

Executive

Corporate Improvement Plan Fear of Crime and Anti Social Behaviour

6 December 2010

Report of Head of Safer Communities, Urban and Rural Services

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To advise the Executive of the outcomes from the Corporate Improvement Plan Project: Fear of Crime and Anti Social Behaviour and to consider the proposed future priorities and actions for the service arising from the Project.

This report is public

Recommendations

The Executive is recommended:

- (1) To note the findings and conclusions from the Corporate Improvement Plan Project: Fear of Crime and Anti Social Behaviour.
- (2) To agree the future priorities and draft action plan which should form the basis of the 2011/12 Service Plan.

Executive Summary

Introduction

- 1.1 Anti social behaviour (ASB) is a blight on the lives of individuals who are directly affected; on the perceptions of communities for whom it signals neglect in their neighbourhoods; and on the reputation of the agencies who are often thought to be unconcerned or ineffectual.
- 1.2 The core difficulty in developing a coherent response to ASB is the breadth of the term and the fact that it means different things to different people. ASB is a mixed bag of crime, disorder and their precursors, with rowdy/disorderly behaviour being the overwhelmingly majority of reported events [Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary (HMIC)].
- 1.3 ASB does not have the same status as 'crime' for the police. There are consequences of this. Very importantly, the public draw no meaningful distinction between crime and ASB (HMIC).
- 1.4 This Fear of Crime and ASB Corporate Improvement Plan Project was prioritised

because of the apparent continuing and disproportionate perception of fear of crime and ASB in comparison to the year on year reductions in the levels of crime across Cherwell. It was subsequently extended to include a short Value for Money (VFM) analysis of the service.

- 1.5 The project was also undertaken at a time when the Council was preparing for future budget reductions and was experiencing loss of external income relevant to the community safety and ASB activities it provides. These matters were considered at a special meeting of the Cherwell Community Safety Partnership (CSCP) in September where partners prioritised the services and initiatives currently delivered.

Proposals

- 1.6 The Project recognised that the public perception of crime and ASB in a low crime area is influenced by many factors and that the Council's services need to change using the better information and understanding now available. There is therefore a need to achieve greater clarity of intent and to prioritise activity against where the Council can make a real difference with the reducing budget it has.
- 1.7 The Project identified a number of key priorities and lessons learned that are set out in an Action Plan. The key priorities can be summarised under 5 broad headings which involve a greater focus on addressing the fear of crime as follows:
- Improved information and communication with the community and with victims of crime and ASB.
 - Improvements to the effectiveness of working in partnership because it makes business sense not because of funding or targets.
 - Improve our visibility and accessibility particularly through the Street Wardens.
 - Adding value to what we have already and seek to make further efficiencies to transfer resources to support the priorities.
 - Improved data quality, recording, information sharing and performance monitoring to achieve better targeted resources/actions.
- 1.8 The approach proposed involves a better targeting of reduced resource levels and more effective partnership working based on a business model - not partnership because of funding or targets. This targeting centres on a lighter touch over crime reduction activities and a shift towards specific activities which address the fear of crime. The key priorities and action plan will require a further review with the CSCP and finalised once the Council's and partners' funding positions are clear to ensure that the priorities can be delivered. In this report, the priorities are presented in the context of the currently known reductions in funding. A specific focus on **Priority A. Information/Communication** and **Priority C. Improve our Visibility** will be given in the first instance as a direct response to resident feedback and satisfaction levels in relation to the fear of crime.

Conclusion

- 1.9 The VFM analysis indicates that, out of the 14 councils in its family group, Cherwell is the seventh most expensive, spending 5.1% above the average. This is partly because of the employment of street wardens in this service area which, whilst being very beneficial, does have cost implications when compared to other councils who do not have such employees. This comparative financial position is likely to change in relation to the Council's service cost base given the planned budget reductions and loss of external income for local projects and activities. However, the same sort of changes are likely to

affect other local authorities.

- 1.10 The Project report has identified many lessons learned from market research and service analysis which have informed the proposed key priorities and actions. The work was undertaken at a time of significant change arising from the new Coalition Government's revised approach, reduced funding and proposals for changes in guidance. Considerable uncertainty still remains as revised guidance is still awaited and further clarity required around Government grant settlement for the Council. Further adjustments and prioritisation are going to be required once the final budget position for 2011/12 is finalised and the implications of the changes in the police force are known in the form of any revised approach from them arising from the HMIC report.

Background Information

2.1 Why a Corporate Improvement Plan Project?

In 2008, the Cherwell Safer Communities Partnership launched its Community Safety Strategy 2008-2011: Working Together to Create a Safe and Healthy Cherwell. The Foreword states:

'Cherwell is enjoying the lowest recorded rates of crime for more than a decade. These figures are still falling. We live in a safe district where the chances of being a victim of crime are very small'.

The Strategy promises to achieve the Cherwell Vision of:

A Safe and Healthy Cherwell
Improving Community Safety and reducing the drugs problem
Making Cherwell a Safer Place to Live

Three years on, this commitment and partnership working remain, with the trend of falling crime continuing, but where fear of crime still remains disproportionate to the actual levels in Cherwell. It is for this reason, and because dealing with antisocial behaviour (ASB) has very low levels of satisfaction from the Cherwell Residents Survey data with a high priority by the public for improvement, that this Corporate Improvement Plan project has been undertaken.

2.2 Scope of the Project

The project focused on understanding and addressing the issues around:

1. Fear of crime
2. Dealing with antisocial behaviour.

The Project set out to examine the Council's work on community safety and anti social behaviour, and the best practice in these areas from high performing councils. It also secured views on the Council's performance in these services from key partners in Cherwell and undertook focused research with members of the public.

What the Project has not attempted to do is focus on work around tackling crime this is the responsibility of the police. However both service areas have a remit to work to reduce crime so the Project has sought to identify/address issues that support this objective and in which the Council has direct influence and can make an impact/add value.

2.3 Project Objectives

Fear of Crime

Understand the key drivers behind current levels of performance for fear of crime Clarify the Council's statutory responsibilities and discretionary functions. Determine changes appropriate to Cherwell that will result in tangible performance improvement

Anti Social Behaviour

Understand the key drivers behind current levels of performance for antisocial behaviour

Clarify the Council's statutory responsibilities

Assess our ability to deliver against the statutory requirements

Determine changes appropriate to Cherwell that will result in tangible performance improvement

2.4 Current Services

The Community Safety Service includes:

- Supporting and promoting community safety initiatives
- Monitoring performance of 4 action groups as part of the Safer Communities Strategy
- Lead for the Cherwell Safer Communities Partnership
- Managing street warden schemes in Banbury and Bicester
- Coordinating 6 Neighbourhood Action Groups
- Managing the partnership budget
- Managing the CCTV partnership

The ASB Service comprises:

- The investigation of complaints of nuisance (including high hedges) this encompasses performing the role of Responsible Authority for public nuisance under the Licensing Act 2003.
- Partnership working to tackle anti social behaviour, drug and alcohol misuse
Operation of Night safe including administrative support to Bicester and Kidlington Pub Watch Schemes and a new Banbury Rural scheme.

Across Oxfordshire, it is the Local Area Agreement 2008-2011 and targets that have been the drivers for all of Oxfordshire's community safety activities over recent years. These have been lead by the Oxfordshire Community Safety Partnership and are then co-ordinated and delivered across Cherwell by the CSCP, which has statutory responsibility for this.

These District wide priorities have informed the work that the ASB Team and the Safer Communities Team undertake through the Service Plan and whilst LAA targets have now been dropped by the Coalition Government, the CSCP has continued to focus on these areas of work.

2.5 Funding Issues

Since the Project scope was agreed by CMT in April 2010, the Coalition Government has come to power following the May 2010 General Election. This has seen a significant shift in the Policy framework around community safety and ASB and a Comprehensive Spending Review that will see Government Grant to the Council reduced by in the order of 26%.

At the time of writing, the precise settlement and impact on services is not clear. What is known is that: there are already areas of funding that have been cut; that further

reductions in Government grant will affect services; that savings as part of the Council's MTFS will reduce the resources available and will limit either the extent or timetable of improvement actions that have been identified by this project.

2.6 Current Budget

There are 4 elements to the **current** Safer Communities and ASB budget:

1. Cherwell District Council Revenue budget
 - ASB £242,795
 - Safer Communities £571,529
2. Thames Valley Police Basic Command Unit budget £55,500 which will be lost from 2011/12
3. Area Based Grant £110,000 (ABG) which is likely to be lost in whole or part in 2011/12
4. Local Area Agreement Reward Grant £25,000 capital and £25,000 revenue (both one off) which will not be available in 21011/12.

It is clear that future service planning cannot rely on external partnership funding as it has for many years as demonstrated by the funding loss from items 2, 3 and 4 above. This is further exacerbated by the loss of a proportion of Charter Community Housing funding for the street warden service which is part of the Council's core Safer Communities budget.

2.7 Value For Money

Comparison of the 2010/11 RA budget estimates amongst CIPFA comparators reveals that Cherwell is the second most expensive authority, spending 30% above the average. However, on further investigation of the three components that make up the RA return (crime reduction, safety services and CCTV) the picture is significantly different once adjustments are made for comparative purposes (See Appendix 1). The net effect of these adjustments puts Cherwell at the seventh most expensive (out of 14), spending 5.1% more than the average.

While the Council is cost effective for CCTV and crime reduction, once adjustments have been made, it remains comparatively expensive for community safety services due to the model for funding and the eight street wardens it employs.

2.8 MTFS

The MTFS and Building Block work has identified £50,000 potential savings. These are from

- Reduction in Street Warden services saving £16,000 – this reflects the loss of partnership funding and will result in a reduction in street wardens from 8 to 6 in 2011.
- New Street Wardens enforcement capability generating income of £16,000
- Reduction in Night Safe Service saving £13,000
- Reduction in out of hours ASB service saving over time costs of £5,000

The post of Neighbourhood Management Support Officer (which has been funded annually from ABG) also comes to an end at the end of December 2010 and is not being renewed at this time. This enables a review of the priorities for any future post

linked to the outcomes of this project and to the level of funding then available.

2.9 CSCP Prioritisation

At a special meeting of the CSCP in September, work was undertaken to plan future Partnership priorities around funding scenarios. The 5 priority areas from the existing 10 key areas of work were identified as:

- ASB
- Serious Acquisitive Crime
- Young People
- Domestic Abuse
- Alcohol related crime

Partnership priorities need to be factored into the outcomes of this Project to ensure Co-ordinated approach to service delivery through partner organisations.

2.10 Project Report

A full copy of the detailed project report has been made available in the Members Room. The methodology used in delivering the Project Brief has included:

- Identifying the legislative requirements for the services
- Benchmarking against other top performing local authorities for best practice and value for money
- Interrogation of the Annual Public Satisfaction Survey
- Further on street survey work to identify key public requirements
- Survey of all the key agencies that make up the Cherwell Safer Communities Partnership
- Citizens jury- research the reasons for fear of crime and identify suitable courses of action.

2.11 Satisfaction Levels

Satisfaction levels around fear of crime in all the areas that were surveyed in 2009 have improved in 2010. People do generally feel safe in their homes and communities. Public responses to these criteria consistently achieve higher than 90%. However, there remain areas of concern - a considerably lower percentage of people feeling safe after dark in their community (66%) and in town centres (44%). Full extract of the survey results are available in the Project Report.

The Cherwell Satisfaction Survey outcomes for how the Council and its partners deal with Anti Social Behaviour are significantly lower. Examples of this are:

- Dealing with noise: 36%
- Speed of response to complaints: 37%
- Visual presence of Police: 28%.
- Dealing with vandalism and graffiti: 28%.

- Visual presence of Street Wardens: 29%.
- Dealing with youths hanging around on streets: 23%.

This gives some key messages about how and where the Council and its partners need to focus their attention in the future particularly in relation to the fear of crime.

2.12 Citizens Jury

As part of the project further detailed work was undertaken to understand peoples' perceptions and fears through citizens' juries. This involved engaging residents from different age groups and locations (rural and urban) to achieve an overall picture of opinion across the district. Participants were asked to identify the key problems and the solutions to address fear of crime in Cherwell and this work has been taken into account in the key outcomes.

This was an extremely valuable exercise and identified that Rural residents don't have a problem in their areas, only a perception that urban areas were places of high crime, that perception and reality in crime figures were widely different, and that targeted action in key locations may lead to improved satisfaction through visible action being taken on perceived hot spots

A copy of the Citizens Jury outcomes is available with the main Project report

2.13 Benchmarking

Comparison work was undertaken with the CIPFA Family Group and with the other councils in Oxfordshire. Comparative performance across Oxfordshire available from NI21 performance for 2009/10 is shown below.

	Indicator	Oxfordshire	Cherwell	City	South	Vale	West
NI21	Dealing with local concerns about anti-social behaviour and crime issues by the police/council	28.1% (best third)	26.9%	32.6%	26.1%	26.4%	26.9%

The top performing councils for NI21 were Ribble Valley at 40.1% and East Dorset at 37.7%

This level of satisfaction is significantly better than in Cherwell and will lead to further work to try and understand how these council areas are achieving this.

2.14 HMIC: ASB Inspection Findings

The Project took place at the same time that HMIC undertook national research into ASB across the 43 Police forces and this Executive report draws on the HMIC inspection findings from its report "Stop the Rot".

In September 2010 the Chief Inspector of Constabulary said that cutting efforts to fight anti social behaviour would be a very serious mistake for the police and warned that if spending cuts led police to neglect the problem, some areas could fall into a spiral of decline.

The HMIC report concluded: "...there is an alternative which offers the prospect of nipping much more of the problem in the bud. This is an early intervention strategy...it will require reform of police availability and a refocusing on what causes harm in

communities, rather than what is or is not a “crime”, or what can be managed out of the police system. Make no mistake; it requires feet on the street. It will also require better pace and focus of partnership efforts to deal, for example, with wayward tenants, and shops selling alcohol, knives and spray paints.

2.15 Budget Consultation and Other Resident Feedback

This Corporate Improvement Plan Project considered the outcomes of the 2010 Customer Satisfaction Survey, and the Council’s budget consultation. Overall residents were divided in their views on community safety services. For some this is a service priority area that should remain untouched, while for others it is less of a concern.

Generally speaking, the majority of residents felt that the Safer Communities services could afford to take a hit in the budget cuts. This is largely because Cherwell is not seen to be an unsafe area. However when people were asked whether or not community safety and ASB is a priority people tend to agree that it is. This is a dilemma for planning priorities and in making decision on service and budget cuts.

The Project undertook additional survey work, most importantly with its partners and through Citizens Juries to try and ‘unpick’ this variation in views and inform priorities and financial commitments.

The HMIC report stated: Confronted by spending cuts, Community Safety Partnerships may be tempted to reduce the amount of work they do in relation to ASB and to concentrate instead on volume crime. All the evidence HMIC have available indicates that this would be a very significant mistake. Managing ASB is crucial to sustaining the vitality and confidence of communities. Untreated ASB acts like a magnet for other crime and disorder problems and areas can quite easily tip into a spiral of economic and social decline.

Key Issues for Consideration/Reasons for Decision and Options

- 3.1 There are some clear messages arising from this Project and a need to reposition the Council’s Community Safety and ASB services. The funding position has changed markedly where there is now a position where there cannot be any reliance on external funding to drive project work. The generally low satisfaction levels evident from the Council’s annual survey provide and the Citizens Jury messages provide a clear indication of where the Council needs to concentrate its effort and resources in the future. From this feedback, there is a strong argument to adjust the service with a lighter touch over crime reduction activities and a shift towards specific activities which address the fear of crime.
- 3.2 The Council’s own financial position also needs to be factored into what it should and can do in the future. Not only is there declining external funding, but the consequences of the MTFs proposals means that its own resources will diminish in the future which means that clarity of priorities and a focus on what is most important will be essential.
- 3.3 One key issue which arises from this report is the role of street wardens. There is significant evidence to suggest that their role is appreciated by the wider community due to their flexibility and variety of functions. However,

given that their prime function when originally established was to create safer neighbourhoods in Banbury and Bicester, the wide range of tasks they undertake now needs to be questioned. Their cost also needs to be justified as it is the employment of the eight post holders which positions the Council as above average cost when compared to other similar councils.

- 3.4 There is therefore a need to achieve greater clarity of intent and to prioritise activity against where the Council can make a real difference with the reducing budget it has. Members need to consider, external funding reductions and the how its safer communities and ASB services address resident needs particularly in relation to the fear of crime. The key priorities which frame the action plan at Appendix 2 are intended to reconcile all these issues in a way which prioritises activities and makes the best use of reducing Council resources. A specific focus on Priority A. Information/Communication and Priority C. Improve our Visibility will be given in the first instance as a direct response to resident feedback and satisfaction levels in relation to the fear of crime.
- 3.5 Achievement and timing of these actions will depend on the level of funding confirmed through the CSR process and also the decisions taken by the Council on the MTFS.

The following options have been identified. The approach in the recommendations is believed to be the best way forward

- Option One** Approve the Key Priorities, Aims and Objectives set out in this report
- Option Two** Amend the Key Priorities, Aims and Objectives.

Consultations

- Cherwell Community Safety Partnership** Work on the Partnership priorities and survey work on performance and satisfaction with community safety and ASB services.
- Citizens Jury** See main Project Report
- Cherwell Customer Satisfaction Survey** See main Project Report

Implications

- Financial:** There is a clear loss of external funding which the service must take account of. This has already begun where it affects posts. Further cost reductions are planned and in hand as part of the Council's MTFS.
- Comments checked by Karen Curtin, Head of Finance, 01295 221551
- Legal:** There are no specific legal implications arising from this report.

Comments checked by Liz Howlett, Head of Legal and Democratic Services, 01295 221686

Risk Management:

The main risk arising from this report is reputational. The Council has been proactive within the communities it serves with its various community safety and ASB services and there is therefore a public expectation that the Council will continue to respond to local need. However, reducing external and internal resource levels will mean that it will have far less capability in the future. Focus on what is important and prioritisation will assist but expectation also needs to be managed.

Comments checked by Rosemary Watts, 01295 221566

Wards Affected

All

Corporate Plan Themes

Safe and Healthy

Executive Portfolio

Councillor Nigel Morris

Portfolio Holder for Community Safety, Street Scene and Rural Services

Document Information

Appendix No	Title
Appendix 1	Value For Money Summary
Appendix 2	Key Aims and Objectives
Background Papers	
1. Corporate Improvement Plan; Fear of Crime and Anti Social Behaviour 2. HMIC ASB Inspection Findings: Stop the rot" 3. Cherwell Customer Satisfaction survey 2010 4. Report of Citizens Juries 4. Project File and Work Packages	
Report Author	Chris Rothwell, Head of Safer Communities, Urban and Rural Services
Contact Information	01295 221712 chris.rothwell@Cherwell-dc.gov.uk

Fear of Crime/Antisocial Behaviour Value for Money Summary

	Community safety	Exp/head	Rank
Basingstoke and Deane	£909,000	£5.62	1
Cherwell	£740,000	£5.35	2
Test Valley	£615,000	£5.33	3
Colchester	£959,000	£5.30	4
Braintree	£585,000	£4.12	5
Eastleigh	£467,000	£3.86	6
Maidstone	£555,000	£3.82	7
Aylesbury Vale	£564,000	£3.20	8
Chelmsford	£535,000	£3.20	9
Ashford	£344,000	£3.03	10
Tonbridge and Malling	£326,000	£2.78	11
East Hertfordshire	£375,000	£2.77	12
Vale of White Horse	£255,000	£2.18	13
Harrogate	£281,000	£1.75	14

Comparison of the 2010/11 RA budget estimates amongst CIPFA comparators reveals the following;

- Cherwell is the 2nd most expensive authority, and is £1.62 per head (30%) above the average or £2.51 (47%) above the lowest quartile spending authority
- This equates to a spend of £223,500 above average, or £346,730 above the lowest quartile spending authority

The RA return for Community Safety was looked at in more detail to discover more about the apparently high cost, and additional benchmarking work was carried out with authorities to better understand their funding and operation. The RA return is made up of 3 separate lines; crime reduction, safety services and CCTV

CCTV

- For CCTV, Cherwell was only the 8th highest spend out of 14, and spending 27% less than the average (or £49,800 less).

Capital charges of £15k were allocated incorrectly to Crime Reduction on the 2010/11 RA form. Exclusion of this from the net expenditure sum results in Cherwell being the 9th most expensive authority, 35% below the average (or £63,700 less).

A comparison was made of authority expenditure for the number of cameras deployed (for the 8 authorities that gave figures). This revealed;

- The average cost per camera deployed was £2,670, with Cherwell's cost for 50 cameras at £2,380 each (10.8% lower than average).
- The lowest cost authority was Harrogate, who deploy 118 cameras for £138,000 of (net) expenditure, largely due to £130,000 received in income

This suggests that Cherwell obtains good value for money from its current CCTV arrangements, although further efficiencies could still be found through shared arrangements, joint procurement or through additional income

Community Safety Services

- For Community Safety Services, Cherwell was the 4th most expensive authority, spending 57% more than the average (or £112,700 more)

Community Safety Services comprises spending on areas such as provision of lighting for safety, provision of safety railings, providing home safety advice and community or neighbourhood wardens

A comparison with how other authorities approach these costs revealed;

- 6 authorities have no street wardens (Braintree, VOWH, Chelmsford, East Herts, Aylesbury Vale and Harrogate)
- Kent authorities (Maidstone, Ashford and Tonbridge & Malling) have between 7 and 9 community wardens that are provided by the County Council at no cost to the District Council
- Colchester has 6 street wardens which are part funded by Essex County Council, and two of which are paid for by Colchester Borough Homes,
- Eastleigh has county council funded accredited community safety officers and 5 police PCSOs which it jointly funds to the tune of £35k

The number of wardens and the nature of their funding is a policy decision by the council. Although the number of wardens does not appear to be significantly higher than elsewhere the nature of how they are funded could be the source of higher than average costs in this area.

Crime Reduction

- For Crime Reduction, Cherwell was the 2nd most expensive authority, spending 117% more than the average (or £160,600 more)

The RA guidance for Crime Reduction suggests that this should include areas such as fees paid to police forces to secure extra police for a particular area, providing crime prevention advice or any community safety (crime reduction) expenditure that cannot be clearly or properly allocated to any other specific service.

Currently the Cherwell RA return for Crime Reduction includes the Street Scene Enforcement cost centre, which accounts for £203k of net expenditure. This is not in the spirit of the guidance and could, arguably, be included in line 522 (Environmental Protection). Exclusion of this sum, and correct allocation of the £15k CCTV capital charges, results in a net Crime Reduction expenditure of £99,000 (£0.72 per head) which is 19% lower than the average (or £23,200 less than the average authority)

Overall RA Total

- Cherwell is the 2nd most expensive authority, and is £1.62 per head (30%) above the average or £2.51 (47%) above the lowest quartile spending authority

The net effect of the charges above result in an overall spend of £527k (£3.81 per head) making Cherwell the 7th most expensive authority and spending 5.1% more than the average (or £25,700 more)

Income

An analysis of the most recent available RO (outturn) data for 2008/09 for the comparator authorities was examined as this contains additional information on employee costs, running costs and levels of income.

In 2008/09 Cherwell appeared to be 50% below average on the level of income it used to offset its costs (8th out of 14, or £106,700 below average), with three authorities obtaining income of over £600,000 per annum. When viewed as a proportion of total expenditure Cherwell was just 10th highest at 12% compared to Ashford whom obtained 68% of its expenditure as income.

Area Based Grant (ABG) is received from the Home Office on an area basis and then divided amongst authorities by Public Service Boards according to local priorities and policies. An analysis of ABG allocation for the 10 authorities that provided data for the current year revealed the following;

- The average ABG per 1,000 population was £0.59, with Cherwell obtaining £0.94, or 58.7% above the average
- Unlike Cherwell, a number of authorities were reliant on ABG to fund mainstream community safety posts.

Assuming that ABG levels have not changed radically since 2008/09 this would indicate that other sources of income are used to supplement community safety expenditure.

Appendix 2

Fear of Crime and ASB - Key Priorities, Aims and Objectives

Priority A. Information/Communication:		
Ref	Aim	Objective
A	Improve information and communication with the community and with victims of crime and ASB.	A1. Establish a communications approach to addressing perceptions around fear of crime and ASB.
		A2. Improved publicity about crime statistics and success stories from the Partnership.
		A3. Establish a 'name and shame' policy of offenders and use media channels to bring this to public attention.
		A4. Establish a clear Vision and agreed set of priorities around community safety and ASB that flow through all the tiers of community safety working.
Constraints: 1. Loss of the Neighbourhood Management Support Officer to coordinate information. 2. Uncertainty about funding and partner priorities 3. Potential loss/reduction of ABG funding that supports ASB with £25,000		

Priority B. Effective Working.		
Ref	Aim	Objective
B	Improvements to the effectiveness. Working in partnership because it makes business sense not because of funding or targets.	B1. Improved internal working within CDC to maximise the resources we have in the community.
		B2. Targeting our efforts in a more coordinated way and at what the public and the available intelligence tells us are the priorities.
		B3. Provide the right tools for staff to undertake their work more effectively and be seen by the public to make a difference.
		B4. Establish a risk driven approach to managing ASB case load...and more effective management of public expectations for case load on nuisance investigation.
		B5. Simplify structures. Work in partnership because there are business reasons to do so, not because of funding or targets.
Constraints: 1. Reduction in staffing levels could limit the range of partnership working 2. Funding reductions may limit the extent to which technology/IT systems can support this aim 3. Potential loss/reduction of ABG funding that supports ASB with £25,000		

Priority C. Improve our Visibility		
Ref	Aim	Objective
C	Improve our visibility and accessibility.	C1. Improve the visibility of street wardens (and the police).
		C2. Improve public access to information about community safety.
		C3. Community volunteering to play a part in helping to solve neighbourhood issues.
		C4. Deal with issues at first point of contact and before they escalate.
		C5. Better use of/profile of/public reporting using CCTV.
Constraints: 1. Reduction in number of street wardens from 8 to 6. 2. Reduction in external funding of Street Warden service 3. Reduction in staffing to support coordination of information 4. Cost of the CCTV provision.		

Priority D. Efficiencies.		
Ref	Aim	Objective
D	Add value to what we have already and seek to make further efficiencies to transfer resources to support the priorities.	D1. Improve the effectiveness of the existing resources.
		D2. Achieve savings from Joint procurement arrangements (across services and with partners).
		D3. Demonstrate the benefits of Community Intelligence Hub (CIH) to external partners to explore whether CIH can be the system of choice across the partnership to record data and provide information/performance reports to guide resourcing.
Constraints: 1. Upgrade costs of CIH		

Priority E. Data Quality:		
Ref	Aim	Objective
E	Improve data quality, recording, information sharing and performance monitoring to achieve better targeting of resources/actions.	E1. Agreed sharing of information across the partner agencies
		E2. Ensure standardised approach to data input within CDC
		E3. Determine the future of CIH
		E4. Improved performance management
Constraints: 1. Willingness of partners to further share information under the Data Sharing Protocol 2. Future of CIH		