

**CUSTOMER AND COMMUNITIES POSC (MEETING AS  
THE CRIME AND DISORDER COMMITTEE)**

**Friday, 8th July, 2011**

**2.00 pm**

Darent Room, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone







## AGENDA

### Kent County Council

## CUSTOMER AND COMMUNITIES POSC (MEETING AS THE CRIME AND DISORDER COMMITTEE)

Friday, 8th July, 2011, at 2.00 pm                      Ask for:        Denise Fitch  
Darent Room, Sessions House, County Hall,        Telephone     01622 694269  
Maidstone

*Refreshments will be available before the meeting*

### Membership (12)

- Conservative (10):        Mrs E M Tweed (Chairman), Mr R B Burgess, Mr A R Chell (Vice-Chairman), Mr H J Craske, Ms A Hohler, Mrs J P Law, Mr J M Ozog, Mr R Tolputt, Mrs C J Waters Mr A T Willicombe
- Liberal Democrat (1):    Mr I S Chittenden
- Labour (1)                        Mrs E Green

### **UNRESTRICTED ITEMS**

*(During these items the meeting is likely to be open to the public)*

#### **A. Committee Business**

- 1        Substitutes
- 2        Declarations of Interests by Members in items on the Agenda for this meeting
- 3        Minutes of the meeting held on 6 April 2010 (4.-7)  
The Protocol for the operation of the Crime and Disorder Committee is attached (Page Nos 1 - 4 ) for information  
  
Matters arising from the minutes (Page Nos 5 -7) - There will be the following updates  
  
CCTV  
Powers of Police Community Support Officers (PCSO's)

#### **B. Items for consideration**

- 4        Presentation from Kent Police on their new structure

- 5 Presentation from Kent Fire and Rescue Service on its new structure
- 6 Community Safety Agreement 2011-14 ( 9 - 30)

**EXEMPT ITEMS**

*(At the time of preparing the agenda there were no exempt items. During any such items which may arise the meeting is likely NOT to be open to the public)*

Peter Sass  
Head of Democratic Services and Local Leadership  
(01622) 694002

**Thursday, 30 June 2011**

**Protocol for the operation of the Kent Council Council's (KCC's) Crime and Disorder committee functions**

**(approved by Kent County Council on 10 December 2009)**

Contents

1. Introduction
2. Scope
3. Frequency of meetings/agenda setting
4. Co-option of Members
5. Requirement to attend meetings
6. Requirement to provide information
7. Meeting protocol
8. Responses to Crime and Disorder reports

**1. Introduction**

(1) Section 19 of the Police and Justice Act 2006 (which came into force on 30 April 2009) requires all local authorities to identify a Crime and Disorder Committee.

(2) At the meeting of the County Council on 30 April 2009 KCC identified the Communities Policy Overview and Scrutiny Committee (POSC) as its Crime and Disorder Committee.

**2. Scope of the Committee**

(1) The Crime and Disorder Committee has the power to:

- Review and scrutinise decisions made, or other action taken, in connection with the discharge by the authorities responsible for crime and disorder strategies of their crime and disorder functions and make recommendations.
- Consider a Councillor Call for Action relating to crime and disorder matters

(2) The role of the Committee is as a “critical friend” of the community safety partnership, providing it with constructive challenge at a strategic level. Its role is not fault finding at an operational level.

(3) The Committee’s remit is to review and scrutinise the decisions and actions of the partnership as a whole and not individual organisations within it.

Note: the authorities responsible for Crime and Disorder strategies are: Kent Police Authority, Kent Police, Kent & Medway Fire and Rescue Authority, Primary Care Trusts and District/County Councils (plus Kent Probation Service from April 2010)

### **3. Frequency of meetings/agenda setting**

(1) Meetings of the Communities POSC (meeting as the Crime and Disorder Committee) will be programmed to be held at least twice a year.

(2) An informal meeting will be held at least six weeks before each Committee meeting (and if possible much earlier) where the Chairman, Vice Chairman and Liberal Democrat Spokesman will consider items for the next meeting and agree the agenda.

(3) It is intended that items for the Committee will be suggested by the County Strategy Group and that the Chairman of this Group will attend the agenda setting meeting to put forward these items.

(4) As soon as the agenda has been agreed relevant responsible partners will be informed of any information, attendance or co-optees required for that meeting.

### **4. Co-option of additional Members**

(1) The Kent Police Authority and Kent & Medway Fire and Rescue Authority shall be represented on the Committee by members of the Committee who are also members of the Kent Police Authority/Kent & Medway Fire and Rescue Authority.

(2) The Committee has the right to co-opt representatives from responsible authorities onto the Committee when a specific matter is being considered that may lead to recommendations for that authority.

### **5. Requirement to attend meetings**

(1) The Committee may require an officer of a responsible authority or of a co-operating body to attend before it in order to answer questions.

(2) A minimum of 28 days notice will be given of the requirement to attend, except in the case of urgent items when the notice period may be shorter.

## **6. Requirement to provide information to the Committee**

- (1) Information requested by the Committee from responsible authorities which is relevant to the exercise of the Committee's functions must be provided
- (2) The Committee will give at least 28 days notice of information that it requires, except in the case of urgent items when the notice period may be shorter but this will be the exception.

## **7. Meeting protocol**

- (1) Committee members should not request detailed information from representatives of a community safety partner or another local authority at meetings of the Committee, unless they have given prior notice through the Democratic Services Officer. If, in the course of a question-and-answer session at a Committee meeting, it becomes apparent that further information would be useful, the representative being questioned may be required to submit it in writing to members of the Committee.
- (2) In the course of questioning at meetings, representatives of a community safety partner or another local authority may decline to give information or respond to questions on the ground that it is more appropriate that the question be directed to a more senior officer or Member.
- (3) Representatives of a community safety partner or another local authority may decline to give information on the grounds that the answer might disclose information which may not be disclosed under the Local Government (Access to Information Act) 1985 or the Data Protection Act 1998 (in this event, the Committee may resolve to exclude the media and public in order that the question may be answered in private session).
- (4) During the course of the meeting, the Committee, and its members, may not criticise or adversely comment by name any individual officer of another local authority or of a community safety partner organisation.

## **8. Responses to Crime and Disorder Committee reports**

- (1) If the Committee intends to make a recommendation or a report to a responsible authority it will do so in draft form and give the relevant responsible authority the opportunity to comment on the factual accuracy of it before it makes a formal recommendation or produces a report.
- (2) Once a formal recommendation or report is made to a responsible authority, the authority is required to respond in writing to the Committee within 28 days. If there are extenuating circumstances which make this timescale unreasonable, the Committee should be made aware of them in writing as soon as possible and before the end of the 28 day period.

This page is intentionally left blank

**COMMUNITIES POSC (MEETING AS THE CRIME AND  
DISORDER COMMITTEE)**

MINUTES of a meeting of the Communities POSC (meeting as the Crime and Disorder Committee) held in the Darent Room, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone on Tuesday, 6 April 2010.

PRESENT: Mrs E M Tweed (Chairman), Mr A R Chell (Vice-Chairman), Mr I S Chittenden, Mr H J Craske, Mr J Ozog, Mr R Tolputt and Mr A Willicombe

ALSO PRESENT: Mr M Gilmartin, Mr P M Hill, OBE and Chief Inspector R Nyman

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr S Beaumont (County Manager, Community Safety), Mr J Parris (Assistant Manager, Community Safety), Ms D Fitch (Assistant Democratic Services Manager (Policy Overview)) and Mr P D Wickenden (Overview, Scrutiny and Localism Manager)

**UNRESTRICTED ITEMS**

**1. Brief induction - setting out the framework for the operation of this Committee**  
*(Item B1)*

(1) The Chairman welcomed all partners to the first meeting of this Committee under its Crime and Disorder remit.

(2) Mr Beaumont and Mr Parris gave a brief induction presentation on the background to the work of this Committee and answered questions from Members. The constructive, critical friend role of the Committee and the aim of reviewing the work of the partnership rather than individual partners was emphasised. It was intended that this Committee would look at countywide arrangements and that issues of local or geographical concern would be considered at a District/Borough level.

(3) It was explained that a key document for the Committee would be the Kent County Community Safety Agreement. This would set out the key strategic priorities which could form the basis of issues for the Committee to consider.

(4) When considering issues the Committee would be encouraged to look at how the partners work together, to see whether there were any barriers, and to look for best practise that could be shared across the partnership. The Chairman stated that her aim was to ensure that this Committee added value to the work of the partnership.

(5) The Chairman of the County Strategy Group suggested that the meetings of the Committee should be held after the Group so that the Committee could receive a report on what had been considered at the Group.

(6) RESOLVED that the presentation be noted and that when a copy of the Kent County Community Safety Agreement be circulated to Members of the Committee when it has been agreed by the County Strategy Group.

## **2. The differing use of powers held by Police Community Support Officer (PCSO's) across the County - with an apparent reluctance by many to enforce the CNEA (Cleaner Neighbourhood and Environment Act)**

*(Item B2)*

(1) The Chairman welcomed Mr Snelling and Chief Inspector Nyman to the meeting.

(2) Mr Snelling had asked for this item to be put on the agenda on behalf of the Dartford and Gravesham Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership. Mr Snelling explained that this issue had been raised at a meeting of Kent Leaders, and related to the views from the public that litter and dog fouling should be dealt with as low level crime and the perception that the PCSO's were reluctant to issue on the spot penalties for these offences, especially dog fouling.

(3) Chief Inspector Nyman provided some background to this issue. He informed the Committee that there were 382 PCSO's in Kent and that the funding for these was not clear after 2011. He explained that there were 20 standard powers that PCSO's could use, which were set out in the papers for the meeting and examples were given. The powers relating to fixed penalties for littering and dog fouling were discretionary and that PCSO's tried to find sustainable solutions to these common problems. All Kent Leaders and Chief Executives were being consulted by the Police on the use of these discretionary powers. Chief Inspector Nyman explained that the decision on which powers should be delegated to PCSO's would rest with the new Chief Constable.

(4) The issue of parking on pavements was raised and the need for the roles of local enforcement and PCSO's to be clarified for the public. Chief Inspector Nyman stated that this would be something that a joined up partnership approach could assist with. Reference was made to the ability of Local Authorities to introduce a bye law to cover this issue.

(5) Mr Gilmartin (Chief Executive of the Police Authority) noted the key issues on PCSO powers raised by Members with a view to using them in the recruitment process for the new Chief Constable.

(6) RESOLVED that it be noted that the PCSO's delegated powers were currently under review and that an update be submitted to the Committee in due course.

## **3. CCTV Monitoring**

*(Item B3)*

(1) Mr Hill, Chairman of the County Strategy Group, had asked for this item to be considered by the Committee. He explained CCTV monitoring had been raised by a number of District Council leaders, including the Leader of Tunbridge Well Borough Council in relation to the financial burden that this placed upon them. He stated that

a Group was being established with the Police Authority and Kent Police to carry out a joint piece of work. Mr Gilmartin explained that an initial meeting had been held and draft terms of reference had been produced and shared with the Leader of Tunbridge Wells Borough Council. This would be a wide ranging piece of work, which would include options for CCTV across the County and also the possible establishment of a single non-emergency number.

(2) Members referred to a number of options for CCTV in the County including shared monitoring/provision between Districts.

(3) Mr Gilmartin stated that there were a number of possible options that could be explored between the two extremes of each Council running their own service and a single county wide solution, key issues were the importance of CCTV evidence being able to assist the Police in their investigations, even if it was not of the highest standard, and the capital cost of replacement equipment.

(4) Mr Snelling, as Leader of Gravesham Borough Council, stated that his Council had had a debate on this recently. CCTV was popular with the public but the problem for the Council was the limited capacity and the lack of finance to address this. There was an attraction in economies of scale but these need to be established very carefully and the whole range of options explored.

(5) RESOLVED that the establishment of a multi-agency group to look at options for the future of CCTV across the county be noted and that the Committee be kept informed of its progress.

#### **4. Countywide arrangements in place for overview and scrutiny of CDRP's.** *(Item B4)*

(1) At the request of the Police Authority the Committee considered a report which set out the current countywide arrangements for the overview and scrutiny of CDRP's. Mr Wickenden emphasised that this was about partnership working and that scrutiny officers from across Kent would be working together to ensure that their Crime and Disorder Committees added value for the residents of Kent and the duplication was avoided. Initial discussion had been held at officer level to produce an agreement on inter-authority co-operation, including engagement with partners, which it was intended would be embedded in authorities constitutions.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

#### **5. Date of next meeting - 11 November 2010 at 2.00pm** *(Item B5)*

This page is intentionally left blank

**To: KCC Crime & Disorder Scrutiny Committee – 8 July 2011**

**By: Stuart Beaumont – Head of Community Safety**

**Subject: Community Safety Agreement 2011-14**

---

## **1. Introduction**

At its meeting on 6<sup>th</sup> April 2010, the Crime and Disorder Overview and Scrutiny Committee decided that the community safety agreement for Kent would be the key reference document for the Committee in order to assist with the scrutiny of community safety.

The Community Safety Agreement sets the key strategic priorities which could form the basis of issues for the Committee to consider. The Community Safety Agreement for 2011-2014 was approved on 20 May 2011 by the Kent Community Safety Partnership

## **2. Community Safety Agreement**

In order to deliver the statutory duty under Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 (as amended by the Police and Justice Act 2006), two tier authorities are required to prepare a Community Safety Agreement for the county. Section 17 recognises that there are key stakeholders that have responsibility for a wide range of services to the community that can deliver community safety solutions. The Kent Community Safety Agreement recognises that community safety does not respect district / borough council boundaries and that the coordination of effort across county wide partners can lead to economies of scale, joined up working and more effective solutions.

The Kent Community Safety Partnership is responsible for the delivery of the Kent Community Safety Agreement priorities, with membership taken from senior officers across statutory partners, CSP Chairs and the County Council portfolio holder.

The Kent Community Safety Agreement is the product of the amalgamation of the strategic assessments for each of the CSPs in the county. From the strategic assessments that were completed during late 2010 – early 2011 a number of areas emerged as crime and disorder issues or themes across CSPs. The strategic assessments have relied heavily upon the exchange of data between a range of partners, information gathered from consultation with communities, surveys and national policy initiatives.

In addition to the analysis of the strategic assessment data two partner workshops were held in order primarily to ensure that all partners had the opportunity to have an input to the priority setting process. The workshops were very well supported by partners with the second workshop focussing on how existing partnership arrangements / strategies could become more focussed towards delivering the identified priorities. Given the current resource limitations being experienced by all partners joint working and the sharing of actions is the primary aim of the new agreement.

## **3. County Wide Priorities**

The identified county wide priorities that will form the basis of the new County Community Safety Agreement for 2011-2014 are as follows:

- Anti-social behaviour including environmental
- Domestic abuse
- Substance misuse
- Acquisitive crime (ie thefts and shoplifting)
- Violent crime
- Road safety

Work is now progressing with partners to ensure that all statutory partners & CSPs give the necessary level of priority to the approved work streams. This process will be supported with the communication of high level action plans. The majority of the priorities already have detailed action plans in place as part of wider partnership plans and these will be consolidated to ensure the necessary focus towards delivering against the identified priority areas.

It is also planned to further support the priorities with the completion of a geographic analytical product in conjunction with Kent Police, that will provide a focus for the allocation of any scarce resources and will link with community based budgeting and other similar local based projects.

Lead Officers will take responsibility for the delivery of each of the priority areas and will report progress to meetings of the Kent Community Safety Partnership and the Crime & Disorder Scrutiny Committee.

#### **4. Links with Partnership Plans**

All the priorities listed above have enforcement implications but they also share cross partner priority in terms of the core business activity of statutory partners. As part of the workshops, partners were asked to reference the above priorities with their existing strategies / plans and to identify key linkages. The result being that the new priorities are underwritten by cross cutting themes that enable clear links to be established with statutory partner business planning processes and help to identify where business objectives can be shared. The identified cross cutting themes that support the identified priorities are:

- Early intervention, prevention and education
- Priority neighbourhoods / geographic focus
- Vulnerable households and individuals
- Safeguarding children and young people
- Reducing re-offending

The cross cutting themes will bring together other work streams with the community safety priorities and enable shared objectives and priorities therefore engaging more partnership focus towards delivering sustainable local solutions.

#### **5. Recommendations**

That Members of the Crime & Disorder Scrutiny Committee note the contents of the report.

S. Beaumont  
Head of Community Safety

July 2011

# **Kent Community Safety Agreement**

---

**April 2011 to March 2014**

For Further information on this Community Safety Agreement please contact Kent County Council's Community Safety Unit:

**KCC Community Safety Unit**  
**1st Floor**  
**Invicta House**  
**Maidstone**  
**Kent**  
**ME14 1XX**

Email: [communitysafetyunit@kent.gov.uk](mailto:communitysafetyunit@kent.gov.uk)

# Contents

Foreword.....	4
1. Introduction .....	5
2. Purpose of the Agreement .....	5
3. Governance .....	6
4. County Priorities.....	7
5. Priority Leads .....	8
6. Links to Strategies and Plans.....	9
7. Signatories .....	10
<b>Appendices</b>	
Appendix A: Key Priorities and Cross-Cutting Themes (2011-12) .....	11
Appendix B: Current Context .....	12

# Foreword

As Chair of the Kent Community Safety Partnership I am pleased to present the Kent Community Safety Agreement for 2011/14

The Community Safety Agreement sets out how partners in Kent will work together to address the key community safety priorities for the County, identifying the shared objectives and outcomes required to improve the lives of the people of Kent. Whilst enforcement of the law will always play a major part in community safety, much can be done to prevent problems before they arise and a great deal of effort is devoted to supporting vulnerable people and their families, tackling issues of substance misuse, improving road safety and improving security of people's homes. A major part of crime and disorder reduction can be achieved through considering and addressing the causes. The root causes include social issues of poverty, poor education attainment and training opportunities, unemployment and drug and alcohol misuse. Striving towards stronger communities, helping people become active citizens and improving personal responsibility in the community, as part of the Big Society, also contributes to improving community safety

Whilst the agreement aims to address the needs of local communities it will also help to meet the objectives set out in the recent Home Office paper entitled 'A New Approach to Fighting Crime' which gives a clear direction to the public and partners about the changing focus of community safety.

All agencies and services are aware of the current challenging economic landscape that we are all working within and the opportunities this presents in applying new methods of service delivery and resourcing such as community budgets. This agreement outlines an opportunity for partners to focus their limited resources towards jointly delivering against the partnership priorities.

The success of this agreement can only be achieved through delivery of the action plans, which will not be possible without the considerable support of partner agencies at both district/borough and county level, as well as non-statutory organisations and the voluntary sector which are vital in providing the services required to deliver the identified priorities and I would like to thank them for their continued support.

## **Mike Hill OBE**

Chair Kent Community Safety Partnership  
Cabinet Member Customer and Communities

# 1. Introduction

- 1.1. The Crime and Disorder Act 1998 gave statutory responsibility to local authorities, the police, and key partners to reduce crime and disorder in their communities. Under this legislation district/borough level Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) were required to carry out 3 yearly audits and to implement crime reduction strategies.
- 1.2. A formal review of the 1998 Act took place in 2006, which resulted in a revision to these requirements. Most notably at a district/borough level, the 3 yearly audits were replaced by annual Strategic Assessments and public consultation; whilst the crime reduction strategies were replaced by a 3 year rolling Partnership Plan refreshed annually. For two tier authorities, such as Kent, a statutory Community Safety Agreement was introduced.
- 1.3. Medway Unitary Authority undertakes a similar process, suitable for single tier authorities, which will include an annual strategic assessment of their community safety issues and production of a Community Safety Plan. Where appropriate, partners in Kent and Medway will work collaboratively to tackle common priorities.

## 2. Purpose of the Agreement

- 2.1. To deliver the statutory duty under Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 (as amended by the Police and Justice Act 2006), two tier authorities are required to prepare a community safety agreement for the county. Section 17 recognises that there are key stakeholders that have responsibility for a wide range of services to the community that can deliver community safety solutions.
- 2.2. To develop a more joined-up approach to public service delivery, enable more effective and co-ordinated strategic planning across partner agencies and to ensure sustainable and lasting improvements in delivering outcomes. This agreement recognises that community safety issues do not always respect district boundaries, and that coordination of effort can lead to economies of scale, joined up working, and more effective outcomes.
- 2.3. To contribute to the delivery of the three countywide ambitions as set out in the new Vision for Kent 2011-21; to grow the economy; to tackle disadvantage; and to put citizens in control. These ambitions cannot be achieved without the commitment and contribution of all partners through their own delivery plans and strategies as well as multi-agency agreements such as the Kent Community Safety Agreement.

### 3. Governance


3.1. The Kent Community Safety Partnership (KCSP) is responsible for the delivery of the Kent Community Safety Agreement priorities, with membership taken from senior officers across statutory partners (see below), local Community Safety Partnership (CSP) Chairs and the County Council portfolio holder.

*The Statutory Partners are:- Kent Police, Kent Police Authority, District & Borough Councils, Kent County Council, Primary Care Trusts, Kent Fire & Rescue Service and Kent Probation.*

3.2. The Kent Community Safety Partnership will be supported by a virtual Community Safety team consisting of senior representatives from all the countywide statutory partners and will in turn be supported by an operational sub-group drawing on expertise from local CSPs and Community Safety Units.

3.3. The statutory partners aim to deliver effectively and efficiently the priorities outlined in this agreement and to comply with statutory responsibilities.

3.4. The Customer and Communities Policy and Overview Scrutiny Committee (POSC) will also serve as the Crime and Disorder Committee and therefore will have a statutory responsibility to review and scrutinise delivery of the Community Safety Agreement.



## 4. County Priorities

- 4.1. The Community Safety Agreement is an amalgamation of the strategic assessments undertaken annually by the eleven local Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) across Kent. The common issues and priorities from these assessments have been identified and relevant key stakeholders consulted to identify any potential gaps and cross-cutting themes for inclusion in the agreement.
- 4.2. The following priorities have been identified for 2011/12 as those with the potential to benefit from being supported at a county level, with the cross-cutting themes to be addressed within each priority:-

PRIORITIES	
Anti-social behaviour including environmental	Domestic Abuse
Substance Misuse	Acquisitive crime (i.e. thefts/shoplifting)
Violent Crime	Road Safety
CROSS-CUTTING THEMES	Early Intervention, Prevention & Education
	Priority Neighbourhoods / Geographic Focus
	Vulnerable Households & Individuals
	Safeguarding Children & Young People
	Reducing Re-Offending

*i) The source and context for the choice of priorities are detailed in Appendices A and B; ii) The above priorities will be reviewed annually and refreshed as required.*

- 4.3. Several of the identified priorities already have existing multi-agency partnership arrangements in place that are ensuring a coordinated approach across organisations at a strategic level. These arrangements can be further enhanced with linkages to the Kent Community Safety Agreement and where necessary suitable co-operative arrangements and joint interventions can be established to deliver shared priorities or issues. These plans will be developed in due course.

- 4.4. Although Preventing Violent Extremism has not been identified as a priority within the Community Safety Agreement, it is recognised that there is a need to address this issue due to the strategic position of Kent between London and mainland Europe. In addition to the location, Kent has a number of key sites as well as links to major upcoming events based in London and the South East such as the 2012 Olympics. In order to deliver the preventive strand of the government's counter-terrorism strategy, Kent has a very proactive Steering Board in place which works collaboratively with all statutory partners.
- 4.5. In conjunction with all of the priorities and cross-cutting themes identified through this process is the importance of building stronger communities through community engagement and the principles of the Big Society - helping people to come together to improve their own lives and ensure their communities are safe and supportive places in which to live.

## 5. Priority Leads

Lead officers for each of the priorities have been identified below and have the responsibility for developing, with partners, the action plans to address the countywide priorities. The leads will also act as a champion for the designated priority and provide regular progress updates for the Kent Community Safety Partnership (KCSP) and Overview and Scrutiny Committee (POSC) as required. They will be supported by secondary lead officers who will be responsible for individual actions within each plan.

Priority	Lead Officer/Agency
<b>Anti-social behaviour inc. environmental</b>	TBC
<b>Domestic Abuse</b>	Chair of Kent & Medway Domestic Abuse Strategy Group
<b>Substance Misuse</b>	Head of Kent Drug and Alcohol Action Team (KDAAT)
<b>Acquisitive crime (i.e. thefts/shoplifting)</b>	Head of Partnership and Communities Command, Kent Police
<b>Violent Crime</b>	Head of Partnership and Communities Command, Kent Police
<b>Road Safety</b>	Director Community Safety, Kent Fire & Rescue Service

## 6. Links to Strategies and Plans

The priorities set out in this Community Safety Agreement link to, and assist in the achievement of a number of national and local partnership plans and strategies including:

- A New Approach to Fighting Crime
- More Effective Responses to Anti-Social Behaviour
  
- Vision for Kent, 2011-2021
- Local Community Safety Partnership (CSP) Community Safety Plans
- Policing Kent, 2011-2014
- Kent Police Violent Crime Strategy
- Kent Police Business Crime Strategy
- Kent Police Drug and Alcohol Strategy
- Kent Police Anti-Social Behaviour Strategy
- Kent Fire and Rescue Service Towards 2020: Integrated Risk Management Plan, 2011-2020
- Kent Fire and Rescue Service Performance Plan, 2011-2012
- Kent Fire and Rescue Road Safety Action Plan, 2009-2012
- Bold Steps for Kent, 2011-2015
- Kent Probation Business Plan, 2011-2014
- Integrated Offender Management (IOM) Business Plan, 2011-2012
- Prolific and Priority Offenders Strategy
- Kent Criminal Justice Board Business Plan 2011-12
- Kent Youth Justice Strategic Plan, 2011-12
- Joint Strategic Needs Assessment for Health and Social Care
- NHS Strategic Commissioning Plans (will include QUIPP Commissioning Plans)
- Health and Wellbeing Action Plans
- Kent and Medway Domestic Abuse Strategy, 2010-2013
- Kent Children and Young Peoples Plan, 2011-2014
- Safeguarding and Looked After Childrens Services Improvement and Development Plan
- Kent Alcohol Strategy, 2010-2013
- Kent Hidden Harm Strategy, 2010-2013
- KDAAT Adult Needs Assessment, 2010-2011
- KDAAT Young Person's Substance Misuse Needs Assessment, 2010-2011
- KDAAT Adult Treatment Plan, 2010-2011
- KDAAT Young People's Specialist Substance Misuse Treatment Plan, 2010-2011
- Kent Supporting People Strategy, 2010-2015

- CaRe Road Safety Strategic Assessment
- Active Lives Now: The Future of Social Care in Kent, 2010-2013
- Policy Framework for Later Life
- Clean Kent Delivery Plan
- Kent and Medway Housing Strategy (in development)

## 7. Signatories

This agreement has been drawn up on behalf of the Partners of the Kent Community Safety Partnership:-

- Kent Police
- Kent Police Authority
- Kent Fire and Rescue Service
- Kent Probation
- Primary Care Trusts
- Kent County Council
- Local District/Borough Community Safety Partnerships

# Appendix A: Key Priorities and Cross-Cutting Themes (2011-12)

## Local Community Safety Partnership (CSP) strategic assessments:

All statutory partners including Police, Fire and Rescue, Primary Care Trusts (PCT's), Probation, County Council services, Local Authority services etc. provided community safety related data sets and contextual information to each Community Safety Partnership (CSP). These data sets were used by the CSPs during the strategic assessment process to identify their key community safety priorities using an evidence based scoring system.

The following table shows the results of the strategic assessments completed during late 2010 – early 2011, with the common issues highlighted:-

Priority	No. of CSPs selecting the priority <sup>3</sup>
<b>ASB/Environmental</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Domestic Abuse</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Substance Misuse</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Theft<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Violence (other than DA)</b>	<b>6</b>
Burglary	4
Criminal Damage	4
Young People	4
Offenders/Re-offending	4
Vehicle Related <sup>2</sup>	3
Public Perceptions	2
Vulnerable Adults	1

<sup>1</sup> Includes Shoplifting, Theft and Handling etc.

<sup>2</sup> Includes Road Traffic Collisions (RTCs), Speeding, Theft From Motor Vehicle (TFMV)

<sup>3</sup> There are 12 district/ boroughs in Kent, but only 11 Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) as Dartford and Gravesham have a joint CSP.

## Stakeholder Workshop:

Relevant key stakeholders were consulted about the above common priorities, as well as having an opportunity to identify any perceived gaps, during a multi-agency workshop in January 2011. The following additional priorities/themes resulted from the workshop discussion:-

- Reducing re-offending
- Road Safety
- Burglary (domestic, other, distraction)
- Vulnerable Adults
- Hate Crime

## Appendix B: Current Context

### Anti-social behaviour including environmental

- Anti-social behaviour describes a range of everyday nuisance, disorder and crime, from graffiti and noisy neighbours to harassment and street drug dealing. It is sometimes dismissed as trivial, but anti-social behaviour has a huge impact on victims' quality of life, and it is the public's number one concern when it comes to local crime issues. Over 3.5 million incidents were reported to police forces in England and Wales last year, and many more were reported to other local agencies such as councils and housing associations, or not reported at all.<sup>1</sup>
- Reducing anti-social behaviour is a government priority and a priority for the police and other agencies as well, particularly where it is criminal or targeted at vulnerable victims. Unchecked, anti-social behaviour can be linked to increased disorder, low-level crime and fear of crime in a neighbourhood, the so-called 'broken windows' effect.<sup>1</sup>
- In spring 2010, a countrywide review of anti-social behaviour by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) concluded that the public perceive no real difference between crime and anti-social behaviour highlighting how important it is for partners to tackle it.<sup>2</sup>
- During 2009/10, Kent Police recorded over 60,000 incidents of anti-social behaviour of which almost 28,000 were categorised as the highest priority for the public. These Highest Priority ASB Incidents include: Teenagers hanging around, alcohol related, vehicle nuisance, substance misuse and vandalism.<sup>3</sup>
- Tackling anti-social behaviour is a focus for many organisations within Kent, in particular local authorities, neighbourhood policing teams, housing associations and Clean Kent. A recent review into reporting methods and the process of dealing with such reports has been undertaken in Kent to help inform future solutions for partnership working.
- All eleven local Community Safety Partnerships in Kent assessed that anti-social behaviour (including environmental crime) was a key priority for their district/borough during the 2010/11 strategic assessment process.

### Domestic Abuse

- Domestic violence is a serious crime and public health issue affecting one in four women and one in six men in their lifetime<sup>4</sup>, with women suffering higher rates of repeat victimisation and serious injury. Over 89% of those who suffer four or more incidents of domestic abuse are women.<sup>5</sup> For women aged 19-44 years, domestic abuse is the greatest cause of morbidity, greater than cancer and vehicle accidents.<sup>6</sup>

- Domestic abuse happens in all sections of society irrespective of race, culture, nationality, religion, sexuality, disability, age, class or educational level. However findings from the 2007/08 British Crime Survey (BCS) indicated that the likelihood of being a victim of any domestic abuse tended to increase with decreasing household income.<sup>7</sup> Women living in households with an income of less than £10,000 were at particularly high risk of any domestic abuse; whilst Men and women living in areas where physical disorder was assessed as high and in rented accommodation were more likely to be victims of any domestic abuse in the past year.<sup>7</sup>
- Domestic violence accounts for between 16%<sup>8</sup> and one quarter of all recorded violent crime.<sup>9</sup> ‘Violent breakdown of relationship’ is a factor in around 16% of homelessness acceptances every year and women who experience domestic abuse may be forced to move repeatedly to get away from the perpetrator.<sup>10</sup> Research shows that domestic abuse is a factor in the lives of 75% of children on the Child Protection Register and at least 750,000 children a year witness domestic violence nationally.<sup>11</sup> Also 75% of domestic abuse cases result in physical injury or mental ill health and between 50% and 60% of women mental health service users have experienced domestic violence, and up to 20% will experience recurring abuse.<sup>12</sup>
- The number of domestic abuse incidents reported to the Police in Kent and Medway during the 2010 calendar year was 21,545; and reported incidents have been increasing over recent years.<sup>3</sup> However, it is generally accepted that incidents are under-reported and, using the Home Office Statistical Toolkit<sup>13</sup>, it is estimated that the actual number of female victims of domestic abuse in Kent is 53,953 (it currently only calculates female victim data). In addition, it has been calculated that the cost to Kent and Medway services in dealing with the effects of domestic abuse and sexual assault is over £315million (£317,125,587).<sup>13</sup>
- Management exercises carried out in April and July 2010, (by the Audit Commission and representatives from Kent’s public agencies and voluntary organisations) identified that there has been no downturn in reported incidents; that the complex and fragmented nature of the domestic abuse environment can be very confusing with gaps and unclear processes; and there are both short and long term resourcing issues (i.e. refuges, floating support, independent domestic violence advisors, special domestic violence courts etc).
- The Kent and Medway Domestic Abuse Strategy Group commissioned a report to look into the services for children affected by domestic abuse, which highlighted a number of recurring themes including: lack of sustainable funding; local variations in service delivery; the importance of partnership working and early identification and preventative work.
- All eleven local Community Safety Partnerships in Kent assessed that Domestic Abuse was a key priority for their district/borough during the 2010/11 strategic assessment process.

## Substance Misuse

- Drug and alcohol misuse causes significant harm to individuals, families and communities in Kent and across the country. It has been estimated that drug misuse in England costs as much as £15.4 billion per year<sup>14</sup> and alcohol as much as £20 billion. Drug and Alcohol Treatment has been proven to be highly effective and beneficial for society. Studies have concluded that every £1 spent on drug treatment<sup>15</sup> leads to £2.50 in savings for society as a whole and for every £1 spent on alcohol treatment, the public sector saves £5.<sup>16</sup>
- Drug and alcohol treatment delivers benefits for the criminal justice system and local communities in terms of reduced crime and anti-social behaviour; it contributes to improvements in public health by reducing rates of infection and transmission of blood borne viruses (BBVs) such as Hepatitis B, Hepatitis C and HIV.<sup>17</sup>
- Kent has benefited from investment in drug and alcohol services in recent years with substantially more people accessing and completing treatment free from dependency. There remains a strong and continuing need for drug and alcohol services in the county.
- Home Office research<sup>18</sup> suggests that Kent has more than 5,600 problem drug users (i.e. those using heroin or crack cocaine). Estimates of problematic alcohol use indicate that Kent has between 235,000 and 279,000 adults with higher or increasing risk of problematic alcohol consumption and between 22,000 and 38,000 dependent drinkers.
- The strong link between drug use and specific crimes (classified as Drug Interventions Programme (DIP) trigger offences<sup>19</sup>) provides an indication of the level of drug use in the local area based on the numbers of arrests for these particular offences. Arrests for DIP trigger offences increased by 5% in 2010 compared to 2009 and have accounted for an increasing proportion of crime in Kent in the past three years.
- Within Kent, the Supporting People Programme works in partnership to commission and provide housing related support services through accommodation based supported housing (including women's refuges) and floating support. The programme collates data which shows that drug and alcohol problems transcend most of their client groups. Analysis of client record data shows that out of a total 4,123 new clients accessing support services in 2009/10, 543 (12.8%) were identified as having alcohol problems and 479 (11.6%) were identified as having drug problems.<sup>20</sup>
- Eight of the eleven local Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) in Kent assessed that substance misuse was a key priority for their district/borough during the 2010/11 strategic assessment process. Those partnerships that have not highlighted substance misuse as a priority have recognised that substance misuse is a cross cutting theme and has been referenced in their assessments.

## Acquisitive crime (i.e. thefts, shoplifting)

- Acquisitive crime covers a wide spectrum of categories including shoplifting and thefts from a person to more serious crimes such as vehicle theft and robbery. Acquisitive crime impacts on individuals as well as businesses which can in turn have detrimental effects to an area as a whole.
- During the 2010 calendar year, Kent Police recorded 29,811 theft and handling stolen goods offences (theft, shoplifting, theft of pedal cycle and vehicle interference) which is an increase of 1800 offences since 2009. Whilst serious acquisitive crime (vehicle crime, domestic burglary and robbery) fell slightly (651 less offences) to 16,583 incidents during 2010.<sup>3</sup>
- According to the Local Government Improvement and Development (IDeA) website, total levels of acquisitive crime are falling across the UK, however, the actual number of offences remains high.<sup>21</sup> Therefore it continues to be a priority for community safety partnerships to tackle the issue by bringing offenders to justice, implementing crime prevention measures,<sup>21</sup> providing guidance/advice and effective management of prolific and priority offenders.
- Eight of the eleven local Community Safety Partnerships in Kent assessed that elements of acquisitive crime were a key priority for their district/borough during the 2010/11 strategic assessment process.
- Tackling acquisitive crime is not just the remit of Kent Police and since 2001 they have worked with businesses to create a network of Business Crime Reduction Partnerships (BCRPs) across Kent and Medway; Kent also has the largest community alcohol partnership in the country to tackle underage sales;<sup>22</sup> and the Community Safety Units work in partnership to prevent and educate against acquisitive crime, support victims and tackle the underlying causes.

## Violent Crime

- The Home Office defines violent crime as robbery, sexual offences, and a group of violence against the person offences ranging from assault without injury, through wounding, to homicide.<sup>23</sup>
- Violent crime costs society around £13 billion annually in England and Wales of which £4 billion is incurred by the NHS and the Criminal Justice System.<sup>23</sup> In addition, more than 45% of violent offenders are thought to be under the influence of alcohol and young men are at almost four times greater risk of being a victim of violence than the rest of the adult population.<sup>23</sup>
- Violent crime in Kent has been decreasing for the last two years with a decrease of over 1,300 crimes within the last year, despite these reductions the volume of violent crime is still high.<sup>3</sup> In addition, there has been an increase in Sexual Offences and Kent now has a rate higher than in 2008.<sup>3</sup>

- During recent years there has been significant focus on tackling Night Time Economy (NTE) crime, including violent crime and there are many examples of successful partnership projects which are in effect. In addition, Kent Police has developed a strategy looking at tackling Violent Crime, which includes 'NTE Based Violent Crime and 'Youth Related Violent Crime' as two of the five priorities.<sup>24</sup>
- Six of the eleven CSPs in Kent identified Violence as a priority for their district/borough within their 2011/12 Strategic Assessments.

## Road Safety

- According to figures recently released by Kent County Council, fatal and serious casualties on Kent's roads have halved over the last 10 years.<sup>25</sup> Figures show that the number of people killed or seriously injured on the roads in Kent fell to an all-time low of 545<sup>26</sup> last year, which is down from the Kent annual average of 1,196 casualties recorded 10 years ago.<sup>25</sup>
- Kent Fire and Rescue Service (KFRS) Road Safety Plan (2009-2012), indicated that KFRS was attending more incidents of road traffic collisions than house fires. According to data available at the time (2007) there were 4,779 collisions in Kent (excluding Medway) in which there were 6,466 casualties and as a result 91 people died and 632 were seriously injured.<sup>27</sup>
- Kent Police attended over 5,000 incidents of road traffic collisions in 2010<sup>3</sup>, whilst the South East Coast Ambulance Service attended over 4,500 incidents<sup>28</sup> during the same period, which is a reduction for both services compared to 2009.
- Despite these reductions, road traffic is still the biggest cause of unnatural death, injury and harm to the people of Kent, especially the young people in Kent aged between five and 25.<sup>29</sup> The lives that are lost or changed forever through road traffic death and injury is tragic, whilst the direct and indirect costs also have a considerable effect on the families of those impacted as well as public service resources.<sup>29</sup>
- Kent County Council is the Highway Authority for Kent and has a Statutory Duty under the Road Traffic Act for 'road safety' with the aim to reduce casualties through a combination of safer road engineering and education, in conjunction with Police enforcement activity. However, road safety is not just the remit of one organisation and certain aspects such as education benefit from a partnership approach. KCC works closely with partners from the CaRe group (see below) as well as district/borough authorities and parish councils to provide guidance, advice and promote road safety across Kent.
- The Kent CaRe Group is a multi-agency, non-statutory, county-level forum, with a strategic objective to reduce casualties on the roads in Kent and Medway. Members include representatives from Kent Police, Kent County Council, Kent Fire and Rescue Service, the Highways Agency and Medway

Council. The group has proposed long term casualty reduction targets for 2020<sup>30</sup> and identified priority concerns for the next 12 months which include young drivers (and their passengers), motorcyclists and business drivers.<sup>31</sup>

- In addition to the above, Kent's residents have expressed concern regarding more common road safety issues including speeding, nuisance parking and other vehicle related nuisance issues that affect their lives. In 2010 Kent Police recorded just under 83,000 Blackberry Engagements with Kent residents of which almost half reported no problems, however the remainder had concerns about a range of issues including over 14,500 reports of vehicle related nuisance.<sup>32</sup>
- Although road safety has not been identified as a common priority by the local district/borough CSPs in Kent it was highlighted at a county-level as an issue that can benefit from a continued county focus. This is also supported by the recent release of the Government Strategic Framework for Road Safety which expects both central and local government to continue to prioritise road safety and continue to seek improvements.<sup>33</sup>

## Appendix B References:-

- 1) Home Office (2011), More Effective Responses to Anti-Social Behaviour
- 2) Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) (2010), Anti-social Behaviour: Stop the rot
- 3) Kent Police, Business Information Unit
- 4) Home Office, 2006
- 5) Home Office Research Study 276 'Domestic Violence, Sexual Assault and Stalking: Findings from the British Crime Survey', March 2004
- 6) Home Office, 2005
- 7) Home Office Statistical Bulletin: 'Homicides, Firearm Offences and Intimate Violence 2007/08
- 8) Home Office Violent Crime Unit (2004), Developing Domestic Violence Strategies (London: Home Office)
- 9) Womens Aid Domestic Violence Statistics, June 2007
- 10) Department of Communities and Local Government (2002), Homelessness Statistics: September 2002 and Domestic Violence
- 11) Department of Health (2003), Women's Mental Health: Into the Mainstream – Strategic Development of Mental Health Care for Women
- 12) Bowstead, Janet (2000) *Mental health and domestic violence: Audit 1999* (Greenwich Multi-agency Domestic Violence Forum Mental Health Working Group); ReSisters (2001) *Women speak out* (Leeds: ReSisters); Department of Health (2003) op.cit.
- 13) Home Office Crime Reduction website: Violence Against Women and Girls Ready Reckoner tool
- 14) Gordon, L., Tinsley, L., Godfrey, C. and Parrott, S. (2006) The economic and social costs of Class A drug use in England and Wales, 2003/04, In Singleton, N., Murray, R. and Tinsley, L. (eds) 'Measuring different aspects of problem drug use: methodological developments.' Home Office Online Report 16/06
- 15) Home Office (2009), Drug Treatment Outcomes Research (DTORS) Study
- 16) UKATT Research Team (2005). Cost-effectiveness of treatment for alcohol problems: Findings of the UK Alcohol Treatment Trial. *British Medical Journal*, 331:544–547
- 17) National Treatment Agency, 2010, Injecting drug use in England: A declining trend
- 18) The Centre for Drug Misuse Research, University of Glasgow (2010). Estimates of the prevalence of opiate use and/or crack cocaine use (2008/09) South East Region
- 19) A list of offences identified as DIP trigger offences is available
- 20) Client Records 2009-2010, University of St. Andrews
- 21) Local Government Improvement and Development (IDeA) website, Tackling Acquisitive Crime: About Acquisitive Crime, August 2010
- 22) Kent Police Authority and Kent Police Business Crime Strategy
- 23) National Audit Office, 'Reducing the risk of violent crime' (2008)
- 24) Kent Police Violent Crime Strategy
- 25) Kent County Council website press release, '*Serious Road Casualties down by Half*', 22 February 2011.
- 26) Kent County Council, Highways Service

- 27) Kent Fire and Rescue Service (KFRS), 'Making Kent's Roads Safer' Road Safety Action Plan 2009-2012
- 28) South East Coast Ambulance Service
- 29) Kent & Medway Casualty Reduction Partnership (Kent CaRe Group), Integration of Road Safety into Community Safety, December 2010
- 30) Kent & Medway Casualty Reduction Partnership (Kent CaRe Group), Strategy Proposal Paper – 2011 to 2020
- 31) Kent & Medway Casualty Reduction Partnership (Kent CaRe Group), Road Safety Strategic Assessment, December 2010
- 32) Kent Police Blackberry Engagement Data
- 33) Department for Transport (May 2011), *Strategic Framework for Road Safety*.

This document is available in alternative formats and can be explained in a range of languages.  
For details please call 01622 696187.



**Kent Fire & Rescue Service**



**Kent Police**



*Changing Lives  
Reducing Crime*

