

Report from Stakeholder Group meeting

12th November 2008

1. Background to Stakeholder Group

The word 'Stakeholder' is on the list to be avoided from the Plain English Campaign. They suggest that the word 'people' should be used instead. However, the dictionary definition is 'somebody or something with direct interest, a person or group with a direct interest, involvement or investment in something.'

The Stakeholder Group of the Community Safety Partnership is made up of representatives of organisations that have direct interest, involvement and investment in community safety in Richmond upon Thames. For that reason the word is the most accurate description.

The purpose of the Stakeholder Group is to ensure the work of the Community Safety Partnership reflects the reality of life for those who live or work in, or visit, Richmond upon Thames. The Stakeholder Group are a consultative body, who also act as critical friends to the Responsible Authorities for community safety¹ and those other key organisations (Probation Service, Registered Social Landlords) who form the Strategy Group of the Community Safety Partnership.

The members of the Stakeholder Group also have the ability to take steps to reduce crime and anti-social behaviour and/or to support victims. The Stakeholder Group meetings give them opportunities to identify these steps and commit to taking them.

2. Stakeholder Group meeting 12th November 2008

The meeting was held to present the initial findings from the update to the Strategic Assessment which sets out the analysis of a range of information and prioritises issues for the Community Safety Partnership.

Any analysis is likely to raise a number of questions, and the Stakeholder Group members have a role to play in asking those questions and providing some of the solutions to the challenges/issues raised.

¹ Local Authority, Police Service, Police Authority, Primary Care Trust, Fire Authority.

This report sets out the views of the Stakeholder Group members present and is the basis for consultation on the update of the Community Safety Partnership Plan.

3. Findings of the Strategic Assessment.

4. People's expectations of this first Stakeholder Group meeting

4.1 We asked – what do you want from this meeting and this group

4.2 We were told that those attending:

- had an interest in specific issues (young people; alcohol; anti-social behaviour);
- wanted to know what other organisations were doing about community safety;
- wanted to have a say in the future work of the Community Safety Partnership;
- wanted to know how their organisation could work with others to improve community safety; and
- Wanted to examine how we manage expectations.

Other feedback included suggestions for improving future events, such as sending out papers in advance and being clearer in pre-event publicity about the purpose of the day.

4.3 As a result:

Terms of Reference will be drawn up and circulated (these will address all those groups that are required to participate or the Community Safety Partnership is required to invite to participate;

For the next event in April an agenda will be sent out to all those attending one week before the event.

5. **Identified gaps and issues coming from the Strategic Assessment**

5.1 We asked – what are the information gaps in the Strategic Assessment that and what challenges can you identify for the Community Safety Partnership.

5.2 We were told:

5.2.1 Gaps

- Information about drugs markets;
- How crime figures relate to the day time population of the borough;
- How perceptions are measured and managed;
- How will economic downturn affect crime and anti-social behaviour;
- Information about what we are doing right;
- Deeper analysis of town centre hot spots;

5.2.2 Challenges

- Impact of media on fear of crime;

- Cross border work;
- How we communicate across borders;
- Engaging with the public (particularly those who are not members of organised groups);
- How SNT priorities fit into this process;
- Questions as to why anti-social behaviour was not identified as a priority in this process;
- Questions as to whether cctv and/or introduction of SNTs have increased reported crime.

5.3 We asked – what would you prioritise?

- Earlier interventions
- anti-social behaviour
- media management
- Violent crime
- Motor vehicle crime
- Cross border work with other boroughs and forces
- Underreported crime
- Town centres/night time economy
- Improved data gathering/sharing

Questions were raised as to why terrorism was a priority, with comments that the reasons need to be made clearer.

5.4 As a result:

The Community Safety Partnership workplan for the year will include considerable emphasis on anti-social behaviour; communications and information sharing.

The Community Safety Partnership Plan update will also set out why terrorism is a priority.

6. Anti-social behaviour

6.1 Early intervention

6.1.1 We asked – how can we intervene earlier?

6.1.2 We were told:

- Earlier liaison with parents and support;
- Risk assess new tenants;
- Use the Common Assessment Framework (CAF) as an indicator of anti-social behaviour;
- Joint tasking;
- Encourage reporting of low level anti-social behaviour;
- Reinforcing what is appropriate and inappropriate behaviour;
- More information sharing between police and other agencies over problems at an earlier stage;
- Look at relationship between young people (particularly boys) with dyslexia and anti-social behaviour;
- Improve tolerance of young people

6.2 Reporting

6.1.1 We asked for how people would like to report anti-social behaviour

6.2.2 We were told

- Web;
- Email;
- Through more agencies;
- Hot line or one stop shop;
- Anonymous or third party reporting;
- Single form for any reporting mechanism;
- Whichever methods, they need to be well publicised;
- Police non emergency number;
- Central council contact number – similar to police non emergency number;

6.2 Expectations from reporting

6.2.1 We asked – when you report anti-social behaviour what would you want to see happen in an ideal world?

6.2.2 We were told:

- Speedy response;
- Information shared with other organisations;
- Mediation offered;
- Action plan to tackle problem;
- Standardised diary sheet;
- Feedback to victim at all stages;
- Support offered to victims;
- Information provided to victim about what happens next;
- Work of Anti-Social Behaviour Panel to be publicised.

There was also concern about anti-social behaviour in private sector housing.

6.3 Priorities

6.3.1 We asked – what should the priorities be?

6.3.2 We were told:

- Work to improve cross generational understanding;
- Outreach
- Youth activities to divert young people;
- Data sharing
- Publicity
- Mediation

6.4 As a result:

The Community Safety Partnership team workplan will include a review of anti-social behaviour and change the current system to include many of the suggestions made above.

7 Domestic Abuse

7.1 Measuring confidence

7.1.1 We asked – how should the Community Safety Partnership measure ‘confidence’ in the reporting of domestic abuse.

7.1.2 We were told:

- Continue to measure and review the expected level against the actual level;
- Ensure reports reflect the demographics of the borough;
- Use of borough schemes by victims;
- Investigate data (e.g. to see if there are repeat cautions);
- Comparison with other courts;
- Investigate national expected figure and compare with other similar areas;
- Increase in conviction rate;
- Sample surveys

Suggestions for increasing reporting included:

- Publicise successes
- Make housing situation clearer
- Schools initiative;
- More victim support.
- Refuge for men

7.2 Perpetrators

7.2.1 We asked – how should we deal with perpetrators?

7.2.2 We were told:

- Conditional cautions;
- Voluntary programmes;
- Publicise help available;
- Publicise ‘what works’;
- Liaise with CPS and courts over sentences – publicise policy;
- Emphasise social stigma;
- Change tenancy agreements to victims remains in home;

7.3 Increasing reporting among under represented groups

7.3.1 We asked – how do we increase reporting among under-represented groups such as LGBT and affluent communities;

7.3.2 We were told:

- More publicity about Victim Support capabilities and specialisms;
- Address issue of stereotyping
- Clear channels of communication
- Publicise success stories
- Address perception and toleration of abuse;
- Reduce stigma of reporting incidents;
- One stop shop;
- Work with LGBT forum;
- Link to vulnerable adults work;
- Focused info for groups;
- Target where they are – gyms, hair dressers, etc.
- Identify a champion from relevant community;

- Training on LGBT abuse.
- Encourage neighbours to report.

7.4 As a result:

The feedback above will be used by the Domestic Abuse Forum when planning their work for 2009/10.

8 Acquisitive Crime

8.1 What else can be done

8.1.1 We asked – what else can we do to reduce acquisitive crime?

8.1.2 We were told:

Raise awareness of Selecta DNA;

Investigate how sale of Selecta DNA can be promoted;

Develop Christmas campaign by getting more new year property marking achieved, e.g. schools.

Extend property marking to public facing staff in other boroughs;

Examine what is contained in 'theft other' and tackle;

Reinvigorate neighbourhood watch schemes with a role in tackling property crime;

Take stronger line on burglaries or motor vehicle crime where property/vehicle left insecure;

Use voluntary sector (e.g. Key Strategic Organisations) to publicise work.

Tackle prolific offenders;

Scan for potential impact of financial situation.

8.2 Reaching a plateau

8.2.1 We asked – when do we accept that we have reached a plateau?

8.2.2 We were told:

- We should not accept this – we need to maintain initiatives;
- Priorities can shift;
- Need to analyse remaining risks;
- Look at cost benefit analysis;
- Opportunity to tackle other acquisitive crime;

8.3 next steps when/if a plateau is reached

8.3.1 We asked what do we do when/if we reach a plateau?

8.3.2 We were told:

- Keep going to keep a lid on the problem;
- Concentrate on wider preventative measures, particularly around drugs;
- Publicise low levels of crime.

8.4 As a result:

Operation Lockout will consider the points above;

The next Strategic Assessment will include more information about 'theft other'.

9 Community Engagement – engaging with discrete communities

9.1 We asked: how can we engage with discrete communities (for example businesses; visitors; people who work here; students?)

9.2 We were told:

- Develop an online Police Liaison Group;
- Make links with colleges and universities
- Contact victims of crime
- Attend business fairs;
- Identify major employers;
- Make contact through general online forums, particularly those aimed at young people;
- Advertise in doctors' surgeries;
- Link with overseas visitors and expats;
- Take meeting to the community (pubs, faith buildings);
- Link to tourism based businesses
- Link with voluntary/community groups such as Rotary or Trade Associations;
- Work out what the message is and what information they want;
- Identify Champions;
- Feed information into PLGs from other forums;
- Clear rules of engagement for all agencies/organisations
- Email groups and social networks
- Joint publicity or patrolling;
- Recognise that people only turn up in large numbers when there is a burning issue;
- Link with Chamber of Commerce;
- Take advantage of other events;
- Social events – Christmas Party for Police Liaison Groups;
- Link with faith leaders and faith events (coffee mornings etc).
- Magistrates identified as an unengaged group – should a community impact statement be attached to case files?
- SNT surgeries

9.3 Priorities for community engagement work

- Incentives/inducements to participate;
- Identify local issues;
- Identify particular crimes linked to groups (businesses and shoplifting; students and violent crime)
- Identify new arrivals and places where they gather;
- Feedback results of engagement;
- Define engagement and set boundaries and ground rules
- More imaginative outreach;
- More recognition for ward priorities and links to overall priorities;
- Engage with faith groups.

9.3 As a result:

The Community Safety Partnership workplan will include the development of a Communications Strategy. The Strategy will include a number of the suggestions above.

10. Results from Stakeholder event

The following are direct results of this event.

Terms of Reference to be prepared for the Stakeholder Group.

Anti-social behaviour Review to be carried out

Workplan for Domestic Abuse Forum to consider feedback

Communications Strategy to be prepared.

Operation Lockout to consider feedback.

Theft Other to be analysed in more detail.

Information Sharing review to be planned.

The Community Safety Partnership team will report on progress at the next Stakeholder Event which will be held on 22nd April 2009. An agenda will be sent one week before the event to all those who have reserved places.

To reserve a place please contact community.safety@richmond.gov.uk

If you would prefer to attend an evening event please let us know on the same address.

The Community Safety Partnership Team can also be contacted on 020 8891 7777.