (a 20% reduction based on the baseline average for the period 2005 to 2009).	A reduction of 21 casualties a year	31 March 2016	Road Safety Manager
Deliver 'Licence to Kill?' to pupils in Medway attending Academies, Sixth forms and Colleges.	80% of year 12 to students	31 March 2016	Principal Road Safety Officer / Partnership Manager, KFRS
Multi-agency motor bikes/bicycle campaign to raise awareness to drivers. March - May	1 campaign delivered	31 March 2016	Principal Road Safety Officer
Operation Enact targeting nuisance vehicles/motor bikes	10 per year	31 March 2016	Kent Police – CSP Sergeant
Working with Public Health to promote alcohol awareness sessions	Two programmes delivered	31 March 2016	Principal Road Safety Officer / Senior Public Health Manager
Working collectively with partners and agencies to address irresponsible driving at key hotspot areas within Medway to reduce KSI's.	Discussions with partners early 2015 to agree hotspot areas.	31 March 2016	Partnership Manager, KFRS
Working collectively with partners and agencies to address reckless driving at key hotspot areas within Medway to reduce KSI's. KFRS Will support Kent Police and Medway Council as requested. Consider use of Predpol as a platform.	A quarterly discussion	31 March 2016	Partnership Manager, KFRS

Diversity Impact Assessment: Screening Form

Directorate RCC	Name of Function or Policy or Major Service Change Medway's Community Safety Plan 2013-2016	
Officer responsible for assessment <i>Neil Howlett</i>	Date of assessment <i>15/12/2014</i>	New or existing? <i>Existing</i>
Defining what is being assessed		
1. Briefly describe the purpose and objectives	<p><i>This DIA is an update of the one submitted for the Community Safety Plan 2013-2016.</i></p> <p><i>Government legislation has provided the context for the establishment and evolution of Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs), set up as statutory bodies under the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, which placed a statutory duty on the Police and Councils to jointly tackle community safety issues in their area, by working closely with other statutory agencies, known as 'responsible authorities'.</i></p> <p><i>The CSP plan aims to reduce crime and disorder in Medway by working in partnership with key agencies in Medway to achieve the identified priorities, and specifically to support diverse groups that are affected by crime and disorder. The CSP's identified priorities for 2013-2016 are:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• Tackle drug and alcohol abuse.</i> <i>• Tackle Anti Social Behaviour and envirocrime.</i> <i>• Reduce re-offending.</i> <i>• Tackle domestic abuse.</i> <i>• Reduce the Number of People Killed or Seriously Injured in Road Traffic Collisions.</i> <p><i>The plan and identified priorities are there to achieve a positive rather than negative impact. All minority groups will continue to be protected by this plan. All groups will benefit – individual action plans underpin each of these priorities with an overarching aim of protecting all sections of our community. The priorities are aimed at protecting the groups this DIA identifies.</i></p> <p><i>The responsible authorities for Medway CSP, from April 2013, are currently Medway Council, Kent Police, Medway Clinical Commissioning Group, Ken, Surrey and Sussex Community Rehabilitation Company (KSS CSC - formerly Probation) and Kent Fire and Rescue Service. Each of these authorities has nominated senior persons to sit on the Strategic Executive Group of the CSP.</i></p> <p><i>From 2012 Police Authorities in England and Wales were replaced with directly elected Police and Crime Commissioners (PCC). PCCs are responsible for the appointment of Chief Constables, holding them to account for the running of the force, setting out a Police and Crime Plan based on local priorities, setting the local precept and force budget and making grants to external organisations.</i></p> <p><i>The elected PCC for Kent and Medway, Ann Barnes, will remain in office for a period of four years, until May 2016, with a Policing and Crime Plan to cover this period. As such Medway's Community Safety Plan has been developed to be coterminous with this period of tenure.</i></p> <p><i>The CSP has an annual duty to prepare a strategic assessment of crime and disorder in the proceeding year and to consider whether the plan needs to be reviewed.</i></p>	
2. Who is intended to benefit, and in what way?	<i>All residents, visitors and businesses of Medway through focused initiatives.</i>	
3. What outcomes are wanted?	<i>Medway is a safe, clean place to live, work, visit and socialise.</i>	

<p>4. What factors/forces could contribute/detract from the outcomes?</p>	<p>Contribute</p> <p><i>Good partnership working</i></p> <p><i>Good communication with residents</i></p>	<p>Detract</p> <p><i>Large geographic area</i></p> <p><i>Historically high level of crime (Medway and Thanet are top 2 places in Kent)</i></p> <p><i>Changes to funding structures, and changes in funding with the newly elected Police and Crime Commissioner.</i></p> <p><i>Changes to structure of partner organisations.</i></p>
<p>5. Who are the main stakeholders?</p>	<p><i>All residents, visitors and businesses of Medway. Kent Police in Medway, Kent Fire and Rescue, NHS Medway, KSS CSC, the voluntary sector, the Home Office, and all parts of Medway Council.</i></p>	
<p>6. Who implements this and who is responsible?</p>	<p><i>The Strategic Executive Group of the CSP is ultimately responsible. Specific thematic groups based on the five priorities report to this group. This Plan is delivered by a number of agencies and not just Medway Council.</i></p>	
<p>Assessing impact</p>		
<p>7. Are there concerns that there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>racial groups</i>?</p>	<p>NO</p>	
<p>What evidence exists for this?</p>	<p><i>The plan sets our approach to Community Safety in Medway. National Statistics indicate that amongst offenders, ethnic minority groups are disproportionately represented and therefore any strategy must ensure that it considers equality and diversity issues and ensure that there is no discrimination in the use of policing and local authority powers. Medway Council has implemented Diversity Impact Assessments across all its services, which should ensure that we do not have a differential impact based on an individual's race or ethnic origin.</i></p> <p><i>Each of the priorities within the Community Safety Plan will have underpinning action plans from a number of services to deliver that priority (all stakeholders listed in section 5 are expected to adhere to there own policies and procedures when issues affect racial groups – and all aim to support diverse groups of people).</i></p> <p><i>The purpose of the CSP plan is to pull together the stakeholders listed in section 5, with the aim of addressing the issues highlighted in a strategic assessment as priorities for Medway.</i></p> <p><i>Each of the priorities aims to take positive steps to reduce the risk of victimisation to those who live, work or are visiting Medway (through the positive actions in the plan). These actions ensure that there is no differential impact.</i></p> <p><i>The CSP is also engaged with, and supports the Medway Independent Advisory Group in partnership with Kent Police.</i></p>	
<p>8. Are there concerns that there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>disability</i>?</p>	<p>NO</p>	
<p>What evidence exists for this?</p>	<p><i>The plan sets our approach to Community Safety in Medway. It sets out priorities for reducing crime and anti-social behaviour. Evidence demonstrates that people with disabilities are disproportionately more likely to be victims of crime. This is considered in the development of the action plans, specifically around 'tackling ASB'.</i></p> <p><i>Each of the priorities within the Community Safety Plan will have underpinning action plans from a number of services to deliver that priority (all stakeholders listed in section 5 are expected to adhere to there own policies and procedures</i></p>	

	<p><i>when issues affect disabled people – and all aim to support diverse groups of people).</i></p> <p><i>The purpose of the CSP plan is to pull together the stakeholders listed in section 5, with the aim of addressing the issues highlighted in a strategic assessment as priorities for Medway.</i></p> <p><i>Each of the priorities aims to take positive steps to reduce the risk of victimisation to those who live, work or are visiting Medway (through the positive actions in the plan). These actions ensure that there is no differential impact.</i></p> <p><i>The CSP is also engaged with, and supports the Medway Independent Advisory Group in partnership with Kent Police.</i></p>	
<p>9. Are there concerns that there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to gender?</p>		
<p>What evidence exists for this?</p>	<p>NO</p>	<p><i>The plan sets our approach to Community Safety in Medway. It sets out priorities for reducing crime and anti-social behaviour. Evidence shows that young males between 16-24 years of age are disproportionately represented amongst offenders, and victims of crime. This group are also more likely to be victims of road traffic collisions. . The CSP has targeted a reduction in road traffic collisions a priority for 2013-2016.</i></p> <p><i>Research evidence demonstrates that women and girls are more likely to be the victims of domestic abuse than men, and the abuse that they suffer is likely to be more significant. The CSP has identified domestic abuse as one of the priority areas for 2013-2016.</i></p> <p><i>Each of the priorities within the Community Safety Plan will have underpinning action plans from a number of services to deliver that priority (all stakeholders listed in section 5 are expected to adhere to there own policies and procedures when issues of gender are affected – and all aim to support diverse groups of people).</i></p> <p><i>The purpose of the CSP plan is to pull together the stakeholders listed in section 5, with the aim of addressing the issues highlighted in a strategic assessment as priorities for Medway.</i></p> <p><i>Each of the priorities aims to take positive steps to reduce the risk of victimisation to those who live, work or are visiting Medway (through the positive actions in the plan). These actions ensure that there is no differential impact.</i></p>
<p>10. Are there concerns there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to sexual orientation?</p>		
<p>What evidence exists for this?</p>	<p>NO</p>	<p><i>The plan sets our approach to Community Safety in Medway. It sets out priorities for reducing crime and anti-social behaviour. Evidence shows that some people suffer disproportionate levels of crime due to their sexual orientation. The CSP is engaged with, and supports the Supporting LGBT young people group.</i></p> <p><i>Each of the priorities within the Community Safety Plan will have underpinning action plans from a number of services to deliver that priority (all stakeholders listed in section 5 are expected to adhere to there own policies and procedures when issues affect LGBT groups – and all aim to support diverse groups of people).</i></p> <p><i>The purpose of the CSP plan is to pull together the stakeholders listed in section 5, with the aim of addressing the issues highlighted in a strategic assessment as priorities for Medway.</i></p> <p><i>Each of the priorities aims to take positive steps to reduce the risk of victimisation to those who live, work or are visiting Medway (through the positive actions in the plan). These actions ensure that there is no differential impact.</i></p> <p><i>The CSP is also engaged with, and supports the Medway Independent Advisory</i></p>

	<i>Group in partnership with Kent Police.</i>	
11. Are there concerns there <u>could</u> be a have a differential impact due to religion or belief?		
	NO	
What evidence exists for this?	<p><i>The plan sets our approach to Community Safety in Medway. It sets out priorities for reducing crime and anti-social behaviour. There is no evidence to suggest any differential impact.</i></p> <p><i>Each of the priorities within the Community Safety Plan will have underpinning action plans from a number of services to deliver that priority (all stakeholders listed in section 5 are expected to adhere to there own policies and procedures when issues affect religion or belief – and all aim to support diverse groups of people).</i></p> <p><i>The purpose of the CSP plan is to pull together the stakeholders listed in section 5, with the aim of addressing the issues highlighted in a strategic assessment as priorities for Medway.</i></p> <p><i>Each of the priorities aims to take positive steps to reduce the risk of victimisation to those who live, work or are visiting Medway (through the positive actions in the plan). These actions ensure that there is no differential impact.</i></p> <p><i>The CSP is also engaged with, and supports the Medway Independent Advisory Group in partnership with Kent Police.</i></p>	
12. Are there concerns there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to people's age?		
	NO	
What evidence exists for this?	<p><i>The plan sets our approach to Community Safety in Medway. It sets out priorities for reducing crime and anti-social behaviour. It is recognised that there maybe more of an impact on young people aged 14-25 as they are more likely to be involved in the Criminal Justice system. Those aged over 65 are generally more fearful of teenagers hanging around, however the strategic assessment has highlighted that a priority area is dealing with anti-social behaviour, often this is associated with young people and affects older people. This will be considered in the development of any action plans. Those under the age of 21 are often identified as being involved in anti-social behaviour and binge drinking, therefore resources are often directed to challenge this behaviour. Checks and measures are to be put in place to ensure that any activities are balanced to provide positive support as well as enforcement.</i></p> <p><i>Each of the priorities within the Community Safety Plan will have underpinning action plans from a number of services to deliver that priority (all stakeholders listed in section 5 are expected to adhere to there own policies and procedures when issues affect different age groups differently – and all aim to support diverse groups of people).</i></p> <p><i>The purpose of the CSP plan is to pull together the stakeholders listed in section 5, with the aim of addressing the issues highlighted in a strategic assessment as priorities for Medway.</i></p> <p><i>Each of the priorities aims to take positive steps to reduce the risk of victimisation to those who live, work or are visiting Medway (through the positive actions in the plan). These actions ensure that there is no differential impact.</i></p>	
13. Are there concerns that there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to being trans-gendered or transsexual?		
	NO	
What evidence exists for this?	<p><i>The plan sets our approach to Community Safety in Medway. It sets out priorities for reducing crime and anti-social behaviour. It should be noted that the impact on the transgender community is a difficult area as there is little reporting/recording. Kent Police aim to record, investigate all homophobic and</i></p>	

	<p><i>transphobic incidents. Evidence has shown that lots of homophobic or transphobic incidents are not reported. Even if they are, the person reporting them may not say that it is a homophobic or transphobic incident because they do not want the police to know that they are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender.</i></p> <p><i>Each of the priorities within the Community Safety Plan will have underpinning action plans from a number of services to deliver that priority (all stakeholders listed in section 5 are expected to adhere to their own policies and procedures when issues affect transgender or transsexual people – and all aim to support diverse groups of people).</i></p> <p><i>The purpose of the CSP plan is to pull together the stakeholders listed in section 5, with the aim of addressing the issues highlighted in a strategic assessment as priorities for Medway.</i></p> <p><i>Each of the priorities aim to take positive steps to reduce the risk of victimisation to those who live, work or are visiting Medway (through the positive actions in the plan). These actions ensure that there is no differential impact.</i></p> <p><i>The CSP is also engaged with, and supports the Medway Independent Advisory Group in partnership with Kent Police.</i></p>	
<p>14. Are there any <i>other</i> groups that would find it difficult to access/make use of the function (e.g. young parents, commuters, people with caring responsibilities or dependants, young carers, or people living in rural areas)?</p>	<p>NO</p>	
<p>What evidence exists for this?</p>	<p><i>The plan sets our approach to Community Safety in Medway. It sets out priorities for reducing crime and anti-social behaviour.</i></p> <p><i>Each of the priorities within the Community Safety Plan will have underpinning action plans from a number of services to deliver that priority (all stakeholders listed in section 5 are expected to adhere to their own policies and procedures when issues affect people with protected characteristics – and all aim to support diverse groups of people).</i></p> <p><i>The purpose of the CSP plan is to pull together the stakeholders listed in section 5, with the aim of addressing the issues highlighted in a strategic assessment as priorities for Medway.</i></p> <p><i>Each of the priorities aims to take positive steps to reduce the risk of victimisation to those who live, work or are visiting Medway (through the positive actions in the plan). These actions ensure that there is no differential impact.</i></p>	
<p>15. Are there concerns there <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to <i>multiple discriminations</i> (e.g. disability <u>and</u> age)?</p>	<p>NO</p>	
<p>What evidence exists for this?</p>	<p><i>The plan sets our approach to Community Safety in Medway. It sets out priorities for reducing crime and anti-social behaviour.</i></p> <p><i>Each of the priorities within the Community Safety Plan will have underpinning action plans from a number of services to deliver that priority (all stakeholders listed in section 5 are expected to adhere to their own policies and procedures when issues affect people with protected characteristics – and all aim to support diverse groups of people).</i></p> <p><i>The purpose of the CSP plan is to pull together the stakeholders listed in section</i></p>	

	<p>5, with the aim of addressing the issues highlighted in a strategic assessment as priorities for Medway.</p> <p>Each of the priorities aims to take positive steps to reduce the risk of victimisation to those who live, work or are visiting Medway (through the positive actions in the plan). These actions ensure that there is no differential impact.</p>
--	---

Conclusions and recommendation

16. Could the differential impacts identified in questions 7-15 amount to there being the potential for adverse impact?		<i>This plan is based upon positive actions and interventions, and is designed to be supportive and inclusive of all diverse groups mentioned, and is targeted on ensuring that all minority groups are not discriminated against. For example, Kent Police continue to monitor Hate Crimes through the Community Liaison Officers within the Community Safety Unit. Weekly tension monitoring forms are submitted by front line Police and Council Officers; Kent Police and Medway Council support the LGBT Forum held at Medway Council, also the Independent Advisory Group held by Kent Police. The focus of the plan is to address working with those groups that require more intervention and support, but this is to support the improvements in community safety for all residents – the ultimate aim of the plan. To do that some groups require more intervention or support than others.</i>
	NO	
17. Can the adverse impact be justified on the grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group? Or another reason?		See above.
	NO	

Recommendation to proceed to a full impact assessment?

NO	<i>This plan complies with the requirements of the legislation and there is evidence to show this is the case. Issues have been identified as part of the needs assessment process; these will be addressed in the resulting action plans and will be monitored by the CSP. The monitoring of statistics will be reported to the CSP at quarterly intervals to enable the reviewing of any diversity issues that may arise.</i>
NO, BUT ...	What is required to ensure this complies with the requirements of the legislation? (see DIA Guidance Notes)?
YES	Give details of key person responsible and target date for carrying out full impact assessment (see DIA Guidance Notes)

Action plan to make Minor modifications

Outcome	Actions (with date of completion)	Officer responsible
<i>Priority owners are aware of their responsibilities to</i>	<i>Ensure a focus on monitoring diversity issues in the setting up of any Action Plans.</i>	<i>Neil Howlett</i>

<i>consider diversity issues</i>		
<i>Deal with any diversity issues that arise effectively</i>	<i>Monitored on a quarterly basis by the Strategic Executive Group of the CSP.</i>	<i>Neil Howlett</i>
Planning ahead: Reminders for the next review		
Date of next review	<i>The Community Safety Plan will be formally reviewed during its next redrafting.</i>	
Areas to check at next review (e.g. new census information, new legislation due)		
Is there <i>another</i> group (e.g. new communities) that is relevant and ought to be considered next time?		
Signed (completing officer/service manager)	Date	
Signed (service manager/Assistant Director)	Date	