REPORT FOR EXECUTIVE MEETING ON 7 OCTOBER

Item No.	Classification: Open	Date: 07/10/03	MEETING NAME Executive
Report title:		*Best Value Review of Community Safety*	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		All	
From:		Assistant Chief Executive (Performance and Strategy)	

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Executive agree to the actions proposed by the Safer Southwark Partnership (SSP) to improve the effectiveness of the Council and its partners in tackling crime and disorder:

   a) Improve the effectiveness of the SSP by:

   - Re-defining the role and structure of the SSP so that it provides strategic leadership and direction for the partnership and holds the sub-groups accountable for delivery of the crime and disorder strategy. The SSP to continue to meet quarterly.

   - Establish a new Performance Group to co-ordinate across the theme groups, membership to include chairs of the theme groups and key agencies and Assistant Chief Executive (Performance and Strategy) (see appendix A). Performance Group to meet monthly.

   - Reviewing the membership of the SSP to ensure that agencies are represented by individuals at the right level who have the capacity to make decisions.

   - Rationalising the theme groups, appointing new Chairs where appropriate and providing the SSP theme groups with effective support.

   b) Improve performance management across the SSP through piloting the Home Office self assessment framework.

   c) Restructure the Community Safety Unit (CSU) so that it provides a strategic lead within which Departments deliver services to tackle crime and disorder and performance manages community safety work across the Council.   This will be done by:

   - Merging the CSU and the police partnership unit
   - Creating new posts of Deputy Head of Community Safety to act as performance co-ordinator for the SSP and ASB co-ordinator, funded in part from the police partnership budget.
   - Identifying individuals within the merged team to support each area of SSP work.

     Consultation with staff on the new structure will take place in September and October 2003.

    d) Ensure a consistent, whole council approach to tackling community safety, and in particular anti social behaviour through the following measures:

- Requiring each council department to identify a lead officer for community safety (this should normally be at second tier level).

- The appointment of an ASB co-ordinator (as an internal secondment) who will produce the anti-social behaviour strategy and ensure that within council departments there is a clear link between the strategic and operational delivery.

- The Head of Community Safety will be ultimately responsible for the delivery of the anti-social behaviour strategy within the council. Departments will need to ensure that operational delivery fits within the overall anti-social behaviour strategy and to link to the ASB co-ordinator and to report performance management through him to the Head of Community Safety.

- Southwark's Anti Social Behaviour Unit (SASBU) needs to be seen as part of the council's overall anti-social behaviour 'service' and should report to the Head of Community Safety on overall strategy and performance management.

    e) Re-prioritise work around anti-social behaviour, hate crime, serious and violent crime, drug related crime and fear of crime as set out in the report.

BACKGROUND

2. Cutting crime and the fear of crime is one of the Council's top priorities. The vision for the SSP is 'to contribute to Southwark's renewal as a safe place to live and work by reducing crime and disorder and increasing public reassurance across all sections of the community'. Areas of activity are based on Neighbourhoods, crime hotspots, hate crime and young people.   Our approach tackles crime and disorder through a range of approaches: enforcement, reducing opportunities, challenging behaviours, addressing risk factors and strengthening communities.

3. The terms of reference for the Best Value review focused on a strategic look at how to improve the work of the SSP in achieving and delivering the strategic outcomes and actions provided in the Crime and Disorder Strategy. In particular:
- How objectives and policies are agreed and set
- How efficiently resources are allocated
- How actions are monitored
- How performance is assessed
- How improvements are made and best practice taken account
- How effectively we address crime and the fear of crime in the borough

4. Combined with a specific focus on how the Council and its Partners manage and deliver on the issues of:
- Hate crime
- Anti-social behaviour
- Serious and violent crime
- Drug related crime
- Fear of crime associated with these areas

REPORT FOR EXECUTIVE MEETING ON 7 OCTOBER

The area of youth crime is being considered as part of a separate Best Value Review in the 2003/4 review programme. The review is scheduled to take place between December 2003 and March 2004 and will cover a wide range of children's issues.

Current performance

5. The SSP has introduced many successful initiatives to tackle crime, some of which have been recognised as models of good practice and are being rolled out nationally (eg Karrot, SASBU, Youth Crime strategy). Our wardens scheme is the largest in the country and the national Safer Schools Partnership was based on the Southwark project.

6. After an increase in total crime in 2001-02 significant improvements were achieved in 2002-03:

   • Reduction in hate crime following initiatives in Bermondsey and an increase in hate crime reporting
   • Reductions in youth crime
   • Successful crack house closures
   • Total notifiable offences were down by 6%
   • Street crime dropped by 23%
   • Violent crime is down by 2%

7. Southwark's position within its Crime and Disorder Partnership family has shifted from worst in 1998 to fifth in 2001 (out of 11 authorities). We have set a target of achieving average rate of crime per 1000 people in the CDRP family. Southwark is currently above the average rate, in fifth place. If current levels of reduction are sustained, we could be close to the average by the end of the year, demonstrating a quicker rate of improvement than other partnerships in the family.

8. However, although we are making good progress in tackling crime more needs to be done. Figures show that sexual offences increased by 5.1% (although small in number) and the overall monthly trend for violent crime is upwards, with an increase of 6.4% in violence against the person. Fear of crime among residents, measured through the MORI survey has continued to increase between 1998, 2000 and 2002.The 2002 MORI survey illustrates the dramatic contrast in residents feelings of the net safety from day (+74) to night (-2).

Review Process

9. The work on the review focused on six areas:
   • The effectiveness of the SSP
   • The role of the Community Safety Unit (CSU)
   • Anti social behaviour
   • Hate crime
   • Serious and violent crime
   • Fear of crime
   • Drug related crime

10. **Challenge**: For each area, challenge workshops were held with key stakeholders, followed by a gap analysis of Southwark's performance against good practice and other authorities. Findings were fed back to the project team and challenged. Action plans were analysed to check whether targets were SMART.

11. **Consultation:** An analysis of the already available consultation results was carried out. Consultation was also carried out with key partners within the SSP agencies. As there has already been extensive research carried out with the community into crime and disorder it was agreed that no additional consultation would be necessary. A summary of consultation results is at appendix B.

12. **Comparison**: Desk research was carried out to look at best practice authorities. In many cases, Southwark is seen as a leader in Crime and Disorder reduction, which means there is relatively little comparison information to learn from. An analysis of inspection reports and other best value reviews was carried out and visits were made to Croydon's hate crime one stop shop, Merton's ASB Unit and a meeting with officers from Glasgow.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

SSP structure and role issues

13. SSP incorporates the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership (CDRP) and the Drug and Alcohol Action Team (DAAT) and is made up of senior members from the partner agencies. Sub groups have been formed to deliver on the key priorities and these are made up of key people from the partner agencies.

14. Since 1996 four separate reviews have been conducted of the SSP and its activities. In the main these demonstrate positive partnership activity; the Hough review defined the SSP as a 'market leader'. However the SSP's own internal review conducted in November 2001 was more self-critical and identified a range of weaknesses that focused around accountability and performance management. These areas were therefore made the focus of the review.

15. In addition, the Home Office has recently published the characteristics of what makes a successful crime and disorder partnership. This has fed into the self-assessment model, which Southwark is piloting, along with Merton. This model of good practice was used during the review as a template against which to judge the performance of the SSP.

16. There is a lot evidence of very successful partnership working at an operational level. This is shown by partnership initiatives such as SASBU, street wardens, tackling hate crime in Bermondsey, crack house closure, working with the fire brigade in reducing arson. These initiatives have been recognised as good practice by Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) and other local authorities.

17. However, this partnership success at an operational level is not reflected at a strategic level by the SSP. Although the SSP meets regularly to review performance it does not yet demonstrate the characteristics of an effective partnership that provides leadership, sets clear strategies and holds agencies to account for delivery. Further detail is set out below.

REPORT FOR EXECUTIVE MEETING ON 7 OCTOBER

SSP

18. Although the SSP agrees the Crime and Disorder Strategy, it does not yet provide a firm strategic framework within which partner agencies and sub-groups should deliver action plans, or hold them accountable for delivering against the strategy. There are currently no specific strategies for tackling hate crime, anti-social behaviour or fear of crime.

19. The SSP is supported by the CSU, but there is no specific partnership co-ordinator.

20. The SSP does not currently have influence over the resources needed to deliver against the strategies and to ensure accountability for the delivery of the action plans. [The membership of the SSP from some agencies is not at a senior enough level to ensure that the SSP can make and implement decisions.]

21. There is a lack of proactive engagement with and from Health and the community/voluntary sector.

22. SSP does not communicate effectively within the partnership or with the community. This means the community is often not aware of the good work being carried out by the SSP and that it is not seen by the community or wider audience as an innovative partnership, even though we are often ahead of other councils in this area.

Theme groups

23. Chairs and members of the theme groups are unclear about their roles and responsibilities. The success of the sub-groups in delivering against the action plans too often depends on the individuals leading and participating in that group. Chairing sub-groups is seen as an add on to day to day work.

24. The sub-groups do not have ownership of the action plans and there is a lack of accountability for delivering them. For some sub groups, action plans are not achievable and there are no SMART targets set. There are often no priorities set and no resources linked to the action plans.

25. The rationale and levels of involvement from the community and voluntary sectors within the sub groups is not clear. Some agencies (in particular Health) are not sufficiently involved in the partnership and where they are involved are unclear about their roles.

26. There are no formal channels for the sub group members to share good practice, lessons learnt etc.

28. Members often turn up to meetings not having done the action agreed and there is no system for holding members to account for delivering actions. Often different people from an agency come to the meeting so there is no consistency of attendance.

29. The Drugs Reference Group (DRG) carried out a productive Partnership Breakthrough session (an Audit Commission framework for judging the performance of a partnership) and the work groups have subsequently been re-designed and new Chairs appointed to take forward the action plans. The DRG has also been renamed Drug Management Board.

REPORT FOR EXECUTIVE MEETING ON 7 OCTOBER

Performance management

30. The performance management within the SSP is something that has been highlighted as an area of weakness, and is a corporate priority to improve across the council.   To address this, the Hate Crime group worked with the Audit Commission using the Partnership Breakthrough Model. The lessons from this should be disseminated across the other theme groups and the SSP. Key areas being focused action plans, opportunities for review of progress against action plan and group process and external facilitation support.

31. Currently not all agencies are signed up to collecting and reporting on aggregated data, which means there is an inadequate baseline against which to judge success. Although there are many sources of data these are not collected and analysed.

SSP action points

32. Re-define the role of the SSP so that so that it provides strategic leadership, clearly sets out the direction for the partnership, influences resources and ensures accountability for the delivery of action plans by the sub groups.

33. Review the membership of the SSP to ensure agencies are represented by individuals at the right level who have the capacity to make decisions.

34. Agree that the role of the Chair of the SSP is to deliver on the Crime and Disorder strategy, monitor performance, and on the Council's section 17 duties to mainstream community safety measures across the council.

35. Establish a new Performance Group to co-ordinate across the theme groups, membership to include chairs of the theme groups and key agencies and Assistant Chief Executive (Performance and Strategy) (see appendix A). Performance group to meet monthly.

36. Involve the community and voluntary sector more proactively than at present to achieve results on some key areas such as fear of crime. (There is currently some work being carried out by the LSP into community engagement and by SAVO into voluntary organisations' representation on partnership boards, Southwark Children's and Young People's Partnership Board is working with SCFA to establish voluntary sector involvement. These initiatives may help voluntary sector involvement on the SSP).

37. Review the current Chairs of the theme groups to ensure they can deliver and appoint new Chairs where these individuals are not appropriate. The Chairs of the Drugs Management Board/DRG groups are already being reviewed.   In taking these decisions, the SSP will need to take into account the following issues:

    - The Chairs of the theme groups should represent all the key agencies, rather than just the police and council, as at present.
    - There is currently no chair for the Hate Crime group. A Health representative is being sought to fill this role. In the interim the Head of Social Inclusion will act as Chair.

38. Appoint a performance co-ordinator (from within the existing staff in the Community Safety Unit) initially to support the self assessment pilot (Merton have also done this).

39. Merge the Neighbourhoods and Hotspots sub groups to provide better co-ordination and to prevent duplication of work (see section on ASB). The Director of Environment has agreed to take on the role of Chair of this sub-group.

40. Ensure agencies sign up to collect performance management data.

41. Make proposals for joint planning and pooled budget arrangements to ensure better use of resources within the SSP.

Action on Chairs' role and theme group terms of reference

42. Create a new role to co-ordinate and programme manage the work of the sub groups. The Assistant Chief Executive (Performance and Strategy) will take on this role.

43. The Drug Management Board/DRG is chaired by the Borough Commander with a co-ordination role, although with additional commissioning responsibility for DAAT funds.

44. All theme group chairs will act as project managers and be responsible for ensuring action plans are delivered. To ensure this happens theme group chairs will have to sign up to job descriptions setting out their roles and responsibilities. Briefly, these will include:

- Providing leadership
- Production and delivery of their action plan
- Commissioning funding to resource the action plan
- Providing information to feed into the communications plan
- Ensuring there is space/channels to share information and best practice
- Monitoring and reporting back on progress to relevant bodies

44. It was originally proposed that in future administrative support should be provided for the sub group by the Chair's organisation. However, the SSP was concerned that this would place a burden on the agency who supplies the chair, and that the current arrangements work well. The recommendation is therefore that sub groups when agreeing their work plan should set out what administrative support they will need. The Head of Community Safety will be responsible for ensuring that sub groups have sufficient administrative support, supplied either from within the CSU or funded through partnership funding.

Action for group members

45. Work with the DRG has produced some draft terms of reference for the sub groups. We propose to use these as a standard set for all sub groups across the SSP to be signed up to by all sub group members. The standard terms of reference are:

- A recognition that membership is part of their day job
- People need to have enough delegated power to be able to take action & decisions

- Lead on sub-group actions allocated to them
- Bring along information about what is happening in other partnership bodies and agencies
- Offer advice on the best approach to delivery using local knowledge
- Attend regularly and send reports where necessary when they can't attend

46. Agree a behaviour protocol for sub group members through a standard ocument; roles and responsibilities of chair and group members.

47. Chairs of the sub groups should rationalise the voluntary sector representation on each of the sub groups.

Action on performance management

48. The Performance Breakthrough work carried out with the hate crime sub group needs to be shared and built upon across the SSP. The findings from this will feed in to the self assessment framework being piloted by Southwark for GOL.

49. Once priorities for the sub groups have been set, agencies need to sign up to making relevant performance management data available on a regular basis. A formal process should be developed to ensure that agencies sign up to deliver against the delivery plans. Agencies should develop individual delivery plans with clear lines of accountability.

50. Delivery plans and project plans need to include targets for improving delivery on the ground and targets need to include Quality of Life indicators. Local targets will need to be incorporated into the national GOL performance management framework.

Action on data management

51. There needs to be a consistent approach to collecting data across the council and partners. The Community Safety Unit should be responsible for this. When agencies sign up to delivering action plans they should also sign up to making relevant data available on a regular basis. In addition to this, the Sentinel system needs to be looked at in terms of its potential to increase information flow.

52. In terms of sharing personal data, an information sharing protocol has already been agreed between the Council, the police and SLAM (South London & Maudsley NHS Trust). This will be re-launched and other agencies will be encouraged to sign up to it.

Community Safety Unit (CSU)

53 The Home Office characteristics of a good CDRP sets out the importance of an effective CSU to support the partnership. A new Head of Community Safety has recently been appointed from the Police and is acting as head of both the Community Safety Unit and the Police Partnership Unit. This will lead to even greater joint working between the two teams and provides an ideal opportunity to look at the resources available within the two teams and the role that the CSU should play.

REPORT FOR EXECUTIVE MEETING ON 7 OCTOBER

Key findings for the CSU

54. The current CSU is staffed by 4 permanent staff, 1 secondment, 3 fixed term and 7 temporary staff, the staff cover both CDRP and DAAT partnership related work including programme delivery. These posts are funded through mainstream funds (4) and programme funds (11). Comparison with other London local authorities show that community safety units are resourced from a variety of mainstream and programme funds and also police secondments. A GOL survey in 2002 showed considerable variation between local authority areas. Home Office funds have been made available to CDRP's and DAT's to ensure that all partnerships have adequate capacity to deliver against key areas of work.

55. The CSU plays a strategic role in tackling community safety and does not manage any operational delivery. It produces the Crime and Disorder Audit and strategy and currently provides support for the SSP and sub groups, although there is no specified performance co-ordinator for the SSP.   It provides a hate crime co-ordinator who supports the Campaign Against Hate Crime and several staff who support the DRG. The CSU also analyses performance data, collates quarterly reports to the SSP and monitors reports on funding and performance to Government Office for London.

56. To date, the work of the CSU has focused on carrying out the initial work on initiatives and then ensuring these are mainstreamed by service delivery departments. However, given the number of initiatives, and the capacity of the unit, it has not been possible to keep strategic policy control of all these initiatives. This has led to initiatives being implemented inconsistently across the council.   Currently the CSU plays a mainly reactive role and does not have the capacity to currently co-ordinate or drive initiatives or policies to tackle community safety across the council and partnership. This has led to different approaches to tackling crime being taken by different Council departments, particularly in the area of anti-social behaviour.

57. Although the teams work closely together, there is a risk of some duplication of work with the Southwark Police Partnership Unit.

Action for the CSU

58. The CSU needs to play a more proactive role supporting the SSP. The unit needs to have a more strategic, co-ordinating role and provide a policy lead for the other parts of the council delivering the community safety agenda.   It should set strategic performance targets for community safety activities across departments. This also reflects the management protocol that is an outcome of the review of Strategic Support Services. In order to do this, the action to be taken is set out below:

59. Produce a specification for the CSU which sets out roles and responsibilities. We propose that these are:
- Performance management of community safety work across the council
- Identifying and sharing best practice
- Data gathering and analysis
- Communications
- Co-ordinating council policy and strategies on community safety
- Setting roles and responsibilities for individuals supporting sub groups

60. Reporting to SSP where progress in specific areas is not happening

- Merge the CSU and the Police Partnership Team to ensure best use of resources and data and to ensure that there is no duplication of work.

- Create two new posts to increase the capacity of the CSU to provide strategic direction:
  o a Deputy Head of Community Safety to increase strategic capacity within the unit and to act as performance co-ordinator to support the self assessment framework.
  o an ASB co-ordinator (as an internal secondment) to co-ordinate council policy on ASB and the ASB Bill and to produce the ASB strategy.

61. Require each council department to identify a lead officer for community safety (this should normally be at second tier level).

62. The CSU should continue to support the SSP, the theme groups and the new performance group. Named individuals within the merged unit will be responsible for supporting the SSP sub groups.

63. Investigate secondments from council departments, and statutory partners particularly Health into the unit from the public heath and the Healthy Southwark partnership teams.

SPECIFIC AREAS OF WORK

Anti social behaviour

64. With the ASB Bill coming into force in early 2004, the review focused on whether the Partnership has the capacity to implement the proposals, and whether there are policies in place to tackle the issues raised by the new Bill. In some cases, eg Drugs Protocol, Southwark's delivery is above the standard required in the Bill. In other areas, the council will need to identify additional resources to implement the ASB Bill policies.

65. Desktop research was carried out to compare Southwark with best practice and to identify gaps in the partnership's delivery of services to tackle ASB. Focus groups with key stakeholders were carried out.

66. Consultation results show that ASB is a key concern of Southwark residents. The main concerns are litter, vandalism and graffiti and young people 'hanging around', clearly linked to a lack of facilities for young people.

Anti social behaviour key findings

67. There is no overall ASB strategy and insufficient co-ordination of ASB work. The CSU has not set the direction for ASB work and does not hold Departments to account for delivering against strategic targets. This has led to a lack of a consistent approach to ASB across the council as Departments develop their own policies rather than operating within an overall strategy.

68. As SASBU plays such a key role in tackling ASB across the council, and its responsibilities are likely to widen with the introduction of the ASB Bill, it needs to be more directly involved in developing and implementing ASB strategy across the council.

69. The council needs to agree policies and the approach to communication on key aspects, in particular:

- 'Naming and shaming' with the Bill's removal of automatic reporting restrictions.
- Fixed Penalty notices
- Community Safety Accreditation scheme for council staff

70. There is a lack of accountability for ASB; no one person is responsible for delivering the agenda. There needs to be a specific heading and focus of work across the council.

71. There is no structure within the council to drive the agenda. In terms of risk management, ASB is being co-ordinated and managed through individuals. Over £3 million is going into ASB across the council. Some of these resources may need to be shifted or rationalised to ensure we have the capacity to deliver on the ASB Bill.

72. Community involvement in tackling ASB needs to be strengthened.

73. There is currently no central data collection and analysis of ASB data from the sources across the partnership. There is no baseline information from which to judge performance. This links to the overall recommendation around data collection and needs to link with the Sentinel project, Neighbourhood Wardens baseline survey, Networked housing ASB database and the Quality of Life indicators being developed. There is a need for monitoring and performance management systems to be put in place. This links with the overarching finding around performance management.

74. The focus of most of the work on ASB is on tackling perpetrators. We need to ensure a balance between all work done around perpetrators and ensure there are sufficient victim support initiatives and preventative work.

75. There is no alcohol strategy to drive and co-ordinate the council's response to the 'drunken yob culture' and 'street drinking' issues highlighted in the Bill.

Actions on anti social behaviour

76. Appoint a full time ASB co-ordinator on a fixed term contract and managed by the Head of Community Safety. This could be a secondment from Council department. Their role will be to produce the ASB strategy for the partnership and to ensure that within Council departments there is a clear link between the strategy and operational delivery.

77. SSP should agree the ASB strategy, and Departments delivering services need to ensure that operational delivery fits within the strategy. To ensure this, Departments that deliver services tackling ASB will need to link to the ASB co-ordinator and report performance through him/her to the Head of Community Safety. The Head of Community Safety will be ultimately accountable for the delivery of ASB strategy within the council. (This links with the council's management protocol).

78. SASBU needs to be seen as part of the overall council ASB 'service' and should report to the Head of Community Safety strategically on overall strategy and performance management. There also needs to be a formal link from SASBU to the ASB co-ordinator in terms of strategic policy development and back to Housing in terms of the strategic role which SASBU plays.

79. CSU will set strategic targets for SASBU and the Head of Community Safety will hold SASBU to account for delivering against these targets. The Divisional Housing Manager with responsibility for community safety will be accountable for achieving these targets.

80. The Neighbourhood sub group should focus on co-ordinating the detailed work around service delivery and be re-named the ASB/Neighbourhood sub group. The Neighbourhood group and Hotspot groups should be combined to deliver the ASB agenda. The ASB/Neighbourhoods sub group needs to drive the response to the ASB Bill forward, with the operational managers being brought together as a sub group. The sub-group will identify resources being put into ASB across the council and identifying savings/growth and capacity to deliver on the ASB Bill.

81. Produce a directory on who does what on ASB across the council so that front line staff know who to pass reports onto. This should be supported by a route map on the intranet on who to contact (this would need to maintain confidentiality of SASBU staff). This would involve some staff training. Hate crime issues should also be picked up as part of this. A directory of hate crime support services is being completed.

82. ASB issues need to be fed into the communications planner (this should be done via the ASB/Neighbourhoods sub group).

Hate crime

83. Work around hate crime is carried out by many different agencies within Southwark, including the Police, SASBU, Victim Support Southwark and other voluntary sector organisations. There is also SRB funding for the Campaign Against Hate Crime, which focuses on community based solutions to hate crime.

Hate crime key findings

84. There is currently no hate crime strategy to drive the work. This issue was identified in baseline research carried out by Goldsmith's college in 2000 as a gap and has been the priority for the sub group since then but has not been produced. This has led to fragmented projects being implemented.

85. There is a lack of clarity around the definition of the work and the responsibilities for key stakeholders, particularly the voluntary sector. The Action Plan is viewed by group members as unrealistic with unattainable targets.

86. Data Collection and Analysis of hate crime data:
   - There is no coherent picture of the nature of hate crime based on multi-agency data recording and no system in place to properly collect, analyse and disseminate existing data. This means there is no solid basis for the allocation of resources and addressing priorities.
   - There is no system in place to collect and monitor data on hate crime from agencies other than the Police.

87. Service Delivery Issues:
    - There is differential treatment of hate crime victims; access to services will vary depending on the point of reporting and type of hate crime.
    - There is a lack of capacity within Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual and Transsexual groups to lead on key projects.
    - There is a lack of initiatives addressing the attitudes of potential and actual perpetrators.
    - There are numerous voluntary sector groups tackling aspects of hate crime. The CDRP needs to be clear about what services these groups provide and identify boundaries and responsibilities for key hate crime projects. The Voluntary Sector involvement has so far been limited to fragmented projects.

88. Hate crimes subgroup lacks overall strategy and policy priorities to focus activities. There is also weak engagement from some stakeholders and poor levels of communication between key agencies. The lack of a strategy means;
    - Communication is ineffective
    - There is no Identification of responsibility
    - There are no systems of monitoring and accountability
    - There are no protocols for the inclusion of external bodies

Actions on hate crime

89. Detailed action plan has been written up into a work plan for the Hate Crime sub-group. Key points include:
    - Produce a hate crime strategy, agreed by all key partners, by December 2003, including specific strategies for the three areas of hate crime.
    - Agree a Public Service Agreement for hate crime by 2006.
    - Produce a map of activity around hate crime by summer 2003 including a mapping exercise to identify perpetrator projects across Southwark and a needs analysis for perpetrators to identify gaps in provision.

90. Improve the effectiveness of the Hate Crime sub-group through implementing the actions from the Partnership Breakthrough session

91. Improve the capacity and engagement of the voluntary sector.
    - Mainstream the work of the Campaign Against Hate Crime
    - Increase capacity of LGBT groups to tackle hate crime and support development of Domestic Violence forum.
    - Launch and support a racial incidents forum.
    - Raise profile and awareness of hate crime issues within community and key agencies and ensure Hate Hurts branding is used by all agencies.
    - Implement rolling hate crime training plan.

92. Increase support to victims by tackling inconsistencies in victim support through the Equality Impact assessment. Raise the profile of male and same sex domestic violence victims.

Serious and violent crime

93. Violent crime is made up of robbery, sexual offences and violence against the person. Overall, the monthly trend is upwards for violent crimes although in the year ending June 2003 violent crime was down by 2%. Sexual offences however were up by 5.1%.

REPORT FOR EXECUTIVE MEETING ON 7 OCTOBER

Serious and violent crime key findings

94. Gun related crime

- Although the SSP agencies have several data sources for potential perpetrators and victims, they don't collect and analyse these (eg from trauma wards, A&E). If we had a clearer picture of likely perpetrators and victims, resources could be better targeted.

- Good practice stresses the need for community involvement from all groups and community empowerment to tackle the problems and address the key issues behind violence. Churches and faith groups in Southwark need to be more closely involved and the community needs to be more involved in the solutions.

- Voluntary sector organisations within Southwark are carrying out a lot of work on gun violence, particularly with young people. However, we have no clear picture of this work or how it fits with our strategies around educating young people.

- To date we have not carried out evaluation of education initiatives, particularly Boyhood to Manhood work and gun crime conferences.

- Although there has been a reduction in the number of gun crimes there has not been much publicity or public reassurance around this.

- In the past, the sub-group has not been effective in identifying priorities or driving action. A vague, unachievable action plan has been adopted with little buy-in from members of the sub group.

- There is a need to focus more resources on the enforcement action around perpetrators. It is not clear whether the penalties for gun crime are having an effect on perpetrators.

95. Sexual assault, there is no clear picture of the extent and nature of sexual assault in the borough of Southwark in terms of rape, indecent assault, sexual offences and young people.

96. Knife related crime, although in the past there has been a lot of work done around knife related crime, recently this area has been somewhat neglected in comparison with gun related crime. The judicial disposal rate has reduced and is decreasing. There has not been any evaluation of the success of the work done with young people in schools.

97. Serious assault
- 40% of violent crime and 78% of assaults are linked to alcohol. However, we don't have clear idea of amount of alcohol related violence and where it is happening. We also do not have an alcohol related violence strategy.
- Drunken beggars harassing residents leads to high fear of crime and we are not currently tackling the issues behind this.

Action on serious and violent crime

98. Serious and Violent crime sub group core membership to be reviewed to ensure membership has an overview at the broad strategic level.

99. Working groups to be established for each of the key project areas, servicing of the working groups to be via its chair/organisation:
     - Terrorism and Disruptive Incident sub group
     - Gun crime
     - Rape and sexual assault
     - Knife related crime (incorporating offensive weapons)
     - Serious assault, baseline data and research to be established

100. Research into the nature of sexual assault in Southwark was commissioned in May and the report will be published in the next few weeks. This will set a baseline from which the sub group can set priorities and produce a work plan.

101. Voluntary sector groups are already involved in the various working groups, however representation on the Serious and Violent crime sub group needs to be to be taken forward as part of the SSP review.

102. Work on alcohol to be co-ordinated by the DAAT across the various DAAT/CDRP sub-groups. A mapping and gap analysis will be completed by October to provide a good basis for developing priorities.

103. Class A drug related crime is dealt with through the DAAT Communities and Availabilities group. Key areas of work are: prevention, wrap around services and tackling drug markets. Work to date has focused on the drugs focus desk and the crack protocol.

104. It was proposed that resources should be moved to focus on knife related crime. However, the Chair of the Serious & Violent Crime group argued that gun crime is the main priority and area of increasing crime and that resources should remain focused on this area.   This should be kept under review.

Drug related crime

Key findings drug related crime

105. There are clear tensions in the drugs agenda between delivering against the national targets and having a strategy in place which delivers against local priorities.

106. The lack of Chief Officer involvement meant it would be difficult to influence national agencies and establish reporting systems that focused more on how Southwark is delivering against locally defined need and how the DAAT strategy can be mainstreamed.

107. The SSP therefore gave a commitment that there would be support for a locally driven strategy which may sometimes be at odds with national priorities and timescales but stressed that there needed to be more clarity around partner agency accountability and a robust structure in place to deliver against key local priorities.

108. As drug related crime was being examined as part of the Best Value Review the Performance Breakthrough approach was used to help to develop a framework for delivery.

REPORT FOR EXECUTIVE MEETING ON 7 OCTOBER

109. A Drug Reference Group (DRG) workshop was held to re-examine the function of the DRG and the role and responsibilities of its sub groups and look at the overall structure of the DAAT. There is a detailed report available but this paper highlights those points taken a way from the workshop which will have a direct bearing on the way sub groups will operate.

Action on drug related crime

110. Terms of reference and the role of the Drug Management Board/DRG have been developed and are being agreed with key stakeholders.   These are also being used as a model for the SSP and theme groups.

111. The chairs and membership of the groups are being reviewed and roles and responsibilities and terms of reference agreed. Details on action to tackle drug related crime is contained within the work programme of the DAAT Communities and Availabilities sub group.

Action on Drug Management Board theme groups

112. The groups will focus on three areas: Treatment & Care, Young People and Communities and Availability. The role of the sub group members will be revised to reflect the role set out for all SSP sub groups.

113. The Chairs of the sub group will sit on the DRG and will accountable for delivering against the priorities agreed by the sub group members. The role of Chair will be supported and facilitated by a specific project officer but the role of chair must be seen as part of the day job and there will be a need for input around the strategy between meetings.

114. There will be time-limited action groups established to take forward specific pieces of work and progress against targets will be reported through the sub group Chairs.

115. Sub groups will need to identify 5 key priorities. These priorities should be broken down into actions which are:
- Time limited
- Resourced
- Measurable/milestones
- Link to other areas of DAAT strategy
- Have clear outcomes

Performance management

115. In terms of specific performance management for the drugs agenda:
- Reported information to relate to the target (ie be operational) and need
- Report to the DRG every three months
- Agencies will be responsible for particular milestones
- Agreement on who has the information
- Ensure that targets are embedded in the work programmes of the agencies
- Greater communication between agencies at appropriate/relevant levels

REPORT FOR EXECUTIVE MEETING ON 7 OCTOBER

Fear of crime

116. The gap analysis for fear of crime was carried out comparing Southwark's approach with the Home Office toolkit for tackling fear of crime. This sets out best practice with examples of innovative ways of dealing with fear of crime.

117. There was some debate around the level of fear of crime within Southwark and a general feeling that the levels of fear of crime are not out of step with the levels of actual crime.

Key findings on fear of crime

118. There is no overall strategy to drive or pull together the various strands of work being carried out to tackle fear of crime.

119. There is a lack of knowledge of the different concerns of different groups. MORI survey question is a blunt measure and does not analyse the different reasons behind fear of crime.

120. It is unlikely that Southwark can reach the top quartile in terms of level of fear of crime, because of the high levels of crime and the high numbers of vulnerable people. It might be more helpful to focus on realistic targets and local quality of life indicators.

121. Our reassurance work is generally carried out on a one size fits all approach which does not target work in terms of geographical concerns or to specific vulnerable groups. This may lead to a lack of support for minority groups.

122. There is a lack of recognition/understanding among residents of work being done to tackle crime. The MPS PPS shows only a third of residents are aware of work being done to tackle crime and only 35% of residents think the council is doing a good job in promoting community safety. These figures differ by ward areas.

123. We don't hold baseline data on repeat victimisation. Targets are set only for hate crime repeat victimisation.

124. We don't currently provide any third party reporting centres to enable victims to report crime to other agencies. This is being developed on hate crime and as part of SkYVoC (support service for Southwark young victims of crime)

125. There needs to be greater involvement with the community in identifying crime and disorder issues and practical ways to tackle them. There is some work underway within small areas from Community Chest projects and a pilot project being undertaken on four estates in the borough to tackle drug issues.

Action on fear of crime

126. It was originally agreed by the project board that the communication strategy for the SSP would be able to pick up and address these issues. However, it has since become clear that these issues are too wide ranging to be tackled through the communication strategy alone.

REPORT FOR EXECUTIVE MEETING ON 7 OCTOBER

127. The action is therefore for the SSP to develop a reassurance strategy, based on the national reassurance strategy and based on the reassurance project being carried out by street action teams. Adrian Rabot will be the lead officer for this.

128. Each sub group will need to include reassurance in their action plans, with key strands of communication, visibility, interaction with the community and reassurance.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE BEST VALUE REVIEW

129. There are no immediate savings identified for the Council in this report. In terms of the Community Safety Unit the growth requirements are set out in the implementation plan (Appendix C) and can be funded by external funding from the Home Office and Police funding.
Summary of costs:

   - Anti-social behaviour co-ordinator £40k pa
   - Anti-social behaviour project officer £30k pa
   - Re-grade existing post to establish post of performance manager for community safety £10k pa
   - Communications budget for re-assurance £30k

   NB These new posts have not yet been graded, costs are indicative.

130. Community Safety Unit growth bids have also been put forward for 2004/5. The growth is to cover a number of posts currently externally funded (Home Office, LDA, NRF). In 2004/5 the costs of these posts plus project costs will be £160k.

CONSULTATION WITH TRADE UNIONS

131. This report has been circulated to the Trade Unions and any comments will be tabled.

REASONS FOR URGENCY

132. The Best Value Review of Community Safety sets out a forward plan for future areas of work on community safety across the council. The Best Value Review recommendations identify future priorities for key areas of work which will impact on the current business planning cycle.

133. The report also recommends the amalgamation of the Police Partnership Team with the Community Safety Unit. This has implications for officers in both organisations and budget implications for the police. In order to release funds from the MPS to fund the new post as outlined in the recommendations and transfer the funds to the Council a business case has to be made before the end of October.

REASON FOR LATENESS

134. Following the meeting of the Safer Southwark Partnership on Friday 26th September amendments have been made to the report and structure chart. Finalising the amendments has led to the delay in circulation of the report.

REPORT FOR EXECUTIVE MEETING ON 7 OCTOBER

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Title of document(s)	*Title of department / unit Address*	*Name Phone number*
Best Value Review of Community Safety files	Community Safety Unit, Town Hall	Susan Crisp x57316

APPENDIX A
Audit Trail

This section must be included in all reports.

Lead Officer	**Adrian Rabot, Head of Community Safety**		
Report Author	**Catherine Mangan, Susan Crisp**		
Version	**Final Report**		
Dated	*3rd October 2003*		
Key Decision?	*Yes*		
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / EXECUTIVE MEMBER			
Officer Title		**Comments Sought**	**Comments included**
Borough Solicitor & Secretary		Yes	No
Chief Finance Officer		Yes	No
List other Officers here			
Executive Member		Yes	No
Date final report sent to Constitutional Support Services			3rd October 2003

REPORT FOR EXECUTIVE MEETING ON 7 OCTOBER

Safer Southwark Partnership (CDRP/DAAT)
Chair: Bob Coomber, Chief Executive, Southwark Council
Partnership Board meets three times a year, topic based meetings, agrees broad strategy, policy and direction and manages partnership.

SSP Performance Group
Chair: Sarah Naylor
Members: theme group chairs and key stakeholders, meets monthly

Community Safety Division
Adrian Rabot,
Head of Service
SSP:
Strategy and policy
performance data

Drug Management Board (DRG)
Chair: Ian Thomas

Young Crime Steering Group
Chair Romi Bowen, DD, Social Services
- **Responsible for:** Youth Justice Plan
Southwark Safer Schools Partnership

Community and Availability
Chair: Daniel Curry, St Giles

ASB/Neighbourhoods Group
Chair Gill Davies, CO, Env & Leisure
(Merged with Hotspot group)
Responsible for: ASB strategy and delivery

Treatment and Care
Chair: Hugh McCrossan SLAM

Serious & Violent Crime Group
Chair Superintendent Ed Bateman
- **Work Groups:** Terrorism & Disruptive Incidents, Gun Crime/Southwark Youth Against Guns, Rape & Sexual Assault

Young People
Chair, Karl Murray, Youth & Connexions Service

Hate Crime Group
Chair Nathalie Hadjifotiou HoS Social Inclusion
Responsible for: Hate Crime strategy and delivery

Commissioners
Mary McFeeley, Probation
Tony Lawlor, PCT Commissioning Manager
Jeff Doodson DSS Commissioner

REPORT FOR EXECUTIVE MEETING ON 7 OCTOBER

Appendix B – Review of Recent Community Safety Consultation in Southwark

1. Introduction

This report is a review of recent consultation research in the London Borough of Southwark concerning Community Safety (CS). CS is a multi-faceted idea, made up of a variety of inter-linked concepts. CS therefore has different meanings for different people. Official Indicators give one interpretation of Community Safety from a quantitative viewpoint. While these figures are important in a target driven approach to solving CS problems they do not adequately address all aspects of CS. Consultation research attempts to incorporate the perceptions of local people, often without using quantitative methods, in order to provide a more balanced approach to analysing CS problems.

The Councils' approach to CS is driven statutorily through the Crime and Disorder Strategy. Section 2 outlines this approach. Consultation research has a role in this statutory approach but sometimes plays a secondary role to the target approach of offence data analysis within CS. This report adopts a thematic approach to reviewing CS consultation research that has been recently conducted. Community Safety is defined here through a number of key concepts/elements. These elements each contribute to the general quality of life, and Community Safety in particular. These CS themes are as follows:

- Perceptions of Crime and the Fear of Crime
- The Image and Identity of Local Areas
- Black and Minority Ethnic Communities (Issues, Needs, Priorities and Opinions)
- Experiences of Crime (including Anti-social Behaviour and Hate Crime)
- Relations with and attitudes towards council
- Relations with and attitudes towards police
- Youth Crime is a key theme to be covered within any review of consultation concerning CS. This report utilises the Southwark Youth Offending Team Research 2000 (YOT 2000) within the thematic approach. Youth crime is an important issue, particularly for Southwark, and there is a large amount of consultation research. Therefore, recent consultation research in Southwark has largely been reviewed separately, in the report titled: Youth Crime – Review of Recent Consultation in Southwark (CCU, 2002).

The consultation research examined in this report uses a variety of methods, including both quantitative and qualitative techniques. Both are needed to gain a better idea of 'reality' and to address validity concerns that arise from relying solely on quantitative methods. Therefore, some of the research findings presented in this report are qualitative in nature. It must be remembered that qualitative research is designed to be illustrative rather than statistically representative. As such, the findings cannot be used to conclude that "x% of Black and minority ethnic residents hold a particular view".

> Qualitative Research is exploratory and interactive, and allows for an in-depth analysis of key issues. It allows insights into the attitudes, and the reasons for these attitudes that could not be probed with as much depth with a structured questionnaire (Response to the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry - Young People, p.3)

There are a variety of other issues that impact upon the quality of life, and are linked with Community Safety. This report does not encompass all these. Further

consultation projects that involve CS can be found under the departmental headings that include Housing, the Elderly, Employment, Health, and Education. Many of these have been addressed through a variety of Single Regeneration Projects, other focussed programs, Action Plans and Independent Bodies. This report focuses on research utilised by Southwark Council.

Thematic Approach to Community Safety

The next 6 sections provide reviews of consultation research under thematic headings. The various research projects consulted a variety of audiences and sought an array of information. Different scales of respondents were consulted as well, from small to large. This should be taken into consideration when utilising this review and the information in it. The reports are linked here under common thematic headings according to the relevant component of CS being analysed.

2. Perceptions of Crime and the Fear of Crime

This section reviews the consultation involving perceptions of crime and the fear of crime in Southwark. Both the perception of crime and the fear of crime are vital components of Community Safety. The concepts are inter-linked and are analysed together in this section. In particular, the fear of crime directly impacts on the quality of life and the opportunity for equal participation in the community. The fear of crime is listed as a key priority area of the most recent crime audit.
Perceptions of crime and the fear of crime are often very different form the statistical record of recorded crime. Perceptions of crime and the fear of crime also tend to differ between different sections of the community. Therefore, it is necessary to consult with local people, in order to establish a representation of their perceptions and fears of crime.

The perception of crime in a local area involves a variety of components. These components include the general feeling of safety, possible police action to improve safety, youth perceptions, perpetrators, location, problem priority, victimisation. Different research reports focus on varied components.

Liddle Ward Survey 2000 (also known as the Damilola Taylor research)
- Opinion is divided on how much residents' personal quality of life is affected by crime and anti-social behaviour – 44% say 'a great deal/fair amount', but most say 'a little/not at all'. Younger, male Black Caribbeans and Black Africans are least likely to be concerned. Previous research has shown young men to be the most likely victims of crime – and, conversely, the group that feel the most safe!
- How safe do you feel walking outside in this area alone? Around six in ten residents (61%) say they feel unsafe walking outside in the area alone, especially Older, White and Black African residents (72% and 60% vs 45% for Black Caribbean residents). While the overall results for feeling unsafe compares unfavourably to the 36% in the 1997 Peckham Partnership survey, it is on a par with how residents felt walking outside the area after dark in the 2000 residents survey throughout Southwark (55%).
- Residents who feel less safe focus on 'muggings and assaults' (59%) and the 'level of crime in the area' (45%), reflecting a similar pattern found in the 1997 Peckham Partnership survey. However, 'drugs dealing/drug related problems' (mentioned by a fifth) as a reason has increased markedly from 1997 and is a point to address.

- This finding is also reflected in the school survey where over two-fifths (44%) said they felt unsafe walking alone outside in Peckham alone. The main reasons given were bullying (85%), drug dealing (80%), mugging and assaults (71%) and the level of crime (65%).
- Perceptions on the causes of crime and anti social behaviour vary. Around two-fifths (37%) spontaneously say 'drugs', whilst a third (32%) say 'unemployment'. A fifth cite 'boredom', whilst just one in six (16% say 'peer pressure'.
- -What do you think the Police should be doing to help make your local neighbourhood a safer place? 72% of respondents identified more police patrolling on foot as the solution to this question.

Responding to the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry (Young People)
- younger groups (11-15) are main perpetrators of common forms of crime such as street robbery
- crime is perceived to be a big problem, street crime such as mugging and theft cited as the biggest problem
- agreement that the incidence of crime is greatest in parks, shopping areas and on housing estates
- less fear among 16-19 than 11-13 yr olds

Responding to the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry (Parents)
- all parents see crime and safety as key issues in their area. While many of the black parents feel that levels of crime have reduced in their neighbourhood, it is still perceived to be a major cause for concern and most say they still do not feel safe walking around their area at night- much due to gangs hanging around.
- for those in Peckham there is a sense that crime has become less of a problem due to better housing development, improved lighting and CCTV.
- views from the Bermondsey area don't necessarily agree with these.
- most people tend to associate the common forms of crime, such as muggings and vandalism, with young male teenagers and perceive criminal and anti social behaviour to be the direct result of a lack of things for young people to do. While the majority of people identify young men in their teens as the main perpetrators of these crimes, there is some suggestion that anti social behaviour begins before many children enter their teens
- people from Peckham don't attribute criminal activity to one particular ethnic group. Those from Bermondsey are more likely to associate crime with young black people, they also see incidence of gang culture as being higher among blacks.

YOT 2000
- crime and anti-social behaviour is said to affect the quality of life of around 3 in 4 Southwark residents. The same proportion view youth crime as a serious problem in their local area – although in Peckham almost all residents (92%) hold this opinion. Key concerns include mugging and theft, burglaries, disturbances from teenagers, vandalism and people hanging around the streets. Fear of crime is higher than the national average – more feel unsafe than safe walking alone outside at night. While the majority feel safe walking alone outside during the day, one in five do not. This prop has decreased since July 2000, part of which can probably be explained as a reaction to the Damilola Taylor murder which happened a few days before the start of this survey.

- 87% of residents say they have been a victim of crime or anti-social behaviour in the last year and 2 in 3 think this was committed by a young person. Most commonly people say that they have been affected by young people hanging around the streets and disturbances from teenagers. For other crimes, victims are less sure of the offenders age, however those where at least half were thought to have been carried out by someone aged 17 or under, are vandalism and graffiti, incidents on public transport and drug use or dealing.
- reducing crime and improving safety within Southwark is, therefore, a key priority for residents. However the majority of residents have very little confidence that a young offender will be caught by the police, or if they are caught, that they will be punished by the courts. The majority feel that the police and courts do not have enough ways of dealing with young offenders but, that said, there is very little spontaneous awareness of the sanctions which are actually available beyond detention in a young offenders institution and work in the community. When asked what they consider to be appropriate sentences for young offenders, a community sentence or formal warning (with a criminal record) are favoured for first offences. However, over half favour custodial sentences for more persistent offending or violent crimes, although community sentences are still supported by a significant minority. On the whole, people think that community sentencing should involve work in the community, advice from the YOT, curfews and victim reparation.
- residents make a strong connection between facilities for young people and crime in the borough – over 2 in 3 (68%) think that improved facilities would reduce the amount of crime and anti-social behaviour inn Britain. More (1 in 4) believe that poverty, drugs and a lack of discipline from parents are key causes. Nevertheless, over half are dissatisfied with the amount and quality of facilities for young people within the Borough.
- youth crime and anti-social behaviour are key concerns for Southwark residents. The survey provides useful measures of fear of crime and youth crime, as well as incidence of youth crime and anti-social behaviour, against which changes can be tracked over time. However the Damilola Taylor murder will have impacted these attitudes.
- A lack of facilities for young people is also linked with youth crime and residents are dissatisfied with both the amount and quality of such amenities within the Borough. MORI indicate this may be an area to focus on due to other surveys as well.

The YOT research contains a variety of other consultation research involving CS. In terms of perceptions of crime and the fear of crime these include:
- walking alone (fear)
- crime impact on Quality of Life
- crime Key Concerns
- youth crime significance
- facilities
- causes of crime

Further analysis of these topics take place in the YOT report itself and in Youth Crime – Review of Recent Consultation in Southwark.

3. The Image and Identity of local Areas

The image and identity of an area is another important component of CS. An area perceived as having a particular image or identity definitely influences upon the

perception of crime and the fear of crime in that area. In some cases it is argued that the image and identity of an area directly influences the likelihood of crime taking place there. The research shows that the image and identity of local neighbourhoods within Southwark are very diverse. This can be seen by consultation that targets various spatial locations, various ages (there are important gender differentials as well) and various ethnicities. Tracking these changes over time can be a useful exercise to evaluate improvement projects.

Liddle Ward Survey 2000
- Crime and personal safety top the list spontaneously as the negative aspects about the local area
- Other negative aspects mentioned by residents were 'drugs/drug dealing' 25% and 'vandalism' (19%). In the school survey, murders/violence (36%), level of violence (33%), drug dealers (19%), muggings/assaults (18% top the list as the most negative aspects
- Priorities for improving the area
- Community safety (as seen in fear of crime section)

Responding to the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry (Young People)
- Young peoples attitudes to living in Southwark – attitudes differ according to local area and ethnicity, but some common themes emerge. Overall young people are positive about living in Southwark and the 'community spirit' they feel exists. Particularly for Black and Asian teenagers who state that having a strong community is important in making them feel safe. In part this seems to mean living in an area where people from your own community/ethnic/cultural group are present in a reasonable manner.

Responding to the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry (Parents)
- in terms of physical environment, there is a sense that Southwark as a whole has improved over the last 5-10 yrs, with better housing spontaneously mentioned (consistent with young people)
- there are differences b/w how black and white parents view area, but some similarities.
- beyond housing improvements and poor facilities fot young people, peoples' experience of living in Southwark differ according to area and more specifically, the housing estates that people live on or nearby.
- the black parents are fairly positive about living in Peckham (community, ethnic and cultural similarities, provides a safe and friendly environment for them and their children).
- white parents from Bermondsey area say that there is little community spirit in the area where they live and the community spirit that the community spirit that once existed has eroded over time.
- there is a perception that the area has gotten worse. This is perceived mainly because of people coming to live in the area from other places and other parts of the Borough, and the resultant lack of harmony between the different communities.. People are therefore less positive about living in Bermondsey and they tend to have a lesser sense of pride in the area they live in.

Survey of Black and Ethnic Minority Communities in Southwark (Jan 2001)
- Satisfaction with the area. The majority of black and ethnic minority residents in Southwark are satisfied with the Borough as a place to live. In both the 1998 and 2000 residents surveys and in the 1999 People's panel, around three quarters of Black and Asian residents say that they are satisfied withtheir area. Although Asian appears to be more positive (and this is

something that comes across in other work we have done), these results should be treated with caution given the small base size. While the overall satisfaction with the area has increased slightly between 1998 and 2000, there is no statistically significant change – up or down – in the views of BME residents.

- Positive aspects about the area. Many of the positive aspects of living in Southwark identified by BMEs are similar to those seen as positive by other residents. BMEs see accessibility to central London, good transport links and good shopping facilities as advantages of living in the Borough (these will be linked to the central areas of Southwark where many BMEs live). Black residents are however more likely to see the peaceful or quiet character of their area as being a good thing.
- Negative aspects about the area. The high crime rate and the fear of crime are a major concern for BMEs in Southwark. Black and Asian residents in the Borough also feel that there is a problem with young people or teenagers hanging around the streets in their area, adding to feelings of insecurity (again, as quotes demonstrate, these need to be seen in an area of context). There has been a significant increase in Black residents in particular who feel there is a problem where they live.
- Compared with issues surrounding crime and anti-social behaviour, a relatively small percentage of BMEs perceive racism as a problem in their area (although this is not to underestimate the seriousness for those who do experience it). However, this may be because many live in areas with large non-white populations. Due to perceived racial tension in areas of the Borough with smaller non-white populations. Due to perceived racial tension in areas of the Borough with smaller non-white communities (Bermondsey is mentioned as an example) BMEs may feel restricted in their movements across Southwark.

Survey of Black and Ethnic Minority Communities in Southwark 1990
The majority (60%) of BMEs are satisfied with Southwark as a place to live, with about a quarter (27%) dissatisfied. The main way in which respondents think their neighbourhood could be made a better place to live, is by cleaning it up and providing more litter bins (31%). The issues or problems most frequently mentioned spontaneously as facing their communities are unemployment, housing, poll tax, racial harassment and poor or overcrowded housing. 3 in 5 respondents describe their area as unsafe due to robberies, burglaries, attacks or muggings (p iii).

Southwark Residents 1996 centre-west area
- residents indicated that they considered a clean, safe environment to be the most important factors in making somewhere a good place to live (similar to other parts of Southwark)
- residents in Camberwell and Walworth were more critical of local housing, with half (49%) saying they are dissatisfied with the quality of the available housing. They were also less likely to say they were satisfied that there was good policing in the area. Whereas over half of residents in other areas of the Borough (North 57%, Centre-East 51% and South 52%) say that they are satisfied, only 36% of those in the Centre-West area say this. Possibly reflecting their concern for personal safety, residents in the area are also more less likely to say that there are friendly people and neighbours in the locality.
- on issues such as the range of shops and public transport available, residents are more positive than elsewhere in the Borough.
- main problems in neighbourhood- muggings, litter/dogs' mess and vandalism

Three quarters of Camberwell and Walworth residents say they feel safe when walking around the area during daytime (74%). This is lower than in any other part of the Borough (North 85%, Centre-East 80% and the South 84%). In keeping with other residents in the central area, only 28% feel safe walking outside alone after dark, this is below the average figure for London (36%).
Despite having greater concerns about safety, Camberwell and Walworth residents (36%) are less likely to have been a victim of crime than those living in the North (42%) and Centre-East (47%) of the Borough. Furthermore, one in ten (10%) residents in the Centre-West have experienced two or more crimes, compared to 13% for Southwark as a whole.

QOL Issues Black and Minority Ethnic Communities
Overall people are fairly positive about living in Southwark, although they do recognise areas that require improvements. Views are not homogenous: the experience of black and minority groups living in Southwark differs according to the area of the Borough they live in and to some extent, the length of time they have lived in Southwark. Those who have lived in the Borough the longest tend to be more positive – since they have seen more changes in the area over time. However there are areas of commonality among all groups.

4. Black and Minority Ethnic Communities (Issues, Needs, Priorities and Opinions)

The previous section has demonstrated that there are particular implications of being a BME in terms of perceptions of CS issues (such as the fear of crime and the image of your local area) Given the large number of BME's in Southwark, this is obviously an area of particular consideration for this Borough. BME communities also tend to be disadvantaged compared to other ethnicities. For a profile of BME's in Southwark see Black and Minority Ethnic Residents in Southwark (Jan 2001, page 6). This section further explores the consultation of BME's regarding CS issues.

QOL Issues Black and Minority Ethnic Communities
This report gauges the views and opinions of the black and minority communities in Southwark in relation to their quality of life. The research also intended to help develop a strategy for Southwark Council and the Strategic Advisory Group to improve the position of these communities. More specifically the research examines:

1. the experience of black and minority ethnic communities of living in Southwark
2. Key issues affecting black and minority ethnic communities and their quality of life including education, housing and crime.
3. Ways in which the quality of life for black and minority ethnic communities can be improved.
4. How black and minority ethnic groups can be more engaged in the local decision making process.

Understanding Southwark Residents (Peoples Panel Oct 1999)
- given the particular demographic breakdown of ethnic minority residents in Southwark, reiterated below, there are a number of key areas that Southwark Council needs to target as priorities for improvement for this section of the local community (for example, black residents are particularly likely to prioritise council housing as an area that needs more spending). These areas are:
    ➢ Employment opportunities

> ➢ Facilities for young people and education
> ➢ Council housing
- background profile of BMEs
- cycles of deprivation
- views on crime and safety (P16)
- mixed views on crime and safety, reflecting the conflicting effects of different parts of the demographic profile of ethnic minority residents. For example, while black residents tend to live in areas traditionally associated with higher levels of crime (which may, for example help to explain the relatively high support for CCTV), there are well publicised concerns relating to their relationship with the police, they are also younger and so less likely to be concerned for their personal safety.
- The peoples panel survey reveals that three in ten black residents think that it is important for CCTV to be introduced into their area, higher than average across Southwark. However, according to the 1998 residents survey, black residents feel safer walking around in their area after dark than white and Asian residents. This is more likely to be associated with their younger profile than the areas they live in, as residents of the Peckham area as a whole do not feel as safe walking there alone after dark. In the 1999 Peoples Panel survey, black residents are also less likely to pick out policing as an area that needs improvement.
- CHAID analysis: The best predictor for satisfaction with safety and low crime is area, the ethnic origin of a resident makes no significant difference to their views on safety and low crime in Southwark.

Survey of Black and Ethnic Minority Communities in Southwark (1990)
- safety in the area, three in five describe it as very or fairly safe (62%), and 34% as unsafe.
- women find the area less safe than men, Dulwich safer than Bermondsey and Peckham.
- different opinions exist between different ethnic groups
- reasons for unsafe/safe perceptions are also probed

Black and Minority Ethnic Residents in Southwark (in 2001)
- crime and safety is an important priority for BME residents , with an increasing number of BMEs now feeling unsafe in their area alone after dark – at an even faster rate than Southwark residents as a whole. It has already been noted that some of this fear can be attributed to the large number of young people hanging around in gangs at night, which people find intimidating and which can make them feel unsafe.
- despite this insecurity, some residents do feel that crime has become less of a problem in their area due to improved lighting and CCTV cameras. A better development of housing with fewer alleyways on the estates is also seen as contributing to this.
- as with Southwark residents as a whole, BME residents see preventing young people from becoming involved in crime as key to tackling the problem. Younger BMEs themselves fear street muggings and theft most and some see gang membership as a way of protecting themselves. Many do not however see petty crime as leading to more serious crime later in life.
- findings from the 1999 Peoples Panel show that BME residents in Southwark are dissatisfied with progress on crime and safety. This should however be put in context of higher levels of dissatisfaction with, for example, progress on improving exam results (net satisfaction –26% Black and –36% Asian).

REPORT FOR EXECUTIVE MEETING ON 7 OCTOBER

6. Experiences of Crime (including Anti-social Behaviour and Hate Crime)

Consultation research regarding the actual experience of crime can be untaken in terms of victims or perpetrators. Such research is a valuable check against official crime and justice statistics commonly used in CS issues. It also allows important concerns to be identified that may not show up in the official statistics For example, the widespread concern in the community felt over young people hanging around in groups on the streets. This is not a crime but does lead to people feeling threatened, thus making it a valid issue of concern within CS. Both victim and perpetrator experiences have been sought in the consultation, but the focus has been upon victims.

<u>Liddle Ward Residents 2000</u>
Who has been a recent victim of crime? Around a quarter of residents (24%) have been a victim of a crime in the last 12 months, with theft (7%) and burglary (6%) being the most common crimes experienced. Only one in ten (11%) did not report the crime to the police, with 'no chance of catching the criminals' and 'didn't want to get involved/interfere' (5 and 4 residents out of 32 respectively) and the reasons given why. Friends and the Police (perhaps at a later stage) were the other people residents spoke to about the crime if the crime was not reported initially.

Black and Minority Ethnic Residents in Southwark (Jan 2001)
- If us 13 year olds were out there and took someones's purse, they could not prove it. I would get a discharge. They would give me a caution (11-13 year old, Black British)

QOL issues (Aug 2000)
- Is racism an issue? Racism is frequently referred to as an issue, but it is not a top-of-mind concern such as housing or education. There is a sense that racial tension is less of an issue and less widespread in the Borough than previously. While most people tend to associate mainly with people of the same ethnic background as themselves, there is a perception that there is a greater degree of harmony and integration between different ethnic groups in the Borough. However they do recognise that racism still exists.
- many people believe incidents of overt racism, such as name calling, to be less common, but there is a greater awareness of more subtle forms of discrimination based on race. In particular, many feel that racism, prevents them accessing certain services such as education, employment and housing. There is also a belief that the police are still discriminatory when they have dealings with black and minority ethnic people, despite the recommendations of the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry. P17 quotes
- people from the Bangladeshi community mention incidents of racism more frequently than other groups. They mention incidents of racial harassment - both verbal and physical - from neighbours (both black and white), on the estate where they live. This finding also emerged during the study among young people in Southwark's response to the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry where it transpired that young Bangladeshi males were more likely to fear racial harassment than their black peers. This may be attributable to the fact that this particular community faces greater language barriers and occupies a lower socio-economic position in Southwark than the Black Caribbean and Black African communities. There is also a sense that they feel less confident about addressing and challenging such issues.

REPORT FOR EXECUTIVE MEETING ON 7 OCTOBER

- A few weeks ago when we came out of our local mosque a gang of white youths started shouting at us using vulgar language…And they were pelting stones at our mosque (Male, Bangladeshi, 55+ years).

<u>Southwark YOT Research 2000</u>
- Respondents were read out a list of 18 types of crime and anti-social behaviour, and were asked to identify which, if any, they had been a victim of, or had been affected by, within the last year.
- confirming the salience that youth crime and anti-social behaviour has among Southwark residents, around half of all respondents claim to have been affected by people hanging around the streets (51%) and disturbances from teenagers (48%).
- between a quarter and two in five have also been affected by vandalism, drunkenness in the street, theft or damage to parked cars, noise from neighbours, lack of personal safety on public transport and drug dealing.
- around one in six or fewer respondents have been affected by the remaining crimes and anti-social behaviours.

Responding to the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry (Young People)
- as with fear of crime there is a sense that involvement in the most common forms of crime such as muggings and theft tends to differ with age.
- 11-13 year olds. Most of the people in the younger age groups we recruited, with the exception of the Bangladeshi teenagers, openly admitted to being members of gangs, being involved in street crime and using soft drugs (cannabis). Young people in this age group did not view taking part in these types of crimes as serious and do not believe that involvement in these crimes will lead to more serious criminal activity. To persuade them to view this differently would require considerable effort and resources. The main reasons young people give for involvement in crime are:
  - ➤ boredom and frustration, lack of things to do
  - ➤ to get money
  - ➤ enjoyment of the risk element that doing something illicit involves, giving them a 'buzz'
  - ➤ peer group influence
  - ➤ a feeling that young people can be involved in petty crimes with impunity, since the law is not a sufficient deterrent.
- 16-19 year olds. Older teenagers feel that it is the younger age groups who have a greater involvement in street crime. They tend to sympathise with them, as they have nothing else to keep them occupied. Many of the black teenagers state it is almost a 'rite of passage' that they will grow out of later in life.
- because you are just bored sitting indoors watching the telly, you just don't want to do it, you want to go out and do something…You smash a window or something, the police come and it's fun (16-19 years old, White).
- some of the white participants from the Bermondsey area believe that with age, young people become more community minded and are therefore less likely to get involved in crime.
- in contrast other groups, feel that taking part in petty crime peters out with age because:
  - ➤ young people become more mobile and can travel outside of their local area for entertainment and leisure activities.
  - ➤ with age, people tend to have more money and are therefore less likely to steal for money.
  - ➤ the law is stronger and more of a deterrent as people get older.

- getting involved in more serious crime. For both older and younger teenagers there is a sense that petty crime does not lead to more serious forms of crime in later life (these are perceptions but overlap with experience).
- they are unable to pinpoint the triggers of involvement in more serious forms of crime later in life but associate it mainly with drug dealing. There are also some suggestions that involvement in serious crime is a result of weak personality – i.e. those who are unable to resist pressures to take risks.
- overall people are less threatened by serious crime since it is perceived as 'more underground' and therefore less visible. There is also a feeling that those involved in more serious forms of crime come from outside of the Borough such as rival gangs and drug dealers. However many of the younger Black teenagers raise concerns about petty street crime becoming more serious, with the use of knives and other weapons becoming more common.
- Bangladeshi Teenagers. There is a perception among Bangladeshi teenagers that they are less likely to be involved in both petty and serious crimes. The main reason they suggest for this is parental pressure and the repercussions of criminal involvement in the community more generally. They have a fear of 'getting a bad reputation' within their family and immediate community and run the risk of being ostracised, a price they feel is too high to pay.

5. Relations with and attitudes towards Southwark Council

Sections 7 and 8 focus on the relationships between residents of Southwark with the Council and the Police Service respectively. These relationships are vital to addressing many CS problems, particularly since the Southwark approach to Crime and Disorder is cross-cutting. Satisfactory relationships between these players (particularly adequate levels of communication) is vital to the CS approach. In Southwark the bi-annual MORI Residents Survey provides data on the priorities of residents and their relationship with the local Council. As this survey has been regularly conducted it provides data that can be tracked over a number of years to monitor changes. The most recent Residents Survey (2000) explores these issues in some detail. This section gives a sample of the type of data that can be tracked over time as it is from the 1994 survey. This research is particularly useful for gauging the priorities of local residents.

6. Relations with and attitudes towards police

As mentioned in Section 7 there are particular implications for CS policy, which are dependent on the good working relationship between the police and the local residents. Once again there are particular issues for Southwark due to the large BME population and the difficulties that have occurred in the past relationship between BME's and the police service.

Black and Minority Ethnic Residents in Southwark (Jan 2001)
Satisfaction with policing in the Borough among Black and minority ethnic groups is similar to that of other Southwark residents. There has been a slight increase in BME satisfaction with the police from 1998 to 2000. However, satisfaction with the police is still lower than is found in the 1999/2000 national MORI People's Panel Ethnic Minority Booster (65% satisfied, 12% dissatisfied, +53 net satisfied). Nonetheless, many Blacks and Asians in Southwark are critical of the police. Among Black and Bangladeshi teenagers in particular there is a feeling of cynicism and entrenched

hostility towards the police. Personal experience of the police is seen as being at the root of this perception, with many feeling that they have been unfairly treated. Some also feel that they have been victimised and accused of crimes because of their colour.

> Its like having the NF on one side and the Police on the other, you wouldn't be able to tell the difference (16-19 years old Bangladeshi).

Older BMEs tend to be less negative towards the police than young people. Although the police may be perceived as ineffectual, they are more likely to call on them for help and assistance. Racism and discrimination are however still seen as problems despite some optimism following the Stephen Lawrence inquiry. Foot patrols are felt to be a good way of deterring criminals in some problem spots on estates.

Responding to the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry (Young People)
We found an ingrained belief among most young people that the job of the police is not to help people but rather to victimise and antagonise. Young people say that when approached by the police, they are patronised, belittled and spoken to in an aggressive and accusatory manner. Most are adamant they would never ask police for help or assistance. Only the white older teenagers from the Bermondsey area claim that they would consider asking the police for help.

Responding to the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry (Parents)
- Many of the black parents perceive the police as being racist and discriminating unfairly against people on the grounds of their colour. However, there is some optimism that the Lawrence Inquiry is helping to eliminate some of the mistrust and suspicion that exists between the black community and the police. People also accept that forging good relations will take time.

- Many of the white parents from the Bermondsey area feel that there has been a knee-jerk reaction by the police to the Lawrence Inquiry. There is a feeling that the police are 'scared' of the black community because they do not want to be accused of racism. Therefore there is a perception that the police are likely to be more lenient with black people.

All this recent consultation points to further work being required to develop relationships between the police and the general community (and with BME's in particular). This will enable CS projects to function far more easily when they involve the police co-operating with members of the public.

Final:
This report has outlined Southwark's approach to CS through the statutory method of the Crime and Disorder Strategy. Consultation plays a significant role in this statutory process. The consultation used by Southwark Council has then been reviewed here using a thematic approach. It is extremely difficult to identify accurately the full extent of all the SSP partners investment in crime reduction and community safety to date. However this report acknowledges it is not a comprehensive directory of all CS consultation research. The appropriate sections of research (i.e. those utilised by the Council) were gathered under these thematic headings to give an overall view of CS consultation research.

Appendix C Best Value Report on Community Safety
Community Safety Action plan 2003-2006

ISSUE 1 Improve the effectiveness of the SSP

Objective. Improve the effectiveness of the SSP						
Action **Lead Responsibility**	**Performance Measures /Targets**	**Milestones**	**Resources (£k)** Costs / (savings)			
			'03/04	**'04/05**	**'05/06**	**Comments**
1. Re-define the role and structure of the SSP. Adrian Rabot	New structure agreed by SSP by October 2003.	• Terms of reference adopted for SSP and sub groups Dec 2003. • Roles and responsibilities adopted by Dec 2003 • Create SSP board and executive group by October 2003	-	-	-	From existing resources
2. **Review the membership of the SSP to ensure agencies are represented at the right level.** **Adrian Rabot**	New membership reviewed by October 2003.	• Membership agreed by Nov 03.	-	-	-	From existing resources

REPORT FOR EXECUTIVE MEETING ON 7 OCTOBER

Objective. Improve the effectiveness of the SSP						
Action **Lead Responsibility**	**Performance Measures /Targets**	**Milestones**	*Resources (£k)* Costs / (savings)			
			'03/04	**'04/05**	**'05/06**	**Comments**
3. Rationalise the sub groups, appoint new Chairs where appropriate and provide sub groups with effective support. Adrian Rabot	New structure agreed and new Chairs appointed by October 03.	• Neighbourhoods and hotspots groups merged by Nov 2003 • Chair of Hate crime sub group appointed by x. • Adopt performance co-ordinator and project management roles by Oct 03.	-	-	-	From existing resources
4. Adopt partnership self assessment framework. Adrian Rabot	Self assessment completed by end Sept.	• Self assessment completed by end Sept. • Development plan completed by end of Oct, integrate with Partnership breakthrough work • Review self assessment and BV action plan March 2004	-	-	-	Home Office training provided Resources to support partnership development from Home Office (BSC/BCU)
5. Sub groups agree re-focused action plans by Dec 03. Chairs of sub groups	• Action plans SMART targets	• Revised action plans agreed by Dec 03.	-	-	-	From existing resources

Objective. Improve the effectiveness of the SSP						
Action **Lead Responsibility**	**Performance Measures /Targets**	**Milestones**	*Resources (£k)* Costs / (savings)			
			'03/04	**'04/05**	**'05/06**	**Comments**
6. Relaunch information sharing protocol Adrian Rabot	Other agencies sign up to protocol Dec 03.	• All agencies signed up by Jan 04 • Incorporate Information Sharing in SSP multi-agency training programmes Jan 04 and short leaflet	-	-	-	From existing resources

ISSUE 2 Increase capacity of Community Safety Unit

Objective. Improve effectiveness of Community Safety Unit and best use of resources						
Action **Lead Responsibility**	**Performance Measures /Targets**	**Milestones**	*Resources (£k)* *Costs / (savings)*			
			'03/04	**'04/05**	**'05/06**	**Comments**
1. Merge the CSU and police partnership unit Adrian Rabot	• Phase 1 integrated teams completed by Dec 03	• *Consultation with staff by end Oct.* • Identify individuals to support each sub group	-	-	-	Phase 1 within existing resources

Objective. Improve effectiveness of Community Safety Unit and best use of resources					
Action **Lead Responsibility**	**Performance Measures /Targets**	**Milestones**	*Resources (£k)* *Costs / (savings)*		
			'03/04	**'04/05**	**'05/06**	**Comments**
2. Restructure CSU through new appointments. Adrian Rabot	• *Appoint additional staff by Dec 03.* • Phase 2 review line management arrangements April 2004	• *Appoint deputy head of community safety with responsibility for performance management to support SSP. (Post upgraded)* • *Appoint ASB co-ordinator and project support. (New posts)*	4k 20k	10k 40k	10k £40k	Home office funding and Police partnership funding for additional posts/upgrade
3. Investigate secondments from Council Depts /Health into the CSU.	• *Secondments to deliver on key projects in action plans*	• Advertise secondments April 2004	-	£35k	£35k	Police partnership funding

ISSUE 3 Ensure a consistent, whole council approach to tackling anti-social behaviour

Objective. Ensure a consistent, whole council approach to tackling anti-social behaviour

REPORT FOR EXECUTIVE MEETING ON 7 OCTOBER

Action Lead Responsibility	Performance Measures /Targets	Milestones	Resources (£k) Costs / (savings)			
			'03/04	'04/05	'05/06	**Comments**
1. Each Department to identify a lead officer for community safety (at second tier level). Chief Officers	• Each Department has named lead officer for community safety by Nov 03.	• To COT in Nov 03.	-	-	-	Within existing staffing
2. Carry out ASB audit Adrian Rabot	• Baseline data agreed Dec 03	• Draft audit to SSP meeting by Jan 2004.	-	-	-	Additional staffing funded by Home Office
3. Produce ASB strategy by April 2004 ASB coordinator (staffing cost as above Issue 2.2)	• ASB strategy and targets agreed by SSP by April 2004	• All Departments realigned operational delivery to fit within ASB strategy by April 2004.	-	-	-	Additional costs to depts. not quantified
5. Neighbourhoods/Hotspots sub groups to take lead on delivering response to ASB Bill. Gill Davies	• Audit and strategy completed April 2004 • Consultation on asb strategy and promotional publicity	• Agree action plan Nov 03 •	10k	-	-	Additional costs funded by Home Office

ISSUE 4 Re-focus work of the sub groups to tackle hate crime, serious and violent crime, drug related crime and fear of crime

REPORT FOR EXECUTIVE MEETING ON 7 OCTOBER

Objective.						
Action Lead Responsibility	Performance Measures /Targets	Milestones	*Resources (£k)* *Costs / (savings)*			
			'03/04	**'04/05**	**'05/06**	**Comments**
1. Produce Hate Crime strategy (see Hate Crime action plan) Taiwo Dayo-Payne	Agreed by Dec 03 with SMART targets.	• Draft strategy by mid Nov 03	-	-	-	Within existing resources, although delivery of strategy will have longer term resourcing implications
2. Hate Crime sub group to produce re-focused action plan. Nathalie Hadjifotiou	Agreed by Feb 04	• Implement actions from performance breakthrough by Dec 03	-	-	-	Mainstreaming implications of Campaign Against Hate Crime in 2005/6 (partial) and 2006/7 (full)
3. Serious and violent crime sub group to produce re-focused action plan. Ed Bateman	• Agree detailed action plans PI's with task group chairs by Nov 03	• Review group membership • Terms of reference and action plans for task groups • Develop forward plans and budgets	-	-	-	Support from combined police/CSU Future action plans not costed

REPORT FOR EXECUTIVE MEETING ON 7 OCTOBER

<table>
<tr><td colspan="7">Objective.</td></tr>
<tr>
<td rowspan="2">Action
Lead Responsibility</td>
<td rowspan="2">Performance Measures /Targets</td>
<td rowspan="2">Milestones</td>
<td colspan="4">Resources (£k)

Costs / (savings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'03/04</td>
<td>'04/05</td>
<td>'05/06</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.   Agree SSP wide reassurance strategy.

Adrian Rabot</td>
<td>
• Agree borough wide strategy by Dec 2003
• Develop neighbourhood and community of interest reassurance plans April 2004
</td>
<td>
• All theme group action plans to include reassurance in action plans by April 2004.
</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£30k</td>
<td>£30k</td>
<td>Communications within Home Office Budget – Briefings within existing budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.   Drug related crime</td>
<td>
• Promote existing work to tackle drug related crime
• Provide performance data and improve PI's
</td>
<td>
• Refer BV review to Communities and Availability's group
• Develop forward plan on CAD/Strengthening Communities
</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>tbd</td>
<td>Address mainstreaming of CAD programme 2005/6</td>
</tr>
</table>

REPORT FOR EXECUTIVE MEETING ON 7 OCTOBER

Summary

The actions contained above principally require the reallocation and/or prioritisation of existing resources, mostly staff or operational budgets to minimise the requirement for additional resources.

	2003/2004	2004/2005	2005/2006	Total
Corporate savings to Council Budget Process	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Growth Required	0	0	0	0
Funded from existing resources	**£34k** Funded externally	**£115k** Funded externally	**£115k** Funded externally	**£264k** Funded externally

REPORT FOR EXECUTIVE MEETING ON 7 OCTOBER

REPORT FOR EXECUTIVE MEETING ON 7 OCTOBER