

AGENDA

SAFER PLYMOUTH PARTNERSHIP



Date: 21 January 2016

Time: 10 am – 1 pm

Place: Warspite Room, Council House, Plymouth * indicates paperwork included

Item	Subject	Who	Decision Required	Time (approx)
1	Welcome/Introductions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mel Joyner Bronwyn Prosser – new SP meeting facilitator. Apologies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None received at time of publication. 	Chair/AB	None.	10.00-10.05
2	Minutes and actions from of Last Meeting – 24.9.2015 *. (Pages 1 - 4)	Chair/AB	Agree minutes as accurate and discuss matters arising.	10.05-10.15
Agenda Items for Discussion:				
3	Domestic Abuse/Violence * – update from review. (Pages 5 – 8)	SW	To note and discuss SP's contribution in addressing gaps and risks.	10.15-10.30
4	Locality Issue * – Rolled over from last meeting - Discussion paper from Pete Aley. (Pages 9– 10)	PA	SP to consider report and next steps.	10.30-10.45
5	CSE Organised Crime Profile - SP to consider oversight and contribution to the work of PSCB.	AB/JH	To discuss PSCB CSE action plan priorities and SP contribution.	10.45-11.00
6	Sexual Predators – Discussion to be led by Mel Joyner of Plymouth University re concerns around North Hill and Campus.	MJ	To consider partnership contribution and added value in addressing key concerns.	11.00 – 11.20
BREAK				
7	Safer Plymouth * - next steps in our development. (Pages 11- 16)	PA	Consider recommendations and make decisions on next steps.	11.30 – 12.45
8	Election of Chair – AB agreed to be interim chair in July 2015 while the board considers the next steps as above.	AB/JH	Post the above to agree chair and length of tenure.	12.45 – 13.00
BRIEFINGS (DISCUSS BY EXCEPTION ONLY):				
9	None Scheduled.	N/a	N/a	N/a
10	Dates of Future Meetings: (All meetings will commence at 10 am. Venues TBC). Thursday 14 April 2016			

SAFER PLYMOUTH PARTNERSHIP

Draft Minutes from Meeting held on Thursday 24 September
2015



Present:	<p>Chief Superintendent Andy Boulting, Devon and Cornwall Police (Chair) Councillor Philippa Davey, Cabinet Member for Safer and Stronger Communities (PCC) Sarah Hopkins, Community Safety and Partnerships Manager (PCC) Katey Johns, Democratic Support Officer (PCC) Georgia Webb, National Probation Service Nick Jones, Devon and Somerset Fire and Rescue Services Danny Slay, Devon and Somerset Fire and Rescue Services Heather Welch, Victim Services Manager, Plymouth Judith Harwood, Assistant Director for Learning and Communities (PCC)</p>
Apologies:	<p>Susan Moores, Octopus Project (ZEBRA) Ian Ansell, Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner Nicola Jones, New Devon CCG, NHS Charlotte Coker, Dorset, Devon and Cornwall Community Rehabilitation Company Pete Aley, Head of Neighbourhood and Community Services Mel Joyner, University of Plymouth</p>
The meeting started at 10.10 am and finished at 1.10 pm	
<p>Note: At a future meeting, the partnership will consider the accuracy of these draft minutes so they may be subject to change. Please check the minutes of that meeting to confirm whether these minutes have been amended.</p>	
29	<p>Welcome / Introductions</p> <p>The Chair welcomed everyone present and asked for introductions round the table. It was suggested and <u>agreed</u> that, in light of the number of apologies submitted, the agenda is reorganised as follows –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Item 3 : Sexual Predators – deferred • Item 6 : Strategic Assessment 2015/16 – move item forward to immediately after consideration of the minutes • Item 7 : In Plain Sight - information only paper to be read in own time • New Item – CSE and link to Safeguarding Board – to be added for consideration after Item 8 : Quality Hotel
30	<p>Minutes of Previous Meeting</p> <p><u>Agreed</u> the notes of the meeting held on Thursday 23 July 2015.</p>

31	<p>Safer Plymouth Strategic Assessment 2015/16 – Strategic Priorities</p>								
	<p>The Board considered the strategic assessment which aimed to provide an accurate and realistic evaluation of the significant crime, disorder and substance misuse issues that may impact the partnership over the next 12 months as well as taking account of the areas which had impacted on the partnership over the last 12 months. Its key role was to inform the Safer Plymouth Partnership of the key areas of community safety that it should be focussing on for the coming year.</p> <p>The emerging areas of focus were highlighted as –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Child sexual exploitation • Modern slavery • Impact of mental health on community safety issues • Cyber crime <p>The paper set out a number of recommendations which were discussed by the Board and <u>agreed</u> as follows –</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="319 806 1420 1624"> <tr> <td data-bbox="319 806 399 952">(1)</td> <td data-bbox="399 806 1420 952">Safer Plymouth to adopt the emerging areas of focus as areas of partnership work;</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="319 952 399 1164">(2)</td> <td data-bbox="399 952 1420 1164">Safer Plymouth to commission work to assess and identify the most appropriate and effective development and delivery mechanism/forum for all the agreed areas of focus and receives recommendations back at the next meeting;</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="319 1164 399 1422">(3)</td> <td data-bbox="399 1164 1420 1422">that the established areas of focus should continue to be adopted by the Board as areas of priority and co-ordinated partnership work with the proviso that they could be subject to change should circumstances change and there is a need to review the Partnership's areas of focus/priority;</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="319 1422 399 1624">(4)</td> <td data-bbox="399 1422 1420 1624">to sign off in principle the strategic assessment, specifically agreeing the areas of focus and the supporting narrative content. In addition, Safer Plymouth agrees to provide appropriate feedback to the author regarding the recommendations for each area of focus (emerging and established) and on any changes or additional content.</td> </tr> </table> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>(This item was brought forward and taken immediately after the minutes).</u></p>	(1)	Safer Plymouth to adopt the emerging areas of focus as areas of partnership work;	(2)	Safer Plymouth to commission work to assess and identify the most appropriate and effective development and delivery mechanism/forum for all the agreed areas of focus and receives recommendations back at the next meeting;	(3)	that the established areas of focus should continue to be adopted by the Board as areas of priority and co-ordinated partnership work with the proviso that they could be subject to change should circumstances change and there is a need to review the Partnership's areas of focus/priority;	(4)	to sign off in principle the strategic assessment, specifically agreeing the areas of focus and the supporting narrative content. In addition, Safer Plymouth agrees to provide appropriate feedback to the author regarding the recommendations for each area of focus (emerging and established) and on any changes or additional content.
(1)	Safer Plymouth to adopt the emerging areas of focus as areas of partnership work;								
(2)	Safer Plymouth to commission work to assess and identify the most appropriate and effective development and delivery mechanism/forum for all the agreed areas of focus and receives recommendations back at the next meeting;								
(3)	that the established areas of focus should continue to be adopted by the Board as areas of priority and co-ordinated partnership work with the proviso that they could be subject to change should circumstances change and there is a need to review the Partnership's areas of focus/priority;								
(4)	to sign off in principle the strategic assessment, specifically agreeing the areas of focus and the supporting narrative content. In addition, Safer Plymouth agrees to provide appropriate feedback to the author regarding the recommendations for each area of focus (emerging and established) and on any changes or additional content.								
32	<p>Sexual Predators</p>								
	<p>Item Deferred (minute 29 above refers)</p>								
33	<p>Quality Hotel</p>								
	<p>The Board received an update on the latest situation with regard to the Quality Hotel site following the most recent fire. Members were advised that –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • since the hotel closed and security moved off site there had been numerous 								

incidents of vandalism, arson and anti-social behaviour;

- there was asbestos in the building and whilst this was of no risk to anyone living nearby it was a danger to anyone entering the building (urban explorers / rough sleepers);
- in order to try and address concerns raised by residents and concerned citizens, a public meeting was held involving a number of partner agencies such as public health, planning, police and fire;
- under S215 of the Town and Country Planning Act the owner had been served with an enforcement notice to board up the hotel and tidy the site. Whilst this had been done, the site was still being accessed putting trespassers and the property at risk;
- consideration was being given to Public Space Protection Orders and Defaulter’s Work but both of those had cost implications;
- whilst everything legislatively possible was being done to ensure the current owners were maintaining their responsibility for the site, the Council was conscious of the fact that it did not want to upset the owner nor deter any potential buyers from working with the authority.

The following issues were highlighted during the discussion –

(a)	the building was in a prominent location on The Hoe and did not present a very good public image of the City to tourists or those arriving at Millbay on the ferry;
(b)	the Fire Service was in the process of compiling an ‘empty buildings’ register which would inform them if the premises were used by rough sleepers, for drug taking or anti-social behaviour;

With regard to (b) above, it was suggested that the ‘empty buildings’ register would be a useful document for agencies to share, particularly the Community Safety Partnership with regards anti-social behaviour.

Members were asked to give consideration to how the Board (or individual partners) could help address the Quality Hotel site or other similar sites in the City and contact either the Chair or Sarah with any suggestions.

34

Domestic Abuse

The Chair tabled a position paper on Domestic Abuse and the role of the Plymouth Domestic Abuse Partnership. The aim of the Plymouth Domestic Abuse Partnership was to improve the range and quality of services for people affected by domestic abuse. The report set out the Partnership’s current service delivery and performance position against targets.

Concerns were raised in regard to –

- only one performance target had been set;
- the low number of convictions;
- the lack of a perpetrator programme;

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the number of incidents witnessed by children and subsequent costs incurred from bringing those children into care; correlation between DA incidents and alcohol/substance misuse. <p>It was suggested that there were opportunities for some quick wins within Domestic Abuse and that it should therefore be looked at as a 'wicked issue'.</p> <p><u>Agreed</u> that a sub-group comprising the Chair, Judith Harwood and Heather Welch is formed to look at Domestic Abuse, to include –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> visits with members of the Plymouth Domestic Abuse Partnership / attend a meeting; talk to key individuals working in that field; look at relevant documents / data / funding; visiting a DA refuge; offender perspective. 				
35		“In Plain Sight – Training and Outreach Practitioner”				
		The briefing paper was noted (minute 29 above refers).				
		AOB				
36		CSE and Link to Safeguarding Children’s Board				
		<p>Further to previous discussions on this item and Minute 27, Judith Harwood proposed that, as she sat on both the Safer Plymouth Partnership Board and the Safeguarding Children’s Board, she act as a link between the two. Working with Charlie Pitman, who had been appointed Chair of the SCB sub-group looking at CSE, with whom links were already well established, the two could review the strategy and liaise on how and where the Partnership could add value.</p> <p>The Board <u>agreed</u> –</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="316 1406 1422 1659"> <tr> <td>(1)</td> <td>Judith Harwood would represent the Safer Plymouth Partnership Board and act as its link to the Safeguarding Children’s Board.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(2)</td> <td>to look at the CSE action plan at its next meeting in January 2016.</td> </tr> </table>	(1)	Judith Harwood would represent the Safer Plymouth Partnership Board and act as its link to the Safeguarding Children’s Board.	(2)	to look at the CSE action plan at its next meeting in January 2016.
(1)	Judith Harwood would represent the Safer Plymouth Partnership Board and act as its link to the Safeguarding Children’s Board.					
(2)	to look at the CSE action plan at its next meeting in January 2016.					
37		Locality Issue				
		Item deferred to next meeting.				
38		Dates of Future Meetings				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thursday 21 January 2016 Thursday 14 April 2016 <p>All meetings commence at 10 am.</p>				

SAFER PLYMOUTH PARTNERSHIP

Domestic Abuse (DA) Review Outcome



At the Safer Plymouth Partnership Board meeting on the 24.9.2015 a discussion was held concerning Domestic Abuse (DA) following the submission of a paper compiled by DCI Ben Deer as the Chair of the Strategic Plymouth Domestic Abuse Partnership. The paper identified points for discussion by the Board as to what work is being carried out by agencies in the City in order to safeguard victims and children.

Plymouth Domestic Abuse service (PDAS) provides services to victims in the City. The majority of the referrals come from the Police. However recently there has been an increase in self referrals and those from other agencies including Children's Centres. The service will accept high and medium risk victims. Currently the 'take up' of the PDAS service is 78%, PDAS make 4 attempts to contact victims at a variety of times. PDAS submit monthly figures on a quarterly basis and contract review meetings are held on a quarterly basis. The Partnership is able to compare the number of referrals to the number of crimes and incidents recorded by the Police. PDAS are delivering Early Intervention and Prevention programmes in City schools which is funded by 'Children in Need'. This work is based the RESPECT initiative and looks at healthy relationships, it is designed by and for young people.

Nationally it is known that victims suffer on average 35 incidents before reporting to the authorities. The benefits to the City of multi-agency DASH training is that we know DA is identified at an earlier point in the offending and assistance given to the victim in other settings e.g. Children's Centres. Victims are reporting earlier in the offending and the number of DA crimes within the City is increasing demonstrating more victims are willing to report incidents to the Police. We are also delivering awareness sessions throughout the City e.g. DA Awareness Week, Valentines' Day and Community days.

The impact of Plymouth Domestic Abuse Partnership (PDAP) has been to look at innovative ways to improve services provided to victims across the City and to encourage earlier reporting, this has included the provision of a worker from PDAS now sited within the Police team at Charles Cross Police Station. This means workers are able to visit the victim whilst the perpetrator is in Custody. Links are also made to

other programmes and members targets e.g. the Families with a Future (FWAF) PBR5 target 'That the Family is not subjected to Domestic Violence and Abuse' and that the Domestic Violence, Sexual Abuse, Stalking and Harassment and Honour base violence (DASH) risk assessment score falls below 14. As part of this we have trained FWAF team members to be able to complete DASH forms. FWAF also attend the partnership meetings.

The Commissioning of the City's Domestic Abuse Service is undertaken by the Councils Safer Plymouth and Joint Commissioning teams, funding is from the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner Grant via Safer Plymouth and from Joint Commissioning funding. There are some concerns about this funding in the present economic climate about at the time of writing no funding has been withdrawn.

The identified gap in the delivery of DA services is the lack of perpetrator programme in the City for those people not in the Criminal Justice system for their DA offending. At present the Joint Commissioning team are exploring a range of perpetrator programmes looking at cost and evaluations. The Splitz programme delivered in Devon has been identified as being one of the more expensive courses and to date there has been no monitoring of clients to ascertain if there has been change in their offending behaviour. This is ongoing work which is a priority for the City.

**SUPPORT SERVICES FOR VICTIMS
IDVA DATA COLLECTION FORM**

Name of IDVA Service - PLYMOUTH DOMESTIC ABUSE SERVICE

Referral Data - to be collected in the month of referral

	Apr-14	May-14	Jun-14	Jul-14	Aug-14	Sep-14	Oct-14	Nov-14	Dec-14	Jan-15	Feb-15	Mar-15
Number of referrals by source:												
Police	198	144	113	216	175	166	163	197	240	98	117	132
MARAC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Health	1	1	3	3	0	2	5	8	3	2	2	2
Other DV or SV Service	0	1	3	3	3	0	0	8	0	0	7	14
Housing	2	3	2	5	3	4	2	4	1	2	3	3
Children and Young People's Service's	5	2	4	8	7	1	7	9	5	4	5	6
Self	30	36	50	36	39	21	19	22	25	39	35	41
Other	5	17	9	11	11	13	17	5	20	19	7	11
Total number of referrals	241	204	184	282	238	207	213	253	294	164	176	209
Number of re-referrals	2	3	3	4	5	0	1	8	2	5	5	3
% of total referrals which are referrals	1%	1%	2%	1%	2%	0%	0%	3%	1%	3%	3%	1%
Number of referrals successfully contacted by IDVA service this month	172	159	137	220	166	146	166	178	212	132	130	178
Number of referrals uncontactable (4 attempts/methods at different times of the day)	69	45	47	62	72	61	47	75	82	32	46	31
Number of referrals not accepting support	88	58	33	68	74	58	86	70	87	60	34	26
% of Referrals contacted by IDVA service both successful and unsuccessful	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Engagement Data	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of referrals engaging with service	172	159	137	220	166	146	166	178	212	132	130	178
% of referrals emgaging with the service	71%	78%	74%	78%	70%	71%	78%	70%	72%	80%	74%	85%
Number of referrals that are High Risk or Very High Risk on IDVA assessment	5	10	5	9	8	9	8	9	7	7	5	2
% of referrals that are HR/VHR	2%	5%	3%	3%	3%	4%	4%	4%	2%	4%	3%	1%
Number of clients referred to DAAP	65	88	83	4	4	9	0	0	0	5	4	4
MARAC Data	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of IDVA clients that were reviewed at MARAC	25	15	34	22	29	44	19	26	17	11	14	9
% of IDVA clients reviewed at MARAC	15%	9%	25%	10%	17%	30%	11%	15%	8%	8%	11%	5%
Number of IDVA clients that were repeat MARAC victims	8	5	10	6	11	18	5	4	3	4	4	1
% of Number of IDVA clients that were repeated MARAC victims	5%	3%	7%	3%	7%	12%	3%	2%	1%	3%	3%	1%
Criminal Court Related Support	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of IDVA clients who were involved in the court process	15	27	23	29	20	17	17	27	28	17	18	16
% IDVA clients involved in the court process	9%	17%	17%	13%	12%	12%	10%	15%	13%	14%	14%	9%
Number of IDVA clients supported through this process by the IDVA	11	24	21	28	18	11	11	27	24	17	18	16
Out of the above number how many withdrew from the process	4	1	0	1	2	2	2	0	1	1	0	0
% of IDVA clients supported through the Court Process	73%	89%	91%	97%	90%	65%	65%	100%	86%	100%	100%	100%
% of IDVA clients withdrawing from the Court Process	36%	4%	0%	4%	10%	12%	12%	0%	4%	6%	0%	0%

This page is intentionally left blank

Stonehouse Report

Neighbourhood profile

Stonehouse is characterised by high levels of deprivation, ranked the second most deprived neighbourhood in the city on the IMD, with higher than average low income homes, low levels of educational attainment, and a higher than average mortality rate. It has a higher proportion of younger people than the city average particularly in the 20–30 age group. The housing mix indicates a higher proportion of flats than elsewhere in the city, making up 70% of accommodation, the majority of the rest being terraced housing. There is also a high number of empty properties. The area is under-served by GP's compared to other areas in the city.

Stonehouse has been described as a collection of different 'neighbourhoods', with Union St acting as a physical divide between communities – statistics between the north and south of Union St are different. Stonehouse also contains the historic area of Stonehouse Peninsula. There is no library or community centre, and there is a lack of housing development sites.

Figures from 2012-13 unless stated

- Population of 10,476: 55.2% male, 44.8 % female
- 23.9% claiming benefit compared to city average of 11%
- Rate of ASB of 94.6 per 1000 population, compared to a city wide figure of 39.5
- Rate of all crime 208.3 per 1000 population compared to a city wide figure of 72.4
- Rate of children in need is 1,408 per 10,000 population aged 0-17
- Life expectancy 2010-12 was 77.8, compared to city figure of 80.5
- 34.6% of private sector homes classed as non- decent in 2010 compared to city average of 33.3%
- The rate of all clients in receipt of care packages was 423 per 10,000 population as compared to a city wide figure of 354.5
- 35.5% of pupils achieved 5 or more A* – C grades at GCSE compared to a city wide figure of 61.1%

Community Infrastructure

There are a number of resident and 'friends' groups: Stonehouse Residents Association, North Rd West Residents Association, Royal William Yard Residents Association, Friends of Devonport Park, High St flats informal group, Millfields Residents Association, Friends of Wyndham Sq (not met for a while), Stonehouse Action – support all of Stonehouse but main aim is to connect old and new communities, eg Millbay and Union St area.

Centres

Oasis – foodbank, lunches, provide advice and support, Union Corner – set up by Stonehouse Action as a space for community activity and volunteering, Manor St Childrens Centre, Fredrick St Youth Centre

Clubs

Stonehouse Tennis Club – opening up to local people eg free tennis lessons for local children

Other

Timebank, Millfields Inspired - new charity set up by CEDT, George House homeless hostel – very active and keen on linking with wider community, Stonehouse Play Association, Creative Arts School also housing Pride, REC and Street Factory.

Collaborative enforcement pilot

Proposal for pilot in city centre and Stonehouse agreed by Cabinet in Dec 2014, working on the ‘don’t walk by’ principle for all partner agencies. Agreed priorities are legal highs, abandoned vehicles, engagement and review of data sets.

Community views about priorities:

1000 houses were door knocked in May 2015. The biggest issues are as follows:

- Parking - including parking permits with limited residents parking, signage and rights of carers visiting clients
- Rubbish collection – rubbish left after bin collections, some fly tipping hot spots, residents leaving bins out
- Drugs
- Drunken or rowdy behaviour

Safer Plymouth - next steps in our development

DATE: 21 Jan 2016



Introduction

This paper seeks to highlight some issues and associated pointers for discussion, to help move Safer Plymouth's development forward.

Background

Following on-going discussions about the need for Safer Plymouth to change the way it goes about business, the Board's meeting on 23rd July considered a paper about development of the Partnership.

This noted..... "members' desire to move to a more dynamic and innovative way of working (and away from a "committee" style approach to meetings. Although the partnership has adopted principles of systems leadership, we have yet to fully realise the potential for this to change our approach. Members have indicated their desire to work more collaboratively with wider partnerships and agendas e.g. Safeguarding Boards around Child Sexual Exploitation".

The paper went on to identify new ways of working that could help improve things including, e.g: a focus on outcomes across a broad range of partners' priorities and on key issues rather than structures or geographies; a shared understanding of the culture we will promote; a systems leadership approach extended outside immediate membership; and reducing and simplifying reporting mechanisms and meetings. It also suggested Safer Plymouth may wish to consider requesting it becomes a sub-group of the Health & Well-Being Board.

The meeting agreed that, since the demise of Plymouth 2020, Safer Plymouth had lost some of its momentum and that it was important to regain this and focus on where it could make a greater difference. The Board felt this would require members being honest about what could and couldn't realistically be achieved.

A (rather poorly attended) "away session" on 14th Aug decided to adopt a more dynamic outcome-focused approach, dealing with key issues for the city, rather than sticking to a rigid committee style agenda.

Strategic Assessment

At the next Board meeting, held on 24th Sept, our Strategic Assessment was discussed and it indicated areas of focus that should be adopted by the Board as priorities; but with the proviso that they may be subject to change should circumstances change and there is a need to review the Partnership's areas of focus/priority. (See Appendix page 4.)

Since this, a further iteration of the Strategic Assessment has been circulated and feedback sought.

This follows a similar format to previous Strategic Assessments, and as ever, contains a lot of good analysis. However, it could be argued that some of the information and recommendations need to be reshaped to help us become more outcome focused across wider community safety e.g: the Fire Service's fire safety priorities; the issues of mental health being regularly dealt with by police officers; and the joint commissioning priorities agreed by the council, health and others.

Recommendations in the assessment remain very process orientated, often without clear links to *outcomes* wanted – i.e. the “so what?” factor. Addressing this requires the Board (not the analysts) to be clear about our desired outcomes with better prioritisation and sharing of responsibilities. For example, regarding begging and vagrancy, what do we want here – enforcement, prevention, reputation, well-being?

Furthermore, the Partnership would benefit from better evidence of links between interventions and outputs / outcomes. Eg, did the ASB interventions listed, contribute to performance?

We should also be asking whether maintaining some priorities is the best use of diminishing resources. Eg, should ASB generally continue to be a priority as the Assessment recommends, or do we need to take a more victim focused approach to recommendations? This would require clear(er) agreement on our priorities.

Priorities

The partnership could consider adopting a sharper focus on threat risk and harm, reducing the harm to communities and protecting vulnerable people (along the lines the Police adopt but widened around community safety). This “overlaid” on the Strategic Assessment might help re-focus where our attention and resources should be directed and what outcomes we want.

Plymouth Plan

Around the time of our September meeting, the first part of the Plymouth Plan was being finalised. This makes reference to community safety in the context of policy 12 “Making great places across the city” which talks about supporting “strong and inclusive communities where people have a sense of belonging and ownership, feel safe and confident.....delivering a partnership approach to tackle crime and disorder that causes the most harm and affects those most at risk...(and)...reducing opportunities for crime and the fear of crime by requiring all new development to incorporate good design principles”.

Policy 29, “Better by design” also makes reference to: “ensuring that the layout and details of new development adequately contributes towards high standards of community safety”. But it is questionable what connect there is between the full range of Safer Plymouth's priorities and the Plan. Some work is, however, taking place on the more detailed second stage of the Plymouth Plan to embed community safety issues – nb regarding the evening and night time economy.

Joint delivery

Discussions have taken place over how Safer Plymouth can facilitate better joint delivery of community safety work locally. Potential examples include using the Fire service to “open doors” to reach vulnerable citizens, sharing information on ex-offenders between probation and the council, and closer work at neighbourhood level between the police and the council. However to date, there has been little progress, and focus remains on sub groups.

Way forward

The Board is invited to consider the following suggestions and agree on the way forward for each.

	Suggestion	Points for discussion
1.	Safer Plymouth adopts a tighter focus on threat risk and harm, reducing the harm to communities and protecting vulnerable people, across a broad community safety brief.	Is this the right priority to support becoming more outcome focused? (See appendix page 4.) What level of commitment exists to move this into reality e.g. taking responsibility beyond organisational boundaries and dropping areas of work that don't fall within this?
2.	The Strategic Assessment becomes a more focused document, reflecting wider community safety priorities, with better prioritisation, and with more emphasis on outcomes. (See appendix page 4.)	How can we move to this position and how quickly? How can we be clear about our priorities and outcomes to shape this and can partners' provide the necessary input?
3.	Safer Plymouth Board facilitates improved joint delivery by identifying leads amongst organisations and empowering them to work towards defined outcomes through systems leadership. Don't worry about what structures they adopt (or don't adopt).	Again, how can we be clear about the priorities and outcomes to guide these leads? Are we ready to "let go" in this way and focus on the "what", allowing others to sort out the "how"? How can we get to improved joint delivery at operational level? Does requesting to become a sub-group of the Health & Well-Being Board help? If so what's stopping us?
4.	Safer Plymouth develops stronger links with the Plymouth Plan.	How can we do this? How could the Plymouth Plan replace our Community Safety Plan?

Appendix

STRATEGIC THREAT AND RISK ASSESSMENT AND PRIORITISING SAFER PLYMOUTH AREAS OF WORK

At the most recent Safer Plymouth held on the 24th September 2015 the board agreed to adopt the following areas of partnership work as identified in the 2015/16 Strategic Assessment:

Emerging areas of focus – these are new areas that have previously been mentioned briefly in previous strategic assessments but are now identified as being key emerging issues for the partnership. These tend to be areas where the primary objective should be to gain greater knowledge of the problem within the city in order to consider how best to tackle presently and in the future. The emerging areas of focus are:

- Child Sexual Exploitation
- Modern Slavery
- Impact of Mental Health on Community Safety Issues
- Cybercrime and Fraud

Established areas of focus – these are areas previously referred to in strategic assessments as ‘priority areas’ and are established areas of crime and disorder that has been the subject of partnership action for a sustained period. The established areas of focus are;

- Supporting vulnerable victims of Anti-Social Behaviour
- Hate Crime
- Domestic Abuse
- Sexual Abuse
- Tackling Re-offending
- Violence and Alcohol related harm
- Tackling Violent Extremism

Prioritising areas of work – To assist the Safer Plymouth board in prioritising these areas of work a Strategic Threat and Risk Assessment (STRA) tool has been used which makes a calculated assessment of risk and harm. This year there was more emphasis on risk of harm rather than volume of incidence, in calculating the level of threat and risk of particular issues. Crime and other community safety issues have been awarded a Threat and Risk Assessment rating of high, moderate or standard.

Within Plymouth -

- **Six areas fall into the high risk category (score of 30 or over), these areas are (ranked in order);**
 - Equal highest score (33) - Domestic Abuse, Crimes under 18s.
 - Equal 2nd (30) - Alcohol Related Hospital Admission, Rape and Serious Sexual Offences, Estimated Problem Alcohol Use and Historical Sexual Offences.
- **17 areas fall into moderate risk category (score of 16 or over);** included in this category are; Modern Slavery and Trafficking, Anti-Social Behaviour, Other sexual offences, Hate Crime and Incidents, Alcohol related violence.

- **24 areas fall into standard risk category (score of between 0 and 15);** included in this category are; Radicalisation, Road Traffic Collisions, Dwelling Burglary, Arson and Vehicle Offences.

We can use the results of the STRA (below) to assist in prioritising the work areas adopted by Safer Plymouth by reconciling both.

Using this approach it is recommended that emerging areas of focus are prioritised as follows:

1. Child Sexual Exploitation (Crimes against under 18s and sexual abuse both high risk in the STRA)
2. Modern Slavery (moderate risk in STRA)
3. Mental Health (Not scored in the STRA)
4. Cybercrime and Fraud (Not scored in the STRA).

It is recommended that established areas of focus are prioritised as follows:

1. Domestic Abuse (STRA score 33 – High risk)
2. Alcohol related harm (Alcohol related admissions and problematic use both high risk)
3. Sexual Abuse (Rape and Serious Sexual Offences and Historical Sexual Offences both high risk)
4. Hate Crime (STRA score 20 – Moderate risk)
5. Anti-Social Behaviour STRA score 20 – Moderate risk)
6. Tackling Violent Extremism (Radicalisation STRA score 9 – standard risk)
7. Tackling re-offending (Not scored in the STRA).

Plymouth Strategic Threat and Risk Assessment Results

Offence Type & Category		Incidence/prevalence			Likelihood Score (1-3)	Adjusted Likelihood Score (to allow for known under-reporting)	% Change	Impact Factors					Additional weighting factors				TOTAL SCORE /44	
FORCE Crime, Disorder or Incident Type	Category	Number of Recorded Occurrences Apr 14 - Mar 15	Number of Recorded Occurrences Apr 13 - Mar 14	Estimated Offences per 1000 population				Physical and/or Psychological Harm (0-3)	Financial harm to victims (0-3)	(Potential) Damage to Reputation or Public Confidence / Media Interest (0-3)	Financial / Resourcing cost to police and others (0-3)	Impact Score /12	Impact * Likelihood /36	Decreasing/Increasing Trend (0-2)	Public/Community Concern (0-2)	Vulnerability (0-2)		Benchmarking (0-2)
Domestic Abuse (Crimes + Non Crimes)	Domestic Abuse & Sexual Offences	6512	7026	31.35	3	3	-7.3	3	2	2	3	10	30	0	1	1	1	33
Rape and Serious Sexual Offences (current within 2 years)	Domestic Abuse & Sexual Offences	299	279	1.15	1	2	7.2	3	3	3	3	12	24	2	1	2	1	30
Other Sexual Offences (current within 2 years)	Domestic Abuse & Sexual Offences	76	65	0.29	1	2	16.9	2	2	2	2	8	16	2	1	1	2	22
Historic Sexual Offences (older than 2 years)	Domestic Abuse & Sexual Offences	147	120	0.57	1	2	22.5	3	2	3	3	11	22	2	2	2	2	30
Alcohol Related Disorder	Alcohol	534	505	2.50	1	1	5.7	1	0	1	1	3	3	2	1	1	1	8
Alcohol Related Crime	Alcohol	3536	3475	16.54	3	3	1.8	1	2	1	2	6	18	1	1	1	1	22
Estimated Problematic Alcohol Use	Alcohol	13423	13423	62.78	3	3	0.0	3	2	1	3	9	27	0	1	1	1	30
Alcohol Related Hospital Admissions	Alcohol	5451	5616	25.50	3	3	-2.9	3	2	1	3	9	27	0	1	1	1	30
Public Order	Public Order	1215	1567	4.69	2	2	-22.5	1	0	2	1	4	8	0	1	0	2	11
ASB Immediate/Prompt	Anti-Social Behaviour	6085	6405	23.49	3	3	-5.0	2	0	1	3	6	18	0	2	1	1	22
ASB Routine/Non Attendance	Anti-Social Behaviour	3980	3895	15.36	3	3	2.2	1	0	1	3	5	15	1	2	1	1	20
Class A Drug Supply	Drugs	65	71	0.30	1	2	-8.5	3	3	1	2	9	18	0	1	2	1	22
Class A Possession	Drugs	229	138	1.07	1	2	65.9	3	3	1	2	9	18	2	1	2	2	25
Other Drugs Supply	Drugs	120	130	0.56	1	2	-7.7	3	2	1	2	8	16	0	1	2	1	20
Other Drugs Possession	Drugs	782	736	3.66	2	2	6.3	2	2	1	2	7	14	2	1	1	2	20
Estimated Problematic Drugs Use	Drugs	2084	2372	9.75	2	2	-12.1	3	3	2	3	11	22	0	1	2	1	26
Shoplifting	Business related	1776	1817	6.85	2	3	-2.3	0	3	0	3	6	18	0	1	0	0	19
Metal Theft	Business related	26	93	0.10	1	1	-72.0	0	2	1	1	4	4	0	0	0	1	5
Fuel Theft (all types)	Business related	63	60	0.24	1	1	5.0	0	1	0	1	2	2	1	0	0	1	4
Theft from Farm	Business related	2	3	0.01	1	1	-33.3	1	2	3	1	5	5	0	1	2	1	9
Other crimes with organisation as victim	Business related	1371	1351	5.29	2	3	1.5	1	2	1	1	5	15	1	0	0	1	17
Robbery	Acquisitive Crime	133	113	0.51	1	1	17.7	3	1	1	3	8	8	2	0	2	0	12
Dwelling Burglary	Acquisitive Crime	695	744	6.36	2	2	-6.6	1	2	0	3	6	12	0	0	1	0	13
Other Burglary	Acquisitive Crime	585	632	2.26	1	1	-7.4	0	1	0	3	4	4	0	0	1	0	5
Vehicle Offences	Acquisitive Crime	1273	1177	4.91	2	2	8.2	1	1	0	3	5	10	2	1	0	0	13
Handling Stolen Goods	Acquisitive Crime	34	44	0.13	1	1	-22.7	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1
Theft	Acquisitive Crime	2436	2903	9.40	2	2	-16.1	0	1	0	3	4	8	0	0	0	0	8
Crimes against Under 18s (Violence without injury 29%; Violence with injury 29%; Other sexual offences 13%; Other theft 9%; Non notifiable 7%; Rape 4%)	Protecting the Vulnerable	1543	1413	30.02	3	3	9.2	3	1	2	3	9	27	2	1	2	1	33
Crimes against Over 65s (Criminal damage 29%; Other theft 21%; Violence without injury 10%; Burglary/dwelling 9%; Vehicle offences 8%; Non notifiable 7%)	Protecting the Vulnerable	791	872	17.78	3	3	-9.3	2	2	1	2	7	21	0	1	1	1	24
Hate Crime & Incidents	Protecting the Vulnerable	387	355	1.49	1	2	9.0	2	0	2	3	7	14	2	1	2	1	20
Missing Persons - Adults	Protecting the Vulnerable	583	561	2.81	1	1	3.9	2	1	1	3	7	7	1	0	1	1	10
Missing Persons - Children	Protecting the Vulnerable	356	403	6.93	2	2	-11.7	2	1	3	2	8	16	0	1	1	1	19
Modern Slavery & Trafficking (no of victims)	Protecting the Vulnerable	12	1	0.05	1	2	1100.0	3	3	2	3	11	22	2	1	2	1	28
Radicalisation (Channel referrals)	Protecting the Vulnerable	1	1	0.00	1	1	0.0	2	0	3		5	5	0	1	2	1	9
Safeguarding Adults Alerts	Protecting the Vulnerable	1	1	0.00	1	1	0.0					0	0	0			1	1
RTC - Fatal	Roads Policing & Safety	3	1	0.01	1	1	200.0	3	2	1	3	9	9	2	1	1	2	15
RTC - Serious Injury	Roads Policing & Safety	79	69	0.30	1	1	14.5	3	2	0	3	8	8	2	1	1	2	14
RTC - Slight Casualties	Roads Policing & Safety	522	593	2.01	1	1	-12.0	2	1	0	3	6	6	0	1	1	1	9
Homicide	Violence & Weapon Possession	1	3	0.00	1	1	-66.7	3	3	3	3	12	12	0	1	1	0	14
Violence - ENTE (excluding DA)	Violence & Weapon Possession	1001	954	3.86	2	1	4.9	2	0	1	3	6	6	1	0	1	1	9
Violence with Injury (excluding ENTE & DA)	Violence & Weapon Possession	1193	1039	4.60	2	1	14.8	2	1	1	3	7	7	2	0	0	2	11
Violence without Injury (excluding ENTE & DA)	Violence & Weapon Possession	1384	1115	5.34	2	2	24.1	1	0	0	3	4	8	2	0	0	2	12
Possession of Weapons	Violence & Weapon Possession	152	115	0.59	1	1	32.2	1	0	3	1	5	5	2	0	0	2	9
Criminal Damage	Criminal Damage	2913	2999	11.24	3	3	-2.9	1	2	0	3	6	18	0	1	0	2	21
Arson	Criminal Damage	172	152	0.66	1	1	13.2	2	2	2	3	9	9	2	0	0	2	13