

# Safer and Stronger Communities

## STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP

### 2015/16 ANNUAL REPORT OF THE SAFER AND STRONGER COMMUNITIES STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP

1 July 2016

#### Purpose of the report

1. To review and report on the activity, performance and achievements of the Safer and Stronger Communities Strategic Partnership.

#### Background

2. The Partnership was established in early 2007 and fulfils the legal requirement for a Community Safety Partnership in South Gloucestershire as established under the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 and Police Reform Act 2002. The primary purpose of the Partnership is to co-ordinate and help deliver actions that support the development of safer and stronger communities within South Gloucestershire.
3. The Partnership also acts as the lead on Safer and Stronger Communities work for the South Gloucestershire Partnership.
4. The Partnership Framework, describing its operation in more detail, is attached at Appendix 1.
5. In the 2015/16 municipal year the Partnership's regular meetings took place on the following dates: 12 June 2015; 4 September 2015; 4 December 2015 and 18 March 2016. Links to the agenda papers for each of these meetings, showing the business covered, is given at Appendix 2.
6. In addition the Partnership met on 28 April 2015 and 16 February 2016 to consider the reports from the 2<sup>nd</sup>; 3<sup>rd</sup>; and 4<sup>th</sup> Domestic Homicide Reviews carried out on its behalf by independent chairs.
7. In 2015/16, the Partnership met all its statutory obligations. In addition to the process requirements already identified in this report and Appendix 1 (i.e. involvement of defined Responsible Authorities; an annual public meeting) these can be summarised as:
  - Conducting a Joint Strategic Assessment of Crime and Disorder in the Local Area;
  - Agreeing a Partnership Plan to address priority Crime and Disorder issues; and
  - Implementing the Partnership Plan.

## Major topics considered by the Strategic Partnership 2015/16

8. Through the year the Strategic Partnership maintained a rigorous focus on the outcomes achieved by partners, co-ordinated through the Senior Officer Group, to address its priorities. Performance results for 2014/15 were considered in June 2015, and a Partnership Plan laying out the targets for 2015/16 were agreed at the same meeting. Outcomes for the first 6 months of the year were reviewed at the meeting on 4<sup>th</sup> December 2015. Final performance results for 2015/16 are now available and are covered elsewhere in this report.
9. As a result of this focus the Strategic Partnership identified some areas where results were felt to be problematic, and more detailed analysis of these was carried out at the September 2015 meeting.
  - In respect of **crime levels in Kingswood** the Strategic Partnership found that many priority crime types had reduced in Kingswood and were now much closer to the average across South Gloucestershire as a whole. For example Criminal Damage incidences had reduced across Kingswood while remaining static across South Gloucestershire. For non-dwelling burglary the Kingswood figures were below the average although there had been slight increases in Violence Against the Person and Street Robbery. Theft of Motor Vehicle and Theft of Pedal Cycle were either mirroring or were below average.

Overall Kingswood had seen a similar pattern to the rest of South Gloucestershire. Due to changes in reporting and recording crime levels had seen an overall increase of around 4.2%.

It was also believed that the majority of acquisitive crime was related to drug habits (and that the vast majority of burglaries were attributable to a few individuals and tended to fall significantly following a purge on this type of activity.) It was noted that there was good preventative work going on.
  - More detailed consideration was also given to results from the annual South Gloucestershire Residents Survey and the Citizens Panel. Questions, which showed only 17% of respondents agreed that they felt that they could **influence decisions affecting the local area** – a significant reduction on previous years' results.

Results were analysed by gender, ethnicity, disability and age, and also by Political Ward. There was found to be no significant correlation between demographics and survey results. However, it was noted that respondents had been more likely to indicate that they had not been treated fairly by the Council if they had disagreed with the implementation of a particular decision or policy, such as the green waste charge or Highwood Road.

It was also speculated that some members of the public may not fully understand the decision-making process when some decisions may be made at a parish level rather than a South Gloucestershire Council area and some levels of dissatisfaction may be from parish decisions. It was agreed the Council would add some supplementary questions to the survey to explore whether this was the case.

The 2016 result for this same indicator (22.4%) not only reverses this drop but is the highest value recorded since the national methodology for it was amended in 2012.

10. All groups funded through the Community Safety Grant were again required to present their performance and results. The presentations gave the Strategic Partnership to explore the impact of these services in a very different way to that provided through performance indicator results. This continues to be a valuable exercise, and one the Strategic Partnership is keen to continue in 2016/17.
11. Arrangements for the processes and timetable for allocation of the Community Safety Grant 2016/17 were agreed in December 2015, and in March 2016 the Strategic Partnership determined to continue to fund the four projects which had been supported in the previous year.
12. Three Domestic Homicide Reviews (DHR 2; DHR 3; DHR 4) were completed and considered by the Strategic Partnership during the year. In addition, the Strategic Partnership considered the delivery of recommendations following the first Domestic Homicide Review (DHR1). While noting the significant successes achieved in implementing the Action Plan for DHR1 some corrective action was agreed, and arrangements for monitoring of future action plans amended in order to improve the effectiveness of this process.
13. During the year the Strategic Partnership participated in the development of the Licensing Policy of South Gloucestershire Council by considering, and making comments in response to, consultation on this policy.
14. The Strategic Partnership was also kept abreast of changes in the delivery of services relevant to its remit, including proposals to achieve a £277,000 reduction in the cost of South Gloucestershire Council's Anti-Social Behaviour and Community Safety Service; and the change in operation of Safer and Stronger Community Groups to become Community Engagement Forums.
15. Both the Police and the Police and Crime Commissioner updated the Strategic Partnership of changes in their work and operation on several occasions.

### **Performance Results 2015/2016**

16. Targets for key strategic indicators were set by the Partnership at the beginning of the financial year. Full results for achievement of these targets are shown in Appendix 3, but key outcomes are outlined below. It should be noted that this Annual Report is presented 3 months earlier than in previous years, and so a number of figures (particularly crime figures for comparison to those we recorded in South Gloucestershire) are not yet available.

### ***Be Safe***

17. Continuing national annual changes in crime recording methodology mean that once again it is not possible to draw conclusions about trends in crime types and levels. Instead South Gloucestershire figures, which show a 12% rise in total

recorded crime per 100,000 residents, must be compared with those elsewhere in order to draw conclusions about the prevalence of crime locally. This was taken into account by the Strategic Partnership in setting its targets for 2015/16. For most crime types the Strategic Partnership agreed to minor results and compare them to those elsewhere, rather than set a numerical target. At the time of writing comparable results for other areas have not yet been published.

18. Ironically where the Strategic Partnership did set a numerical target – for reducing dwelling burglaries – that target was achieved.
19. Endeavours to increase the reporting of domestic and serious sexual violence also provided successful, with a 10% increase on the previous year. However the 370 extra cases recorded comprise 25% of the increase in total crime.
20. The Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conference for high risk victims of domestic violence saw a reduction in the level of repeat victimisation, although the final result falls outside the target band.
21. The reduction in personal priority crimes achieved in Kingswood in previous years (down 8.2% between 2012/13 and 2014/15) was reversed with an increase of 16.6%. Even allowing for the changes in recording practice, this causes concern when compared to the 12% increase in overall crime across South Gloucestershire.
22. The proportion of residents believing Anti-Social Behaviour is a problem in their local area increased from 6% to 7%. However this result has been 6% or 7% every year since it was first measured using the current methodology in 2012/13. Although this figure rose the increase is within the margin of error, and is not believed to be a cause for concern.

### ***Feel Safe***

23. Perceptions of crime, and of agencies effectiveness in preventing and dealing with it, were once again contradictory. The percentage of residents who agree police and other public services are successfully dealing with ASB and crime dropped again from the 2014 result. Yet at the same time the proportion of residents feeling safe outside in their local area increased. It is believed that the former figure was driven by national publicity over crime; the impact of (potential) Police funding cuts, and by a few high-profile regional cases. Given all these factors, the reduction is not entirely surprising.

### ***Promoting equality and improving cohesion***

24. Both measures used to monitor equality and cohesion showed improvement once again although the increase in residents believing people from different backgrounds get on well together in their local area (from 64.4% to 64.6%) is not statistically significant. The improved proportion of respondents believing there is a problem with people not treating each other with respect and consideration was more dramatic though. This figure was 15% in 2013/14, and the previous year's reduction to 9.5% was followed by a further drop to 8.5%

### ***Priority Neighbourhoods***

25. The key measures of success for the Priority Neighbourhoods programme are the Indices of Deprivation. The latest results for these were published in autumn 2015 and were examined in detail by the Strategic Partnership in March 2016. The headline result was one area no longer meeting the threshold to be a Priority Neighbourhood, but the improvement in Number of single criteria in which PN LSOAs are in the worst 20% nationally also improved markedly.

### ***Engaging Communities in Decision Making***

26. Last year the Strategic Partnership was extremely concerned about the low proportion (17%) of people who believed they could influence the decisions affecting their local area and considerable effort was devoted to exploring this as described above. It is therefore pleasing to be able to report an improvement in this result in the past 12 months (up to 22.4%).

### ***Voluntary Organisations, Community Groups and Social Enterprises***

27. No results for indicators established by the Strategic Partnership to monitor achievement in this area are yet available.

### ***Community Trigger***

28. During 2015/16 4 Community Trigger applications were received. Full information on these is shown in Appendix 3.

### ***Community Safety Grant***

29. Available results from the work funded through the Community Safety Grant is also included in Appendix 3. In interpreting this data the following information may prove helpful:

### ***ASB Support Service***

30. The figure provided for reduced risk in Qr4 refers only to the 3 clients completing a survey on leaving the service, when 100% were found to be at reduced risk. It does not indicate that ONLY 3 of the cases in Q4 experienced reduced risk.
31. There was a loss of momentum in the talks to hard to reach groups when the previous caseworker left and a new person joined and was trained. This was discussed with the Strategic Partnership at its meeting in September 2015. During the rest of the year the target for number of people attending talks was achieved, although the number of talks themselves could not catch up with that gap in Qtr 1 and Qtr 2.

### ***Towards Freedom Programme***

32. As previously agreed with the Strategic Partnership the results presented are those for the programme run in the priority areas of Patchway, Kingswood and Yate,

although the last of these is not funded by the Strategic Partnership as alternative funding was obtained.

33. The number of attendees significantly exceeds the number of formal referrals made into the scheme, reflecting a high number of victims not coming through Lighthouse or the Police, but who are responding to information about the course itself.
34. The proportion of people reporting the positive outcomes the Strategic Partnership wanted exceeds targets in every case. However the number of attendees completing the form from which this information is collected is low, so the targets for this are missed. This is believed to be at least in part because service users do not always plan their finish time. Survive will be looking at possible mid-way feedback to overcome this difficulty.

### ***Complex Needs IDVA***

35. Results achieved by the Complex Needs IDVA show that the Strategic Partnership's target both for the number of cases dealt with, and the positive outcomes sought, were achieved. In addition a set of 4 case studies (1 per quarter) have been provided and these are also included in Appendix 3.

### **Looking Forward to 2016/17**

36. By considering changes and issues that are likely to impact on its future work, the Partnership can ensure these are appropriately responded to.
37. The most significant change remains the continued pressure on public sector funding, and the changes that will have to be made by public sector organisations in order to meet future savings targets.
38. The Strategic Partnership has made some changes to its own operation in order to continue being effective within the reduced capacity of many of its constituent organisations. These include reducing the number of meetings, while acknowledging more work will need to be done electronically. A close eye will be kept on whether these changes achieve the desired results.
39. Although firm details are not yet available, Government Ministers have alluded on a number of occasions to changes in the oversight and operation of emergency services. Such changes may have a significant impact, and the Strategic Partnership will want to keep a close eye on developments.
40. The result of the election for a new Police and Crime Commissioner will be very significant for 2016/17 and beyond, as will the eventual outcome of plans to devolve more power from central Government to local areas including the West of England.

### **Risk Register**

41. The Risk register for the Safer and Stronger Communities Strategic Partnership is attached as Appendix 4. This Register has been reviewed by the Senior Officer Group and their proposed amendments to the previous Register are highlighted in

the text. In the main these are updates to risks previously agreed, though changes in circumstance have amended the risk score of some items.

42. The most significant risks remain those the Strategic Partnership has no control over, including the impact of budget reductions on key front-line service delivery. The increased statutory obligations being placed on Community Safety Partnerships, following withdrawal of ALL funding for them also remains a significant concern.

### **The Chair's Evaluation of the Partnership Process**

43. The excellent outcomes achieved last year which are detailed in this annual report are testament to the effective partnership working in South Gloucestershire, and the dedication and delivery of those working for our local communities.
44. The Safer and Stronger Communities Strategic Partnership continued to effectively link and shape that work carried out by a significant number of organisations in order not only to reduce crime, but also to strengthen local communities and cohesion.
45. As we look forward into 2016/17 and beyond we face many opportunities as well as finding challenges to overcome. We need to balance the demands placed on us while maintaining a high level focus on achieving the continuing results that are so important to our local residents.

Heather Goddard, Chair

### **Recommendations**

- 1) To review the draft annual report and agree any changes to be made to it
- 2) To approve the Safer and Stronger Communities Strategic Partnership's final annual report for 2015/16.

### **Author**

Heather Goddard, Chair of the Safer and Stronger Communities Strategic Partnership

### **Officer Contacts**

Robert Walsh, Head of Safe and Strong Communities, South Gloucestershire Council

☎ 01454 865818.

## **SOUTH GLOUCESTERSHIRE SAFER AND STRONGER COMMUNITIES STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP**

### **PARTNERSHIP FRAMEWORK**

#### **1 Purpose and Aims of the Partnership**

- 1.1 As its primary purpose, to establish a strategic direction; co-ordinate and help deliver actions that support the development of safer and stronger communities within South Gloucestershire.
- 1.2 To exercise the functions of the statutory Community Safety Partnership for South Gloucestershire.
- 1.3 In particular, to encourage, support and propose actions that will help achieve the agreed aims set out in the South Gloucestershire Community Strategy, namely:-
  - (i) To reduce crime, the harm caused by illegal drugs and alcohol and to reassure the public, reducing the fear of crime and anti-social behaviour and improve safety in homes and public spaces.
  - (ii) To empower local people to have a greater voice and influence over local decision-making and the delivery of services by increasing the strength, capacity and engagement of local communities to create local solutions.
  - (iii) To improve the quality of life for people in existing and new communities in greatest need through targeted service delivery.

#### **2 Terms of Reference**

- 2.1 To promote and guide work that supports the development of sustainable safer and stronger communities.
- 2.2 To oversee, co-ordinate, inform and influence the development of policies, strategies and action plans relating to all of the work of the Partnership.
- 2.3 To secure, on behalf of the Local Strategic Partnership, the implementation of those aspects of the Sustainable Community Strategy that relate to 'Our Communities'.
- 2.4 To monitor progress of the Partnership and its strategies and action plans and ensure equality of opportunity has been addressed on a 6 monthly basis.
- 2.5 To ensure effective liaison and working with other strategic partnerships to achieve shared or related objectives, including making links with sub-regional partnerships.
- 2.6 To be responsible for securing co-ordination between partner agencies and resolution of potential disputes regarding the various strategies, funding and service delivery issues, to enable objectives to be secured.
- 2.7 To promote an understanding of the contribution and responsibilities of individual organisations, based on the shared commitments and aims of the Partnership.
- 2.8 To make recommendations to the Local Strategic Partnership, the Council and other partner organisations on matters relating to the achievement of Community Strategy objectives.



- 2.9 To deliver statutory obligations by forging a constructive partnership which assists in tackling the complex issues associated with crime, disorder, drug and alcohol misuse and influencing change.
- 2.10 To consider the outcome of significant inspections and reviews and advise on necessary changes to policy, strategy and action plans.
- 2.11 To develop and maintain links with community groups and to value the views expressed by voluntary, community and business interests.
- 2.12 To receive; comment upon; and recommend key strategies and policies.

### **3 Legal Status and Decision-Making**

- 3.1 When acting in its Community Safety Partnership capacity, the Partnership is exercising its statutory functions under the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 and the Police Reform Act 2002. The Partnership may make formal decisions to discharge its statutory Community Safety Partnership functions.
- 3.2 The Partnership shall not make executive decisions or exercise executive authority over constituent partner organisations. Neither may the Partnership or any Partnership Sub -Group have the power to make decisions that bind member organisations.
- 3.3 Proposals for the allocation of external funds held in the role of CSP will be made by the Senior Officer Group, for approval by the Strategic Partnership on at least an annual basis.
- 3.4 The Partnership may make recommendations to the South Gloucestershire Local Strategic Partnership, or where executive decisions are needed, to the Council or partner organisation that has responsibility for the function or activity concerned.

### **4. Membership of the Partnership**

- 4.1 The following organisations have formal spaces on the Strategic Partnership.

Avon and Somerset Police	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 member
Avon Fire and Rescue Service	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 member
Clinical Commissioning Group.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 member
Community Engagement Forums	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 members (one from unparished area)
CVS South Gloucestershire	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 Member
National Probation service	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 member
Over 50s Forum	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 member
Police and Crime Commissioner	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 member
Priority Neighbourhoods Partnership Networks	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 member
Public Health	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 member
Registered Social Landlords	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 member
South Gloucestershire Council	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 elected Member and 2 observers
South Gloucestershire Equalities Forum	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 member
Town and Parish Council Forum	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 member

BGSW Community Rehabilitation Company	□ 1 member
---------------------------------------	------------

- 4.2 The Partnership shall have the power to co-opt other members as appropriate, eg to represent young people or older people's organisations.
- 4.3 Each member of the Partnership shall nominate a Deputy who will attend in their absence.
- 4.4 Officers from organisations represented on the Partnership will be available to offer support and give guidance and advice as required.

## **5 Life of the Partnership**

- 5.1 The partnership shall be subject to review if there is no longer a legal requirement to have a Community Safety Partnership.

## **6 Convening and Conducting Meetings**

- 6.1 The Partnership shall meet at least 3 times a year with additional meetings to be arranged as agreed by Members.
- 6.2 The Chair and Vice Chair will be elected by the Partnership and serve for one year. For the purpose of electing a chair and vice-chair, each partner representative has a vote, the outcome being achieved by simple majority of those present at the meeting.
- 6.3 Partnership meetings shall have a quorum of a minimum of a third of partner organisations being represented.
- 6.4 The Partnership should aim to reach its conclusions by consensus. Conclusions reached are not binding on partner organisations in respect of their own executive functions and responsibilities. Conclusions will be referred to the relevant partner organisations for consideration and decision. Outcomes will be reported back to the Partnership.
- 6.5 Secretariat and legal support will be provided by South Gloucestershire Council Legal and Democratic Services, to include:□  
Co-ordination of agenda preparation
- Convening of meetings
  - Publication and circulation of agendas and supporting papers at least five clear (working) days prior to a meeting
  - Taking of minutes
  - Procedural and legal advice
  - Monitoring and progressing actions agreed by the Partnership.
- 6.6 Partners shall have the right to submit agenda items as long as they are received at least seven working days prior to the despatch of the agenda.
- 6.7 Meetings will be open to the public and the agenda and minutes of meetings will be published.

## **7 Partnership Relationships and Linkages**

- 7.1 The South Gloucestershire Safer and Stronger Communities Partnership is responsible to the South Gloucestershire Local Strategic Partnership. Subject to the Local Strategic Partnership's agreement, the Safer and Stronger Communities Partnership will have primary responsibility for representing the views of the LSP on issues within the Safer and Stronger Communities Partnership's terms of reference.

- 7.2 The Partnership will ensure that it supports work towards the related outcomes of any themes in the Sustainable Communities Strategy.

## **8 Probity and Accountability**

- 8.1 The Partnership will meet in public, with the same opportunities for public participation as apply to Council meetings generally. Meeting arrangements and agendas will be published so that the public may be aware of the Partnership's activities and the opportunities to engage with them.
- 8.2 In the interests of transparency and to ensure probity and public confidence in partnership working, all partner representatives at partnership meetings are expected to commit to the seven principles of public life set out in the first report of the Committee on Standards in Public Life as required by the Localism Act 2011 as follows:
- Selflessness
  - Honesty □ Integrity
  - Accountability
  - Openness
  - Leadership □ Objectivity
- and to abide by the Members' Code of Conduct of South Gloucestershire Council as amended from time to time
- 8.3 Partners who consider that they have an interest to declare are asked to: a) State the item number in which they have an interest, b) The nature of the interest, c) Whether the interest is a disclosable pecuniary interest, non-disclosable pecuniary interest or non-pecuniary interest. Any partner who is unsure about the above should seek advice from South Gloucestershire Council's Monitoring Officer prior to the meeting in order to expedite matters at the meeting itself.

## **9 Scrutiny of Partnership**

- 9.1 The activities of the Partnership will be subject to scrutiny by the relevant committee of South Gloucestershire Council. This is currently the Environment and Community Services. Scrutiny will be conducted in accord with the Protocol jointly agreed between the Strategic Partnership and South Gloucestershire Council.
- 9.2 As a minimum, an annual report of the Partnership will provide a basic opportunity for the scrutiny of partnership work to take place. However, individual overview and scrutiny committees may wish to pursue additional and specific areas of scrutiny as they consider appropriate.

## **10 Risk Management**

- 10.1 Good risk management is integral to the delivery of successful partnership working. The Partnership will be guided by and take account of the document "Guidance for Managing Risk and Opportunities in Partnership" in developing aims and objectives and in all its activities.

## Safer & Stronger Communities Partnership Partnership Meetings 2015/16

Date of the Partnership Meeting	Links to Agenda Papers
12 June 2015	<a href="https://council.southglos.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=185&amp;MId=6830&amp;Ver=4">https://council.southglos.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=185&amp;MId=6830&amp;Ver=4</a>
4 September 2015	<a href="https://council.southglos.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=185&amp;MId=7314&amp;Ver=4">https://council.southglos.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=185&amp;MId=7314&amp;Ver=4</a>
4 December 2015	<a href="https://council.southglos.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=185&amp;MId=7315&amp;Ver=4">https://council.southglos.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=185&amp;MId=7315&amp;Ver=4</a>
18 March 2016	<a href="https://council.southglos.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=185&amp;MId=7316&amp;Ver=4">https://council.southglos.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=185&amp;MId=7316&amp;Ver=4</a>

- Papers for the special meeting held on 28 April 2015 can be found at <https://council.southglos.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=185&MId=7223&Ver=4>
- Minutes of the special meeting held on 16 February 2016 can be found at <https://council.southglos.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=185&MId=7683&Ver=4>

## PERFORMANCE RESULTS 2015/16

The results below cover performance against target in 2015/16 for all strategic measures set by the Safer & Stronger Communities Strategic Partnership.

### Legend

✓ = Target achieved

? = Results not yet available

**x** = Target not achieved

Indicator	2015/16 Target	2015/16 Result	Whether target achieved	Comments
<b>BE SAFE</b>				
<i><b>Aim:</b></i> Our aim is quite simply put – To reduce the level of crime, particularly those crimes that have the most impact on communities and victims, whilst keeping the victim at the heart of the justice system by listening and responding to their needs.				
<b>Overall Crime</b>				
Total crimes per 1,000 population	No numerical target set – monitor levels	50.8	?	The rolling 12 month number of crimes in South Glos to the end of March 2016 was 13,809, which is an increase of 1,481 offences or 12.0% compared to the end of year figure for 2014/15 (12,328). However changes in recording practice nationally mean conclusions this figure can only be drawn in comparison to those elsewhere. Comparison figures are not available at the time of writing.
<b>Anti-Social Behaviour</b>				
% residents who think anti-social behaviour is a problem in their local area	6%	7%	x	This result has been 6% or 7% every year since it was first measured using the current methodology in 2012/13. Although this figure represents a rise since last year this is within the margin of error, and is not believed to be a cause for concern.

Indicator	2015/16 Target	2015/16 Result	Whether target achieved	Comments
Number of criminal damage offences per 1,000 population	No numerical target set – monitor levels	7.4	✓	<p>The 12 month number of criminal damage offences to the end of March 2016 is 2,015, which is 19 fewer offences than were recorded during 2014/15 (2,034) and represents a rate of 7.4 offences per 1000. Compared to 7.6 in 2014/15</p> <p>The changes in recording practice nationally will increase rather than decrease the levels recorded. Therefore this figure is believed to represent a genuine reduction.</p>
Number of deliberate secondary fires	195	182	✓	This figure continues to be successfully reduced by the Fire and Rescue service year on year.
Victim satisfaction with handling of ASB cases by the Police	84.0%	75%	✗	<p>There were a number of major challenges during the year including changes to the Police Operating model; the implementation of new tools and powers; and introduction of the Lighthouse service.</p> <p>We have finished the year with a 75.0% satisfaction rate with the handling of ASB cases. This is nearly 7% lower than the satisfaction rate in the previous year and is worse than our target of 84.0%, and is below the level achieved 2013/14.</p>
Victim satisfaction with ASB cases handled by South Gloucestershire Council ASB Team	84%	91%	✓	<p>These results are measured 6 months in arrears with surveys going out on a quarterly basis to all victims who had requested and the case has subsequently been closed.</p> <p>Given the difficulties the team has faced in the last 12 months including new tools and powers; changes in partner arrangements and a service review, the results are particularly impressive.</p>

Indicator	2015/16 Target	2015/16 Result	Whether target achieved	Comments
% ASB cases fully resolved	≥59.3%	52.5%	✗	This figure is nearly 7% lower than the previous year.
<b>Domestic and Sexual Violence</b>				
Reported cases of domestic and serious sexual violence	≥3,500	3,869	✓	<p>The Strategic Partnership set an ambition of achieving an increase in reporting to for this indicator, in support of the PCCs priority.</p> <p>During the course of 2015/16 there were 3,869 reports of domestic violence and serious sexual offences in South Glos. This is a 10% increase on 2014/15 and represents good performance. However this success has contributed to a rise in violence with injury reporting and overall crime levels, for which we are now off target.</p>
Repeat incidents of domestic violence following a Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conference	28%-40%	25%	✗	<p>The MARAC dealt with the same number of referrals dealt as last year (295). The repeat victimisation rate has dropped from 30% last year to 25%.</p> <p>This could be seen as positive given the previous year on year increase in repeat victimisation rate. It is however below what SafeLives recommend which is for it to be between 28-40%.</p> <p>We are however in line with national averages for repeat victimisation.</p>
<b>Burglaries</b>				

Number of dwelling burglaries per 1,000 population	≤2.53	2.46	✓	There were 667 domestic burglary offences in the 12 months to March 2016. This is 13 fewer offences than were seen in 2014/15 (680 offences) and represents an 1.9% decrease in offending. This reverses the slight rise seen in 2014/15.
--	-------	------	---	---



Indicator	2015/16 Target	2015/16 Result	Whether target achieved	Comments
<b>Targeting offenders</b>				
Serious acquisitive crime per 1,000 population	No numerical target set – monitor levels	7.1	?	<p>There were 1,929 serious acquisitive crime offences in the 12 months to March 2016. This is 166 more offences than were seen in 2014/15 (1,763 offences) and represents a 9.4% increase in offending. Our current offending rate is 7.10 offences per 1000.</p> <p>However changes in recording practice nationally mean conclusions this figure can only be drawn in comparison to those elsewhere. Comparison figures are not available at the time of writing.</p>
<b>Reducing Violent Crime</b>				
Violence with injury per 1,000 population	No numerical target set – monitor levels	3.94	?	<p>There were 1,070 violence with injury offences in the 12 months to March 2016. This is 126 more offences than were seen in 2014/15 (945 offences) and represents a 13.3% increase in offending. Our current offending rate is 3.94 offences per 1000.</p> <p>However changes in recording practice nationally mean conclusions this figure can only be drawn in comparison to those elsewhere. Comparison figures are not available at the time of writing.</p>
<b>Reducing Drug or Alcohol Dependency</b>				
Number of drug users recorded in effective treatment	694	Result not available.	?	<p>Data is available 6 months in arrears, so the end of year figure will be available at the end of September 2016.</p> <p>However the Q3 result of 821 in treatment, combined with the ongoing DAAT success rate leaves us on track to achieve target.</p>



Indicator	2015/16 Target	2015/16 Result	Whether target achieved	Comments
People successfully exiting treatment for alcohol misuse	44.6	45.4.	✓	Rate was 46.4% at the end of Q2 and 45.4% at the end of Q3, bettering target.
Young people in a structured treatment programme for drug problems	N/A	N/A	?	The National Treatment Agency set no target for this indicator.
Alcohol-related hospital admissions	N/A	1987	✓	Admissions per 100,000 population is reported a year in arrear so this is the data for 2014/15. This is a marginal reduction on the previous year's figure of 2010.4
<b>Hot Spots</b>				
Level of priority crime in Kingswood.	972 offences	1,133offences	✗	The number of priority crimes in Kingswood rose by 16.6%, compared to an overall rise in the crime rate of 12% across South Gloucestershire
<b>Young People and Crime</b>				
Number of first time entrants to the youth offending system. Per 100,000 young people	134	Result awaited	?	
Levels of reoffending of those in the youth offending system	34%	33%	✓	Performance has stabilised and is now below both local and national averages.
% 10-17 year olds who have not had any contact with the criminal justice system	≥98.37%	Result awaited	?	

Indicator	2015/16 Target	2015/16 Result	Whether target achieved	Comments
<b>FEEL SAFE</b>				
<b>Aim:</b> To improve public confidence and reduce the fear of crime				
% residents who agree police and other public services are successfully dealing with ASB and crime	30.3%	28.9%	✗	This figures improved steadily to a high spot of 37.7% in 2013/14. From that peak it dropped to 30.3% in 2014/15 and has now reduced further. Given national publicity over crime figures and the impact of (potential) reductions in Police funding this change is not entirely surprising.
% residents feeling safe outside in their local area	79%	80%	✓	This figure continues on an upward trend. Constituent figures (day / night) are not yet available but will be provided once received.
<b>PROMOTING EQUALITY AND IMPROVING COHESION</b>				
<b>Aim:</b> To improve cohesion in our local communities by helping vulnerable people through financial advice and support; tackling inequality based on race, religion, age, gender, sex or sexuality; and by bringing people and communities together				
% residents who think there is a problem with people not treating each other with respect and consideration	9.5%	8.5%	✓	This result continues the improvement seen last year from the 2013/14 figure of 15.1%
% residents believing people from different backgrounds get on well together	64.4%	64.6%	✓	This result continues the improvement seen last year from the 2013/14 figure of 51.9%
<b>PRIORITY NEIGHBOURHOODS</b>				
<b>Aim:</b> To reduce the number of criteria in which priority neighbourhoods are listed amongst the 20% most deprived neighbourhoods in England as measured by criteria within the national Indices of Multiple Deprivation.				

Number of Neighbourhoods in the worst 20% nationally as measured through the Indices of Deprivation	<6	5	✓	This marks the first time a Priority Neighbourhood has reached the threshold to exit that status and is to be commended.
---	----	---	---	--

Indicator	2015/16 Target	2015/16 Result	Whether target achieved	Comments
Number of single criteria in which PN LSOAs are in the worst 20% nationally	<28	23	✓	
<b>ENGAGING COMMUNITIES IN DECISION MAKING</b>				
<b>Aim:</b> To increase the extent to which local people understand and influence decisions in their locality.				
% of people who feel they can influence decisions in their locality	17%	22.4%	✓	This not only reverses the reduction in 2014/15, but is the highest figure recorded since the national methodology for this indicator was amended in 2012.
<b>VOLUNTARY ORGANISATIONS, COMMUNITY GROUPS AND SOCIAL ENTERPRISES</b>				
<b>Aim:</b> To build strong voluntary organisations, community groups and social enterprises by stimulating the sector and strengthening resilience and robustness.				
% of funding for voluntary and community sector organisations obtained from non-Council sources	Figure awaited	Result awaited	?	
Investment made by the public sector in grants and contracts with voluntary organisations, community groups and social enterprises	£8,258,100	Result awaited	?	
An increased awareness of the COMPACT is reported by VCSE groups	≥54%	Result awaited	?	
An increased awareness of the COMPACT is reported by public sector signatories to the COMPACT	≥85%	Result awaited	?	

## ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR COMMUNITY TRIGGER APPLICATIONS

Application Reference	Date Received	Trigger Activated?	Date Review Completed	Applicant Appeal?	Comments
CT3	11/06/2015	No	N/A		<p>The application did not meet the criteria of three incidents of reported ASB or hate crime in a 6 month period.</p> <p>The applicant is a Merlin Housing Society tenant and it was agreed Merlin would continue to work with them to ascertain the current situation, recording any new incidents, whilst separating repairs and anti-social behaviour issues.</p> <p>A single point of contact within Merlin whom the applicant is comfortable with was provided and a review of their management transfer application/appeal carried out.</p>
CT4	08/07/2015	Yes			<p>The application followed a long and protracted ASB case which had involved considerable involvement from agencies where the perpetrator of ASB was deemed unfit to plead by the Crown Court. The latter received a hospital order in March 2014, but was released from hospital in January 2015.</p> <p>The anti-social behaviour which led to the Community Trigger activation involves 2 neighbouring semi-detached properties which are privately owned by the applicant and perpetrator respectively.</p> <p>The ASB reported in the community trigger application includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significant verbal abuse directed at the perpetrator at the victim and his associates</li> <li>• Noise issues (including shouting loudly using obscene language) and,</li> <li>• Direct threats to the victim and other residents</li> </ul>

					<p>There were 7 reports of ASB in the 6 months prior to the trigger being activated.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Calls made to the Police by the victim were responded to and reassurance visits were also conducted on each occasion. Consideration could have been given at an earlier opportunity to the use of the new tools and powers – specifically the Community Protection Notice warning - which was eventually used, but could have been issued at an earlier stage.</li> <li>2. A number of meetings were held to discuss the perpetrator's care plan – it would have been beneficial for communication with other departments and agencies to have taken place at this point to have enabled due consideration to have been given to any decision making on the impact to victims and/or the wider community.</li> <li>3. High profile cases such as this one which have a long history and are highly complex should demand immediate intervention from agencies to prevent an escalation.</li> <li>4. This case highlights the need for agencies to consider how issues of ASB can be picked up at the earliest opportunity and shared so that the most appropriate action can be taken.</li> </ol> <p>ASB by the perpetrator is currently not a problem due to the serving of a Community Protection Notice warning and there have been no further incidents since the implementation of the notice.</p> <p>Should an escalation re-occur, agencies need to think collectively as to the best way to deal with the ASB and ensure that communication is free-flowing to support any decisions.</p> <p><b>Lessons</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) That agencies should involve all key stakeholders in the decision making process where those decisions have the potential to impact on victims or the wider community.</li> </ol>
--	--	--	--	--	--



					<p>2) That agencies should consider how intelligence sharing can be improved to ensure swift intervention in order to prevent an escalation in behaviour.</p> <p>3) That the Police should continue to deal with any criminal/ASB offences by the perpetrator in the normal way and previous assessments/dealings would not prevent the Police utilising a power of arrest and putting him before the court should the need arise.</p>
CT5	08/10/2015	No	N/A		<p>The application did not meet the criteria of three incidents of reported ASB or hate crime in a 6 month period.</p> <p>The application was submitted on behalf of a number of residents and related to dog nuisance. Investigations to determine whether the trigger had been activated involved contact with all the residents named in the application and found that those residents had not reported incidents of dog nuisance and were not aware of the community trigger application. However, they were affected by the noise.</p> <p>In response to new and additional information the Environmental Protection Team agreed to open a new investigation in to alleged dog nuisance.</p> <p>The Community Trigger application form was subsequently amended, requiring applicants to confirm they have the agreement and consent of any parties mentioned in the application as they will be contacted.</p>
CT6	10/11/2015	No	16/11/2015		<p>Although the criteria of 3 reported incidents in a 6 month period was met the Community Trigger was not activated as Merlin Housing Society had a current live investigation at the time.</p> <p>Complainant emailed requesting to appeal the decision on 18/11/15 and a Case Conference was held on 26/11/15.</p> <p>Appeal was unable to be upheld – decision conveyed by letter to complainant on 01/12/15.</p> <p>Case was instead managed by ASB Team alongside the CT and successfully reduced the ASB complained of.</p>

## ASB Support Service

## South Gloucestershire Community Safety Grant 2015/16

## Victim Support £25,000

**Description:** Dedicated caseworker and volunteers assessing and supporting the needs of high risk victims of ASB

Activity	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Aim	2015/16 Result	
New referrals	19	21	10	18	N/A	80	N/A
- Self-referrals	2	0	2	6	N/A	4	N/A
- Referrals from partners	17	21	8	12	N/A	76	N/A
Number needs assessments completed	17	21	10	18	60	76	
Number needs identified	17	21	10	17	60	76	
Referrals assessed as high risk	17	21	10	18	N/A	76	N/A
Outcomes	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Aim	2015/16 Result	
Vicims supported	14	19	29	28	60	66	
Cases closed / Exit surveys completed	13	9	2	11/3	40	44	
- Number feeling their needs have been met	13	9	2	3	34	44	
- Number reporting improved health and wellbeing	13	9	2	2	34	44	
- Number feeling satisfied with the service they received	13	9	2	3	34	44	
- Number feeling satisfied with Police / Local Authority	13	9	2	3	34	44	
- Number at reduced risk	13	9	2	3	30	27	
Summary	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Aim	2015/16 Result	
% of High Risk victims at reduced risk	100%	100%	100%	100%	85.0%	100%	
% feeling their needs have been met	100%	100%	100%	100%	85.0%	100%	
% reporting improved health and wellbeing	100%	100%	100%	100%	85.0%	100%	
% feeling satisfied with the service they received	100%	100%	100%	100%	85.0%	100%	
% feeling satisfied with Police / Local Authority	100%	100%	100%	100%	75.0%	100%	

Other Key Deliverables	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Aim	2015/16 Result	
Talks to hard-to-reach groups	0	0	1	2	8	3	
Number of people from hard-to-reach groups aware of how to access service through engagement activities	0	0	100	40 (approx)	80	140	
Drop-in sessions meeting on a (rotating) weekly basis	0	0	3	3	4	6	
Number of volunteers recruited	14	0	0	0	10	14	

#### Quarter 1 Commentary

#### Quarter 2 Commentary

Outreach booked for Filton in November. In Q2 Jazz has been concentrating on building relationships with other agencies, seeing a large increase in referrals from them.

Comments from clients included:

“Information received was helpful”

“I’ve told all my friends Victim Support call and they’re all very impressed. I feel safer and more supported knowing you’re there for me”

“They were lovely the lady I spoke to was really nice and if I needed to talk I could phone her”.

“absolutely brilliant, can’t fault Victim Support. 10 out of 10”

“received face to face as well as telephone support, would not have attended outreach had it been available”

“gave good advice, kept me informed. Polite and patient”

“They got in touch quickly and followed up which put my mind at rest; knowing that someone was up to date and ensuring continuity”

Of the remaining closed cases:

- 10 cases - Victim Support were unable to make initial contact with or unable to contact to complete exit survey
- 4 cases - Declined the exit survey
- 1 case - Duplicate case
- 2 cases - Rejected support from ASB Service
- 3 cases- were not suitable candidates for the exit survey

### Quarter 3 Commentary

This quarter has seen a dip in referrals but it is pleasing to see self referrals being received following the issue of posters in Filton, Patchway, Kingswood and Yate. Project worker attended the "Engage" festival in October, which celebrates the diversity of culture and seeks to breakdown barriers of prejudice. It is estimated that at this event alone, 100 people engaged with the service. The project worker has attended Lighthouse staff meetings, Housing Partnership Management meetings, Safer Stronger Community group meetings and contacted the MPs of priority areas to signpost the service. We have delivered 111 support telephone calls in this Quarter and 10 community visits.

### Quarter 4 Commentary

9 face to face visits booked, 7 of which were attended. 105 support calls successfully made. Attended SARI hate crime workshop event and Filton crime awareness event to raise profile of project, particularly with hard to reach groups.

## Towards Freedom

## South Gloucestershire Community Safety Grant 2015/16

## Survive £20.705

**Description:** Group work to support women who have experienced or are experiencing domestic abuse

Summary	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Aim	2015/16 Result	
% Referrals engaging	153%	129%	50%	155%	50%	143%	
% Successful completions	86%	100%	100%	100%	75%	92%	
% reporting positive outcomes	86%	100%	100%	100%	90%	100%	
% reporting improved health and wellbeing	86%	75%	100%	100%	75%	84%	
% reporting improved feelings of safety	86%	100%	100%	100%	75%	84%	
% reporting increased self-confidence	86%	75%	100%	100%	75%	92%	
% rebuilding networks of support	71%	75%	100%	100%	75%	76%	
% experiencing repeat victimisation	1%	0%	0%	0%	N/A	1%	N/A

  

Activity	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Aim	2015/16 Result	
New referrals	53	41	31	67	200	192	
Vicims supported / engaging	81	53	84	104	100	322	
Number group meetings held	10	7	7	10	30	34	

  

Outcomes	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Aim	2015/16 Result	
Unsuccessful completions / unplanned exits	2	0	0	0	N/A	2	N/A
Successful completions / Exit surveys completed	12	8	2	1	50	23	
- Number reporting positive outcomes	12	8	2	1	40	23	
- Number reporting improved health and wellbeing	12	6	2	1	40	21	
- Number reporting improved feelings of safety	12	8	2	1	40	23	
- Number reporting increased self-confidence	12	6	2	1	40	21	
- Number rebuilding networks of support	10	6	2	1	25	19	
Clients reporting repeat victimisation	1	0	0	0	-	1	N/A

#### Quarter 1 Commentary

Referrals - For new referrals I have counted referrals to all groups as victims often change their mind and turn up to a different group than they first stated. However for Victims engaging / supported I have counted by how many attended each session (so 10 sessions for Q1) in the two groups funded by the CSG in Patchway & Kingswood Only. (3rd group is held in Yate).

#### Quarter 2 Commentary

Quarter two is always quieter due there being no programmes running during the summer holidays. Feedback - "The group has really helped me, the support has been amazing not just for me but my daughter too. Thank you." - "Definitely recommend this course to others in the same position." - "I would recommend this programme as it has helped me a lot. I recognise a lot of signs now since doing the FP"

#### Quarter 3 Commentary

What we have struggled with the most this quarter is reliable crèche cover for our sessions. Due to crèche workers leaving post and ensuring we have excellent and highly qualified staff. However we always manage to find good quality cover and ensure the wellbeing and safeguarding of all the children who attend the crèche. Feedback - "Very helpful, calm safe environment; improved my understanding of warning signs and working with people who been in the same position."

#### Quarter 4 Commentary

Referrals are increasing month by month to the programme. We have had a changeover of staff this quarter which has been managed very well. We are looking at farther training for facilitators so we can increase qualified facilitators to ensure full coverage at all times. The crèches have been running well and are very much appreciated. Feedback from service users this quarter -" Great session, not long enough!", "Gave some clarification to some unanswered questions I have been going over", " Have learnt so much", "Great class, very well explained". We have had some difficulty in gaining feedback from the service users at the end of their time on the programme. This is in part due to them not always planning their finish time. We will be looking at possible mid-way feedback to overcome this difficulty.

## Complex Needs IDVA

## South Gloucestershire Community Safety Grant 2015/16

Survive £19,275

**Description:** Group work to support women who have experienced or are experiencing domestic abuse

Page 50

Activity	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
New referrals	9	13	10	17
Number of clients worked with during the quarter	13	18	26	21
Number of open cases on last day of the quarter	5	16	4	10
Outcomes	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Successful completions / Exit surveys completed	6	2	22	11
- Number clients reporting increased confidence in accessing the service	100%	100%	100%	100%
- Number clients reporting increased personal and family safety	100%	100%	100%	100%
- Number clients reporting positive outcomes from having accessed the service	100%	100%	100%	100%
Summary	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Number of cases				
- Open cases	9	18	26	21
- Cases closed	8	2	22	11
Number of clients with positive outcomes from the service.	8	2	22	11

Aim
N/A
20
N/A
Aim
20
70%
70%
70%
Aim
N/A
20
15

2015/16 Result	
49	N/A
78	
35	N/A
2015/16 Result	
16	
100%	
100%	
100%	
2015/16 Result	
74	
43	
43	

#### Quarter 1 Commentary

#### Quarter 2 Commentary

Referral from September, case heard at MARAC. Young Mum with 4 month old baby. Ex partner was physically and emotionally abusive during their relationship and has continued to harass and threaten her post –separation, including threats to take the baby. I made a referral to NCDV, but progress was delayed due to funding for legal aid. I chased up the referral 2 weeks ago as an emergency, as her ex partner had moved into his parent’s home, which is 5 minutes away from client. She was in court 2 days later and was awarded a non molestation and prohibited steps order which has now been served. I have liaised closely with the family nurse to obtain supporting evidence for the Homechoice panel application, and we are currently awaiting a decision as to whether it will be heard at panel.

**Context** – Complex needs cases: Under 24 & over 55, young mum’s, Drug’s Alcohol and Mental health support needs, Adult Social Care support, physical disabilities, learning disabilities, criminal history, language barriers, religious or cultural barriers, Honour Based Violence Concerns, Irish Travellers and victims with No Recourse to Public Funds.

**IDVA** – Independent Domestic Violence Advisors – Working with victims who are high risk or immediate harm or death. All cases are heard at the South Glos MARAC (Multi Agency Risk Assessment Conference).

**Support through** – Multi Agency Partnerships, Child Protection, Criminal Justice and Civil Justice Remedies – Restraining Orders, Sentencing, Victim Impact Statements, Priority housing needs, Property Target Hardening and ASB support.

#### Quarter 3 Commentary

#### Quarter 4 Commentary



## **Complex Needs IDVA Case Studies**

### **Quarter 1 Case Study 1**

'Jodie' had written a retraction statement in December 2014 as she was too afraid to give evidence in a trial against her ex-partner, Jonathon who had been charged with 3 x Assault, there were Bail Conditions in place not to contact Jodie directly or indirectly which Jonathan had adhered to.

At the time of writing her retraction statement Jodie was under the impression that she would no-longer be called as a witness in the trial. However, approximately 1 month before the trial Witness Liaison contacted by phone asking her if she still required Special Measures. Jodie was surprised to receive this call and said that she was not supporting the case and had made a retraction statement. The Witness Liaison staff explained that the trial was still proceeding and that she would be expected to be available as a Witness. Jodie was very distressed and said that there was no chance of her coming to court as she was too scared. The Liaison Staff said that he would make enquiries and get back to her about the CPS position on this.

Jodie did not receive a call back and so thought that was an end to the matter. However, 24 hours before the Trial, which was still going ahead, Jodie was presented with a Summons to go to court the following day by a Police Officer who arrived on her doorstep. The Summons requested that she give evidence the following day. Jodie stated that she was not going to be at the court the following day and that she would not give evidence. At the same time the IDVA who was due to be in SDVC the following day was made aware of the case and spoke to Jodie. The IDVA explained that there was always the possibility that the Court could issue a warrant for her arrest but that it was unlikely and then discussed with Jodie the possibility of requesting a Non-Conviction Restraining Order, Jodie was keen for this to happen as the Bail Conditions had kept the perpetrator away since he had been arrested and charged and she wanted this to continue.

The following day in court the IDVA passed over the information to the Court and discussed the possibility of Non-Conviction RO and the fact that the perpetrator would have to agree to it if the Trial did not go ahead due to the main witness not being in court. The Trial did not go ahead and the Perpetrator refused to comply with the request for the Non-Conviction RO which meant that he walked out of court with no restrictions or orders in place to protect the victim.

The IDVA contacted the National Centre for Domestic Violence and made a referral to them over the phone for advice on Application for Non-Molestation Order on an Emergency Basis, this meant that they could calculate whether she had any Legal Aid entitlement (which she did) and also then act on her behalf to make the application. Unfortunately Jodie then decided not to proceed with the application for her own personal reasons but it is evidence that the presence of an IDVA in the SDVC makes all the difference in terms of Protective Orders if the Court cannot issue one.

## Quarter 2 Case Study

'Lucy' was referred to the Complex Needs IDVA by the Police/ Lighthouse, after an incident of assault by Lucy's ex-partner. The violence from her ex-partner escalated when she separated from him, and was blamed for 'making him homeless'. As a result, he became increasingly aggressive, harassing and eventually physically harming her. He was arrested, charged by the police and released on bail conditions.

Lucy's main concern was regarding her home security and support throughout the criminal court process to ensure she got a positive result with protective measures. The IDVA referred Lucy to the Bobby Van service to obtain additional security, and ensured the police put an Information Marker on her phone number and address. Furthermore, the IDVA advised Lucy in detail regarding the criminal court process, her role as a witness, her rights as a witness and the potential outcome. She scheduled a pre-trial visit for Lucy and advocated on her behalf with Lighthouse regarding special measures, a restraining order and her request to make a Victim Impact Statement.

On the day of the plea hearing, the SGC Complex-Needs IDVA was present at the SDVC to advocate on her behalf with the court. The defendant pleaded guilty and sentencing was scheduled. The IDVA informed the court of Lucy's request for a restraining order and to have her Victim Impact Statement read out at sentencing. On the day of sentencing, the defendant was given both a prison sentence as well as an indefinite restraining order.

## Quarter 3 Case Study

***"The IDVA worked closely with Police, Lighthouse and her Recovery Worker to ensure Anna was kept informed and understood all court proceedings, and to put together an ongoing safety and support plan for post sentencing, which took into consideration her mental health supported needs".***

'Anna' referred herself to Survive after she attended the Information Session in Filton. Anna was extremely high risk, scoring 22 on the Safelives DASH RIC despite the perpetrator being on remand. The perpetrator assaulted Anna, and during the assault, he caused an injury to their youngest child, which resulted in Children's Social Care removing both children and placing them under special guardianship orders with the perpetrator's family members.

Anna has Borderline Personality Disorder, which affects her ability to protect herself as she is more vulnerable to forming negative attachments and becomes dependent on unhealthy relationships.

Unfortunately, Anna resumed a relationship with the perpetrator, despite the intervention from Children's Social Care. He assaulted her again and was arrested, charged and remanded.

When Anna contacted Survive she was afraid he would be released from prison and harm her again.

The IDVA worked with Anna to make a safety plan for when he may be released. The IDVA organised an Information Marker for Anna's address and mobile, for the bobby van to attend and secure her home and supported her to access legal advice regarding the joint property.

The IDVA advocated for Anna at MARAC and utilised contacts made there for multi agency working; liaising with the Recovery Team (Mental Health) and Children's Social Care to advocate for Anna around contact with her children and organise mediation with the children's guardians.

The IDVA also referred Anna to the Freedom Programme. Unfortunately, Anna did not attend as she met a new partner, and despite the IDVA and Recovery Worker sharing concerns about his connection to the perpetrator, he and Anna got engaged. We believe that this is a direct reflection of her mental health needs and vulnerability to forming negative attachments and highlights the need for a Complex Needs IDVA who can focus on these factors.

When the perpetrator appeared at Bristol Crown Court for a plea hearing, he admitted 5 separate incidents of violence towards her, 7 breaches of a restraining order and received a 27 month sentence. Our Complex Needs IDVA was able to advocate for Anna on the day of sentencing at the SDVC. This outcome was extremely positive; it included 9 months for the new charges and 18 months which was activated from a former suspended sentence for violence against her.

Afterwards, the IDVA worked closely with Police, Lighthouse and her Recovery Worker to ensure Anna was kept informed and understood all court proceedings, and to put together an ongoing safety and support plan for post sentencing, which took into consideration her mental health supported needs.

#### Quarter 4 Case Study

***“Since her engagement with the IDVA, and these orders were put in place, her risks have significantly decreased; she currently has no contact with the perpetrator and has experienced no further abuse.”***

An Indian woman with a young daughter attended Southmead A&E where she was supported by the Survive A&E IDVAS and then provided with longer-time support by our fulltime SGC IDVA. She attended A&E after her ex-partner (the father of her daughter) had punched her, strangled her and hit her head against a cement wall, leading to head injuries.

She informed our IDVA that her relationship had ended with the perpetrator in 2013, however, ongoing child contact caused them to continue to communicate, and he used this as an opportunity to control her. While the client was fearful to support a prosecution of the perpetrator, due to her dependence on the perpetrator for child maintenance, the IDVA has able to discuss with her the positives of seeking a Non Molestation Order. The IDVA also advised the client to withhold child contact until a NMO was in place, and to require the perpetrator to seek a Child Contact Order if he wished for further contact via a third party, in order to ensure her safety and that she would not need to come into direct contact with the perpetrator. This advice was also in response to the client's concerns regarding her baby (who was still breastfeeding) staying overnight with the perpetrator in the home he shares with his new girlfriend who has been verbally abusive to the client.

As a result of the IDVA's advice, the client successfully obtained a NMO and withheld contact until a Child Contact Order was in place. Since her engagement with the IDVA, and these orders were put in place, her risks have significantly decreased; she currently has no contact with the perpetrator and has experienced no further abuse. The Child Contact Order ensures that the baby is picked up and dropped off by the perpetrator via the nursery, and the baby only spends nights with the father once and awhile, but when she does spend the night, it is with the baby's grandparents, rather than at the home he shares with his girlfriend. In the IDVA's closing conversation with the client she stated: ***“The way that you have helped me and the conversations with me have changed my life”***

# Safer & Stronger Communities Partnership Risk Register 2016/17

Low Risk	I	1 – 3
Medium Risk	L	4 - 6
High Risk	S	7 - 9

Impact \* Likelihood = Risk score

Ref	The Risk <i>What can happen and how it can happen</i>	Consequences/Benefits	Inherent Risk			Mitigating Actions/Opportunities	Further Action Required	Risk Owner	Review Date
			I	L	S				
STRATEGIC PLANNING - Risks associated with the particular nature of the Partnership and Division									
S1	<b>Inadequate engagement of statutory partners</b> <i>Triggered by:</i> <i>Conflicting priorities</i> <i>Lack of resources</i> <i>National restructuring of statutory partners</i>	Breach of the Crime & Disorder Act 1998/ Police Reform Act 2004 Inability to achieve priorities <b>Non-compliance with National Standards</b>	3	3 2	9 6	Roles and responsibilities clearly defined in the Terms of Reference and Partnership Plan  Review of operation of the Partnership carried out December 2015.	On-going monitoring of partner involvement.	Chair of Strategic Partnership	Annual
	<b>Inadequate engagement of non-statutory partners</b> <i>Triggered by:</i> <i>National priorities conflicting with local priorities</i> <i>Lack of implementation of Compact</i>	Disengagement by VCS Non compliance with National Standards  Non compliance with government requirement to involve  Reduction in service provision	1	2	2	Periodic review of Compact Guidelines	Ensuring voluntary and community sector are aware of pressures and timescales often imposed by external forces  On-going monitoring of partner involvement.	Chair of Strategic Partnership	Annual

## Appendix 4

Ref	The Risk <i>What can happen and how it can happen</i>	Consequences/Benefits	Inherent Risk			Mitigating Actions/Opportunities	Further Action Required	Risk Owner	Review Date
			I	L	S				
S2	<b>Ineffective Partnership Function/Performance</b> <i>Triggered by:</i> <i>Lack of processes</i> <i>Lack of skilled and knowledgeable staff</i> <i>No review process</i>	Unskilled and incompetent members of the partnership Lack of appropriate representation at senior level Failure to foster respect and trust amongst partners Ineffective decision making process	2	1	2	<del>National Standards implemented</del> Governance structure Ability to identify and review performance. Annual review of effectiveness as part of annual report. Induction for new members Safer and Stronger Communities Partnership Strategy refreshed	Ongoing monitoring of partner involvement.	Chair of Strategic Partnership	Annual
S3	<b>Mishandling and/or mismanagement of information</b> <i>Triggered by:</i> <i>Inappropriate behaviour by Partnership representative</i> <i>Partner giving message without prior consultation</i>	Loss of reputation Loss of public confidence Split partnership	3	1	3	Close working relationship between Marketing/ Communication Officers of each partner	CSP Communications Strategy to be refreshed and agreed by partners (Police now leading this work)	Police	Annual

Appendix 1

Ref	The Risk <i>What can happen and how it can happen</i>	Consequences/Benefits	Inherent Risk			Mitigating Actions/Opportunities	Further Action Required	Risk Owner	Review Date
PERFORMANCE AND DELIVERY – Risks related to standards and provision of service									
P1	<b>Non-supply of depersonalised data</b> <i>Triggered by:</i> <i>Misunderstanding of the Data Protection Act</i> <i>Partner's staff unwilling to co-operate</i> <i>Not aware of the requirements under S.115 of the Crime &amp; Disorder Act 1998 and the Police and Justice Act 2006.</i> <i>Changes in IT make exchange of data physically impossible regardless of willingness to do so.</i>	Inability of CSP to carry out statutory Strategic Assessment  Non-compliance with S.115 of the Crime & Disorder Act 1998  Information Officers unable to provide statistical information and analysis  Operational Case Review Panels unable to make decisions through lack of information	3	<del>3</del> 2	9 6	Crime & Disorder Act 1998 and Police and Justice Act 2006 require data to be shared to prevent or solve a crime or criminal act  <del>National Standards set statutory duty to provide information as set out in the Police and Justice Act 2006.</del>  <del>Mandatory minimum datasets identified</del>  <del>Information Sharing Protocol reviewed in conjunction with Avon &amp; Somerset Criminal Justice Board</del>  Partnership has signed up to new Information Sharing Agreement  Implementation of access to depersonalised Police data for SGC data officer	<del>Implementation of access to depersonalised Police data for SGC data officer</del>	Performance Management & Business Support Team Leader	Ongoing

## Appendix 4

Ref	The Risk <i>What can happen and how it can happen</i>	Consequences/Benefits	Inherent Risk			Mitigating Actions/Opportunities	Further Action Required	Risk Owner	Review Date
P2	<b>Partners ability to provide quality data</b> <i>Triggered by:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Non-collection of minimum data set	<input type="checkbox"/> Risk that relevant intelligence will be missed	3	1	3		<input type="checkbox"/> Ensure partners know the minimum data sets required and timescales for provision	Performance Mgt & Business Support Team Leader	Quarterly
P3	<b>Partners non-allocation of resources</b> <i>Triggered by:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Capacity in conflict with priorities	Reduced resources would limit sustainability of services, projects or initiatives  Adverse impact on partnership's reputation – partnership working; public perception	3	2	6	Partnership Plan includes statement of partners resource allocation  Allocation of joint funds continues to be agreed by Partnership	<del><input type="checkbox"/> Allocation of joint funds continues to be agreed by Partnership</del>	Chair of Strategic Partnership	Annual
P4	<del><b>Changes in organisation function and responsibility reduce performance and effectiveness of service provision</b></del> <del><i>Triggered by:</i></del> <del><i>National restructure of Probation functions</i></del>	<del>The new structure will see the creation of two Probation Services operating within the South Gloucestershire LA. The higher risk cases to be managed by a National Probation Service operating from a reduced number of Offices and the Lower risk cases by a Private company delivering to the old Avon &amp; Somerset, Gloucestershire and Wiltshire areas on a payment by results model</del>  <del>Quality of delivery from single provider is</del>	3	2	6	<del><input type="checkbox"/> Continue to engage with new provider at both operational and strategic levels.</del>	<del><input type="checkbox"/> Strategic Partnership to be briefed when future arrangements certain.</del>	Chair of Strategic Partnership	March 2014

Ref	The Risk <i>What can happen and how it can happen</i>	Consequences/Benefits	Inherent Risk			Mitigating Actions/Opportunities	Further Action Required	Risk Owner	Review Date
		<del>unknown, as are the contract priorities and the criteria on which performance will be judged.</del>  <del>Some individuals may slip through the net preventing reduction in future offending behaviour.</del>							
P5	<b>Mismatched demands placed on Community Safety Partnerships</b> <i>Partnership operates at a strategic rather than operational level.</i> <i>Increasingly, the Government is placing more operational responsibility – such as the commissioning and overview of Domestic Homicide Reviews – on Community Safety Partnerships, which are inconsistent with this approach to their work.</i>	Members of the Partnership required to carry out roles they are not trained or equipped to do.  Possible negative impact on individuals  Possible negative impact on actions and decisions of the Partnership	3	<del>3</del> 2	<del>9</del> 6	Monitor impact  Ensure Members of Partnership have opportunity to alert someone to any personal concerns  Secure support on individual case basis if and when required.		Chair of Strategic Partnership	Annual



Appendix 1

Ref	The Risk <i>What can happen and how it can happen</i>	Consequences/Benefits	Inherent Risk			Mitigating Actions/Opportunities	Further Action Required	Risk Owner	Review Date
LEGAL – Risks related to possible breaches of legislation									
L1	<b>Failure to meet statutory requirements of relevant legislation (Crime &amp; Disorder Act 1998, Police Reform Act 2002, Police &amp; Justice Act 2006, etc)</b> <i>Triggered by:</i> <i>Loss of knowledgeable partners</i> <i>Loss of key management</i> <i>Perverse decisions by Strategic Partnership</i>	Home Office intervention  Loss of reputation	3	1	3	Induction Guide for new partners  Induction event for new partners  Annual Partnership Plan clarifies requirements and operating arrangements.	Review and briefing paper on all new relevant legislation for partners to be produced when required	Chair of Strategic Partnership	Annual
RESOURCES – Risks associated with financial planning and control; internal and external funds; personnel									
R1	<b>Reduced funding</b> <i>Triggered by:</i> <i>Sustainability of funding from the Home Office</i> <i>Insufficient allocation of funds from the Local Authority Grant</i> <i>Reduced core funding from South Gloucestershire Council.</i>	Staff cuts could result in serious impacts to service delivery  Reduced funding would limit sustainability of services, projects or initiatives  Adverse impact on reputation – partnership working; public perception  Inability to deliver key aspects of agenda, e.g. ASB, Alcohol Services	3	3	9	Annual Strategic Assessment indicates trends and priorities  Performance reports to Strategic Partnership  Strategic Partnership to scrutinise and challenge clearly identify priorities  Partnership representative on LSP to champion Community Safety spend  Joint consideration of potential reductions to understand impact of individual organisations changes and mitigate impact on other partners and service		Head of Safe and Strong Communities          Deputy District Commanner	Annual

## Appendix 4

Ref	The Risk <i>What can happen and how it can happen</i>	Consequences/Benefits	Inherent Risk			Mitigating Actions/Opportunities	Further Action Required	Risk Owner	Review Date
R2	<b>Unfunded statutory obligations:</b> <i>Triggered by:</i> <i>New obligations imposed by HM Government such as Domestic Homicide Review</i>	<p>The Strategic Partnership has had statutory obligations such as funding Domestic Homicide Reviews placed on it but no longer has any funding of its own.</p> <p>External (Govt) funding has been passed to the PCC and the Partnership therefore has no funding of its own.</p> <p>Unless funding is secured for individual cases the Strategic Partnership will be unable to meet legal requirements.</p>	3	3	9		Agree protocol between statutory Responsible Authorities for split of costs	Chair of Strategic Partnership	Annual

Ref	The Risk <i>What can happen and how it can happen</i>	Consequences/Benefits	Inherent Risk			Mitigating Actions/Opportunities	Further Action Required	Risk Owner	Review Date
R3	<b>Contracts/Commissioning price</b> <i>Triggered by:</i> <i>Incompetence</i> <i>Poorly priced work</i>	<p>Financial loss</p> <p>Potential deficit</p> <p>Damage to reputation</p>	3	1	3	<p>Ensure compliance with commissioning organisation's procurement and contracting procedures and processes</p> <p>Formal decision making route agreed by the Strategic Partnership.</p> <p>Effective scrutiny of performance by services commissioned</p>	Proper costing of proposed services or interventions undertaken	SSCSP	Ongoing

## PERSONNEL

Pe1	<b>Inappropriate personnel recruited</b> <i>Triggered by:</i> <i>Not following recruitment procedures</i> <i>Job Description/Person Description not including DANOS/SJNOS</i>	Inability to provide services Under-performing staff	3	1	3	Managed within each employing organisation's management procedures	Managed within each employing organisation's management procedures	SOG	Ongoing
-----	--	---	---	---	---	--	--	-----	---------

Ref	The Risk <i>What can happen and how it can happen</i>	Consequences/Benefits	Inherent Risk			Mitigating Actions/Opportunities	Further Action Required	Risk Owner	Review Date
Pe2	<b>Loss of key staff</b> <i>Triggered by:</i> <i>Short-term contracts</i> <i>Relocation</i> <i>Reorganisation</i> <i>Uncertainty over future of posts</i> <i>Reduced public sector finance</i>	Continuity of service lost with direct impact on key areas of work Loss of local knowledge and understanding Loss of expertise, networking/ partnership working skills	3	3	9	Recruitment and retention strategy includes modernised recruitment processes; internal Resourcing; acting ups; job redesign; flexible employee specifications; flexible working; career grades; pay reviews, trainee schemes Contingency arrangements include use of specialist agency, agency staff and interim managers. <i>Division restructured</i> <i>Key posts mainstreamed</i> <i>Review job descriptions</i> <i>Review/modernisation of working practices to allow home working where and when appropriate</i> <i>Staff development and succession planning/ development</i>	Managed within each employing organisation's management procedures	SOG	Ongoing

