

SAFER HILLINGDON PARTNERSHIP'S PROCESS FOR SETTING PRIORITIES

Contact Officer: Ed Shaylor
Telephone: 01895 277532

REASON FOR ITEM

To enable the Committee to comment on the Safer Hillingdon Partnership's process for setting priorities for 2015/16.

OPTIONS AVAILABLE TO THE COMMITTEE

The Committee is asked to note the contents of the report and ask questions of the chief officers of the Safer Hillingdon Partnership in order to clarify matters of concern in the Borough.

INFORMATION

The Safer Hillingdon Partnership is obliged to undertake an annual strategic assessment and create a partnership plan under the Police and Justice Act 2006 and Statutory Instrument 2007 (3076) "Crime and Disorder: Formulation of Strategy".

The assessment and plan should include:

- the priorities for the coming year identified in the strategic assessment;
- the steps each of the responsible authorities will take to meet these priorities;
- how the responsible authorities will allocate resources to meet the priorities;
- how the responsible authorities will measure success in implementing projects to meet the priorities;
- how the strategy group will engage with the local community and encourage local people to assist in reducing crime and disorder; and
- publish a summary of the full plan for people in the local area to have access to.

In order to identify priorities, the Safer Hillingdon Partnership Board has agreed that a matrix would be the most convenient way to collate a range of information and rank community safety issues in order of priority. Each issue is given a numerical score in seven categories (volume, performance, trend, partner priority, public concern, cost and whether the issue generates other problems). See Appendix B for information about how these scores are derived.

Appendix A shows the 2015/16 matrix. The scores for volume, performance, trend, public concern and partner priority are current up to December 2014.

Public concern scores are now a combination of two engagement activities: the public on-line survey conducted in September and October 2014, plus the Safer Neighbourhood Board event that took place on 7 February 2015. The matrix included in this report only has one set of public concern scores added. The final set will be included after the Safer Neighbourhood Board public event in February 2015.

The public survey gave respondents the opportunity to recommend the addition of priorities not listed. A total of 67 additions were suggested, however, these were all subsets of the priority areas of "anti social behaviour "(suggestions included spitting, noise and dumping of rubbish), "harm caused by drugs" (suggestions included drug dealing) and "road safety" (suggestions included driving offences and not driving with correct documentation).

The partner priority, cost and generator scores remain unchanged from last year.

Committee Members are invited to consider whether the list of categories needs revision, to either add or delete categories to reflect current priority issues.

Appendix B contains definitions of each of the seven categories used.

Appendix A

	Volume	Performance	Trend	Public concern survey	Public concern SNB	Priority	Cost	Generator	Score	Ranking 2015/16	Ranking 2014/15
Violence	3	4	4	3		6	4	2	26	1	6
Reoffending	3	2	4	1		8	3	4	25	2	2=
ASB	2(3)	2	2	4		8	3	3	24	3	2=
Harm caused by alcohol	2(3)	1(3)	2(4)	1.5		8	4	4	22.5	4=	4=
Burglary	2(3)	3	1	3.5		8	3	2	22.5	4=	4=
Youth offending	3(2)	2	2(1)	3		6	3	3	22	6	7=
Harm caused by drugs	2(3)	1	1	1.5		8	4	4	21.5	7	2
Robbery	2	4(1)	2	2.5		4	2	3	19.5	8	7=
Domestic violence	4(3)	2	3(2)	1		6	2	1	19	9=	9=
Disorder on public transport	3	4(2)	2	2		2	3	3	19	9=	12
Theft from vehicles	2(3)	4(2)	2(1)	2		4	1	2	17	11	16=
Theft of vehicles	2	2	2(1)	2		4	2	2	16	12=	16=
Hate crime	1	2	3(2)	1		6	2	1	16	12=	13=
Road safety	2	2	2	1.5		4	3	1	15.5	14	15
Theft from shops	3(2)	1(3)	3	1		2	1	3	14	15=	9=
Criminal damage	3(4)	3	3(2)	1		2	1	1	14	15=	13=
Primary fires	2(3)	1(4)	1(3)	0.5		4	3	1	12.5	17	16

- Notes: A: Score is only provisional as it does not take public priority into account (waiting for outcome of Safer Neighbourhood Board event in February 2015)
 B: Figures in brackets are last year's score for comparison. If there are no scores in brackets it means the score has not changed since last year.
 C: Partner priority, cost and generator columns remain the same.
 D: Public concern and partner priority columns are given a weighting of double to make sure public and partner concerns from local knowledge are adequately reflected alongside statistical trends

PART I – MEMBERS, PUBLIC AND PRESS

Definitions

Volume: The number of recorded incidents over the most recent 12-month period.

Re-offending is assessed using the latest information available from London Probation showing caseload of Hillingdon Probation. Anti Social Behaviour was assessed using police computer aided despatch calls (CAD) to ASB plus reports made to London Borough of Hillingdon. Youth Offending data is based on number of court disposals. (High volume = high score).

Performance: How Hillingdon compares with other London boroughs. (Hillingdon performance good = low score).

Trend: Looks at how volume has changed compared to previous years.

If an issue is featured on iQuanta (the Home Office data base) we can look at projected trends over the coming year using past performance as a guide. With other issues that are not featured on iQuanta we have looked at the trend over the past two years or how we are performing against previous years. (Trend line downwards = low score).

Public concern: This considers if an issue is a priority for Ward Panels and the Safer Neighbourhood Board and its ranking in the most recent public community safety survey. (Two scores to reflect the importance of putting our residents first when setting our priorities (ward panel/SNB + top 3 priority in Stakeholder Survey = high score).

Partner priority: Priority concerns for all members of the Safer Hillingdon Partnership.

The score for this category is doubled to reflect the importance of considering professional judgements, partner assessments and government priorities (priority issue for many organisations = high score).

Cost/seriousness: The cost to public authorities of the issue

“The economic & social costs of crimes against individuals and households” – Dubourg & Hamed, updated 2010. If costs were not available we have estimated the seriousness of the impact of an issue on the community (high cost/very high level of seriousness = high score).

Generator: This category considers whether an issue has an impact on, or creates other crimes or fear of crime (significant driver of other crimes/generates high fear of crime = high score).