



**Richmond upon Thames Community Safety
Partnership Plan 2008-11**

(previously the Community Safety & Substance Misuse Strategy)

Update April 2009

Richmond upon Thames Community Safety Partnership Plan 2008-11

Contents

	Foreword
	Glossary
1.	Background 1.1 Statutory Requirements 1.2 Previous Strategies
2.	Strategic Assessment
3.	Consultation
4.	2008 – 2011 Strategy 4.1 Overall Objectives 4.2 Property Crime 4.3 Assaults 4.4 Anti-Social Behaviour 4.5 Drugs and Alcohol 4.6 Counter Terrorism
5.	Cross Cutting Themes 5.1 Joint Tasking 5.1.1. Data issues and sharing 5.1.2 Structures 5.2 Community Engagement 5.3 Communications 5.4 Commissioning Services 5.5 Support for Victims and Witnesses 5.6 Youth Crime 5.7 Offender Management 5.8 Extension of S17 responsibility
6.	CSP Structure
7.	Performance Management
APPENDIX 1	Strategic Assessment Summary
APPENDIX 2	Domestic Violence Strategy
APPENDIX 3	Anti Social Behaviour Strategy

APPENDIX 4	Summary of Recommendations from Task Group review of Alcohol issues.
APPENDIX 5	Alcohol Strategy
APPENDIX 6	Structure Chart
APPENDIX 7	Performance Management Framework –
APPENDIX 8	Equalities Impact Needs Assessment (EINA)
APPENDIX 9	Youth Offending Team Plan
APPENDIX 10	Summary of Targets

Notes on the 2009 Update

While this is a Plan for three years that the Community Safety Partnership adopted in April 2008 we have to update the Plan each year. The additions and changes are shown in boxes like this.

The Appendices have all been refreshed and relate to the updated plan. The original Appendices will be available on the Community Safety Partnership web pages.

It is important to remember that this is a three year plan and considerable activity in year one (2008/09) was preparatory for work to take place in years 2 and 3.

Foreword
March 2008

Richmond borough residents, or people who work or visit here, have the lowest risks of being victims of crime for any London borough.

Recorded crime has fallen over the last year, with 1335 fewer crimes in 2007/8 compared to 2006/7.

The main Government set indicator of reducing a basket of 10 serious crimes by more than 17.5% from the 2003/4 level has been achieved

This has been achieved by developing closer working relationships between the Police, the Council and other organisations (both voluntary and statutory), together with the roll out of Safer Neighbourhood Teams (SNT) in every ward, Safer Transport Teams (STT) dealing with trains and buses and Richmond Park SNTs.

In 2003/4 the biggest priority for our communities was anti-social behaviour and graffiti. Concentrated partnership working has seen graffiti substantially reduced, with rapid action to remove new graffiti. The graffiti alongside our railway lines is more difficult to deal with because of the dangers posed when removing it but it is gradually being tackled. Controlled Drinking Zones and Dispersal Zones have been used to ensure that people visiting our town centres remain safe and are not disturbed by alcohol related anti-social behaviour.

However, new challenges have arisen: counter-terrorism has to be a priority for any London borough and with our iconic sites, including sites of national importance and one of the largest capacity stadia in Europe (82000 capacity), we are taking our responsibilities to reduce the risks seriously. Similarly, remaining London's safest borough will be difficult and challenging, and we need to ensure that our residents and visitors feel they are in the safest borough, which is not always the case. Yet at the same time they must play their part by taking sensible precautions – locking houses and cars and not leaving possessions on display. Reporting suspicious behaviour and speaking with your SNT officers concerning crime prevention advice are key to this.

This Community Safety Partnership Plan is the 4th three year plan developed by the Partnership. It consolidates much of the work that has been developed and aims to make substantial progress in some of the more complex and difficult issues – such as alcohol related harms; reducing domestic violence; ensuring staff from several organisations work together at ground level as well as ensuring that inequalities in our five areas of relative deprivation are reduced.

All the partner organisations are committed to delivering the work set out in this Plan and its associated work plans.

The recession and community safety.

Along with the other partnerships that sit under Richmond upon Thames Local Strategic Partnership, the Community Safety Partnership is monitoring and responding to the impact of the recession on crime and community safety.

This recession is affecting different demographic groups to those affected by the last big recession in the 1980s, so direct comparisons are not particularly relevant.

There is a perception that the recession will lead to more acquisitive crime – although it should be stressed that most unemployed people do not commit crime. The members of the Community Safety Partnership are monitoring crime trends closely and will refocus Operation Lockout if intelligence shows new trends.

The work on managing offenders has already identified the need to improve education, training and employment for ex-offenders – this is one area that will be more difficult in a recession.

There are concerns that the recession will lead to increased alcohol abuse and domestic abuse.

With regard to alcohol abuse there is evidence that the night time economy is already contracting, so any alcohol abuse may be taking place in private or the public consumption of alcohol purchased in off licences. The Alcohol Strategy includes work to address both issues.

The Domestic Abuse Forum are monitoring levels of domestic abuse and will take necessary steps to address their work programme and services provided.

There are also mixed thoughts as to how the recession will affect drugs markets. The Community Safety Partnership is working with other Community Safety Partnerships across London to identify any emerging trends and services will be amended accordingly.

Glossary

While every attempt has been made to make this document accessible and to remove jargon, unfortunately community safety is not immune to technical terms, abbreviations, structures etc. The list below may be of assistance when faced with terms that are unfamiliar. If you are reading this on line the hyperlinks will also take you to sites that provide further explanation.

2009 Update

We have received mixed feedback about having the Glossary at the start of the document. Some people would rather have it at the end so they can refer to it if they find a term they do not know; others have appreciated being able to gain some knowledge about terms before they start reading the document. Further feedback, particularly about phrases or abbreviations that are not included but would be welcome, will be appreciated.

http://www.crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/learningzone/lz_glossary/contents.htm

Abbreviation	Full	Definition and link for further details
ABC	Acceptable Behaviour Contract	A voluntary agreement with a perpetrator of anti-social behaviour which sets out the level of behaviour expected of them. Any breach of this agreement can lead to the partnership seeking an Anti-Social Behaviour Order. (ASBO)
ANPR	Automatic Number Plate Recognition	Technology that recognises licence plates of vehicles. It works by processing images of vehicle number plates captured by video cameras and checking them against a database of vehicle numbers checking whether the vehicle is listed as stolen, uninsured etc
ASBO	Anti-Social Behaviour Order	An order by a magistrate which prohibits the defendant from doing anything described in the order. Set up in the Crime and Disorder Act 1998
ASB Panel	Anti-Social Behaviour Panel	The local panel consisting of officers from a range of agencies that meets to discuss individual cases of anti-social behaviour and decides whether to impose sanctions (ABCs or ASBOs). The Panel also reviews progress with a view to prosecuting where applicable.
BCU	Basic Command Unit	These broadly equate to former police divisions or districts. There are currently 280 BCUs (2003) in England and Wales and recorded crime figures for six key offences at BCU level are published on the Home Office website, "Crime in England & Wales":
CDRP	Crime and	Set up through the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 ,

	Disorder Reduction Partnership	CDRPs must audit crime and disorder annually in their areas and set up a strategy to reduce it every three years.
CJS	Criminal Justice System	The Criminal Justice System in England and Wales is made up of a number of separate agencies and departments which are responsible for various aspects of the work of maintaining law and order and the administration of justice.
DAT	Drug Action Team	A group of high level officers who work to ensure that the targets in the National Drug Strategy are delivered locally. Home Office Tackling Drugs Changing Lives Drug Action Teams
DIP	Drug Intervention Programme	The programme that works to encourage drug using offenders into treatment. In high crime areas offenders are drug tested on arrest; required to undertake an assessment and enter drug treatment. In lower crime boroughs (such as Richmond) the engagement has to be on a voluntary basis. http://drugs.homeoffice.gov.uk/drug-interventions-programme/
EINA	Equalities Impact Needs Assessment	An evaluation of how the work of an organisation impacts on various diversity groups. The report should also include details of how any disproportionate impacts are to be addressed.
MAPPA	Multi Agency Public Protection Arrangements	A process by which high risk offenders are managed in the community by organisations working together. This is essentially a 'case conference' approach to ensure information is shared between organisations and plans are in place to manage the risk. http://noms.justice.gov.uk/protecting-the-public/Supervision/mappa/
MARAC	Multi Agency Risk Assessment Conference	A process to protect victims (currently only of domestic abuse) which uses a case conference approach to ensure organisations are sharing information and putting in place arrangements to support the victim and increase the chances of a successful prosecution. http://www.caada.org.uk/documents/MARAC_FAQs.pdf
PPO	Prolific and	This process uses a case conference approach to

	other Priority Offenders	share information on the most prolific offenders living on the borough, offers support to the offenders if they wish to become rehabilitated but also shares information on those who are still offending to ensure they are brought speedily to justice with a fast track (premium) service. http://www.crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/ppomini/site01.htm
YJB	Youth Justice Board	The national body that sets standards for, and monitors performance of, YOTs. http://www.yjb.gov.uk/
YOT	Youth Offending Team	The local team, made up of professionals from a range of organisations, who work to prevent offending by young people. Youth offending - London Borough of Richmond upon Thames

1. Background

1.1 Statutory requirements

The 1998 Crime and Disorder Act required the police and local authorities to work together and with others to reduce crime and disorder in their areas. These partnerships were called Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRPs). It has become common for CDRPs to merge with Drug Action Teams (DATs), which have been set up under the National Drugs Strategy to reduce the harm caused by illegal drugs. Where this merger has happened the resulting partnerships are commonly called Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs). Richmond upon Thames has a Community Safety Partnership.

CSPs/CDRPs were required by the 1998 Crime and Disorder Act to produce a three yearly strategy based on a three yearly Crime and Disorder Audit and public consultation.

Section 17 of the 1998 Act also required local authorities to do all they reasonably could to reduce crime and disorder in their area.

Various statutory instruments have amended the list of organisations responsible for the development, delivery and monitoring of the list of organisations required to work with the CSP and the list that have to be invited to co-operate.

A review of the 1998 Crime and Disorder Act has resulted in legislation that amends the process for developing the strategy. The 2008-11 Community Safety Strategy is the first to be developed under this new system. Instead of a three year Audit the Community Safety Partnership has been required to produce an annual Strategic Assessment which will be used to determine the priorities for the Community Safety Strategy.

Guidance on implementing the changes has been produced by the Home Office. This sets out a range of indicators of successful partnerships (Hallmarks) and provides examples of good practice from around the country. It highlights areas for development within partnerships that need to be considered in developing the next Community Safety Strategy.

The amendments also clarify the link between the Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) and the CSP. The CSP objectives now have to reflect those of the LSP set out in the Community Plan.

Specific areas for improvement will be highlighted as objectives in the Local Area Agreement, which is agreed by the LSP and Government Office for London and will form the basis of the spending plan of the LSP using Area Based Grant from Government. The Area Based Grant is made up of several funding streams which used to be ring fenced. Local areas have therefore now been given flexibility over how these funds are used.

A set of 198 National Indicators have been established by the Government to measure performance across a range of issues. The Police will also be measured by a suite of indicators, some of which are from the National Indicator set (result based) and some which relate to how the police conduct their business.

This Plan sets out the top level targets and actions. These will be supported by action plans from task groups and other partnership structures that will be regularly updated. For this reason the Plan is designed to be an electronic document that can be easily kept up to date available on the internet.

1.2 Previous strategies/plans

At the time of writing this Plan results for 2007/08 were not available. Early indications are that the Community Safety Partnership will have achieved the British Crime Survey Comparator crime target set nationally. Local targets set as proxy indicators have had a more varied success rate.

As this Plan is the 4th since 1998 many of the actions relate to consolidating the successful initiatives of the first three Plans.

2009 Update:

The 2007/08 British Crime Survey Comparator target was achieved. The local targets were not achieved, partly due to changes in counting rules which made it difficult to measure the targets.

2. Strategic Assessment

The first Strategic Assessment for Richmond upon Thames was drawn up in November 2007. It was based on performance from previous years and performance in 2006/7 to the end of June 2007. This document will be continually updated and the three year Community Safety Strategy will be refreshed annually based on the findings of the Strategic Assessment.

The Strategic Assessment is a detailed set of documents including mapped data to show hotspots; victim and offender profiles; and other key factors for a range of crimes and anti-social behaviour. The key findings from each section have been made public. The full document will be used by working groups who will be tasked to tackle specific issues.

The public document is available on the Community Safety Partnership web pages and is attached to this document as [Appendix 1](#).

The [Strategic Assessment](#) identified the following priorities

- [Property Crime](#) (burglary, robbery, motor vehicle crime etc).
- [Assaults](#) (including Domestic Violence and Hate Crime violence)
- [Anti- Social Behaviour](#)

- [Drugs and Alcohol](#)
- [Counter Terrorism](#)

The [Strategic Assessment](#) also identified the following themes that cut across the above priorities.

- [Joint Tasking](#) (ensuring that staff from several organisations work to the same objectives);
- [Community Engagement](#)* (ensuring that statutory organisations work with the community);
- [Communications](#) *
- [Commissioning services](#) (ensuring we have the right services in place, providing value for money).
- Support for Victims and Witnesses*
- Youth Crime
- Offender Management* (bringing offenders to justice; community punishments and resettlement).
- Mainstreaming crime prevention into all partners' core business.

* These have a direct impact on fear of crime and public confidence.

2009 Update:

The Strategic Assessment was re-run in November 2008. The findings were that using the model for identifying priorities, the following should be priorities:

- Violent Crime,
- Motor Vehicle Crime,
- Residential Burglary,
- Alcohol,
- Drugs
- Terrorism.

The Strategic Assessment was discussed at a Stakeholder Group event in November 2008. Stakeholders were concerned that the Strategic Assessment had not prioritised anti-social behaviour which has an impact on fear of crime and confidence.

As motor vehicle crime and residential burglary are dealt with in the Community Safety Partnership as 'acquisitive crime', this plan update suggests that the originally identified priorities would be retained, with the emphasis on the crimes that make up Property Crime being kept under review according to the types of crime being committed at any one time.

3. Consultation

The Strategic Assessment contained summaries of consultation undertaken by the CSP and the Safer Neighbourhood Teams over the last year.

A stakeholders' event was held in November 2007 to consult on the findings of the Strategic Assessment and the proposed priorities.

In addition, the Strategic Assessment summary has been made available on the Council's web site and circulated to all Police Liaison Group Chairs with a request that it be discussed at Police Liaison Group meetings.

The Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee has conducted a cross cutting review of alcohol related issues. This has included taking evidence on licensing and alcohol related violence and anti-social behaviour. As a result the Alcohol Strategy is being reviewed and an updated version will be presented to Cabinet on 8 June 2009.

A draft version of this strategy has been considered by the Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee; the Environment and Sustainability Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the Cabinet of the Council.

The draft strategy has also been available on the Community Safety web pages for comment by the public and stakeholders from partner organisation.

2009 Update:

Once again a Stakeholder event has formed the basis of consultation on the updates for the Plan. A report summarising the feedback from that event is available on the Community Safety Partnership web pages.

The Strategic Assessment takes account of consultation undertaken by the Police Liaison Groups and Safer Neighbourhood Team priorities.

The draft updated Plan has been circulated to a range of organisations and posted on the Council's web site. A report summarising comments received and action taken as a result will be sent to those who commented and posted on the Council's web site.

While the Place Survey is being used to provide a measurement for one of the Plan's targets, the results will also be used to provide information to working groups. This will be particularly relevant where additional Place Survey work has been undertaken in the five areas of relative disadvantage. The findings of the Place Survey broken down by various demographic factors will also provide information for working groups (particularly the group reviewing how anti-social behaviour is dealt with and perceived in Richmond upon Thames).

Note, the Place Survey is carried out in every borough in the country this year.

4. 2008-11 Strategy

4.1 Overall objectives

The Community Plan sets out the following vision with regards to community safety:

“Our vision is to ensure that everyone here can continue to work, live and enjoy their leisure in the safest borough in London. It is particularly important for us that **all** communities including those in our five priority areas enjoy the benefits of living in a strong, cohesive community with reduced fear of crime and anti-social behaviour.”¹

Our objective is to be London’s safest borough and for people to feel they live in the safest borough.

This will be measured by statistics produced monthly from the Home Office on the iQuanta system showing Total Notifiable Offences per 1000 population for each London Borough.

To measure people’s fear of crime and confidence in the partnership we will use the following indicator:

National Indicator 21 The percentage of people having confidence that the council and police are dealing with their concerns about crime and anti-social behaviour.

We will aim to be the best borough in London for this indicator.

2009 Update:

The borough has consistently had the lowest total notifiable offences per 1000 head of population as measured by iQuanta. Richmond upon Thames has also been consistently the safest borough with regards to violent crime.

The Place Survey will measure residents’ confidence (National Indicator 21) – the results are anticipated in February 2009. Additional surveys have taken place in the five areas of relative deprivation.

During the consultation on the draft of this updated plan it was brought to our attention that the role of Neighbourhood Watch could contribute to improving confidence. As a result the Communications Plan will include specific actions to improve our communications with this important network.

4.2 Property Crime

Successes:

- The lowest level of domestic burglary in more than 4 years.
- A steep reduction in personal robbery – becoming the safest London borough for this crime type.

Gaps/Areas for development/challenges:

¹ Driving Forward our Vision for our Borough Together, The Richmond upon Thames Community Plan 2007-2017

- Maintaining effort (in the past initiatives have ended and the crime types have risen slowly).
- Over 40% of domestic burglaries are preventable if residents use security measures.
- Cross border issues – approx 60% of offenders committing property crimes on this borough live in other boroughs;
- Reducing fear of crime and improving confidence that crime has fallen.
- Bringing offenders to justice.
- Motor vehicle crime

Target: To reduce serious acquisitive crime by 2.9%; with the burglary element of this group of crimes being less than 1000 during the year.

Please note that the Metropolitan Police set targets annually both as an organisation and for each borough. It is sensible that the Community Safety Partnership adopt those targets each year, rather than setting separate targets that may be different.

This will be delivered by :

- Continual development of Operation Lockout providing both physical crime prevention solutions and advice/publicity
- Development of Safer Transport initiatives
- Joint tasking and working.

2009 Update

Acquisitive crime has fallen further. In spite of our best endeavours the targets for the Community Safety Partnership and police were different due to late changes to police targets. We will continue to try and find a way to ensure that we have only one set of targets and therefore give consistent messages about progress.

4.3 Assaults

Successes:

- Richmond has the lowest levels of violent crime across London.

Gaps/Areas for development/challenges:

- Maintaining that position.
- Low levels of reported Domestic Violence suggesting a serious underreporting issue.
- Under reporting of Hate Crime.
- Bringing offenders to justice.
- Reducing the fear of crime and confidence that violent crime levels are comparatively low.

Please note that the Metropolitan Police set targets annually both as an organisation and for each borough. It is sensible that the Community Safety Partnership adopt those targets each year, rather than setting separate targets that may be different.

Target:

To reduce assaults with injury by 1% during 2008/9.

To reduce knife crime by 5.2%

To reduce serious youth violence by 5%

These will be delivered by:

- Delivering the annual Domestic Abuse Forum Action Plan ([Appendix 2](#))
- Safe Streets Co-ordinating Group identifying and tackling hot spots related to the Night Time Economy

2009 Update:

The Safe Streets Co-ordinating Group has changed its emphasis from a regular joint tasking group to a group that concentrates on co-ordinating the work of several organisations during Green Safe and Clean Weeks as well as special events such as Halloween and Fireworks nights. The group does look at night time economy issues as part of its Green Safe and Clean Week planning for the relevant wards.

The Community Safety Partnership will work with the town centre SNTs to look at options for dealing with night time economy hot spots.

- Recruiting a Hate Crime Co-ordinator to ensure that work to identify and support victims of Hate Crime is consistent and well publicised.
- Work under the Alcohol Strategy to reduce Night Time Economy related violence issues such as transport problems; producing a more mixed night time environment etc. – see alcohol strategy
- Working to develop further the LGBT Forum with this group becoming an independent organisation.
- Reviewing and revising as necessary hate crime reporting systems.

2009 Update:

A Hate Crime Co-ordinator is in place and a Hate Crime Forum will be in place by early in 2009/10. The LGBT Forum adopted a constitution to become an independent organisation in 2008 and will achieve charitable status in 2009.

4.4 Anti-Social Behaviour

Successes:

- Anti Graffiti Alliance – leading to reduction in criminal damage and graffiti in particular (which was the number one public concern in the current strategy).
- Targeted use of ASBOs and ABCs.
- Dispersal Zones
- Controlled Drinking Zones

Gaps/Areas for development/challenges:

- The lack of clear reporting mechanisms;
- Insufficient levels of support and feedback to victims
- Hot spots of continual anti-social behaviour (or perceived anti-social behaviour leading to fear of crime).

2009 Update:

A new Community Safety Manager was appointed in November 2008. She will be leading a review of anti-social behaviour during 2009 which will address these issues and those set out below.

Over the next three years we will address these by:

- Introducing and publicising clear reporting mechanisms for anti-social behaviour;
- Training for staff from a range of agencies in how this borough deals with anti-social behaviour; (resourced from Community Safety Partnership team).
- Development of a process for supporting and informing victims of progress;
- Further development of Safe Streets to identify and tackle hot spots of actual or perceived anti-social behaviour.

4.5 Drugs & Alcohol

4.5.1 Drugs

The Community Safety Partnership will continue to deliver services to meet the requirements of the National Drugs Strategy

<http://drugs.homeoffice.gov.uk/drug-strategy/overview/>

Local services are delivered in line with the requirements of funders and a local Needs Analysis.

Successes:

- Establishing a drop in, open access service.
- Bringing a number of professionals employed by different organisations into teams working towards a common goal.
- Getting a high proportion of our problematic drug users into treatment and keeping them in treatment for at least 12 weeks.

Gaps/Areas for development/challenges:

- The Health Care Commission identified some weaknesses in our services to reduce the harm suffered by drug users.
- This borough is not able to test people arrested for drug related offences and insist they be assessed for drug treatment. Neighbouring boroughs have that facility. There is a strong professional feeling that this impacts on the attractiveness of this borough to offenders from other boroughs.
- There have been increases in the finds of powder cocaine and cannabis in this borough which indicate the main problem drugs are cocaine and cannabis.

Over the next three years we will address these by :

- continuing to lobby to be an intensive Drug Intervention Programme area in line with neighbouring boroughs; (this is also in line with the MPS Drugs Strategy).
- clarifying the commissioning arrangements whereby the PCT acts as the commissioning body for drugs and alcohol services on behalf of the Community Safety Partnership.
- Developing the Harm Reduction agenda tackling the high level of Hepatitis C infection and other Blood Borne Viruses among drug users and introducing a process to review Drug Related Deaths in line with good practice.
- Retendering services to ensure the rights services are in place providing value for money.
- Developing services for young people and their parents/carers in line with the outcomes set out in the Children and Young People's Plan.
- Ensuring local information highlights the risks of using cocaine and cannabis.

2009 Update:

Three services have been retendered and new providers are now in place.

Funding has been received from the Home Office for a major piece of work with young people to raise awareness of the effects of cocaine, both on health and wider community issues.

4.5.2 Alcohol

'Safe, Sensible, Social' the Government's update on the National Alcohol Strategy requires this round of Community Safety Plans to include a local Alcohol Strategy. As part of the consultation on this the local authority's Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee has been conducting a cross cutting review of alcohol issues. The Committee's main recommendations are listed in [Appendix 4](#):

Safe, Sensible Social can be found at:

http://www.dh.gov.uk/dr_consum_dh/idcplg?IdcService=GET_FILE&dID=116543&Rendition=Web

The Alcohol Strategy covers the following topics and the detailed document can be found in [Appendix 5](#). **Please note the updated strategy with action plan attached will be added to this document on the web when it has been formally endorsed by partners.**

Health

- Identifying hazardous and harmful drinkers and providing advice and brief interventions
- Providing effective treatment to harmful and dependent drinkers
- Increasing awareness of alcohol units and the sensible drinking message

- Collecting and sharing information about alcohol misuse
- Tackling the overlap of alcohol misuse with the misuse of drugs
- Reducing the impact of alcohol misuse in the workplace.
- Working with GPs to enhance their alcohol interventions.

Community Safety, crime and anti-social behaviour

- Tackling crime and anti-social behaviour linked to under age drinking
- Test purchases for under age sales
- Policing hotspots for under age drinking
- Raising awareness with parents about their responsibilities.
- Tackling environmental issues linked to alcohol use and the night time economy, such as noise and litter.
- Developing the Civic Watch model in line with their pilot project for obtaining a 'purple flag' for town centres.
- Researching the night time economy in the borough (Erskine Report carried out in 2005 and 2007) to discover how and why people come here, what ages they are and how they travel home. Research into the impact the over 21 rules have on the 18-21 group;
- Tackling Domestic Violence linked to the use of alcohol.
- Exploring efficient use of resources to provide alcohol arrest referral.

Children and Young People

- Agree a consistent approach to alcohol education in all schools through Health Schools particularly at transitional stages;
- Provide consistent messages to parents on discussing alcohol use with young people.
- Identifying children and young people at risk of harm from alcohol misuse and referring them to relevant bodies,;
- Providing support and treatment for young people with alcohol problems.
- Targeting parents whose drinking is causing risk to the wellbeing of children.
- Researching the needs of young people and providing alternative events to young people as part of the council's overall programme of positive activities.

2009 Update:

The Health and Wellbeing Partnership leads in the delivery of this work. "Choosing Health" funding has been used to train GPs in delivering brief interventions and to fund work with young people around alcohol.

Following the publication of the Alcohol Task Group's report to the Health, Housing & Social Care Overview & Scrutiny Committee, it was agreed that a joint Alcohol Strategy for the Council, Police and PCT would be developed. This will address the links between alcohol and anti-social behaviour, the impact of alcohol on the health of residents and the need to improve

education for young people, adults and licensees. A draft Strategy will be presented to the Health, Housing & Social Care Overview & Scrutiny Committee on 29 April, the Health & Well-Being Partnership on 5 May and to Cabinet on 8 June. Progress on the actions in the Strategy will be monitored by the Health and Wellbeing Partnership and the Community Safety Partnership.

4.6 Counter Terrorism

The borough contains both iconic sites and facilities that attract large crowds. The borough is also a key hub for transport links. All of these mean that the threat from terrorism has to be taken seriously. The Borough's Resilience Plan has been drawn up to deal with the immediate aftermath from a terrorist attack. Business Continuity is a key element of Counter-Terrorism Plans and the key statutory agencies all have Business Continuity Plans. The private sector are being encouraged and supported to develop their own Business Continuity Plans to ensure that life will return to normality as soon as possible after any disruption, whether caused by terrorism, natural or accidental incident.

Community tension monitoring has also been formalised recently and will continue to develop over the next three years. This will provide early warning both of events that could cause tension among several specific communities include BME, faith, travelling, LGBT communities and those connected with young people and gang activity. While some of these tensions have the potential to contribute to radicalisation of individuals all could adversely affect the cohesion of the borough's communities.

2009 Update:

The Council has held events for managers to train them in how to react in the event of a terrorist attack and held similar events for small businesses.

The Tension Monitoring model is established and working well.

At the Stakeholder event there was concern as to why Counter Terrorism remained a priority. Given that the current threat level remains 'severe', this means there is a high likelihood of future terrorist attacks and indicates a continuing high level of threat to the UK. An attack in Richmond upon Thames would be seen internationally as an attack in London. For this reason, Counter Terrorism continues to be a priority.

The Community Safety Partnership will be expected to put in place a plan to Prevent Violent Extremism (PVE)

This will be developed in 2009 and may require a small multi agency group to develop and deliver.

5. Cross cutting themes

The following elements of the strategy are those themes that cut across all the crime types and community safety issues detailed in section 4 above.

They have either been identified in the new partnership guidance as key elements of a successful partnership or have been identified locally.

5.1 Joint Tasking

Whereas much partnership working depends on finding shared agendas or priorities and negotiating long term strategies or projects to enable two or more partners to achieve those shared outcomes, joint tasking is aimed at developing a more responsive mechanism whereby staff are tasked to respond to situations that have been identified.

There are already some joint tasking mechanisms in place, most notably Safe Streets. Generally joint tasking depends on analysis of data to identify issues, hot spots, characteristics of problems etc. and then staff from more than one agency being 'tasked' to deal with it, based on a solution developed from the data using a structured problem solving process.

2009 Update:

As mentioned above the Safe Streets Group has changed its remit. Further work will be carried out in 2009 to develop ways in which information can be shared and staff jointly tasked.

Partnership organisations work together routinely in ways that could be described as 'joint tasking' (for example when planning and managing crowds during events at Twickenham Stadium and other public events). These will be mapped and opportunities identified to develop joint tasking in other situations.

5.1.1 Data issues and sharing

The Strategic Assessment identified problems with obtaining mappable data from partner organisations, in particular the local authority. Developments are in place to address this over 2008/9. A Statutory Instrument sets out the information that partner organisations are required to provide for the updating of the Strategic Assessment in the autumn of 2008.

During 2009/10 a major review will take place of the Information Sharing protocols.

5.1.2 Structures

The bulk of this strategy is delivered by small focussed groups made up of officers from a range of organisations and some community members. Their terms of reference will reflect the need for information sharing and joint tasking to be at the heart of their work.

5.2 Community Engagement

At present the Community Police Partnership (CPP) and its associated Police Liaison Groups (PLGs) is the main mechanism for engaging with communities. Most of the partnership member organisations have community engagement mechanisms and there are opportunities to use those for community safety related community engagement. There are also gaps in community engagement, recognised by the CPP, with regards to businesses, young people, people who visit and work in the borough etc.

The Community Safety Partnership has facilitated the development of a LGBT Forum which is planning to become a stand alone organisation, similar to the development of EMAG, to provide a liaison group for issues other than those relating to community safety.

EMAG, REP and DEAP are key partners and ensure that their constituent communities' views are fed into the planning processes. However, there are still gaps in direct engagement with hard to reach communities.

There are clearer expectations that the organisations listed in statutory instruments as being required to co-operate with the Community Safety Partnership and those the Community Safety Partnership is required to invite to co-operate should be involved. Most of those groups are connected to hard to reach groups and therefore have a clear community engagement remit.

An Equalities Impact Needs Assessment (EINA) has been carried out on the partnership and this Plan. This can be found at [Appendix 8](#). All task groups will identify how their work plans ([Appendix 7](#)) address the issues identified in the EINA and community engagement.

5.3 Communications

A range of communication methods have been used, from advertising in newspapers and via poster sites, scooter towed A boards and radio adverts to the use of seminar type events.

Research has demonstrated that people who are aware of what local authorities and police forces are doing to tackle crime and anti-social behaviour have more confidence in those agencies. It is therefore critical to achieving one objective that awareness of the activities of the partnership is increased.

Actions:

- Introduce the Community Communications Network of large screens providing up to date information from a range of partners.
- Develop a co-ordinated communications strategy, taking in the CCN (above); newsletters, web communication, press and media coverage. This strategy will also address community engagement to ensure that the voices of all communities in the borough have an opportunity to be heard.

2009 Update:

The first of these actions has been achieved. The second will be developed during 2009.

5.4 Commissioning Services

The Community Safety Partnership commissions drug services using the Pooled Treatment Budget and community safety projects and posts using Safer and Stronger Communities Funding which will become part of the Area Based Grant Local Area Agreement single pot.

5.5 Support for Victims and Witnesses

Improving the experience of victims and witnesses is a key component in improving confidence. Over the last three years the CSP has funded a support worker for vulnerable witnesses and a support worker to work alongside the police in the Community Safety Unit with domestic violence victims. A recent report into racially motivated crime has highlighted the need for more support to victims of hate crime.

2009 Update:

During 2008/09 a Hate Crime Co-ordinator has been appointed. By June 2009 a Forum will be established to ensure that all organisations are working in line with best practice to identify and support victims of Hate Crime.

During 2009 a review will take place of 'third party reporting' on the borough, which was recommended by the Macpherson Report into the death of Stephen Lawrence. The Hate Crime Forum will oversee changes to third party reporting in Richmond upon Thames which may include training for staff, additional publicity etc.

5.6 Youth Crime

The Youth Offending Team (YOT) is the partnership tasked with preventing offending by young people. It reports both the Community Safety Partnership and the Children and Young People's Strategic Partnership.

The work of the YOT breaks down into the following areas:

- Development of programmes to reduce the risk of prevent re-offending
- Targeted work with Young People
- Prevent and Deter
- Victims
- Reducing offending, preventative work

A detailed report from the YOT is attached at Appendix 10. The main points are summarised below:

Successes

- YOT currently performing at Level 5, (highest), in reducing re-offending, 100% of young offenders assessed for mental health
- YOT interventions include “binge drinking” workshops and targeted girls alcohol misuse group.
- 44 young people have been referred to the Prevent and Deter scheme in 2007-8 period to date. Of these only 20.45% have re-offended.
- 2006-7 enjoyed a very positive year in reducing the rate of First Time Entrants and exceeded the expected reduction set by the Youth Justice Board of a 5% reduction significantly.

Challenges/Issues

- Capacity issues prevent regular group work and partnership work from YOT being delivered in all secondary schools
- alcohol related violence in young women shown by disproportionate custody for females in the 2006-7 cohort.
- Secure remands will need to be reduced for male young people
- Funding for Prevent and Deter work has ceased and therefore capacity issues of the YOT to deliver such a concrete and intensive programme will be difficult.
- YOT have maintained their 100% satisfaction rating from victims.
- The YOT need to recruit a more diverse referral panel coordinator base so as to represent the population of young people the YOT service.

Successes in reducing the first time offending rate in 2006-7 mean that it will be more difficult to reduce the figure in 2007-8 as the numbers are now so low.

How the challenges will be met

- Recruitment of an education post has increased contact and support offered to all borough secondary schools.
- A targeted girls group is currently in development and is due to commence at end of February 2008.
- Additional training on Bail Support Packages and further substance misuse group work targeting males.
- Establishing a victim steering group to support t with adopting a more comprehensive restorative framework.
- Restorative conferencing will be offered within the Referral Order panel.

5.7 Offender Management

Bringing offenders to justice and the prevention of re-offending are key priorities in the recent Public Service Agreements. The Drug Intervention Programme (DIP) works with drug using offenders, while the Prolific and other Priority Offender panel (PPO) supervises those offenders who cause the most problems. There is currently a steering group co-ordinating and developing the links between these two mechanisms and the delivery of Drug Rehabilitation Requirements (DRRs).

In addition Multi Agency Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPA) deals with the most high risk offenders.

The Borough Criminal Justice Group has objectives and targets around bringing offenders to justice and witness care.

Changes to the current structure of task groups will see an Offender Management Group set up to take on the work of the existing DIP/PPO/DRR Group. Their workplan will include :

- Housing provision
- Development of PPOs
- Development of MAPPA
- Cross border offending – particularly PPOs.

2009 Update:

Over 2008 more information has been made available to us by the criminal justice system. This will be incorporated into future Strategic Assessments and will form the basis of the workplan of the Offender Management Group which will be attached to this Plan.

5.8 Extension of S17 responsibility

Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act required the local authority to do all it reasonably could to reduce crime in its area. This has been extended to include anti-social behaviour and drug misuse. The responsibility is also being extended to other partnership agencies.

The London Borough of Richmond has carried out an audit of each department's contribution to reducing crime. This will be revised in 2008/9.

Particular links will be drawn with the safeguarding of adults and children.

The Borough will also move towards taking part in Borough Beat, allowing staff to train and work as Special Police Officers during their working hours.

2009 Update

The first recruits for Borough Beat are undergoing basic training and if successful will join Safer Neighbourhood Teams during 2009/10.

A review of the activity of every Council department has taken place which demonstrates how tackling crime and improving community safety is now considered in every element of the Council's work. The range of work will be developed where opportunities are identified and the best practice of departments shared across the Council.

6 CSP Structure

The Partnership Guidance sets out the requirement for a Strategy Group to oversee the development and delivery of the Community Safety Strategy. The Partnership Guidance also highlights as good practice the use of 'champions' for different elements of the strategy to strengthen ownership of the strands. Other changes will be made to the task groups (as covered in paragraphs above). Terms of Reference for all elements of the Community Safety Partnership will be published on the web site.



CSP Structure

7 Performance Management

Each task group will draw up an action plan, stating clearly their objectives, key milestones to establish how they are progressing towards those objectives etc. These will be reviewed at least three times a year by the Strategy Group. In addition each theme will be the subject of a presentation to Strategy Group once a year, giving senior officers the chance to question those delivering this Plan. The Stakeholder Group will receive updates twice a year on progress at their Stakeholder Conferences.

2009 Update

We have been told during consultation that people reading this Plan would like to see a summary of the targets and commitments made in the plan. This is set out in Appendix

APPENDIX 1



Strategic Assessment 2007

The attached information summarises the analysis of information up to 30th June 2007 and the updated information to 30th June 2008.

There have been further reductions in crime since then.

The full range of information will be used by task groups to draw up action plans to tackle specific issues, situations etc.

Richmond upon Thames Community Safety Partnership
York House
Twickenham Road
Richmond
TW1 3AA

020 8891 7777

2009 Update includes 2008 Strategic Assessment

2008 Strategic Assessment summarises the analysis of information up to 30th June 2008

Executive Summary

The analytical process has highlighted the borough's priorities as alcohol and drugs. The next main priorities identified are assaults, residential burglary, personal robbery and anti-social behaviour.

Alcohol and drugs are the key drivers of crime and focusing on these areas will have an impact on many crime types. Alcohol is linked to assaults and criminal damage and this accounts for over a quarter of all total notifiable offences. Focusing on drugs will help reduce acquisitive crime which accounts for over half of all the boroughs total notifiable offences.

These two areas also cross cut many themes and strategies, such as the Every Child Matters Agenda, health issues and domestic violence. They are also key Government priorities.

Alcohol and drugs are also major concerns of the borough residents and focusing on these areas will help address the residents fear of crime issues and Government set fear of crime targets.

Assaults are a priority for the borough, due to the high volume, seriousness of some of the offences and the reduction targets set.

There is no co-ordinated work undertaken regularly by the CSP to look at assaults with the exception of assaults from Domestic Violence. Most assaults are as a result of the night time economy or Domestic Violence. Assaults also account for 12% of total notifiable offences, which will help the borough meet the target of becoming 'London's safest borough'.

Residential burglary continues to be a concern to Richmond borough. It is a high volume crime and is currently showing a slight increase. Therefore tackling burglary will have a significant impact upon becoming 'London's safest borough'. Residential burglary is also high on the list of public concern in terms of fear of crime, and is a serious acquisitive crime, which impacts greatly upon victims. It is also likely to remain as a key police priority.

Robbery continues to be a major concern to the borough of Richmond. Although offence levels are currently low for the Metropolitan Police they are however higher than the average for England and Wales. It is also a major crime committed by young people from this borough and has a high impact upon victims. It is likely to remain as a key police priority.

Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB) generates many police incident reports. More incidents are generated by the Local Authority however this data is insufficient to provide a fuller picture. ASB is also continually identified as the number one concern of borough residents. Tackling ASB will help address fear of crime and meet associated Government targets with regards to public confidence and reassurance.

Terrorism will still need to be a priority for the borough due to the seriousness of the threat and fear of crime it generates for London.

Alcohol- related offending – summary of key findings

- The British Crime Survey suggests that with the exception of 2003/04 the number of alcohol related violent offences has decreased every year since 1995. However the British Crime Survey shows that people are increasingly likely to think that alcohol-related disorder is a problem.
- The most popular concern of the boroughs residents was identified as 'people being drunk/rowdy in public places' in the Metropolitan Police, Public Attitude Survey 2006/07.
- The social and economic costs of alcohol-related assaults are estimated to have cost this borough £8.1 million in 2006/07.
- Almost one quarter of the public houses of the borough are located in South Richmond ward.
- Most alcohol related incidents and violence occur on Friday and Saturday nights in Richmond and Twickenham town centres.
- Just three 250m Cad Grid Squares account for 12% of rowdy inconsiderate behaviour in the borough, between September 2006 to June 2007.
- 83% of assaults between April to June 2007 were related to alcohol.
- Approximately three quarters of victims and suspects of alcohol- related violence were borough residents.
- Alcohol- related violence victims are mainly borough residents, aged between 26-35 and of white ethnic appearance and of either sex.
- Alcohol- related violence suspects are mainly borough residents, male, aged between 18-25 and of white ethnic appearance.
- There is a significant positive correlation between the location of licensed premises and the location of assaults in the borough.
- London Ambulance Service data for 2005/06 found most alcohol- related incidents occur in Richmond and Twickenham town centres.

Anti-social behaviour

- The 2006/07 Police Public Attitude Survey of borough residents found the top four problems identified were; people being drunk or rowdy in public places; teenagers hanging around on the streets; vandalism, graffiti and other deliberate damage to property or vehicles and rubbish or litter lying around.
- Richmond upon Thames has the lowest number of ASB incidents per 1,000 population across the Metropolitan Police Service.
- Richmond and Twickenham town centres have the greatest concentrations of ASB in the borough.
- Friday evening is the peak time for ASB incidents in the borough.
- Improving recording and collation of ASB data was a recommendation of the Crime Audit 2004, ASB scrutiny report 2006 and a target for the 2005 – 2008 Community Safety and Substance Misuse strategy. This has still not been done to a satisfactory level. It is now a requirement of the Crime and Disorder Regulations 2007 to submit ASB data on a quarterly basis with effect from July 2007. This needs to be a priority for the CSP.
- 953 graffiti service requests were recorded by the local authority from April – June 2007.
- 85 service requests were recorded by the local authority for fly-tipping from April – June 2007.
- 337 service requests were recorded by the local authority for noise from April – June 2007.
- Transport for London found the high risk areas for bus crime and disorder are Richmond and Twickenham town centres.
- 33 ASBOs and 58 ABCs have been issued up to the end of March 2008.

Assaults

- Assaults became an MPS priority 3 years ago when the British Crime Survey (BCS) reduction targets were introduced
- Assaults is made up of GBH, ABH and common assault
- The Public Attitude Survey for 2006/07 shows 14% of respondents to be either very worried or fairly worried about being physically attacked
- Assaults are classified as a volume crime and makes up 12% of the Total Notifiable Offences on the borough
- In 2004 the NCRS changed which affected the classification of crimes between common assault and ABH
- There has been a dramatic decrease in assaults over the last four financial years, however the short term trend is showing assaults as constant
- Assaults used to demonstrate a seasonal peak in the summer months, and then again at Christmas. Police and partnership operations over the past 3 years have countered this seasonal trend
- In order to maintain performance it is suggested that the summer and Christmas campaigns should continue
- Richmond is performing well below the CDRP average for both wounding and common assault.
- Iquanta predicts a continued decrease in wounding offences, and a continuation of the current level of common assault offences
- Safe, Sensible and Sociable Strategy is likely to impact on assaults
- 34% of assaults were flagged as domestic violence, 86% of these were related to alcohol
- 83% of all assaults were related to alcohol
- Offences peak between 1600 hrs and 0000hrs
- The peak days are Friday and Saturday
- The hotspots for the borough are the town centres of Richmond and Twickenham
- Town centre assaults tend to occur outside licensed venues and late night food outlets

Burglary (residential)

- Residential burglary continues to be an MPS priority
- Current performance shows a large increase in residential burglary against last year, however this is largely due to a significantly low month in April 2006
- IQanta data shows Richmond Borough to be just above average in comparison to its most similar CDRPs
- Residential burglary is a serious crime, particularly distraction burglary against the elderly.
- The Richmond upon Thames Public Attitude Survey 2006/07 found that 73% of respondents were very worried or fairly worried about having their home broken into and something stolen
- Residential burglary has accounted for 8% of the total notifiable offences on Richmond Borough between April to June 2007. It is the 5th highest volume crime type
- Residential burglary has decreased over the last 7 years since 2000
- IQanta predicts offences to increase if based upon the last three and six months data. However a longer 12 months analysis predicts the number of offences to decline
- Residential burglary is unlikely to generate other crime, however is usually affected by drugs
- The hotspot for all residential burglary offences between 01/04/2007 and 30/06/2007 was the North Barnes area along Castelnau
- The majority (40%) of the offences were committed in the daytime, although there was an increase in this quarter in night time offences
- Weekday offences were more common than weekend offences
- The most commonly stolen items were electrical items
- Forced entry was the commonest MO used to commit a burglary between the search dates making up 35% of the offences
- Commonest entry point was the front door featuring in 26% of the reports
- Between June 2006 and June 2007 only 31% of offenders (where a home address was known) resided on Richmond borough

Criminal Damage

- Criminal damage is showing a large reduction in both Financial Year To Date (FYTD) performance and over the last 5 years.
- The borough is currently exceeding it's reduction target for 07/08 of 11.1%
- Criminal Damage accounts for 15% of Total Notifiable Offences (TNOs) and as such is classified as a high volume crime
- The largest proportion of criminal damage occurs to a motor vehicle
- IQunta data shows Richmond Borough to be performing best in the CDRP group for criminal damage
- IQunta data also predicts criminal damage to further decrease over the next year
- Public concern puts vandalism, graffiti and other deliberate damage to property or vehicles as one of the top 4 problems in the borough according to a Public Attitude Survey(PAS 06/07)
- Criminal damage is not seen as a serious offence in comparison to others as it involves no violence against the person
- Criminal damage is a moderate generator of other crime and the fear of crime, as illustrated by the Broken Windows Theory
- Peak locations for the current quarter were in Richmond town centre and Twickenham town centre
- Saturday is the peak day for offences to occur
- Offences generally occur overnight or in the evening
- Previous analysis has linked alcohol as a driver of criminal damage
- Criminal damage is a youth crime

Drugs

- Drugs crimes are perceived as less problematic in Richmond borough compared with the MPS as a whole.
- Borough residents view one of the key police priorities; is to 'tackle drug dealing and use'.
- The British Crime Survey found in 2006/07 8% of 16-24 year olds reported use of any Class A drug in the past year.
- For 2005/06 and 2006/07 Richmond upon Thames has had the lowest number of drugs offences per 1,000 population across the MPS.
- Friday is the peak day for drugs offences across the borough.
- In 2006/07 93% of drugs offences in the borough where known were committed by males.
- Cannabis is the drug most people are accused of possessing. This is more pronounced amongst youths. However increased proactive police operations of searching people entering certain licensed premises has seen a dramatic increase in the number of people accused of possession of cocaine.
- Three quarters of the Prolific Priority Offenders on the borough are drug users.
- 41% of Drug Intervention Programme clients main drug use is Heroin. This increases to 65% of all clients through the Arrest Referral scheme.

Domestic Violence

- Richmond upon Thames achieved 100% compliance towards the national 2006/07 Best Value Performance Indicator for domestic violence.
- The British Crime Survey 2006/07 found that repeat victimisation accounts for 70% of all incidents of domestic violence.
- The British Crime Survey 2006/07 found that 16% of all incidents of violence were for domestic violence. However 33% of violent incidents against women were domestic violence compared with 6% of incidents against men.
- There are no overall seasonal trends in domestic violence incidents in the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames.
- For 2005/06 and 2006/07 the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames had the lowest number of domestic violence offences across the Metropolitan Police Service, in April to June 2007 the borough had the second lowest.
- Over three-quarters of domestic violence offences are for violence against the person crimes.
- Richmond upon Thames has consistently had one of the highest sanctioned detection rates across the MPS.
- Sunday between 00:00 to 01:00 hours is the peak time for domestic violence offences across the borough.
- People of African/Caribbean appearance are more likely to be victims of domestic violence than are present in the boroughs population. This pattern is echoed across the Metropolitan Police Service.
- Most domestic violence victims are women and this percentage is increasing.
- 77% of victims were aged between 18 and 45. The level of repeat victimisation is decreasing from 11% in 2005/06 to 9% in 2006/06 down to 6% in April to June 2007. This compares with 70% recorded in the British Crime Survey.
- The vast majority of people accused of domestic violence offences in the borough are white, male, aged between 18 and 45.
- Further analysis needs to be conducted to monitor the relationships between victims and perpetrators. As preliminary analysis shows that when males were shown as accused 9% of the victims were also male.
- 79% of offenders were from Richmond upon Thames.

Homophobic Crime

- On average less than one homophobic offence is reported in Richmond upon Thames per month.
- Due to the very low levels of offences most of the data analysed is not statistically significant.
- Crime trends show that homophobic recorded crime has fallen for the last 3 years in Richmond upon Thames.
- The number of homophobic crimes in Richmond upon Thames is consistently below the Metropolitan Police average and it's most similar CDRP group.
- Most homophobic crimes in the borough are for violence against the person offences.
- The sanctioned detection rate for Richmond has increased in 2006/07 to 50.0% from 26.7% in 2005/06.
- Numbers of offences are low therefore no conclusive temporal profiles can be derived however most offences have occurred between 21:00 to 01:59 hours.
- Offenders are equally split between males and females, no offenders have been recorded in the last two years as being aged over 45.
- Three- quarters of those accused of homophobic offences in the last two years live in the borough.
- Most victims of homophobic offences are males of White/European appearance aged between 18 and 45.
- The rate of repeat victimisation has been 10% from April 2005 to June 2007.

Motor Vehicle Crime

- Motor vehicle crime has been an MPS wide priority for many years due to its high volume
- The Public Attitude Survey 2006/07 showed 34% of residents were very worried or fairly worried about having things stolen from their car and 19% felt the same about having their car stolen
- Motor vehicle crime makes up 13% of the borough's total notifiable offences
- Motor vehicle crime rose steadily until 2003/04 where it fell suddenly and continued this decrease throughout 04/05. This large decrease in offences is attributable to Operation Footbrake
- There is no significant seasonal trend with motor vehicle crime
- IQuanta data shows Richmond Borough as performing below average within it's most similar CDRP grouping
- IQuanta predicts vehicle crime to continue falling throughout the next year based on the last 3, 6 and 12 months of data
- The time profile for motor vehicle crime is overnight
- Richmond Town Centre was the hotspot for this period with theft from motor vehicles occurring mostly in the car parks
- There is no significant peak day, however weekdays were generally busier than weekends.
- Suspects for this crime type are mainly unknown as the number of perpetrators caught is low
- Volkswagens, Fords (in particular Focus), and BMW'S were the most popular vehicles to be broken into or stolen from
- The most popular vehicle to be stolen was the Piaggio moped/scooter followed by Vauxhall cars, mainly Corsa's
- Audio radio CD players were the most popular item of property stolen followed by number plates

Race crime

- The Census 2001 showed 9% of the borough classified themselves as being a minority ethnic person.
- Heathfield ward has the greatest concentration of minority ethnic people in the borough.
- The Census 2001 showed that over a quarter of the borough did not specify a religion or stated they had no religion.
- A study of 180 minority ethnic people living and working in the borough found 2 out of every 3 people had been a victim or witnessed a racial incident over the past two years.
- The study found people did not report incidents because the victim did not feel they would be supported or taken seriously.
- The 2006/07 police Public Attitude Survey found 16% of the borough questioned were either very worried or fairly worried about being subject to physical attack because of skin colour, ethnic origin or religion compared to 14% in 2005/06.
- Crime trends show that race crime is falling in the borough.
- The number of race crimes in Richmond upon Thames is consistently below the Metropolitan Police average and it's most similar CDRP group.
- Most race crimes in the borough are for violence against the person offences.
- The sanctioned detection rate for Richmond has increased in 2006/07 to 49.6% from 33.3% in 2005/06, this is one of the highest in the MPS.
- Most race incidents are located in small areas of Whitton, Heathfield and Richmond town centre.
- There is no specific temporal profile for race incidents, only a slight increase in incidents between 21:00 to 01:00 hours.
- The offender profile of race crimes is White European males, aged 18 – 25 from this borough. There has been an increase in the number of Dark Europeans accused of race crimes from 2005/06 to 2006/07.
- The profile of victims of race crimes is Indian/Pakistani females, aged 18 to 45.
- The rate of repeat victimisation was 9% in 2005/06 and this reduced to 6% in 2006/07 and April to June 2007.

Robbery

- Personal Robbery has been an MPS wide priority for many years
- The Police target for the reduction of personal robbery stands at –1% for FY07/08 against FY06/07
- Robbery of the person accounted for 3% of all total notifiable offences within the period studied
- Robbery has risen steadily over the past 7 years, and peaked in 2005/06. Offences decreased last year and appear to be remaining constant in the shorter term.
- The offence rate for personal robbery shows Richmond just below average in comparison to the most similar CDRPs, IQuanta data
- IQuanta data predicts offence levels to continue to significantly decrease over the next year based on the last 3, 6 and 12 months data
- Weekends are generally busier than weekdays for robbery
- Peak time was 1900-2345 hours
- There is no borough hotspot for offences although Twickenham Town Centre, the area around Richmond College and surrounding open spaces and play parks including Marble Hill park and Palewell Park emerged as an area of concern
- The suspect profile shows both white and African-Caribbean males aged 15-18 years
- The victim profile shows white males in the slightly younger age group of 14-17 years
- The property profile shows Mobiles (23%) were the most popular item of property stolen
- Previous police strategic assessments have highlighted robbers travel into Richmond from other boroughs and use their numbers to intimidate victims who are often in groups themselves
- It is presumed that the significant decrease in robbery offences, coupled with the increase in the SD rate can be attributed to the introduction of the borough's 'Q' car.

Youth Crime

- Young people account for approximately one quarter of all crime suspects in the borough this has consistently been the pattern since 2001.
- There is some degree of correlation between the index of Income Deprivation Affecting Children and where young offenders and young people at risk of offending live on the borough.
- Most youth suspected crime consistently occurs in a small output area of Richmond town centre covering George Street and Red Lion Street.
- 16 is the peak age for young offenders.
- 80% of young offenders in this borough are male.
- Criminal damage and robbery of the person are the crimes most committed by young people.
- Where known just over half of young people suspected of crime in this borough are residents of this borough.
- It can be estimated that criminal damage by young people cost this borough £1 million in 2006/07.
- It can be estimated that robbery of the person by young people cost this borough £1.8 million in 2006/07.
- 3 of the PPOs on the borough are juveniles.
- 9.4% of pupils in the boroughs secondary schools had fixed term exclusions compared with 11% in 2005/06.

2008 Strategic Assessment update

Priorities

The Strategic Assessment 2008 has found the recommended priorities for the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames to be:

Violent Crime	Alcohol
Motor Vehicle Crime	Drugs
Residential Burglary	Counter Terrorism

The main changes to the recommendations since the last assessment are:

Robbery has reduced in priority mainly due to the huge reductions in volume and the excellent performance against the most similar Local Strategic Partnerships (LSPs). It no longer features as a recommended priority for the partnership.

Violence against the person (which includes domestic offences) has increased in concern mainly due to raised volume of the more serious offences and current political and public concern, and is now recommended as the top concern for the partnership.

Motor vehicle crime has increased in concern due to worsening performance and the predictions that offences may continue to increase. It now features as a recommended priority and is regarded as a serious acquisitive crime.

Time constraints have led to the omission of hate crime, youth crime and criminal damage profiles for this assessment. They can be commissioned where relevant to support local working groups, but will not impact on this assessment as they, although of importance, are not the key priorities to the partnership

Residential burglary

- The Community Safety Partnership Plan 2008-11 sets a 2.9% reduction target for all serious acquisitive crime; with the burglary element of this group of crimes being less than 1000 crimes during the year
- Nationally the risk of a household being a victim of burglary remained stable compared with 2006/07
- The public attitude survey shows respondents are slightly less concerned about burglary than in previous years
- At 8% of total notifiable offences, residential burglary remains the 5th highest contributor
- Offences across the borough have continued to fall, now at the lowest level in the last 8 years
- The current trend in residential burglary appears to be stabilising after significant decreases since 2000.
- The burglary rate remains below average against the most similar LSPs at 3.751 per 1000 households.
- iQuanta 12 months analysis predicts the number of offences to continue to decline, however more steadily than recent years. It is likely that offences have begun to level out.
- Factors that could impact on residential burglary in the forthcoming year could be; Economic downturn, LA and MPS budget cuts, the Government 10 year Drug Strategy, Violent Crime Reduction Act means prioritisation of other crime, new Police Commissioner may change priorities and resources.
- FY 07/08 saw clusters of residential burglary in North Barnes, along Castlenau and into Mortlake. Richmond, St Margarets/Isleworth borders and

West Teddington were also key areas of note. Mortlake is the borough's historic burglary hotspot.

- Burglary generally peaks throughout the week and is low on a Sunday. This has not differed from previous long term analysis.
- The time profile for burglary also remains unchanged, with the majority of offences being committed during the day and a slight peak overnight.
- Force was the commonest method used to commit a burglary making up 36% of the offences. Combined open/insecure method burglaries made up 18.9% of the offences. Front doors were the most targeted entry point, followed by rear windows. This again remains unchanged since previous assessments.
- Property stolen also remains constant with Electricals being the most commonly stolen items. Jewellery, Cash and Documents (Bank Cards, Passports etc) were also frequently stolen.
- 59 Cars were taken by means of burglary throughout the financial year. The latter part of the financial year seeing a large increase in this type of burglary. This appears to be a rise seen across the MPS and other county forces.
- Again more offenders accused of residential burglaries on Richmond Borough resided off borough.
- 3.7% of Burglary offences FY07 – 08 were distraction burglaries, offences peaking in the month of November.

Personal robbery

- The Community Safety Partnership Plan 2008-11 sets a 2.9% reduction target for all serious acquisitive crime.
- Robbery of the person accounted for 2.18% of all total notifiable offences in FY 07/08. This is a slight decrease from 2.89% in the previous FY.
- Robbery began rising in 2003/04 and peaked in FY 05/06. Offences have decreased in both 06/07 and further in 07/08. Offences this year continue to decrease, mirroring the lowest levels recorded on the borough.
- Current iQuanta data shows Richmond Borough as the 2nd lowest out of the 33 most similar LSP areas, with a personal robbery rate of 0.396 per 1000 residents.
- iQuanta predicts personal robbery offences will continue to decline if based upon the last three, six and 12 months data. The last 3 months analysis predicts the number of offences to decline more steadily. It is likely that offences will reach a plateau eventually.
- Richmond Town Centre again appears as a borough hotspot for offences.
- Temporal profiles remain unchanged. Friday was the peak day for robbery of the person followed by Saturday and Sunday. This remains consistent with previous analysis. Robbery peaks between 1600 and 0000 hrs
- Victim and Suspect profiles also remain consistent. Of the total shown as accused for street crime offences, 53% resided off the borough. Again this is similar to previous years.
- Victims are mostly white males aged between 14-17 years who are either on their own walking home or have become separated from the rest of their friends, in or near open spaces.
- Cash and mobile phones are still the most popular items of property to be taken.

Motor vehicle crime

- The Community Safety Partnership Plan 2008-11 sets a 2.9% reduction target for all serious acquisitive crime.

- The public attitude survey shows only 2% of respondents as very worried about car crime in Richmond Borough (base 459). This compares with 7% for the MPS (base 12257).
- KIN Survey data shows motor vehicle crime as a key concern for the majority of wards.
- Theft from motor vehicle is the third biggest contributor to TNOs after criminal damage and other theft.
- Current iQuanta data shows Richmond Borough as 2nd lowest out of the 33 most similar LSP areas, with a vehicle crime rate of 2.161 per 1000 residents.
- IQuanta predicts theft from motor vehicle offences to decline very steadily based on the last three and six and 12 months data. The significant decreases seen previously appear to be ceasing. Theft from motor vehicle offences are predicted to increase sharply based on the last 3 months data points.
- Factors that could impact on motor vehicle crime in the forthcoming year could be; Economic downturn, LA and MPS budget cuts, Violent Crime Reduction Act means prioritisation of other crime, new Police Commissioner may change priorities and resources.
- The intelligence profile for motor vehicle crime remains unchanged from last year; of note are the following points:
- The temporal profile for offences to occur is overnight, however there are slightly more offences of theft of motor vehicle committed during 1900 hrs to 2200 hrs. There is no significant day on which offences occur.
- Of the total shown as accused for vehicle crime offences, 57% were from off borough. Hammersmith being the most common area for Theft From Motor Vehicle suspects, and Wandsworth for Theft Of Motor Vehicle. The only offence where Richmond borough residents featured highly as the accused was for Criminal Damage to Motor Vehicle.
- The top five vehicles stolen were; PIAGGIO mopeds, FORD FIESTAS, ESCORTS, vans, HONDA motorcycles, VAUXHALL ASTRA CORSA and VW GOLFS.
- The top five vehicles broken into were; VW GOLF, POLO, PASSAT, FORD FOCUS FORD VANS, FIESTAS, MONEDO, KA, ESCORT; BMW; VAUXHALL CORSA, ASTRA, ZAFIRA, VECTRA; MERCEDES
- The most popular item of property to be taken, and proven to be stolen if stopped, was Cash. Other items to be taken were Sat Nav Systems, Number Plates, Mobile Phones, Stereos, and Laptops
- The main methods for entering a vehicle were by smashing a window, forcing locks or entering vehicles without causing any damage. On the majority of occasions it is believed that the vehicles were left insecure.

Violent crime

- The Community Safety Partnership Plan 2008-11 sets 3 reduction targets for violent crimes.
- The Public Attitude Survey for the first quarter of 08/09 shows that 4% (base 160) of Richmond Borough respondents were very worried about violent crime. This is an increase since FY07/08 when the figures read only 2% (base 628).
- There is a significant amount of media coverage at the moment on violent crime, which usually heightens the public's fear of crime.
- Violence against the Person (VAP) accounts for almost 16% of total notifiable offences (TNOs).

- From April 2008 the definition of serious violence changed to APACs (Assessments of Police & Community Safety), which now includes s.18 assaults (GBH with intent) but not s.20 (GBH). Measurements have therefore started with 08/09 being a baseline year.
- Violence against the person offences peaked between the years of 02/03 through to 04/05 and then have declined over the last 3 performance years. Offences in the short term continue to decline.
- iQuanta data shows Richmond upon Thames as being the second best performing borough in it's group of most similar LSPs for Serious Violence (0.006 per 1000 population, where the average is 0.079). Richmond borough is best in it's group for Assault without injury (0.696 against an average of 1.293) and Assault with lesser injury (1.019 against an average of 2.247).
- The review of the licensing Act 2003 found that the new Act has not delivered the reduction in alcohol related violent crime that was intended; instead led to a later and longer 'peak'.
- 25% of VAP within Richmond is flagged as DV (domestic violence).
- 14% had an alcohol indictor. This is unlikely to be a true reflection of the volume of VAP where alcohol is a contributing factor. In August 2008 nearly a third of all VAP involved alcohol however these were picked up by the details of the investigation rather than having an alcohol indictor flag correctly placed on the crime report. In the Town centres previous analysis suggests that nearly all VAP is based around alcohol.
- Overall a Friday between the hours of 1900 to 0300 hours, Saturday 2100 to 0300 hours and Sunday between 2000 and 0100 hours are peaks of activity for this borough.
- May, June and July was the busiest period (summer months) at 29% of the total for the year. December was the quietest month
- London Ambulance Service (LAS) data supports both the temporal and seasonal profiles
- The hotspots for VAP are the town centres in Richmond (14%) and Twickenham (9%).

Domestic Abuse

- For 2006/07 and 2007/08 the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames continued to have the lowest number of domestic violence reports across the Metropolitan Police Service.
- During 2007/08 the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames recorded 1872 domestic violence reports, an increase of 3.1% (57 reports) on the previous financial year.
- The number of recorded domestic abuse crimes decreased by -4.6% (n=29) on the previous financial year.
- The borough continues to have one of the highest sanctioned detection rates (58%) for domestic abuse across the other Metropolitan Police boroughs.
- Sunday between 00:00 to 01:00 hours continues to be the peak time for domestic abuse across the borough.
- 77% of victims are aged between 18 and 45 and mainly white females. The highest age range for victims is 18-25 years old.
- Repeat victimisation has increased from 9% in 2006/07 to 12% in 2007/08. This is low in comparison to the British Crime Survey estimate of 45%.
- The accused are predominantly white, males aged 18 to 45. The highest age range for offenders is 20-24 years old.
- 73% of offenders were from this borough.

Anti-social behaviour

- Richmond upon Thames continues to have the lowest number of ASB incidents per 1,000 population across the Metropolitan Police Service (September 2007 - March 2008)
- Between September 2007 and March 2008, 3191 reports of ASB were recorded by the MPS, a -1.7% decrease on the same period last year.
- Richmond and Twickenham town centres have the greatest concentrations of reported ASB in the borough.
- Saturday is the peak day for ASB incidents in the borough, with half of all ASB reports made between Friday and Sunday.
- Half of the ASB incidents are reported in the evening between 19:00hrs and 00:59hrs.
- Additional peaks in ASB reports are also seen at lunchtimes and at 16:00hrs.
- Over half (58%) of the ASB incidents were classed as a form of Rowdy or Nuisance behaviour.
- Substance misuse and Street drinking accounted for 12.6% of ASB reports.
- Vehicle related nuisance accounted for 9.2% of ASB reports (abandoned & nuisance vehicles)

Drugs

- Drug offences are police generated. The more police activity targeted at drugs the more offences are recorded.
- Drug offences are perceived as less problematic in Richmond borough compared with the MPS as a whole. However, drug related crimes are on the increase
- The drug rate remains below average against the most similar LSPs at 1.07 per 1000 residents, making Richmond borough the 5th lowest borough. The average is 2.499 per 1000 residents. This is an increase on FY2005/06 and FY2006/07 where Richmond had the lowest recorded number of drug offences.
- Drug addiction is a major driver for acquisitive crime.
- Data taken from the ward KIN surveys concluded that respondents and borough residents feel that one of the key police priorities is to 'tackle drug dealing and use'
- Data on the crime reporting system showed that South Richmond was the ward with the highest number of drug offences, with 22 percent (22%) of all offences occurring there. Twickenham Riverside Ham (10%), Petersham and Richmond Riverside (10%), Hampton (6%), and St. Margaret's and North Twickenham (5%) were the wards with the next highest number of offences
- The most common offence recorded was Possession of Cannabis at 73% of offences. Production of Cannabis accounted 2% of offences, Possession of Class A drugs 17%, while possession of Class C accounted 2%. Possession with Intent to Supply (including cannabis, Class A and C) accounted for 4% of all recorded offences. There was one offence of Possession to Supply MDM and one offence for the Supply of cocaine
- According to the National British Crime Survey (BCS) 2007/08, 26% of people perceive 'people using drugs or dealing drugs' to be a problem
- The Public Attitude Survey (PAS) reports that 10% of residents in the borough (base 602) perceive drugs to be a problem
- Data from Richmond upon Thames Primary Care Trust records showed that there were 18 emergency drug related admissions from April to July 2008 to cross borough hospitals

- Data from the Adult Drug Treatment Partnership Report shows that between the last quarter of 2007/08 and the first quarter of the FY2008/09, there has been an increase of 71% in Problematic Drug Users.
- The majority of adults in treatment are males, 59% in the last quarter of FY2007/08 and 63% in the first quarter of FY 2008/09
- The ethnicity of those in treatment is predominantly White British (85%) in the first quarter of FY2008/09. This is a 1% reduction on the last quarter of 2007/08
- The majority of users in treatment are aged between 25 – 49 years (77%)
- Data from the Richmond Drug Intervention Program showed that there were 55 referrals of which 22 were offered a place. Of these 22, only 36% completed the treatment

Alcohol

- The hotspots for alcohol related crime / incidents are Richmond and Twickenham town centres
- The social and economic costs of alcohol related assaults are estimated to have cost this borough £8.1 million in 2006/07
- Almost one quarter of public houses on the borough are located in South Richmond Ward
- There is an emerging hotspot area in Teddington around the High Street and Broad Street
- White Males between the ages of 18 - 38 years contribute to the occurrence, repetition or continuance of alcohol-related crime and disorder within the town
- The Public Attitude Survey for the first quarter of 08/09 shows that 31% (base 4946) of Richmond Borough respondents were concerned about people being drunk or rowdy in public places. This is the same as the previous quarter
- There is a significant link between alcohol and violent crime and a positive correlation between the location of licensed premises and the location of assaults on the borough
- The flag for alcohol related crime is under used
- Police 'call for service' data (incidents), crime data and London Ambulance data all show that there is no significant month where more incidents occur
- The majority of incidents occur on a Friday and Saturday night. During these periods more crimes are reported, more calls are made to CAD and to the London Ambulance Service.
- KIN surveys (surveys completed by Key Individuals on the Borough) conducted across the Borough of Richmond showed that 73% of respondents were concerned by the rise in anti-social behaviour.
- Of the 14 ward KIN surveys conducted in 2008, 65% were concerned with youth drinking
- South Twickenham Ward reported the greatest concern over alcohol use. 20% of respondents stated that there was more rowdiness and noise as a result of the extension in drinking hours.
- The British Crime Survey found that nationally between 40 – 70 percent (40% - 70%) of Domestic Violence offences are thought to be alcohol related
- Data from the Primary Care Trust shows Richmond Borough has a higher percentage of hazardous drinking levels than the average for London, but not the nationwide average
- The estimated number of borough adults who drink above the recommended levels is also higher than the London average but not the nationwide average

APPENDIX 2

DOMESTIC ABUSE STRATEGY

1. Introduction

In the Strategic Assessment, 25% of all violence incidents in the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames were for domestic violence.

2. Consultation

The Domestic Abuse Forum held two open meetings to review the 2005-2008 Domestic Abuse Strategy and develop the next Domestic Abuse Plan. The findings of the Strategic Assessment included a section on domestic violence and this has been publicised on the Community Safety Partnership web pages.

3. Current Position

Examples of current practice to reduce domestic violence

The Domestic Abuse Forum has focused on delivering a number of specific activities to increase confidence, to develop a more effective multi-agency response to domestic violence and to develop the multi-agency framework in the borough. These include:

- A review of publicity, including two new advertising campaigns relating to information about domestic abuse services and the One Stop Shop
- Richmond Upon Thames Victim Support have developed a One-Stop Shop for people who have experienced domestic abuse, with the support of number of other agencies in the borough
- Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conference (MARAC)
- Domestic Abuse Forum multi-agency workshops
- Victim Support Domestic Abuse Caseworker and Refuge Independent Domestic Violence Advocate
- Groups for mothers and their children

4. Gaps/issues/challenges

- Reporting of domestic abuse in Richmond Upon Thames remains low (both as domestic violence offences to the police and to other partner)
- The demographic profile of the borough is challenging in terms of raising awareness of domestic abuse
- Absence of provision for supervised contact (unless the family is already engaged with Specialist Children's Services)
- Limited capacity to address the needs of victim/survivors from diverse communities
- Few men from Richmond Upon Thames are referred into accredited perpetrators programmes and there is little provision for this group of offenders within the borough

5. Actions to be taken

The paragraphs below set out the **additional** work that will be undertaken over the next three years to reduce domestic abuse. The work already undertaken will continue, as will the detailed work undertaken with young people and families as set out in the Children and Young People's Plan.

The 2005 – 2008 Domestic Violence Strategy identified four main aims:

- Increasing safe choices for anyone experiencing domestic violence so that they can plan safer futures without compromising their quality of life
- Holding perpetrators accountable for their behaviour in a way that deters both them and other potential perpetrators from committing acts of domestic violence
- Dispelling myths and stereotypes which undermine social tolerance or approval of domestic violence
- Providing children and young people with the necessary knowledge and skills required to build relationships based on respect and mutual understanding, and to develop a commitment to non-violence

The Domestic Abuse Forum proposes to use continue the themes established in these form aims in the development of the plan. However, the detail of the aims and the action plan and milestones arising will be amended to reflect current practice and the changes in the domestic abuse sector since the 2005-2008 strategy.

The following are the areas of work identified by the Domestic Abuse Forum.

2008-2009: Increasing safe choices for anyone experiencing domestic violence so that they might plan safer futures without compromising their quality of life

- Multi-Agency working – including Information Sharing and Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conference (MARAC)
- Incorporating the standards for agencies delivery domestic violence services (from London Domestic Violence Strategy) *and* national standards e.g. risk assessment into the local context
- Developing links into health (including Teddington Memorial Hospital)
- Development of an IDVA service to compliment existing provision
- Support existing provision (e.g. One Stop Shop, Welcare, etc)
- Developing a mechanism for closer oversight of work in the borough - Domestic Abuse Operations Group
- Housing Safety First scheme (target hardening, developing links with Registered Social Landlords (RSLs's) and cross borough referrals)

- Develop routes for feedback within multi-agency framework – from agencies and victim/survivors
- Training (to Police, within Safeguarding, Magistrates and through multi-agency workshops)
- Responding to the unique needs of victim/survivors from diverse communities
- Clear routes into Safeguarding (Adults) and (Children)
- Publicity and awareness raising
- Data collection

2008-2009: Holding perpetrators accountable for their behaviour in such a way that not only acts as a future deterrent for them / but also as a future deterrent for potential perpetrators

- Monitoring outcomes from Magistrates Court – including use of undertakings, bail conditions and increase number of non-molestation orders, withdrawals and repeats
- Development of a Specialist Domestic Violence Court
- Increase referrals to IDAP (Probation run domestic violence intervention for perpetrators)
- Identifying where those using abuse and violence are seeking help or support (including private routes e.g. therapy)
- Training (initial target Specialist Children's Services)
- Minimum standards for domestic violence work with perpetrators

2008-2009: Dispelling myths and stereotypes which undermine social tolerance/approval of domestic violence

- Diversity strands (x6)
- Without recourse to public funds
- Awareness raising (including White Ribbon and International Day for the Eradication of Violence Against Women)
- Substance use and mental health
- Survivor consultation and engagement – voice of the victim/survivor

2008-2009: Providing children and young people with the necessary knowledge and skills required to build relationships based on respect and mutual understanding, with shared power and a commitment to non-violence

- Work with children and young people
 - Extended schools
 - Contact point and Common Assessment Framework
 - Looked after Children
 - Extended schools
- Carers and children who are carers

- Links to Specialist Children's Services and Education, including guidance
- Schools Domestic Abuse Prevention Project

APPENDIX 3

Anti Social Behaviour Strategy

1. Introduction

Anti-social behaviour has been a key concern of residents every since the Community Safety Partnership was introduced in 1998. It has also been a national concern leading to several pieces of legislation and guidance, most recently the Respect Agenda.

2. Consultation

A seminar on anti-social behaviour was held as part of a series of consultation and engagement events.

The findings of the Strategic Assessment included a section on anti-social behaviour and this has been publicised on the Community Safety Partnership web pages.

The Finance and Resources Overview and Scrutiny Committee held an in depth review of the Community Safety Partnership's role in tackling anti-social behaviour in 2006. The Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee have received updates and made further suggestions.

3. Current Position

Examples of current practice to reduce anti-social behaviour

- Analysis of anti-social behaviour incidents to identify 'hot spots' by Safe Streets Co-ordinating Group, information then being used for problem solving and joint tasking.
- The introduction of Safer Neighbourhood Teams and the Safer Travel Team.
- Joint work to tackle graffiti by providing rapid clearance, shared intelligence to bring offenders to justice, test purchasing to provide evidence to prosecute traders who sell equipment to young people, and talks in schools to highlight the cost of dealing with criminal damage.
- The introduction of Controlled Drinking Zones in Richmond and Twickenham town centres to reduce drink related anti-social behaviour.
- Kickz projects run by Metropolitan Police Service and Football Foundation to target areas where anti-social behaviour by young people is a problem.
- The provision of funding to provide positive activities after school and during school holidays (n.b. this is provided to meet a number of issues related to young people and not purely as an anti-social behaviour reduction measure).
- Revision of the Community Safety Partnership's web pages have led to an increase in calls to the Anti Social Behaviour Coordinator.

5. Gaps/issues/challenges

An analysis of current activity against the Respect Agenda and feedback from victims of anti-social behaviour has identified the following

- The lack of clear reporting mechanisms;
- Insufficient levels of support and feedback to victims
- Hot spots of continual anti-social behaviour (or perceived anti-social behaviour leading to fear of crime.
- Lack of awareness of how the Community Safety Partnership tackles anti-social behaviour

5. Actions to be taken

The paragraphs below set out the **additional** work that will be undertaken over the next three years to reduce anti-social behaviour. The work already undertaken will continue, as will the detailed work undertaken with young people and families as set out in the Children and Young People's Plan, particularly that around bullying out of school.

- Introducing and publicising clear reporting mechanisms for anti-social behaviour;
- Training for staff from a range of agencies in how this borough deals with anti-social behaviour; (resourced from Community Safety Partnership team).
- Development of a process for supporting and informing victims of progress;
- Further development of Safe Streets to identify and tackle hot spots of actual or perceived anti-social behaviour.

APPENDIX 4

**Alcohol Review by Health O&S Committee
Table of Recommendations**

Rec. No.	Recommendation	For action by:
1	That all sources of relevant funding be identified as a matter of urgency as the funding available (and what it can be used for) will impact on other recommendations.	Cabinet / PCT
2	That any application to change A1 (retail shops) to A3 (restaurants and cafes), A4 (drinking establishments) or A5 (hot food takeaways) be given very careful scrutiny in centres where high numbers of restaurants and bars already exist. Planning and licensing committees should be provided with information on trends and cumulative impacts when such applications are heard.	Cabinet
3	That the refuse collection times be co-ordinated so rubbish from shops is not left on the streets at night and wherever possible streets should be cleaned at night.	Cabinet
4	That officers be asked to investigate whether there is any way through planning or licensing conditions or planning obligations that A3, A4 and A5 uses can ensure litter generated is minimised (through conditions not allowing take away food) or otherwise promptly removed from the street.	Cabinet
5	That research be conducted to establish: <p>(a) Who the users of the licensed sector are, how they 'come and go', how much they spend, and what their perceptions of the town centres are.</p> <p>(b) Why adults come to town centres in Richmond upon Thames during the night time economy and where they come from</p> <p>(c) Why under 18s come to town centres in Richmond upon Thames during the night time economy, where they come from and where they get their alcohol from.</p> <p>(d) The pros and cons of over 21 policies at licensed outlets and the impact of 18 – 21 year olds drinking off-license alcohol in the borough.</p>	Cabinet
6	That the voluntary code for alcohol retailers in the borough be re-launched with the wording checked for	Cabinet

Rec. No.	Recommendation	For action by:
	legal compliance, especially regarding competition regulations.	
7	That the local authority and police work with the industry and a local college to develop a module (NVQ / accredited scheme) for staff working in off-licences.	Cabinet / Police
8	That all staff selling alcohol in the borough be trained to ensure alcohol is always sold responsibly.	Cabinet
9	That the Richmond town centre redevelopment plans be reviewed to ensure adequate and appropriate transport provision is made during the night time economy.	Cabinet
10	That further investigations take place in relation to setting up a (pilot) marshalled taxi rank in Richmond (for hackney carriages) and a minicab booking kiosk (for private hire vehicles)	Cabinet
11a	That initiatives to develop a night time economy based on diversity be supported by the local alcohol strategy to help the borough achieve purple flag status.	Cabinet
11b	That consideration be given to the appointment of a retail 'champion' or 'co-ordinator' who would promote, for example, evening opening of shops.	Cabinet
11c	That consideration be given to piloting more cultural events, particularly on Richmond riverside, and sports activities.	Cabinet
12	That the alcohol strategy promotes support for people who are affected by alcohol by for example encouraging all employers in the borough to have a work place alcohol policy.	Cabinet
13	That stakeholders look more vigorously at maximising the income flow available to develop an alcohol arrest referral scheme in Richmond upon Thames.	Cabinet Police / PCT
14	That an enhanced GP service be rolled out across the borough which considers both treatment and prevention during 2008/09.	PCT
15	That more be done in terms of brief interventions at tier 1. Screening tools such as CAGE, AUDIT or FAST should be more widely used by a range of frontline professionals including GPs, A&E, social workers, school nurses, housing officers and the police. (The actual or perceived lack of onward treatment services should not inhibit such screening)	PCT
16	That the best practice contract specifications supplied by Alcohol Concern be compared to current contracts and used in the future if appropriate.	PCT
17	That the movement from tiers 1 to 2, 2 to 3 be as	PCT

Rec. No.	Recommendation	For action by:
	seamless as possible.	
18	That the capacity of tier 2 and 3 services be monitored to ensure the treatment system works as a whole.	PCT
19	That the PCT look at substance abuse models more generally to determine synergies in delivery.	PCT
20a	That support for family members be picked up in service contracts in tier 2.	PCT
20b	That where there is no close (family) support other types of support be made available for drinkers.	PCT
21	That in order to prioritise future service delivery the collection and sharing of data needs to be improved by all in relation to alcohol. In particular, reliable quantitative data is needed for alcohol related attendances in primary care, in A&E and for hospital admissions to address the current data underestimates. This is essential for the alcohol burden to be accurately reflected in the Council / PCT Joint Strategic Needs Assessment.	PCT / West Middlesex University and Kingston Hospitals
22	That A&E departments share with the police data about where drunken patients bought their last drink,	West Middlesex University and Kingston Hospitals / Police
23	That contact be made with neighbouring authorities / PCTs to maximise opportunities to work together and share resources in terms of alcohol service development.	Cabinet / PCT
24a	That throughout the borough, schools provide a robust alcohol education programme within Personal, Social and Health Education and similar arrangements made for the wider school community, including private schools.	Cabinet
24b	That alcohol theme days be used by all schools to ensure alcohol isn't forgotten about as part of Personal, Social and Health Education.	Cabinet
25a	That the Cabinet Member for Children's Services and Education takes a lead on alcohol education ensuring it takes place in each school year with a particular focus given in years 6, 7 and 8.	Cabinet
25b	That communication between primary and secondary schools be improved in relation to alcohol education.	Cabinet
25c	That primary and secondary schools share information associated with alcohol harm and relevant stakeholders work through any resulting issues to ensure children don't 'slip through the net' of	Cabinet

Rec. No.	Recommendation	For action by:
	services’.	
26	That alcohol coordinators be appointed in every school.	Cabinet
27	That stakeholders promote opportunities for young people to meet up and socialise responsibly and safely without pressure to drink.	Cabinet
28	Drugs, smoking and alcohol outreach work be developed to meet and target young people across the borough with harm reduction information around safer drinking.	Cabinet
29	That a peer-led alcohol education campaign by and for young people be developed to counteract the popular media images of alcohol.	Cabinet
30	Improve awareness of the social implications of adult role modelling on younger people.	Cabinet
31	That a more robust strategy be developed in relation to engaging parents in alcohol education so as to encourage confidence in talking with, rather than at, their children about alcohol and safer drinking.	Cabinet
32	That the capacity of Young People’s Drug and Alcohol Support be increased to provide tier 2 alcohol education to targeted young people, for example, in the Pupil Referral Service, secondary schools and special schools.	Cabinet
33	That all stakeholders consider seriously the balance between benefits and harm whenever considering issues relating to the supply and consumption of alcohol.	Cabinet
34a	That Cabinet supports the idea that a senior member of the Local Strategic Partnership be appointed as a champion for the strategy.	Cabinet / LSP
34b	That the first task of the ‘champion’ be to look at how best to establish an alcohol co-ordinator post to ensure the Richmond upon Thames alcohol strategy is delivered. This should include consideration of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • how the post is funded • how the co-ordinator will work across a range of organisations • what outcomes are to be achieved. 	

APPENDIX 5

London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Alcohol Strategy

1. Introduction

Safe, Sensible, Social, the next steps in the National Alcohol Strategy requires that a local alcohol strategy be drawn up as part of the Community Safety and Substance Misuse Strategy for each local authority area.

This strategy aims to reduce the harms caused by alcohol to the residents of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames, while recognising that alcohol plays an important part in the life of the borough.

2. Consultation

The Community Safety Partnership have held a series of seminars on topics related to Community Safety. One of these was on the theme of drug and alcohol. In addition the final seminar was held to discuss the findings of the Strategic Assessment. At both of these seminars the role of alcohol in anti-social behaviour and violence was emphasised as a priority among those attending.

The Strategic Assessment identified that alcohol was a key driver of crime and as such should be a priority in the Community Safety and Substance Misuse Strategy. The findings of that Strategic Assessment have been made available on the Community Safety Partnership's web pages and have been circulated to Police Liaison Groups for further comment.

In addition the Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee has held a cross cutting review of alcohol issues to inform the development of this strategy.

3. Current Position

Considerable work is already underway to reduce the harms caused by alcohol misuse. These were covered extensively in the Health O&S Report.

Examples of current practice to reduce alcohol related harms:

- Provision by Youth Offending Team and Adolescent Resource Team of support to parents and interventions with young people at risk of alcohol related offending.
- Additional police resources at peak times in town centres to 'nip in the bud' any potential problems.
- Analysis of drink related incidents to identify 'hot spots' by Safe Streets Co-ordinating Group, information then being used for problem solving and joint tasking.

- The introduction of Controlled Drinking Zones in Richmond and Twickenham town centres to reduce drink related anti-social behaviour
- Kickz projects run by Metropolitan Police Service and Football Foundation to target areas where anti-social behaviour by young people is a problem.
- Services already commissioned to address alcohol misuse health harms.

6. Gaps/issues/challenges

The Health O&S Committee identified a number of ways in which the work locally could be improved.

These can be found at [Appendix 4](#)

5. Actions to be taken

The paragraphs below set out the **additional** work that will be undertaken over the next three years to reduce alcohol related harms. The work already undertaken and detailed in the O&S report will continue, as will the detailed work undertaken with young people and families as set out in the Children and Young People's Plan.

The options for the best structures to oversee this work and monitor its effectiveness have been debated at the Community Safety Partnership and within the Council. The O&S Report clearly identifies that the majority of the alcohol related harm in this borough is health related. It is therefore thought appropriate that the Local Strategic Partnership and the Health and Wellbeing Partnership should be the leads on the majority of the Alcohol Strategy.

The work identified below will therefore be allocated to existing groups who will need to ensure that their workplans identify how they have considered the findings of the O&S Report.

5.1 Health

- Identifying hazardous and harmful drinkers and providing advice
- Providing effective treatment to harmful and dependent drinkers
- Increasing awareness of alcohol units and the sensible drinking message.
- Collecting and sharing information about alcohol misuse.
- Tackling the overlap of alcohol misuse with the misuse of drugs.
- Reducing the impact of alcohol misuse in the workplace.

5.2 Community Safety, crime and anti-social behaviour

- Tackling crime and anti-social behaviour linked to under age drinking
- Developing further test purchases for under age sales

- Tackling environmental issues linked to alcohol use and the night time economy.
- Developing the Civic Watch model in line for a 'purple flag' scheme.
- Researching the night time economy in the borough to discover how and why people come here, what ages they are and how they travel home. Research into the impact the over 21 rules have on the 18-21 group;
- Tackling Domestic Violence linked to the use of alcohol.

5.3 Children and Young People

- Agree a consistent approach to alcohol education in all schools through Health Schools particularly at transitional stages;
- Provide consistent messages to parents on discussing alcohol use with young people.
- Identifying children and young people at risk of harm from alcohol misuse and referring them to relevant bodies,
- Providing support and treatment for young people with alcohol problems.
- Targeting parents whose drinking is causing risk to the wellbeing of children.
- Providing alternative activities to young people as part of the council's overall programme of positive activities.

APPENDIX 6 Structure Chart

APPENDIX 7
Performance Management – Action Plan Template draft

NAME OF WORK GROUP	
Outcome Measure/ NI	Service plan priorities
Relevant Place survey questions	NI detail
CSP strategy target	Q....
Objectives	3 year target
	1
	2
	3
	4
	Target 1
	Result, 2008/9 due March
	Target 2
	Result, 2009/10 due March
	Target 3
	Result, 2009/10 due March

Objective 1	Owner	Quarter 1 milestone	Quarter 2 milestone	Quarter 3 milestone	Quarter 4 milestone
Action 1					
		Quarter 1 progress	Quarter 2 progress	Quarter 3 progress	Quarter 4 progress
Action 2	Owner	Quarter 1 milestone	Quarter 2 milestone	Quarter 3 milestone	Quarter 4 milestone
		Quarter 1 progress	Quarter 2 progress	Quarter 3, progress	Quarter 4 progress

Action 3	Owner	Quarter 1 milestone	Quarter 2 milestone	Quarter 3 milestone	Quarter 4 milestone
		Quarter 1 progress	Quarter 2 progress	Quarter 3 progress	Quarter 4 progress
Action 4	Owner	Quarter 1 milestone	Quarter 2 milestone	Quarter 3 milestone	Quarter 4 milestone
		Quarter 1 progress	Quarter 2 progress	Quarter 3 progress	Quarter 4 progress
Annual summary					
Performance review					
Areas of concern/ future threats					
Recommendations					

Specify how the work programme above takes into account:

- a) the findings of the Equalities Impact Needs Assessment carried out in respect of the Community Safety Partnership:
- b) how the work plan above addresses the five areas of relative deprivation.
- c) how the work plan addresses community engagement/consultation
- d) alcohol issues, particularly those identified in the Health O&S Report.

OFENDER MANAGEMENT GROUP

Outcome Measure/ NI	Service plan priorities	Target 1	Target 2	Target 3
Relevant Place survey questions	NI detail		Result, 2008/9 due March	Result, 2009/10 due March
CSP strategy target	Q....			
Objectives	3 year target			
	1			
	2			
	3			
	4			

Objective 1					
Action 1	Owner	Quarter 1 milestone	Quarter 2 milestone	Quarter 3 milestone	Quarter 4 milestone
Review PPO Processes		Three way meeting to be held between Police, Probation and Community Safety Partnership to identify staffing process improvements.	Review		
		Quarter 1 progress	Quarter 2 progress	Quarter 3 progress	Quarter 4 progress
Action 2	Owner	Quarter 1 milestone	Quarter 2 milestone	Quarter 3 milestone	Quarter 4 milestone
Improve Cross Border liaison					
		Quarter 1 progress	Quarter 2 progress	Quarter 3, progress	Quarter 4 progress

Action 3	Owner	Quarter 1 milestone	Quarter 2 milestone	Quarter 3 milestone	Quarter 4 milestone
Feasibility study into testing on arrest and extension of arrest referral to alcohol.			Project plan study.	To be inserted when project plan produced.	
		Quarter 1 progress	Quarter 2 progress	Quarter 3 progress	Quarter 4 progress
Action 4	Owner	Quarter 1 milestone	Quarter 2 milestone	Quarter 3 milestone	Quarter 4 milestone
Develop resettlement plan to include housing issues and employment, education and training.				Identify relevant stakeholders; liaise with Regional Resettlement Forum.	
		Quarter 1 progress	Quarter 2 progress	Quarter 3 progress	Quarter 4 progress
Annual summary					
Performance review					
Areas of concern/ future threats					
Recommendations					
Page 83					

Specify how the work programme above takes into account:

- a) the findings of the Equalities Impact Needs Assessment carried out in respect of the Community Safety Partnership: Diversity groups can be overrepresented in the criminal justice system; The PPO list will be monitored for disproportionality.
 - b) how the work plan above addresses the five areas of relative deprivation. People living in areas of deprivation are over represented in the criminal justice system. This may require targeted work.
 - c) how the work plan addresses community engagement/consultation
 - d) The new developments highlighted will be the subject of consultation with the Community Police Partnership
- alcohol issues, particularly those identified in the Health O&S Report.
- The feasibility study into the extension of arrest referral work to cover alcohol addresses some of the relevant issues raised.

DOMESTIC ABUSE WORK PLAN

<p>Outcome</p> <p>Measure/ NI</p>	<p>Service plan priorities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Service users and carers are safeguarded from all forms of abuse, neglect and self harm <p>NI detail</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ NI 20 Assault with injury crime rate ▪ NI 21 Dealing with local concerns about anti-social behaviour and crime by the local council and police <p>In addition to the Local Area Targets, domestic abuse indicators for report are</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ NI 32 Repeat incidents of domestic violence and murder ▪ NI 34 Domestic violence – murder <p>n/a</p>	<p>Target 1</p> <p>Target 2</p> <p>Target 3</p>
<p>Relevant Place survey questions</p> <p>CSP strategy target</p> <p>Objectives</p>	<p>3 year target</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Increasing safe choices for anyone experiencing domestic abuse so that they might plan safer futures without compromising their quality of life 2 Holding perpetrators accountable for their behaviour in such a way that not only acts as a future deterrent for them / but also as a future deterrent for potential perpetrators 3 Dispelling myths and stereotypes which undermine social tolerance/approval of domestic abuse 4 Providing children and young people with the necessary knowledge and skills required to build relationships based on respect and mutual understanding, with shared power and a commitment to non-violence 	<p>Result, 2008/9 due March</p> <p>Result, 2009/10 due March</p>

Objective 1	Increasing safe choices for anyone experiencing domestic abuse so that they might plan safer futures without compromising their quality of life			
Action 1 Develop working arrangements with Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conference (MARAC)	Owner DAFOS	Quarter 1 milestone	Quarter 2 milestone	Quarter 3 milestone To complete the CAADA MARAC Quality Assurance process Quarter 3 progress Quarter 4 milestone To have delivered the MARAC workplan Quarter 4 progress
Action 2 Research the housing needs of those experiencing domestic abuse	Owner Policy & Research Manager (Housing) and DAC	Quarter 1 milestone Develop links into the Anti-Social Behaviour Panel	Quarter 2 milestone To deliver MARAC training (link to objective 3, action 2) to LBRuT Housing Services Quarter 2 progress	Quarter 3 milestone To undertake research into the housing needs of those experiencing domestic abuse, including diverse communities Quarter 3, progress Quarter 4 milestone Develop a protocol between the domestic abuse and housing sectors Quarter 4 progress
Action 3 Improve advice and information about the services and support available to those affected by domestic abuse	Owner DAF Publicity and Training Subgroup	Quarter 1 milestone Produce a leaflet for victim/survivors referred to the MARAC	Quarter 2 milestone To review and amend the content and structure of the LBRuT website relating to domestic abuse, including information for diverse communities Quarter 2 progress	Quarter 3 milestone Produce a Domestic Abuse Directory to be launched as part of the 16 Days of Action Against Domestic Abuse Quarter 3 progress Quarter 4 milestone To review links with the PCT, including the response to and provision for the disclosure of domestic abuse at Teddington Memorial Hospital Quarter 4 progress
Action 4 Develop a	Owner DAC and	Quarter 1 milestone Establish data recording,	Quarter 2 milestone To undertake a refresh of the	Quarter 3 milestone Run a consultation event, Quarter 4 milestone Review provision for

comprehensive profile of domestic abuse, including prevalence, effects and the current level of provision of advice and support in the borough	Intel Manager	collection and sharing with all multi-agency partners for inclusion within the Strategic Assessment and review the Information Sharing Protocol	2008 Strategic Assessment	including the development of a Violence Against Women Strategy (link to objective 1, action 3)	victim/survivors to establish the minimum requirements to meet current and projected need (and identify gaps in provision) in IDVA services, floating support and refuge accommodation
		Quarter 1 progress	Quarter 2 progress	Quarter 3 progress	Quarter 4 progress
Annual summary					
Performance review					
Areas of concern/ future threats					
Recommendations					
Objective 2					
Holding perpetrators accountable for their behaviour in such a way that not only acts as a future deterrent for them / but also as a future deterrent for potential perpetrators					
Action 1	Owner	Quarter 1 milestone	Quarter 2 milestone	Quarter 3 milestone	Quarter 4 milestone
Develop local care/treatment pathways for those experiencing or perpetrating domestic abuse and problematic substance use	DAC		To convene a multi-agency group to develop local care / treatment pathways for those experiencing or perpetrating domestic abuse and problematic substance use	To provide four days of training addressing domestic abuse and substance misuse as they affect victims and perpetrators	To develop a local care/treatment pathway between the domestic abuse and substance misuse sectors
		Quarter 1 progress	Quarter 2 progress	Quarter 3 progress	Quarter 4 progress
Action 2	Owner	Quarter 1 milestone	Quarter 2 milestone	Quarter 3 milestone	Quarter 4 milestone
Identify current	DAC, Intel		As part of the Strategic	Run an awareness raising	Develop mechanisms for

provision for perpetrators (including those engaged by Specialist Children's Services and those not within the Criminal Justice System) and investigate the most effective way to respond in the future	Manager and Police	Quarter 1 progress	Assessment (link to objective 2, action 4) research the progression of domestic abuse case through the Criminal Justice System and make recommendations for improving outcomes	event with the Magistrates Court	managing domestic abuse perpetrators under the Prolific and Priority Offenders scheme which considers safety implications for the victim/survivor and any children
		Quarter 2 progress		Quarter 3, progress	Quarter 4 progress

Annual summary					
Performance review					
Areas of concern/ future threats					
Recommendations					

Objective 3	Dispelling myths and stereotypes which undermine social tolerance/approval of domestic abuse				
Action 1	Owner	Quarter 1 milestone	Quarter 2 milestone	Quarter 3 milestone	Quarter 4 milestone
Increase victim/survivor involvement in the development of policy and practice relating to domestic abuse	DAF Children and Survivor Subgroup	Pilot a service user group to inform yearly action plan and address specific diversity strands	Development and implementation of service user feedback forms to better meet the needs of victim/survivors	To participate in the 16 Days of Action Against Domestic Abuse (link to objective 1, action 3)	Review the use of service user feedback forms
		Quarter 1 progress	Quarter 2 progress	Quarter 3 progress	Quarter 4 progress
Action 2	Owner	Quarter 1 milestone	Quarter 2 milestone	Quarter 3 milestone	Quarter 4 milestone
Provide domestic abuse	DAC, DAF Publicity and	Deliver a workshop on domestic abuse awareness	Develop an introductory domestic abuse awareness	To deliver MARAC training to 120 professionals (Introduction	

<p>training to front line practitioners and maintain and strengthen the networks enabling them to share information, promote good practice and improve the quality of support</p>	<p>Training Subgroup</p>	<p>within the BAMER communities</p>	<p>training session for multi-agency partners to form part of induction training for front line staff</p>	<p>level 1) and 34 professionals (Advanced level 2)</p>
<p>Action 3 Develop a publicity strategy to raise awareness of domestic abuse in all local communities in a variety of languages and media</p>	<p>Owner DAF Publicity and Training Subgroup</p>	<p>Quarter 1 milestone To agree the priorities for a communications in 2009-2010, including the needs of 'hard to reach' victim/survivors and those from diverse communities</p> <p>Quarter 1 progress</p>	<p>Quarter 2 milestone To support the development of publicity detailing the domestic abuse services provided by Victim Support (including the IDVA service)</p> <p>Quarter 2 progress</p>	<p>Quarter 3 milestone To develop and release Domestic Abuse Forum publicity, including the One Stop Shop</p> <p>Quarter 3 progress</p>
<p>Action 4 Develop the capacity of employers within the borough to respond to domestic abuse</p>	<p>Owner DAC, Corporate Domestic Abuse Group and Voluntary Sector Unit</p>	<p>Quarter 1 milestone To provide training to LBRuT Managers on the staff domestic abuse policy</p> <p>Quarter 1 progress</p>	<p>Quarter 2 milestone To commence the role out of Minimum Standards within the LBRuT</p> <p>Quarter 2 progress</p>	<p>Quarter 3 milestone To identify 4 partners within the borough to develop a Staff Domestic Abuse Policy</p> <p>Quarter 3 progress</p>
				<p>Quarter 4 milestone To review the capacity of employers within the Voluntary Sector to respond to domestic abuse and to develop a workplan for 2010-2011</p> <p>Quarter 4 progress</p>

Annual summary	
Performance review	
Areas of concern/ future threats	
Recommendations	

Objective 4	Providing children and young people with the necessary knowledge and skills required to build relationships based on respect and mutual understanding, with shared power and a commitment to non-violence			
Action 1	Owner	Quarter 1 milestone	Quarter 2 milestone	Quarter 3 milestone
Deliver a pilot Domestic Abuse Education Project within three secondary schools and one youth setting	DAF Children and Survivors Subgroup	Produce an Education Pack for Teachers and a Training Pack for Trainers Quarter 1 progress	To have an agreed timetable for delivery within two settings Quarter 2 progress	To have an agreed timetable for delivery within a further two settings Quarter 3 progress
Action 2	Owner	Quarter 1 milestone	Quarter 2 milestone	Quarter 3 milestone
Develop family support services for those affected by domestic abuse	DAC, Andy Elvin and Vol. Sector Liaison Unit		Commence the delivery of a domestic abuse service in children's centres by providing advice and support and victim/survivors and developing awareness amongst the multi-disciplinary teams Quarter 1 progress	To commission a Community Group Treatment Programme, providing a community-based setting in which children and non-abusive parents can meet others in the same situation as themselves, explore their feelings and learn how they can best protect themselves Quarter 2 progress
Action 3	Owner	Quarter 1 milestone	Quarter 2 milestone	Quarter 3 milestone
Work with the Local	DAC	To map the domestic abuse	To deliver MARAC training	Review and create as
		Quarter 1 progress	Quarter 2 progress	Quarter 3, progress
				Quarter 4 milestone
				To support the delivery of at

<p>Safeguarding Children's Board (LSCB) and Children's Trust to ensure that staff have access to the training, awareness and ongoing support necessary to recognise and respond to children affected by domestic abuse</p>	<p>and DAF Children and Survivors Subgroup</p>	<p>training currently available to staff working with children and young people and to agree a training programme for 2010-2011 in consultation with LSCB and Children's Trust</p>	<p>Quarter 1 progress</p>	<p>(link to objective 3, action 2) to Specialist Children's Services and to review the response of Specialist Children's Services to domestic abuse alerts</p>	<p>necessary the formal links between the Forum and the LSCB and Children's Trust</p>	<p>least two workshop to front line staff on effective responses to domestic abuse</p>
<p>Quarter 2 progress</p>						
<p>Quarter 3 progress</p>						
<p>Quarter 4 progress</p>						
<p>Annual summary</p>						
<p>Performance review</p>						
<p>Areas of concern/ future threats</p>						
<p>Recommendations</p>						

EQUALITIES IMPACT NEEDS ASSESSMENT (EINA)

The Domestic Abuse Forum (DAF) Equality and Diversity Subgroup will include representatives from the six diversity strands and is responsible for ensuring that the Domestic Abuse Forum and Workplan take account of diversity in all that they do. The Chair of the subgroup sits on the DAF Operations Subgroup (which is responsible for monitoring the delivery of the workplan) and also submits quarterly reports to the Domestic Abuse Forum. The workplan itself includes specific actions in relation to diverse communities, including the development of a communication plan that includes engagement with 'hard to reach groups' and diverse communities, developing intelligence led planning within the strategic assessment, enhancing service user consultation and the development of a domestic abuse training programme.

SAFER TRANSPORT GROUP 2009/10

Outcome	To increase community confidence that CSP are responding to their issues and therefore feel safer	
Measure/ NI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People will not only live in London's safest Borough but feel that they live in London's safest Borough 	Target 3
Relevant Place survey questions	<p>NI 16 Number of serious acquisitive crimes/total population x 1000</p> <p>Reduce by 2.9%</p> <p>Questions 25 & 26² are the main general measures of satisfaction. Other related questions are Q 1 asks about the importance of public transport in making the area a good place to live, Q2 about whether it needs improving. Q8 ask about satisfaction with local bus services, Q9 about how frequency of bus service use. Q24 is also of some relevance as it includes asking whether "people being drunk or rowdy in public places" is seen as a problem.</p> <p>To reduce serious acquisitive crime by 2.9% with the burglary element of this group of crimes being less than 1000 during the year</p>	<p>2008/9 result</p> <hr style="width: 50%; margin: 0 auto;"/> <p>2009/10 result</p>
CSP strategy target Objectives	<p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p> <p>4</p>	

Objective 1			
Action 1	Owner	Quarter 1 milestone	Quarter 2 milestone
Meeting dates		April to June	July to September
		2 April	2 July
		1 October	1 October
		Quarter 3 milestone	Quarter 4 milestone
		October to December	January to March
		7 January & 18 March 2010	

² It is the responsibility of the police and other local public services to work in partnership to deal with anti-social behaviour and crime in your local area. Q25 So, how much would you agree or disagree that the police and other local public services seek people's views about these issues in your local area? Q26 And how much would you agree or disagree that the police and other local public services are successfully dealing with these issues in your local area?

<p>Action 3 To run a series of partnership reassurance/crime prevention exercises on buses focussing on a different theme each quarter</p>	<p>Owner STT LBRuT</p>	<p>Quarter 1 milestone STT prepare proposals for campaigns and identify approximate dates of activities and ways in which other partners can assist.</p>	<p>Quarter 2 milestone STT involve others in a campaign targeted at young people and their relationships with bus drivers in September when new students are starting at secondary school or college</p>	<p>Quarter 3 milestone STT involve others in a campaign targeted at alcohol-related disorder in December</p>	<p>Quarter 4 milestone Invite LBRuT Hate Crime Coordinator to assist with planning campaign about hate crime on public transport – knowing how to deal with it/defuse it, how to report it</p>
<p>Quarter 1 progress</p>			<p>Quarter 2 progress</p>	<p>Quarter 3 progress</p>	<p>Quarter 4 progress</p>
<p>Action 4 Relevant partners to support Network Rail's level crossing safety awareness campaign. event at Mortlake on 25th June Action Robert to ask NR to invite STT and South West Trains to 16th April planning meeting</p>	<p>Owner BTP NRail LBRuT</p>	<p>Quarter 1 milestone</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ STT, SWT, BTP and LBRuT to attend planning meeting on 16 April organised by Network Rail ▪ Representatives of key organisations to assist at awareness event at Mortlake on 25th June <p>Quarter 1 progress</p>	<p>Quarter 2 milestone None</p>	<p>Quarter 3 milestone None</p>	<p>Quarter 4 milestone Address any level crossing issues identified in the station EVAs (see Action 1)</p>
<p>Annual summary</p>			<p>Quarter 2 progress</p>	<p>Quarter 3 progress</p>	<p>Quarter 4 progress</p>
<p>Performance review</p>					
<p>Areas of concern/ future threats</p>					
<p>Recommendations</p>					

LBRuT = London Borough of Richmond upon Thames
STT = Safer Transport Team (Richmond Police)
SWT = South West Trains

Quarter 1 progress

Quarter 2 progress

Quarter 3 progress

Quarter 4 progress

Safer Transport Group EINA

- Action 1 aims to reduce fear of crime at stations and is likely to have a higher positive impact on women, who research has shown are more likely to feel unsafe on public transport than other groups.
- Action 2 relates to joint tasking around problems with antisocial behaviour by a small minority of Richmond College students on public transport. It is likely to have a higher positive impact on young people in the 16-18 age group.
- Action 3 relates to various themed public reassurance campaigns on buses. The April 2009 Hate Crime Forum revealed that the hate crime experiences of many attendees occurred on public transport. This action will begin to address this issue and will have a higher positive impact on the ethnic minority, LBG, faith and disabled groups who tend to be victims of hate crime.
- Action 4 relates to improving safety at level crossings. As the majority of accidents at crossings occur to children and young people, it will have a higher positive impact on this group.

ASB DEVELOPMENTAL GROUP

<p>Outcome Measure/ NI</p>	<p>People will not only live in London's safest borough but <u>feel</u> they live in London's safest borough NI 21 Dealing with local concerns about anti-social behaviour and crime issues by the local council and police NI detail Target 1 awaiting baseline increase on baseline target 2 Target 2 percentage increase on target 3 percentage increase on target 2</p>					
<p>Relevant Place survey questions</p>	<p>Q6, Making area safer..... Q25, seeking view on ASB & crime..... Q26, Successfully dealing with ASB & crime..... Additional measures Q22 How safe or unsafe do you feel when outside in your local area after dark Q23 How safe do you feel when outside in your local area during the day Q24 How much of a problem do you think each of the following are....</p>	<p>Result, 2008/9 due March</p>	<p>Result, 2009/10 due March</p>			
<p>CSP strategy target Objectives</p>	<p>Aim to be London's best performing borough on NI 21 1 Be more responsive to community issues and realign the CSP strategy accordingly 2 To increase community confidence that the CSP are responding to their issues and therefore feel safer 3 Communicate the successes of multi-agency working in responding to the priorities of the community</p>					
<p>Objective 1</p>	<p>Be more responsive to community issues and realign the CSP strategy accordingly</p>					
<p>Action 1</p>	<p>To review how the Community Safety Partnership deals with anti-social behaviour</p>	<p>Owner NA</p>	<p>Quarter 1 milestone To conduct a review of how the Community Safety Partnership deals with anti-social behaviour currently and produce a report for the Community Safety Partnership May meeting</p>	<p>Quarter 2 milestone To hold an event at the beginning of July looking at the findings of the review and to set up the ASB Development Group, and develop a work plan for the group.</p>	<p>Quarter 3 milestone To communicate and feedback to residents about the ASB review and the ASB development workplan, through community engagement events, the CPP ,PLGs and stakeholder events</p>	<p>Quarter 4 milestone To communicate and feedback to residents about the ASB review and the ASB development workplan, through community engagement events, the CPP ,PLGs and stakeholder events</p>

Objective 3		Communicate the successes of multi-agency working in responding to the priorities of the community			
Action 1	Owner	Quarter 1 milestone	Quarter 2 milestone	Quarter 3 milestone	Quarter 4 milestone
Increase the number of people who feel informed about what is being done to tackle anti-social behaviour as measured by survey	NA	To engage with the community about the ASB review through the stakeholder day in April	To engage with the community about the ASB review through the PLGs and community meetings	To engage with the community about the ASB review through the PLGs and community meetings	To engage with the community about the ASB review through the PLGs and community meetings
		Quarter 1 progress	Quarter 2 progress	Quarter 3 progress	Quarter 4 progress
Action 2 To work with the communications group to produce communications that will increase public awareness	Owner	Quarter 1 milestone Once the Communications group is set up to liaise with them about publicity	Quarter 2 milestone Ongoing	Quarter 3 milestone Ongoing	Quarter 4 milestone Ongoing
		Quarter 1 progress	Quarter 2 progress	Quarter 3, progress	Quarter 4 progress
Action 3	Owner	Quarter 1 milestone	Quarter 2 milestone	Quarter 3 milestone	Quarter 4 milestone
		Quarter 1 progress	Quarter 2 progress	Quarter 3 progress	Quarter 4 progress

EQUALITIES IMPACT NEEDS ASSESSMENT (EINA)

The findings of the Equalities Impact Needs Assessment carried out in respect of the Community Safety Partnership: Diversity groups can be overrepresented in the criminal justice system; The ASB list will be monitored for disproportionality. The ASB group will monitor the number of victims and perpetrators who are members of diversity groups and provide a standardisation for victim and witness support and for ASB action.

Work plans not included

Hate Crime Forum work plan, Operation Lockout work plan, and Tension Monitoring to follow as they still need to be finalised

APPENDIX 8

**PARTNERSHIP - INITIAL ASSESSMENT PROFORMA
EQUALITIES IMPACT NEEDS ASSESSMENT (EINA)**

1. Name of lead officer responsible for completing the initial assessment:

Anne Lawtey

2. Name of partnership under review

Community Safety Partnership

3. What is the origin / nature of the partnership?

- Required by statute
- Local arrangement to promote joint working
- Consultative Group/Forum
- Advisory Group/Forum
- Other, please specify

4. What are the key aims, objectives and activities of the partnership?

Reducing crime, disorder, Anti Social Behaviour and the fear of crime.

5. Who are the members of the partnership?

See attached list.

6. Who are the officers supporting the partnership?

Community Safety Partnership Team

7. Please refer to Richmond's Race Equality Scheme

a. Are the key activities or policies for which the partnership is responsible covered in the list of relevant functions set out in Appendix B (of the Scheme)?

Yes/No

b. Are the key activities or policies covered in the "Timetable for review of prioritised functions and policies" set out at Appendix C?

Yes

c. If so what action or progress has been taken?

This assessment produced.

8. Please refer to Richmond’s Corporate Equality & Diversity Action Plan 2004-5

a. Are the key activities of the partnership referred to in this plan?

Yes/No

b. What action / progress has been taken?

Consultation on strategy; work to reduce hate crime; all workgroups workplans refer to EINA and state how work addresses issues raised

9. Please refer to Richmond’s Community Plan 2007-17

a. Are the key activities or policies for which the partnership is responsible referred to in the Community Plan?

Yes/No

b. What action/progress has been taken?

Strategy delivered and new strategy developed

10. Is there evidence or reason to believe that the activities or policies for which this partnership is responsible could have higher or lower impact on any of the following groups:

	Y	H/L
• Age	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• People from ethnic minority backgrounds	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Women	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Disabled People	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Faith and or religious belief	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Sexual Orientation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

11. Is there evidence or reason to believe that the activities or policies for which this partnership is responsible are likely to have a positive impact on any of the following groups?

	Y/N	H/L
• Age	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• People from ethnic minority backgrounds	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Women	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Disabled People	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Faith and or religious belief	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Sexual Orientation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

12. Is there any evidence or reason to believe that different equality groups have different needs and experiences currently or potentially covered by the activities of this partnership?

	Y/N	H/L
• Age	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- People from ethnic minority backgrounds
- Women
- Disabled People
- Faith and or religious belief
- Sexual Orientation

12b. If so what is the evidence/reason?

See evidence in full assessment.

13. What if any evidence have you drawn from consultation exercises over the last 2 years with regard to the potential impact of the work of this partnership on equality groups?

Research carried out into Hate Crime; work to develop Tension Monitoring process; work to establish and support LGBT forum; Liaison with groups representing people with disabilities.

14. Has prior consultation taken place with organisations, groups or individuals, which indicates a potential or perceived problem that this partnership is likely to address?

Yes/No

15. if YES,

a. Who was consulted?

____BME communities; LGBT Forum, DEAP,

b. How was the consultation carried out?

_____Commissioned research; attending meetings and discussions

c. What was learnt from the consultation?

_____National research and findings confirmed as being relevant locally;

d. What, if any changes have been changed or proposed as a result of the consultation

Each working group is being asked to indicate how they have taken the findings of national research and local consultation into account in drawing up their work plans. Hate Crime Co-ordinator post written into workplan; links made with Adult Safeguarding and Local Safeguarding Board for children and young people

If no please state why no consultation was carried out.

16. Who do you regard as the main customers or service users affected by the activities of this partnership?

Residents of LBRuT; organisations and community groups; partner organisations.

17. Who do you regard as the main stakeholders in relation to this partnership area (i.e. internal or external colleagues or agencies with a stated interest in this partnership)?

Internal colleagues; external colleagues; police; probation; health etc.

18. What impact could or does the activities of this partnership have on Richmond staff from any of the equality groups?

Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act requires the local authority to minimise crime in its area, this includes reducing hate crime suffered in the workplace and directed at some of the equality groups identified. Members of staff who are also residents of the borough will be affected by the partnership's activities.

19. Data

a. What data have you been using to assess the impact of this partnership?

crime statistics and 3rd party reporting form data for hate crime

b. Are there any data gaps that you have identified?

Underreporting of criminal activity and reluctance to use 3rd party reporting forms

c. How could you seek to fill these data gaps?

Reviewing 3rd party reporting forms;

20. Are there any additional measures that can be adapted/undertaken to progress equality/diversity issues in this area?

Consideration given in all work to the impact on diversity groups.

21. In what ways could you promote good community/race relations in this area?

Responses to community tension indicators

Addressing community cohesion issues.

22. Please provide any further information that you think is relevant to the initial assessment.

23. From your assessment do you think a full assessment is needed? Please provide a full reason for your answers.

YES – range of national and local indicators of adverse impact demonstrates need for full EINA.

24. If a full assessment is not needed please provide an outline of any equality objectives, which have arisen from your initial assessment of gaps or further areas to progress. These need to also be included in the relevant Directorate equality/diversity action plan.

SIGN OFF

(For each name and date)

Project Manager: _____ Anne Lawtey April 2009

Project Sponsor: _____

Partnership

Chair _____

Executive Board: _____

**FULL ASSESSMENT REPORT
Community Safety Partnership EINA**

The final report should run to no more than 5 pages. This does not include any necessary attachments, which should be included as appendices. The partnership board or steering group will be keen to discuss the methodology, but particularly the findings and recommendations.

The recommended structure for the final report is as follows.

MAIN REPORT

1. Policy/service/function/area area under review
Community Safety Partnership

2. Summary findings of the initial review

A full EINA is required due to the impact of the subject on individuals.

3. Summary of the methodology used

Local research into racially motivated hate crime undertaken by Kusminder Chahal and submitted to the Race Equality Partnership.

Input from representatives of diversity groups into seminar consultation events and in discussions with the team;

Findings of a survey into bullying carried out by the Make a Positive Contribution Group of the Children and Young People's Strategic Partnership.

National research which is backed up by the findings of the above methods.

4. Key emerging issues via,

- analysis of data

The British Crime Survey shows:

Diversity groups are disproportionately affected by hate crimes there is a reluctance to report these to the police;;

- research, if any

An Alcohol Concern Report found that members of the LGBT community have specific needs relating to alcohol use – including higher levels of alcohol misuse which does not decline with age; specific personal stress factors put members of these communities at risk of alcohol abuse and there are a number of barriers to their seeking support.

MIND research has shown that people with mental health problems are 11 times more likely to be victimised than the population as a whole, with 22% of their respondents having been assaulted in the previous year compared to 3.6% of the population cited in the British Crime Survey.

In borough specific research members of BME communities resident in the borough are not confident about reporting hate crime to the police although they are suffering from this in line with national levels. In focus groups 90% of participants reporting experiencing racist incidents and/or harassment with only 60% reporting this.

- consultation route

MENCAP have informed us that people with learning disabilities are increasingly reporting hate crime directed to them;

The LGBT Forum have informed us that there are issues relating to domestic violence within same sex relationships that are not yet addressed locally; there are also issues around public sex environments and the risks of homophobic attacks.

5. Your findings

The experiences of members of diversity groups in this borough mirror the national picture in that they are the target of specific crimes; some groups have specific issues in connection with certain crimes and related factors; victims of crimes (particularly hate crime) from diversity groups have specific needs which are not always addressed to their satisfaction. Counter terrorism has been identified in the strategic assessment and there will be community cohesion issues and tension monitoring issues to be addressed in response to this issue.

6. Recommendations, including proposals for review

All working groups to demonstrate they have considered disproportionality in their workplans. Structured consultation to be included in communication strategy;

Recommendations to also include any additional measures that can be adapted/undertaken to progress equality/diversity issues in this area

The recruitment of a Hate Crime Co-ordinator will help address some of the issues identified;

All working groups will identify how the findings of this EINA have been taken into account in their work plans;

Regular Community Tension Monitoring will be undertaken looking at tension levels relating to race, faith, travellers, the LGBT community, young people (including gang activity) and issues relating to people with disabilities.

The communication strategy will include specific objectives relating to engagement with diversity groups.

7. Recommendations to also include in what ways you could promote good community/race relations in this area

Tension monitoring – see above;

Developing third party reporting;

Developing specific support for victims;

Work to increase community cohesion; and

Developing the Multi Agency Risk Assessment Conference process to include other vulnerable victims.

A Preventing Violent Extremism action plan will be produced.

APPENDICES

Include as appendices any of the following aspects:

1. The team

2. The initial assessment
3. Research data, if used and consultation responses, both staff and external consultees.

Team

Anne Lawtey, Community Planning Manager
Natasha Allen, Community Safety Manager
Hollie Phillips, Intelligence Manager
Kevin Fletcher-Biles, Community Safety Co-ordinator
Juliette Taylor, Community Safety Officer
Julie Brownbridge, Community Safety Officer
Peter Kirkham, Hate Crime Co-ordinator
James Rowlands, Domestic Abuse Co-ordinator
Robert Munday, Anti-social Behaviour Co-ordinator



Stakeholders Day
feedback report.doc

Members of the Community Safety Partnership Executive Group

LBRuT
Metropolitan Police Authority
Metropolitan Police Service
London Fire Brigade
London Probation
Richmond and Twickenham Primary Care Trust
Richmond Housing Partnership

APPENDIX FOR EINA

<http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/crime-victims/reducing-crime/hate-crime/>

http://www.ojp.gov/ovc/publications/infores/ServingVictimsWithDisabilities_bulletin/crime.html

<http://www.met.police.uk/contacts/LGBT.htm>

<http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs2/hosb802.pdf>

<http://www.crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/toolkits/fc100201.htm>

<http://www.copfs.gov.uk/About/Departmental-Overview/diversity/racist-crime/race-index>

<http://www.crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/partnerships34.htm>

[http://lcjb.cjonline.gov.uk/area24/library/Hate%20Crime%20\(Travellers\).pdf](http://lcjb.cjonline.gov.uk/area24/library/Hate%20Crime%20(Travellers).pdf)

<http://www.mpa.gov.uk/scrutinies/youth/>

<http://www.lga.gov.uk/lga/core/page.do?pagelD=840712>

<http://www.nya.org.uk/information/108998/109430/114639/114642/july08/>
<http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs08/hosb0708.pdf>

<http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/bcs1.html>

British Crime Survey

<http://www.crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/toolkits/fc0203.htm>

minorities and crime/fear of crime

<http://drugs.homeoffice.gov.uk/casestudies/diversity-rotherham?version=1>

BME and alcohol services

<http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/crime-victims/reducing-crime/hate-crime/>

hate crime

http://www.bbc.co.uk/ouch/closeup/disability_crime.shtml

disability and crime

<http://www.library.nhs.uk/learningdisabilities/ViewResource.aspx?resID=2702>

[77](#)

learning disabilities and crime

APPENDIX 9

Youth Offending in Richmond upon Thames

Development of programmes to reduce the risk of prevent re-offending

- YOT currently performing at Level 5, (highest), in reducing re-offending, (80%)
- Marked improvement in ETE form 75% in 06-07 cohort to 80.6% currently
- 100% of young offenders assessed for mental health
- 100% of young offenders receive substance misuse within timescales
- 100% in suitable accommodation
- Custody rate as a ratio of all sentences 2.6%

Successful provision of prevention work in schools

YOT deliver weekly group work sessions to Richmond House. The aim of these sessions is to work in partnership with the school supporting them with challenging young people, whilst also delivering interventions relating to offending behaviour. Many of these young people are current YOT clients or have been known to the YOT historically. Since the commencement of this academic year, (September 2007), there have been 15 young people worked with by the YOT as part of their education programme at Richmond House. 66.6% of these young people are/have been known to YOT. Since the commencement of the academic year re-offending rates within this cohort has been 0%.

In 2007, 5 young males were subject to ISSP disposals at Richmond House, 80% successfully completed the ISSP element, one remained subject to requirements.

Targeted work is being rolled out in all borough secondary schools, encompassing work on group offending. At this early stage comment cannot be made upon its benefit or success.

Challenges/Issues

Capacity ensures that regular group work and partnership work from YOT is not possible to all secondary schools.

How the challenges will be met

Recruitment of an education post has increased contact and support offered to all borough secondary schools. In addition the current presentations being delivered by YOT will hope to secure referral processes through to prevention services aiding early identification.

Both the YOT improvement plan, (recommendation 6), and Priority 10 of the Children's and Young Peoples Plan are thus adhered to by this provision.

Targeted work with Young People

Concern over alcohol related violence in young women manifested in disproportionate custody for females in the 2006-7 cohort. Females are approximately 20% of YOT population with 50% of all custodial sentences in this period being female.

YOT interventions include “binge drinking” workshops and targeted girls alcohol misuse group. Of total custodial sentences imposed in the 2007-8 period 0% have been female, further to which there have been no female remands. This meets the need for establishing targeted girls groups as per Priority 10 of the Children and Young People’s Plan.

Challenge/Issues

Whilst YOT have reduced the incidence of females entering custody, given that custody rates are very low in this Borough for young people small numbers can dramatically affect the figures. Our challenge is to continue supporting young women especially around targeted alcohol linked to violence offending. Secure remands will need to be reduced for male young people.

How the challenges will be met

A targeted girls group is currently in development and is due to commence at end of February 2008. Targeted work on those most at risk both through the Prevent and Deter strand and targeted girls group will continue. Further is in development regarding reducing remand rates across gender with additional training on Bail Support Packages and further substance misuse group work targeting males.

Prevent and Deter

Prevention of re-offending with highest risk young people. (Risk in this instance relates to risk of harm to public and risk of re-offending) through the prevent and deter work

Successes

44 young people have been referred to the Prevent and Deter scheme in 2007-8 period to date.

Of these only 20.45% have re-offended.

As of January 2008, 24 live cases.

100% of young people on the Prevent and Deter scheme engaged in positive recreational activity, support with ETE status and engage in group work. The group work requirement for independent living skills under priority 10 of the Children and young People’s Plan is also delivered on.

Good attendance on the Prevent and Deter panel ensures that a range of needs are supported for young people including substance misuse needs and accommodation and housing issues.

Delivery on a YOT Risk Management Board affords those at high risk to have management oversight and regular review of provision to manage the risk,

(YOT Improvement Plan 07, recommendation 3)

Challenges/Issues

Due to low numbers recidivism data is often disproportionately influenced by a small number of young people. Data at present also does not reflect relative decrease in offending, (ie its frequency for individual young people), and thus is not a true reflection of the reduction of re-offending. Funding for Prevent and Deter work has ceased and therefore capacity issues of the YOT to deliver such a concrete and intensive programme will be difficult.

How the challenges will be met:

The Youth Justice Board will begin performance measurement of relative re-offending, i.e. its frequency amongst individuals, as of September 2008 thereby reflecting a truer and more representative picture of re-offending by young people in this borough.

Prevention of offending

Victims

Successes

YOT have maintained their 100% satisfaction rating from victims. Following the YOT HMI inspection clear victim processes have been put in place and a diverse range of indirect reparation have been established whereby victims can repay the harm to the community at large. This is complimented by victim empathy interventions. Corporate victims have been identified for both reparative and restorative justice.

YOT have an identified police officer dedicated to working with victims including the offer of home visits and as such victim impact is addressed fully in 100% of pre sentence reports.

The YOT are in the process of establishing a victim steering group to support them with adopting a more comprehensive restorative framework. This is on track and due to commence in March 2008.

Challenges/issues:

The YOT need to recruit a more diverse referral panel coordinator base so as to represent the population of young people the YOT service.

Victim processes within YOT require a clearer format so that all timescales continue to be adhered to and victims receive a clear, efficient and comprehensive service from the YOT.

Restorative Justice practice needs to be embedded into the team practice via a higher frequency of restorative conferences and direct mediation with victims and offenders. Victims will need to be consulted with in order to take account their needs.

How the challenges will be met:

In order to undertake comprehensive Restorative Justice and a full service to

victims and young people comprehensive RJ training will be undertaken by the entire team and Referral Panel volunteers.
Clear and confidential recording of all work with victims shall be undertaken with a clear follow up policy when requested.

Restorative conferencing will be offered within the Referral Order panel. Final Warnings, Community Orders and Custodial sentences will also offer safe, supported direct mediation with victims.

An article will be published in the local press discussing both benefit and mechanism of restorative justice, this will encompass a recruitment drive for further referral order panel member volunteers.

Victims will be given the opportunity to comment and discuss the restorative process offered by the YOT and a report highlighting findings and analysis of the victim cohort will be prepared.

This will adhere to priority 10 of the Children and Young Peoples Plan and recommendation 8 of the YOT Improvement Plan 07.

Reducing offending, preventative work

Key performance indicator:

Reducing number of First Time Entrants into the system by 5%

Successes

Full comprehensive analysis of First Time Entrants to the youth justice system being undertaken will ensure targeted prevention provision.
Interventions offered to schools will alert all young people to the consequences of offending and also help to support and reinforce correct referral pathways for young people at risk of offending.

Challenges/issues:

2006-7 enjoyed a very positive year in reducing the rate of First Time Entrants and exceeded the expected reduction set by the Youth Justice Board of a 5% reduction significantly, (20%). This has impacted upon reductions in 2008. 2007-8 continue to struggle to meet further reductions upon this figure.

How the challenges will be met:

Full analysis of First Time entrants will be completed and referral pathways in identified areas will be developed onto the YISP.
Early identification will ensue challenges in terms of meeting the needs of young people and ensuring partner agencies are alert to risk of offending and referring appropriately.

Inserted in 2009 update

APPENDIX

SUMMARY OF TARGETS AND ACTIONS TO BE TAKEN IN 2009/10

Community Plan target

To be the safest London borough measured by the total number of crimes per 1000 head of population by the Home Office iQuanta system.

Reported monthly.

National Indicator definitions may be found at the following website:

<http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/localgovernment/indicatorsdefinitions>

Local Area Agreement Indicator targets

NI 16 Serious Acquisitive Crime

Graph to be inserted showing

2007/8 baseline figure

2008/9 achievement (*to be inserted when confirmed in July 2009*)

Trajectory for next two years

The MPS set a target for each borough for this indicator. The Community Safety Partnership will adopt the police target when confirmed (May 2009). The graph above will be kept 'live' in the electronic version of this Plan.

NI20 Assault causing injury

Crime

Graph to be inserted showing

2007/8 baseline figure (*to be updated with 2008/09 baseline due to crime recording changes affecting assaults since 1st April 2009*)

2008/9 achievement (*this will now be a baseline and inserted when confirmed in July 2009*)

Trajectory for next two years

The MPS set a target for each borough for this indicator. The Community Safety Partnership will adopt the police target when confirmed (May 2009). The graph above will be kept 'live' in the electronic version of this Plan.

NI21 Confidence that the police and local authority are tackling concerns about crime and antisocial behaviour.

The Community Safety Partnership aims to be the best in London for this figure. A target for improvement may be set in negotiation with Government Office for London to be confirmed by June 2009.

Update to be included in electronic version of this Plan.

In line with the national move to reduce the number of indicators, these are our key measurements of performance. The workplans of each group will be

kept up to date and posted on the web site. These will show the progress each group is making towards delivering the outcomes above.

This page is intentionally left blank