

COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP

20TH MAY 2021

ITEM: 8a Delivery Group Updates: Strategic Group**Introduction:**

This report will summarise the Partnership's current performance in respect of specific key strategic priorities that has significant importance to the Partnership, in terms of current Threat, Risk or Harm, whilst the JAG report will provide more detailed analysis of each of the CSP priorities as listed in the current CSP Plan.

Theme 1: Making Communities Safer:**Priority 1: To Reduce All Crime**

Table 1 Quarter 1: Overview Crime Performance from the 1st April 2020 to 31st March 2021 compared to 1st April 2019 to 31st March 2020

Crime Type	Performance to Date	Total Crime as at 31st March 2021	Total Crime as at 31st March 2020	Difference	Family Group Position 31st March 2021
All Crime	-5.3%	12030	12703	-673	10/15
Violence with Injury	+40.8%	1470	1044	+426	13/15
Burglary – Residential	-36%	536	832	-296	14/15
Burglary – Business	-21%	170	216	-46	4/15
Theft of Vehicles	-38%	217	352	-135	9/15
Theft from Vehicles	-34%	600	916	-316	12/15
Robbery	-20%	74	93	-19	7/15
Cycle Theft	-6.2%	259	276	-17	13/15
Shoplifting	-24.6%	598	793	-195	3/15

Table 1 illustrates the CSP's end of year (2020/21) crime data, highlighting the Partnerships effective response to 'Making Communities Safer'. The Partnership continues to deliver a reduction in 'All Crime' with 673 less victims of crime (-5.3%) compared to the previous year.

It is also pleasing to report significant reductions in the following crime domains:

- Burglary Residential: -36%
- Theft of Vehicles: -38%
- Theft From Vehicles: -34%
- Robbery: -20%

Given we have been in COVID lockdown for much of 2020/21, it would be remiss not to include the restrictions as a contributing factor for these crime reductions. This will certainly be the case in terms of offences relating to the Night-Time Economy, given this sector has remained closed for extensive periods throughout the year. It is likely with the Government road map for lifting the restrictions, that the Partnership will see an increase in certain reported crime domains during 2021/22.

Despite the lockdown restrictions, the Partnership continues to have an increase in Violence with Injury Offences with an end of year figure of +40.8%. There is currently no detailed analysis to understand this increase and further work will be required in order to direct our preventative measures.

The 'Serious Violence Bill' has still to be progressed through Parliament and was not included in the recent Queen's speech delivered on 11th May 2021. Once this Bill is made statute law, it will add to the statutory duties placed upon Community Safety Partnerships, requiring the CSP to play its part in reducing serious violence. In advance of that duty, the CSP has already commenced work on a localised plan. There have been a number of initial meetings to look at the establishment of what the Violence Reduction Network (VRN) are calling a 'Community Panel.' The rationale is that as part of the Serious Violence Reduction Plan, the VRN is seeking to capture the voice of the community, including support agencies working in our neighbourhoods within Charnwood, with the aim of shaping the Preventative strand of the violence reduction strategy. This work stream will be shaped further throughout the forthcoming performance year and I will report on progress at future CSP meeting.

Priority 2: Create safer town centres by reducing alcohol / substance misuse related violence, commercial crime and street related ASB

The CSP under the banner of 'Operation Influence' continues to deliver an effective Night-Time Economy plan. With the planned changes in the easing of the COVID restrictions, a weekly multiagency meeting takes place which includes representation from: Leicestershire Police, Community Safety, Licensing, Environmental Health, Loughborough BID, Trading Standards (LCC), Loughborough University.

The above integrated team works through the themes of Engage, Explain, Encourage & Enforce, with the focus being on delivering a vibrant and safe night-time economy across the Borough. The weekly review allows partners to identify any licensed premises of concern and any hot spot locations for either COVID breaches or alcohol fuelled ASB/Disorder. The Community Safety Manager continues to attend the fortnightly LLR NTE Recovery meeting and reports directly into that group in respect of any emerging issues or threats to the localised plan.

The CSP is also committed to ensuring that Loughborough town Centre remains a safe place for both residents and visitors. Operation Lexical is the CSP's multiagency response to tackling student related crime and disorder. Partners are continuing to plan for both the end of this final 2020/21 student term and the start of the 2021/22 academic year. Central to this planning will be the ongoing Student Street Support Scheme which will be part of the CSP's safer streets focus for both students and other local residents.

As reported to the CSP meeting in February 2021, the Partnership continues to receive no external complaints from local residents nor local businesses in respect of begging within the town centre. Legal Services at Charnwood have advised, in keeping with recent legislation *Lăcătuș v Switzerland* (January 2021) that we should only take positive action, under the current Civil Injunction, if we receive external complaints and it can be evidenced that the beggar's behaviour was likely to cause harm if unchallenged. To continue to take positive planned action against the individuals begging in the town, without such external complaints, would be deemed to be neither proportionate nor necessary.

Theme 2: Protecting Vulnerable People

Priority 3: Protect the most vulnerable in our communities particularly High Risk, Previous and Repeat Victims of Crime and ASB

The strategic theme of protecting the most vulnerable in our communities is a critical area of business for the CSP. Through analytical work, it has become very clear that this area of business is growing in both its complexity and its demand in terms of resource time. It has been identified that Primary Aggravating Factors listed as contributing to the commission of criminal offences and anti-social behaviour within Charnwood are:

1. Vulnerability
2. Domestic Abuse
3. Substance Misuse
4. Mental Health

To address the risk posed by these themes, the CSP has two multi-agency specialist groups that sit within the current delivery structure - one focused on Youths and one focused on Adults at Risk.

Moreover, a recent paper to the LLR Strategic Partnership Board (SPB) has also presented similar analytical work focused upon aggravating factors in respect of anti-social behaviour. The paper identified a number of vulnerabilities in respect to the recording of ASB across Leicester, Leicestershire & Rutland, for example a lack of consistency in the identification of repeat victims, varying different ASB policies across LLR and no agreed definition of Anti-Social Behaviour. As a result of that paper, SPB have commissioned several workstreams which will now be implemented to address the vulnerabilities identified:

1. A review of ASB Policies to establish both the agreed definition of ASB, with the intention of having a consistent LLR ASB Policy
2. The creation of a User Protocol for Sentinel – to ensure consistency across partners in terms of case recording/management
3. The development of a training package for Sentinel, which will include a practitioner's guide
4. Repeat Victim process – to incorporate an agreed definition of the term repeat victim and a consistent LLR response to such vulnerable individuals

It was also highlighted at SPB that there was an inconsistent picture in response to Community Triggers in terms of CSP's across LLR. For context, there is a duty for each CSP to publish the Community Trigger process and to update their website annually in respect of how many Community Triggers have been received, how many Triggers made/did not make the threshold assessment and how many Triggers resulted in positive actions being implemented. I can confirm that the Charnwood CSP data is available.

All of the above workstreams will be overseen by SPB and the workgroups will be delivered by the LLR ASB Strategic Group – chaired by Chris Thomas (LCC). A more detailed report on Community Triggers (as requested by the CSP at the February 2021 meeting) is included at Appendix B of this report.

Finally, in respect of the theme of 'Protecting Vulnerable People', I can report that the LLR Domestic Abuse Perpetrator Project is now embedded across partner agencies. This project was as a result of a successful OPCC bid to the Home Office whereby they have secured £230,911 central government funding for 2020/21, which will require an element of match funding from CSP's for 2021/22. Furthermore, the project has recently secured additional Home Office funding that will now cover the period 1st October 2021 to 31st March 2022.

Recent data for Charnwood illustrates that under the above Domestic Abuse Perpetrator Project there have been a total of 9 referrals for December 2020 – March 2021.

Theme 3: Increasing Community Confidence, Engagement & Cohesion
Priority 5: To reduce the level of fear of crime and ASB

People Zone : - Since the CSP meeting in February 2021, the OPCC has announced that they will be providing funding for the People Zones initiative, which will result in the CSP receiving £25,000 for 2021/22 and a further £25,000 for 2022/23 for the Bell Foundry PZ.

CSPs are being encouraged to spend the funding on activities and provision relevant and appropriate to their specific People Zone area. Moreover, to ensure that People Zones continue to develop, build community resilience and ensure long term sustainability, the following three key fundamental principles will need to be adhered to as part of the funding requirement:

- 1) **Delivery Plan** - produce a PZ delivery plan that is embedded into the overall CSP annual plans
- 2) **Outcomes** – to be agreed and selected locally with partners and community members
- 3) **Quarterly reporting** – provide progress update reports to OPCC / Community Development Officer

Work is taking place to start the first draft of the delivery plan which will be looking at the first 6 months as we support the community coming out of recovery. The last year has had a significant impact on the residents in the People Zone and it will be a priority to engage and identify their concerns and needs as we start to open up more face to face services and increased local presence.

Through the CSP we will look to re-engage partners to ensure that all appropriate organisations are in attendance. The original People Zone meetings of Place and People will be arranged with an opportunity to review and refresh to ensure they remain fit for purpose and that partners are fully engaged and providing their much needed community intelligence and information. We will look to the delivery plan and identified needs to see where the funding is best spent.

Key areas of focus for delivery in the coming weeks will be a number of community events including Estate Walks and outside coffee mornings. Whilst restrictions remain the MTC hub will continue to operate on an appointment basis providing support to those that need it.

Safer Streets : - The Home Office Safer Streets Project, which was located on the Warwick Way & Dishley Estate, Loughborough East, ended on 31st March 2021. This project resulted in the target hardening of properties located within the designated location on the estate and the procurement of both ANPR and CCTV cameras, which will be located in key strategic locations within the neighbourhood. The overarching principle of this project is to reduce crime, particularly Burglary – Residential and to

increase public confidence. An evaluation is being undertaken by the OPCC which I will include in my future report.

In keeping with the theme of Safer Streets, I can report that the Home Office has released a further £25 million funding opportunity for 2021/22, with a focus on 'Violence Against Women And Girls' (VAWG). This funding stream is borne out of the tragic death of Sarah Everard and a drive to make our public spaces and streets a safer place for women/girls. A workshop was hosted by the OPCC on 20th April 2021 to identify potential delivery partners and stakeholders. The PCC will now work with localities to identify potential bids to be submitted to the Home Office.

Community Triggers: Finally, on the theme of Community Confidence, the CSP has received 5 Community Triggers during the performance year 2020/21. In keeping with section 104 of the ASB, Crime & Policing Act 2014, all activations were assessed against the LLR threshold and all progressed to a full Trigger Review. All 5 cases resulted in Action Plans being created for the relevant agencies involved and 1 case has progressed to Appeal. I can also report that in Quarter 1 of 2021/22 we have received 2 further Community Trigger which is currently awaiting assessment. A more detailed report on Community Triggers is attached in *Appendix B*.

Funding

The Strategic Group continues to oversee the spending of the Partnership Locality Fund (PLF). The proposed 2021/22 spending profile is presented at *Appendix A* of this report. As a caveat, I must point out that this profile is indicative of how the CSP proposes to spend its allocated budget, but currently the Partnership has not yet received the Partnership Locality Fund contract to sign and the OPCC has recently updated that there will be a delay in that process. Services will not be able to be commissioned until receipt of the signed contract.

Tim McCabe
Community Safety Manager

Appendix A
2021/22 Proposed PLF Spending profile

Charnwood Community Safety Partnership will have access to funding from various sources. This will be managed on behalf of the partnership by the Community Safety Manager at Charnwood Borough Council and overseen by the Charnwood Community Safety Partnership.

The funds proposed to be received by the CSP are:
 Police and Crime Commissioner PLF - £75,500

Description	Amount Allocated 2021/22
To address transient student related ASB	£10,000
Mediation	£5,000
Street Pastors	£3000
Targeted multiagency preventative action to reduce SAQ offences within the Priority Neighbourhood – Loughborough Central (N62	£2,000
Prevention Campaign Materials/ and Domestic Burglary Packs	£8,000
Student Crime Awareness	£2,000
Substance Misuse Project	£12,000
Mobile CCTV Camera fund	£3,000
Domestic Abuse Services	£10,000
Cycle Theft	£1000
Youth Violence Projects	£10,000
Charnwood Watch	£4,500
Contingency	£5000
Total	£75,500.00

PCC CI001 – Youth Prevention and Diversion – 2021/22

The Office of Police and Crime Commissioner has made £15,956.25 CI001 funding to Charnwood in 2020/21.

Fund criteria:

CI001 Youth Prevention and Diversion funding is for use with the following groups:

- a) Young people identified as being high-risk first-time entrants to the Criminal Justice System
- b) Repeat offenders (primarily those already working with Youth Offending Service). In 2015/16 these were defined in the PCC monitoring requirements as 'Deter Young Offenders'. (The Youth Justice Board define Deter Young Offenders (DYO) as being those that are likely to cause the most harm to communities and pose a high risk of reoffending).

Initiative Description	Funding Received	Amount Allocated
PCC CI001 – Youth Prevention and Diversion	£15,956.25	
Parent and Young People Support Programme		£4,644
Youth Engagement and Outreach in Hotspot Locations		£6,872
Anstey Active Youth Engagement sport sessions		£2,240
YOS Spot Purchasing		£500
Contingence Fund		£1700
Total		£15,956.00

Appendix B: Community Triggers

Purpose of the Report

In keeping with the action set at the CSP meeting – 25th February 2021, this report will provide the Community Safety Partnership with an update in respect of Community Triggers activated by victims within Charnwood.

Introduction:

Community Triggers are an integral part of the ‘*ASB, Crime & Policing Act 2014*’. The Home Office in introducing this legislation focussed specifically on putting victims at the heart of the response to anti-social behaviour. We know that, where left unchecked, anti-social behaviour can have an overwhelming impact on its victims and in some cases, on the wider community. Therefore, the formal ‘Anti-social Behaviour Case Review’, known as the ‘Community Trigger’, is an important safety net in ensuring that victims, who believe they have not had a satisfactory response to their anti-social behaviour complaints, have their voices heard. The relevant bodies that this legislation relates to are:

- Councils.
- Police.
- Clinical Commissioning Groups in England and Local Health Boards in Wales.
- Registered providers of social housing who are co-opted into this group.

The legislation under *Section 104 of the ASB, Crime & Policing Act 2014*, places a statutory duty upon a Community Safety Partnership, that duty being:

‘to undertake an anti-social behaviour case review on the grounds that a victim states they are dissatisfied with the response they have received to their reported ASB and on the grounds that the threshold for such a trigger is duly met.’

The threshold for the Community Trigger has been set locally on the following criteria:

- an individual has complained to the Council, Police or a Registered Housing Provider about three separate incidents of ASB in the last six months.
- If three individuals in the local community have complained separately to the Council, Police or Registered Housing Provider in the last six months about the same incident of anti-social behaviour in the locality.
- If an individual has been a victim of a single hate crime or incident in the last six months.

The legislation also allows for the Community Trigger to be activated by a person on behalf of the victim who is aware of the circumstances and acts with the victim’s consent. This might include a family member, friend, carer, councillor, Member of

Parliament or other professional. A victim under this Act is defined as being an individual, a business or a community group.

There is also a further statutory duty placed upon the Community Safety Partnership, that being to ensure that the Community Trigger process is easily accessible to victims and to publish annually data in respect of:

- No. of Community Triggers activated
- No. of Triggers where the local threshold was met/not met
- No. of Triggers that have resulted in the creation of Action Plans

Charnwood Community Trigger Process:

Each Community Trigger that is activated is acknowledged by the Community Safety Manager within 5 working days of receipt. Relevant agencies are notified of the activation and a record of their involvement in the case management is collated into a chronology of events.

Upon receipt of the chronology, the locally agreed LLR threshold assessment is undertaken, and the victim is formally notified of the outcome of that stage, be it an affirmative or negative assessment. The legislation gives a very clear steer in terms of this assessment and states that due consideration in considering whether the threshold is met, should have regard to:

- the persistence of the anti-social behaviour;
- the harm or potential harm caused by the anti-social behaviour; and
- the adequacy of the response from agencies

If the threshold assessment is met, the CSP must convene a panel of the relevant agencies and undertake a formal assessment of the case within 28 working days of the threshold decision. For context, the management of each relevant partner is contacted once an informed threshold decision is made and who identify appropriate representation to form the Panel.

The latest Home Office statutory guidance published in January 2021, stipulates that the victim should play a central role in the Community Trigger Review. It is advised that the panel should always consider inviting the victim to attend a section of the case review meeting to help all members of the panel understand the level of harm and impact. However, if the victim feels unable to attend, then it may be more appropriate to invite a representative of the victim, especially where they have activated the case review on behalf of the victim. It is recommended good practice that the victim's voice must be heard during the formal review meeting.

Upon completion of the Community Trigger Review, the Community Safety Manager has a duty to notify the victim/advocate of the panel's findings and the recommendations made to agencies as part of the case review. The policy also states that the victim should be notified of the appeals process, should they remain dissatisfied, which involves the case being escalated to the Chair of the Community Safety Partnership.

Charnwood Community Trigger Findings

Since the implementation of the statutory duty Charnwood CSP have received:

- 18 Community Triggers in total
- 2 activations were deemed not to have met the threshold
- 14 cases progressed to a formal review, with accompanying recommendations
- 2 cases have just met the threshold assessment (13th May 2021) and will progress to a formal review

The Triggers have been received from locations across the Borough and there is no specific repeat location in respect of the activations. However, an analysis of the Community Triggers does highlight repeating patterns in respect of the Partnership's ASB case management function. The following are regular themes identified as part of the formal reviews:

1. **An inconsistent approach to recording of ASB incidents.** This has particular relevance when undertaking the threshold assessment. A search of Sentinel would not necessarily contain the full corporate complaint history of a victim making reports of ASB. It is often the case that the victim has complained to the relevant agencies in keeping with threshold assessment, however the incidents are not in a searchable format on Sentinel and are often found on STORM (Police Command & Control System), Lagan, or Flare. This approach leaves the Partnership open to challenge should the victim's Trigger activation be declined based on the locally agreed threshold assessment. In addition, Registered Housing Providers do not utilise Sentinel, and have their own internal recording systems, which is problematic in terms of capturing all incidents of ASB and all agencies being aware of the full picture.
2. **Failures to identify both Repeat Victims and Vulnerable Victims.** Practitioners appear to be unaware of the definition of a Repeat Victim and are not routinely recording victims as such on Sentinel nor identifying them as 'Vulnerable'. The Triggers show that on Sentinel, practitioners often record both these critical victim status updates as 'Unknown'. This has been found to be the case even though there may be multiple incidents for a victim recorded on the Sentinel system. Where victims have either 'Repeat Victim' or 'Vulnerable Victim' status recorded as 'Unknown', they will not be picked up in a search to identify such cases. For context, whilst Sentinel is used to search the corporate history to identify Repeat Victims/Vulnerable Victims – this search will only raise those cases where the practitioner has answered 'YES' to the relevant question asking: Is this a Repeat Victim? Is this victim Vulnerable. This search should be regularly undertaken by relevant agencies in preparation for such meetings as the JAG, Adults At Risk etc. However, the Community Triggers where Victims have 'Unknown' recorded on Sentinel, would be missed in that database search.
3. **Practitioners do not consistently assess the Harm Index of a case.** The Triggers have identified many of the cases are complex by their nature and the victims/perpetrators have key aggravating factors in the commission of the offences. The Reviews have often found that cases involve the 'Trilogy of Risk',

namely: 'Mental Health', 'Substance Misuse' and 'Violence/Threat of Violence.' The harm or potential harm of these key aggravating factors are an integral part of victim support/harm reduction. They have an increased importance if the victim is either a repeat or vulnerable victim. As it is well established, vulnerable victims are less resilient to the impact of persistent ASB. Primary and Secondary Aggravating factors are rarely recorded on Sentinel and practitioner's knowledge of the importance of the harm index in assessing a case holistically, has varied.

4. Risk Assessments not regularly reviewed, or in some cases not recorded.

In keeping with the harm index of a case, it is essential for practitioners to complete a robust and detailed risk assessment. Sentinel operates a 5 x 5 Risk Matrix giving consideration to the Probability and the Impact of the ASB on the victim, which should be completed on creation of the case. However, Risk Assessment matrices cannot provide a definitive assessment of someone's needs – this requires the practitioner to consider the accumulative impact of the ASB and the subsequent impact upon harm and risk. The aggravating factors posed by both the victim and perpetrator need to be factored into the risk assessment. Moreover, the Reviews have found that risk assessments are generally undertaken at the creation of a Sentinel case, however, it is common for these risk assessments not to be regularly reviewed and assessed against the increasing harm. Moreover, in the Sentinel Risk Matrix there is a narrative box for the practitioners to record their rationale in terms of their risk assessment. As this narrative box is not a mandatory field, there are inconsistencies in its completion. Sentinel records every occasion a practitioner revisits the risk involved in the case management. The Triggers have highlighted that cases have been closed without any further review of the Risk Assessment from the point of creation.

5. Inconsistencies in recording Hate Incidents.

The ASB Case Review/Community Trigger is specifically designed to deal with anti-social behaviour. However anti- social behaviour can often be motivated by hate and it is critical that the LLR Hate Policy is consistently applied in dealing with victims. The Reviews to date have highlighted that some practitioners have a lack of knowledge in respect of this policy and specifically in respect of the definition of a Hate Incident. There have been a number of reviews were agencies as part of the Action Plan, have had to retrospectively record Hate Incidents several months after the event had occurred.

6. Case Management recording practices.

The Reviews have highlighted an inconsistent approach in recording of ASB across the Partnership. Some agencies record incidents on Sentinel in keeping with the best practice prescribed by Leicestershire Police/LLR, whilst others have adopted their own recording practices. This varying approach has an impact upon the corporate history of a victim. Master Sentinel records are utilised under both approaches, but significant differences have been highlighted. Under the LLR best practice, a new Sentinel record is created for each incident reported by the victim (allowing for a 24 hour delay rule between incidents). The new incidents should still be risk assessed and closed before being linked to the Master Record. This approach allows for the corporate history to be obtained and searched in its

entirety. The other approach being utilised is the creation of a Master Record, with the victim being tasked with completing diary sheets. A running log is maintained on the Master Record of actions taken to date, however, there is no creation of a Sentinel record for each incident. This approach means that a victim's corporate history cannot be searched in its entirety and in some of the Triggers, it has highlighted that a threshold assessment would not have been met.

- 7. Lack of multi-agency working.** The reviews highlight, that despite the opportunity to work collaboratively on a case via Sentinel, it is often the fact that there has been limited communication and joint problem solving across agencies involved. In some instances, agencies had created their own Master Sentinel record, recording their actions, whilst another agency joined to the same case, was operating their own Master Record in the same fashion. This issue could be overcome quite simply as Sentinel allows for agencies to send each other 'Action Trigger Alerts' whereby practitioners can notify each agency of the fact they have created a Master Sentinel. These 'Action Alerts' are key for agencies to record and set collaborative tasks in respect of joint case management, thereby reducing any duplication of work streams. The reviews also highlight that cases are not being referred to the JAG or a multi-agency meeting being convened in a timely fashion. All of the cases that have met the threshold assessment for a full case review have been found to be complex cases, which would have benefitted from an integrated approach from agencies, working collaboratively in seeking to address the complaints raised at an early stage.

Summary

The above represent key repeating patterns identified through the Community Triggers here in Charnwood. As detailed in my main report, SPB have also raised inconsistencies across other CSPs in relation to ASB. At the LLR ASB Strategic Group (29th April 2021), it was highlighted that there were vulnerabilities in terms of:

- the robustness of recording ASB
- Repeat Victims – no agreed LLR definition
- Gaps in the identification of the vulnerable needs of victims
- Interfaces – not all CSPs have interfaces for the recording of ASB
- Risk Assessment – particularly in respect of the perpetrator

With the highlighting of these vulnerabilities, SPB have commissioned workstreams to look at inconsistencies across LLR in terms of ASB Case Management, which will also include a review of the Community Trigger policy. This work will be undertaken by the LLR ASB Delivery Group, at which Charnwood CSP has representation from both the Community Safety Team, Landlord Services and the Police.

Tim McCabe
Community Safety Manager