Community Safety:  
Crime & Disorder Reduction Strategy 2005-08

Introduction

The County Council has a statutory responsibility for crime and disorder reduction. It discharges this responsibility in part through its two representatives on each of the eleven borough/district Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRPs) in Surrey. However, in April 2004 the County Council also recognised its broader strategic and coordinating role on crime and disorder matters through the publication of its Community Safety Action Plan 2004/05.

The requirement on CDRPs to produce a third round of borough/district strategies for 2005-08, and the County Council’s own policy and productivity review process, have provided the opportunity for the County Council to develop a complementary three-year strategy.

This three-year strategy will be accompanied by annual action plans, and the one for 2005/06 is attached. This approach enables the County Council to address those crime and disorder issues occurring across the county, and necessitating a strategic perspective, as well as being sufficiently specific about the County Council’s contribution at borough level. This should enable the County Council to exercise a coordinating role with its partners at county level, and to be clear about its specific priorities and service contribution at borough CDRP level.

This strategy is intended for County and Borough Councillors, County Council service managers, all CDRP partners, Surrey Fire and Rescue Service, Surrey Police Authority, Surrey Police, PCT chief executives, the Drug Action Team (DAT), the Youth Offending Team (YOT), the Probation Service, the Prison Service, the Surrey Criminal Justice Board, and GOSE.

The County Council is committed to tackling all forms of unlawful or unfair discrimination, and has adopted a wide-ranging equalities policy (‘Action for Equalities’) that is being mainstreamed into services. The County Council is taking a broader approach to addressing equalities issues through the use of Equality Impact Assessments applied to its services. Equality Impact Assessments require all SCC Services to audit their policies and services to ensure that they are accessible to, and do not discriminate against, people on the grounds of race, gender, ethnicity, age, faith, sexual orientation.

National context

The Home Office has prescribed some priority areas for CDRPs. These are set out in the Home Office Strategic Plan 2004-08, which has five main aims:

- People are, and feel, more secure in their homes and daily lives: addressing anti-social behaviour, and youth inclusion
- More offenders are caught, punished and stop offending and victims are better supported: focus on prolific offenders and preventing and deterring criminality
- Fewer people’s lives are ruined by drugs and alcohol: relates to the new licensing powers of district/borough councils
- Migration is managed to benefit the UK
- Citizens, communities and the voluntary sector are more fully engaged in tackling social problems.

The Government’s overall aims have been supplemented by additional strategies regarding drugs, alcohol, anti-social behaviour, the targeting of priority and prolific offenders, and the prevention and deterrence of potential criminality. Other government departments have emphasised the importance of early intervention in child and family life to protect against the risk factors that can lead down the pathway to criminality.

The County Council’s contribution to both the national and local agenda on crime and disorder is likely to be subject to a Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA) in 2007, which will include a new focus on Safer and Stronger Communities. The key focus of the CPA in this area will be to ascertain evidence that:
- “The Council contributes to successful outcomes in reducing and preventing crime and fear of crime, in particular through partnership working…”
- Community safety issues are integrated into the planning and delivery of all Council services” (s.17 commitment).

Regional context

Hitherto GOSE funding from the Safer and Stronger Communities Fund has been paid directly to CDRPs. New guidance indicates that with effect from 2006/07 this funding may be received initially by the County Council, for subsequent disaggregation to borough CDRPs in accordance with national, and local targets.

These financial responsibilities are likely to be exercised through a Local Area Agreement (LAA) relating to the priority outcomes being sought by Government.

This strategy, and the actions pursuant to it, are aimed at meeting these obligations, and in particular at working in partnership with countywide partners – Surrey Police/Authority, DAT, YOT, Surrey Criminal Justice Board, and district/borough CDRPs.

The Home Office and GOSE have set a particular target for the South East Region of reducing crime by 16.5% over the next three years, measured against a baseline of 42,103, being an estimated figure for Surrey from the British Crime Survey for 2003/04. It is important to note that the BCS, though statistically very reliable, is not the same as crime that is reported to, and recorded by, the Police. This target has then been disaggregated by GOSE on a borough basis, and in greater detail, for adoption by CDRPs in their strategies for 2005-08.
The County Council is an active member of all eleven CDRPs through the participation of Area Directors, and the Surrey Fire and Rescue Service. The Council will continue to make its contribution at borough/district level. Indeed part of the purpose of this strategy and the action plan is to make it clear what the Council will contribute in terms of the quantum of ongoing service and initiatives at borough level.

Consultation process

The consultation process was in two stages. The first preparatory stage was to find out the views of partners about what might be the key themes of the forthcoming strategy, and its value added. This was done in Autumn 2004, by:

- Personal visits to several borough/district CDRPs
- Convening four area/divisional meetings of CDRPs
- Holding informal discussions with the Surrey Police Authority and Surrey Police
- Meeting with the Surrey Youth Parliament
- Consulting the DAT
- Consultation with the County Council’s Community Safety Select Committee
- Consultation with the Surrey Equalities Group.

In addition the County Council drew on its own extensive “Surrey Community Survey 2003”. This showed that residents regarded crime and policing as the second most important long term priority, after transport issues. Amongst current priorities, 32% of residents felt that improving the safety and appearance of local streets was an important priority. The two actions most favoured were dealing with traffic flow and congestion, and providing more facilities for young people.

To some degree the key messages from the CDRP and area consultations were similar. These have been tabulated in Appendix 1 and show that the principal policy issues were:

- Anti-social behaviour
- Fear of crime and reassurance (links to the above)
- Impact of alcohol
- Youth issues, both in the sense of young people “hanging around”, and the disproportionate likelihood of young people being victims of crime and disorder
- Traffic speed and casualty reduction.

In addition to the substantive issues above, the consultation process drew attention to process weaknesses such as the extent to which the County Council is able to vary its local service input to meet the priorities of local CDRPs. This issue was about whether SCC services could be varied – for example underage alcohol test purchases, youth outreach work – in response to local needs. The approach in this strategy and action plan is to set some common standards across the county (e.g. domestic violence outreach workers), but also to prioritise some key target areas. The implication is therefore that some boroughs/districts will get less of a resource,
and others more. This is an unavoidable consequence of differentiating scarce resources according to need.

The second consultative stage took place in Winter 2005, with the publication of the consultation draft of the strategy in December 2004. Comments on the strategy were invited by 22 February 2005, and four area-based meetings were held with CDRPs. The principal comments to emerge from these consultations were:

Table 1: Results of consultation on draft strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>SCC Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A request for more specific detail of SCC actions on a borough basis.</td>
<td>Accepted; more detail provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Inappropriate in a 3-year strategy to identify specific town centres as their crime rates should change.</td>
<td>Accepted; principle of targeting is retained, but list of town centres now remitted to annual action plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Concerns that theme of &quot;protection&quot; did not fully cover the risks to vulnerable adults.</td>
<td>Accepted entirely; changes made accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Concerns about omission of rural crime</td>
<td>No evidence of a discrete form of rural crime, or of higher rates in rural areas, but recognition that the public’s perception of local crime issues can be heightened in rural communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Concerns about antisocial driver behaviour</td>
<td>Accepted; subject of joint work with Surrey Police.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Crime & disorder in Surrey – the evidence

The evidence of trends in crime and disorder can be seen from the table below. Surrey still has one of the lowest recorded crime rates in England. It also has lower rates of crime than other counties in the same “family group” – the Most Similar Police Forces (MSF) that the Home Office uses as the basis for comparisons. The point is illustrated in Table 2 below:
However, these figures need to be assessed alongside other information from the British Crime Survey (2003) about fear of crime. This shows that whilst actual crime in Surrey is the lowest in the MSF group, it is second highest to Cambridgeshire in terms of the percentage of residents who perceive disorder to be high. The Home Office national count of anti-social behaviour in September 2003 resulted in the reporting of 530 incidents in Surrey in one 24-hour period. If this level were sustained constantly throughout the year it would indicate that anti-social behaviour is three times higher than actual reported crime.

Key themes from the CDRP crime and disorder audits, 2004

There is strong evidence that anti-social behaviour is a key issue both nationally, and in Surrey. National research by the Home Office using the British Crime Survey (BCS) distinguishes anti-social behaviour both in terms of the public’s perception, and actual experience. In terms of *perception*, the elements most commonly identified were:

1) Speeding traffic  
2) Illegal or inconvenient car parking  
3) Rubbish or litter  
4) Fireworks  
5) Vandalism and graffiti.

However when the public were questioned about their *experience*, the BCS shows the order to be:

1) Incidents with young people hanging around  
2) Noisy neighbours  
3) Drunk or rowdy behaviour  
4) Vandalism and graffiti  
5) Drug use or dealing.

Similar concerns are also reflected in Surrey. Each of the eleven borough and district Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships in Surrey conducted an audit in 2004 to establish the local characteristics of crime and disorder, and to identify
priorities on which their 2005-08 strategies might focus. A summary of the key
issues is attached as Appendix 2, and some clear messages have emerged:

- There is a relatively low incidence in Surrey of ‘mainstream’ crimes,
  though vehicle crime and non-domestic burglary are an issue for some
  areas
- The public’s principal concern is anti-social behaviour, including
  behavioural disturbance often linked to alcohol abuse, criminal damage,
  graffiti, abandoned vehicles and fly-tipping
- Violent crime, including domestic violence, is also a priority across the
  county
- Much disorderly behaviour is linked to substance misuse, especially
  alcohol abuse, particularly in town centres.

The fear of crime and disturbance in Surrey is disproportionately high relative to the
actual crime figures. Most CDRPs are expecting to tackle this issue specifically,
through rapid work to remove environmental neglect and damage and also to tackle
people’s perceptions of what is threatening.

County Council role

The County Council wishes to take a strategic role on crime and disorder reduction
on both a countywide basis, and through a positive contribution at CDRP level. The
Council has defined its role in its current Crime and Disorder Action Plan 2004/05 as
being one of:

1. Preventing (criminality)
2. Protecting (vulnerable adults, children, road users and young people)
3. Intervening (in anti-social behaviour)

The emphasis on prevention fits with the County Council’s mainstream role in
providing education and social services. The rationale for this is set out in a joint
SCC/Surrey Police paper on “Prevention, Protection and Local Intervention:
Balancing long term and short term interventions”. This paper addresses the
County Council’s preventative role, and the fact that a number of risk factors are the
same for poor educational attainment, high social welfare and health needs, and risk
of criminality. The aim is to determine a process for identifying high need families,
and then providing supportive services to them; many of these are existing services
but they are not received by families in an integrated way. Proposals for taking
forward a pilot project in the North West area are being developed. This approach
fits very closely with the Home Office’s “Prevent and Deter” policy.

The emphasis on protection recognises the Council’s mainstream role as a
 corporate parent to children in care, and in providing safeguarding services to
 protect those at risk of abuse. It also addresses the role of the Council in protecting
vulnerable adults, including the 2,700 service users with learning disabilities. The
casualty reduction work is similarly aimed at protecting road users and pedestrians
from personal accidents.
Finally, the local intervention work is that which occurs at the street level—
including improving street lighting, youth outreach work, test purchases, checking on
under-age sales, fire safety checks in pubs and clubs and young fire-fighters
schemes for young arsonists. A second joint SCC/Police paper on “Tackling Anti-
Social Behaviour Together” has led to a major new joint initiative with Surrey Police
— “Surrey Together”, described below — aimed at addressing anti-social behaviour in
neighbourhoods.

All three strands of the Council’s approach are highly proactive — there is little that is
more demanding of the time and energy of the social care worker, education
psychologist or youth worker than working with high need families to address their
particular needs, and thereby diminishing the risk of adverse life chances and
criminality.

The Council sees its role as being complementary to that of Surrey Police, and
being entirely consistent with Home Office encouragement to address risk factors
correlating with offending, reinforced by similar research by the DfES. The
complementary role of the two agencies in illustrated in the Table 3 below

Table 3: Complementary Roles of Surrey County Council and Surrey Police
Key issues

Town centre crime and disorder

The majority of crime occurs in town centres, and indeed in a small number of particular locations within them. An analysis of the crime and disorder statistics for police localities (which highlight town centre areas more clearly than do wards) for the period September 2003 to August 2004 highlights the extent to which this is the case:

- Of the top 20 police localities for recorded crime and those incidents that reflect disorder, all are town centre locations
- Within this there are 6 town centres that stand out very clearly, indicating that a disproportionate amount of crime and disorder is occurring in a small number of town centres.

The practical implication for the County Council is that it needs to concentrate its investment on environmental improvements, and on service activities such as Trading Standards test purchasing, joint patrolling of pubs and clubs by Fire and Rescue and Police, and youth outreach in these key town centre locations.

The annual action plan will target the six town centres with the highest combined total for crime and disorder over the previous year. Details of the initial list are in the action plan for 2005/06 attached.

Anti-social behaviour

All the evidence is that anti-social behaviour (ASB) is the single most important aspect of crime and disorder for the County Council to address over the next three years.

The behaviour of young people is often cited as the principal aspect of ASB, but it needs to be remembered that young people also share fear of crime, and are at greater risk of ASB than other age groups. The County Council funds 25% of the cost of the eleven Youth PCSOs – one per borough – to work positively with young people in addressing their problems, and working closely with the Council’s Youth Service.

Issues of ASB are often a matter of perception, but are no less real to the public. For example, whilst there is no evidence of particular patterns of crime and disorder in the rural areas of the county, the adverse impact of disorder can be felt much more acutely by local residents who are otherwise accustomed to a quiet rural life. This is particularly true where land is occupied in contravention of planning legislation. Local residents may have a perception of increased crime and disorder that is not necessarily borne out by reported crime figures, in turn reflecting the disillusion of residents in no longer reporting incidents when they perceive nothing is done about the issues. There is a need for closer community engagement in these cases.
Surrey Police changed their recording process for the elements of ASB in April 2004, which makes year on year trends difficult to ascertain. Moreover, there is no single recording system for the various elements of ASB as highlighted by the Home Office survey in September 2003. The fact that there are so many leading indicators that cut across public authority boundaries, and departmental boundaries within authorities, means that particular efforts need to be made to achieve a "joined up" approach to sharing data, and taking action. Nevertheless, there was a 17% increase in anti-social behaviour incidents recorded between 2002/03 and 2003/04, and this has serious implications.

In view of the many aspects of anti-social behaviour, it is clear that these can only be addressed by effective cooperation between the public authorities (principally the County Council – Youth Service, Highways, Trading Standards –, Borough Councils and the Police) and with the support of local communities in reporting incidents when they occur. This will necessitate closer community engagement between the public authorities and the local public to address their concerns and fear of crime.

In pursuance of this, the County Council has launched a major initiative with Surrey Police to provide joint targeted intervention in local communities. The “Surrey Together: Promoting Social Standards” project will consist of four mobile teams (one per police division), each led by a Police Sergeant and including 3 Police Community Support Officers, a full time detached Youth Worker and a half time Trading Standards Officer. The teams will focus intensively on particular neighbourhoods where a problem has been identified, working directly with local people and businesses to prevent anti-social behaviour, on a sustained basis.

Improved street lighting can also provide reassurance and also enable better use of CCTV. The County Council has negotiated a successful PFI bid enabling 74,000 streetlights in Surrey (out of 86,000) to be replaced over twenty-five years, and is providing 9,000 additional streetlights at sites identified locally.

Improved street lighting and the wider use of CCTV for traffic control purposes enables links to be made with Automatic Number Plate Recognition, as there may be scope to use the same columns for both purposes. The scope for this is being considered jointly with Surrey Police. Initiatives of this type would also enable more effective action against anti-social driver behaviour – racing, wheel spinning, excessive noise from music etc.

Traffic speed/road safety

Traffic and road safety, the environment and quality of life continue to be major issues in Surrey. Traffic flow on ‘A’ roads in Surrey is 78% above the national average, car ownership is 20% above the national average and there are typically over 6,000 casualties on Surrey roads annually. There were 72 fatalities in 2004, which was around the average annual figure. The crime and disorder audits of Surrey residents have shown that the fear of traffic and traffic speed are prime concerns. The County Council’s policy is aimed at reducing road collisions and enabling all road users to feel safer through the effective management of vehicle speeds.
Safety cameras have been used in Surrey since 1995, and there are currently a total of 23 sites enforced by fixed speed enforcement cameras, added to which there are 11 Police Casualty Reduction Units offering mobile enforcement as well as a range of other traffic enforcement and driver education activities. The fixed speed camera sites have achieved a 43 per cent reduction in people killed and seriously injured, and 28 per cent reduction in collisions resulting in personal injury. The use of safety cameras has the potential for excellent reduction in road casualties and should also assist in reducing residents’ fear of traffic (particularly speed).

Surrey Police share a prime responsibility with Surrey County Council for effective speed management and together will undertake focused and intelligence-led interventions to reduce speed related collisions, and to ensure compliance with speed limits. Some of the major initiatives are detailed below:

- Identification of routes (known as “Red Roads”) as a priority for extra traffic enforcement activity
- Agreement of a safety camera partnership with the Police in 2005/06 to introduce safety cameras at the most dangerous locations where there has been a history of collisions and other options have been exhausted
- Accident Working Groups (AWGs) consisting of Local Engineers, specialised Safety Engineers, Road Safety Officers and Police, meet periodically in each district or borough to identify and agree measures to address locations with a history of personal injury road collisions
- 33 road safety advice days held annually with the Police, and Surrey Fire and Rescue Service, many of which will have a specific focus on speeding traffic
- A very successful first “Safe Drive Stay Alive” day for young people about to become drivers, which will be developed into a sustained programme.

Drugs and alcohol

The County Council’s role is primarily one of education and prevention. It works closely with the Drug Action Team to develop a drug prevention and education programme with schools. Some 203 schools (out of 413 maintained schools in total) have adopted the Healthy Schools programme that addresses issues of safe limits to drinking, and drug abuse. Targeted action is taken by Trading Standards in conducting test purchases for under-age alcohol sales, and by the Fire and Rescue Service undertaking joint patrols with the Police, and District/ Borough Environmental Health Services in town centre pubs and clubs. The Children’s Service has a project officer dedicated to ensuring the protection of children within pubs, clubs and all activities requiring a licence under the new Licensing Act 2003.

The County Council’s Community Safety Select Committee studied the issue of town centre violence related to alcohol in 2004, and recommended that:

- A conference be held to establish widespread commitment to tackling alcohol issues and agreeing a way forward. Those invited would include a wide cross-section of representatives from both the statutory and non-statutory agencies, the drinks industry and service users
• Surrey Community Safety Unit be commissioned to work with the Health Sector to develop a shared approach to gathering data on night-time incidents of ASB
• Trading Standards be asked to prioritise underage alcohol test purchasing
• CDRPs be encouraged to invest in late night bus schemes
• Surrey Drug Action Team be supported in taking alcohol as an additional focus for its work and in appointing a full time alcohol coordinator.

Protection

The nature of abuse and personal risk is similar whether for children, adults within a relationship, or for vulnerable adults. Abuse can take the form of neglect or be of a physical, sexual, financial, or psychological nature. It may occur at home, or in other settings. It involves children within their families and vulnerable people living alone or with a relative; it may occur within nursing, residential or day care settings; in hospitals, custodial situations, support services into people’s own homes and other places previously assumed safe, or in public places.

Abuse is likely to become an area of increasing concern for the Police and its partners, as common assault has become an arrestable offence, and this will put a greater demand on police resources.

The protection of children is a government priority and all agencies are required to work together to ensure children are safe from harm; children need to be protected from maltreatment, neglect, violence and sexual exploitation. They also need to be safe from accidental injury and death, from bullying and discrimination and to be provided with security, stability and care.

Recent legislation defines significant harm as including the experiences of children in seeing or hearing the ill treatment of another.

The Children’s Service social care teams currently provide a service to 5021 children who meet their eligibility criteria. A range of services is provided to children in need, and all concerns that a child or young person may be suffering abuse are investigated. From April 2003 to March 2004, 837 referrals were made which required child protection enquiries and investigations. Some 244 initial child protection conferences involving 466 children took place last year, and of these 225 initial and review conferences involved children known to be living with domestic violence.

The Department of Health ‘No Secrets’ guidance defines a ‘vulnerable adult’ as someone “who is or may be in need of community care services by reason of mental or other disability, age, or illness; and who is or may be unable to take care of him or herself, or unable to protect him or herself against significant harm or exploitation”

SCC Adults and Community Care provide a service to approximately 12,000 adults who meet their eligibility criteria. However, Adults and Community Care will investigate allegations of abuse concerning all vulnerable adults, whether or not they are eligible for community care services. From April 2003 to March 2004, there
were 200 referrals relating to Adult Protection allegations in Surrey that were investigated by Adults and Community Care. There has been steady increase in referrals in the following 2 quarters.

Domestic violence (DV) is a crime that cuts across all socio-economic groups and all geographic areas of Surrey.

The principal aims are to encourage reporting of DV incidents, to prosecute offenders, and reduce repeat victimisation. There has been some success in encouraging reporting of DV, but less so in reversing the number of repeat victims, where the victim has been subject to a further incident within 12 months. There are recognised peak increases in DV in August and December. The figures are as follows:

**Table 4: Incidence of DV**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of recorded DV incidents</strong></td>
<td>4249</td>
<td>5696</td>
<td>7811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number designated as repeats</strong></td>
<td>1196</td>
<td>1506</td>
<td>1917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% designated as repeats</strong></td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The County Council contributes to the funding of DV outreach workers for each of the eleven boroughs/districts, to two posts dealing with DV coordination and training in the Surrey Community Safety Unit, and to children’s workers in the refuges.

The current BVPI 176 records the number of refuge places per 10,000 population, which are under-provided in Surrey. A proposed new BVPI puts greater emphasis on the quality of the DV service, on sanctuary-type schemes enabling women to remain in their own homes safely, and on the eviction of DV perpetrators being a clause in social landlord tenancy agreements. The publication of the new Domestic Violence, Crime and Victims Act 2004 ensures that DV will remain a high profile issue during the period of this strategy. The County Council is also a principal contributor to the current Surrey Multi-Agency Domestic Abuse Strategy 05-08, currently in preparation.

The County Council is also in the process of negotiating a Public Service Agreement (PSA) with the OPDM on DV. This would result in £135,000 of pump priming monies into the DV sector, followed by £1.8 million after 3 years. This will only be received if “stretch targets” can be achieved for increased reporting and reduced repeat victimisation.
Race/hate crime

Race/hate crime is defined as abuse, violence or discrimination against individuals or groups based on their race, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, disability, age or gender. The evidence from police data about racially motivated crime shows an upward trend:

Table 5: Racially motivated crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2001/02</th>
<th>2002/03</th>
<th>% change</th>
<th>2003/04</th>
<th>% change</th>
<th>Projection for 2004/05</th>
<th>Projected % change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>308</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>+32.1%</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>+18.4%</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>+16.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Homophobic crimes are also few in number: 2002/03 – 33 crimes; 2003/04 – 22, but evidence for this year (2004/05) again shows an upward trend. The fact that numbers are low does not lessen the impact on the individuals and communities affected.

The County Council aims to:
- Improve the awareness of its own staff about racism and equalities issues
- Increase the reporting of racist incidents (BVPI 174) within the County Council
- Promote the “no racism here” message within schools, and make wider use of the annual data on trends in racist incidents in schools
- Adopt a common third party reporting system across the county, including within the County Council itself
- Build the confidence and trust of minority groups in the County Council’s services.

Prevention

The Index of Multiple Deprivation 2004 is the most recent of a series of indices which draw together a wide range of data to identify the relative levels of need and deprivation in local areas. Although Surrey scores generally low on this national index, there are some wards where significant deprivation has been identified. Economic, social and educational disadvantage is recognised as enhancing the risk of people becoming offenders. Police information identifying the home location of offenders in Surrey is not yet available, but more limited data drawn from the caseloads of Probation and the Youth Offending Team demonstrates strong evidence of a link. Examining the data for the 20 most deprived wards out of the 206 in the County:
- 13 also appear in the top 20 wards for Probation caseload, and 10 on that of the YOT’s caseload
- 3 of these wards – Stoke, Sunbury Common and Merstham – feature in all 3 lists.
Improving partnership processes

The consultation process has identified the need to address deficiencies in processes and practices that currently inhibit effective partnership working. There is a balance to be struck between the needs of different district and borough CDRPs and the need for common standards and practices. The areas to be addressed are:

- Developing a common process for defining and recording anti-social behaviour
- Assessing the need for further annual one day ASB surveys to monitor trends
- Standardising SCC participation in the multi-agency case conferences CIAGs (about named individuals) and JAGs (about local problems); the need is for Children’s Service staff to attend the CIAG, and Highways, and Youth Service to attend the JAG (or equivalent)
- Assessing the potential for improved information sharing between public agencies about individuals at risk, including the potential for a common case tracking system for CIAGs across the county, or at least by area
- Assessing the potential for standardising the conduct of future crime and disorder audits across the County, or at least by area
- Ensuring that the CDRPs are the commissioners of DV outreach services as they are the funding agencies
- Developing standard processes for community or neighbourhood panels that are sponsored by the district-level Local Strategic Partnerships, and are therefore multi-agency, rather than single service, so that the County Council engages more fully with local communities
- Examining the possibility of developing a broadly based initiative on “Safer Schools” that addresses issues of safe access to schools, personal safety within schools, the protection of property from criminal damage and so on
- Ensuring closer links between the communications officers of Surrey County Council, Surrey Police authority and Surrey Police so that consistent messages are given to the public, and staff, in the interest of reassurance.

Aims

The County Council will work with its key partners, both strategically across the County and through CDRPs, to make its contribution to the GOSE target of reducing recorded crime by 16.5% over the next three years. The County Council’s declared aim is:

“**We want people to be safe and feel safe, so that they can enjoy life in Surrey. We aim to do this by:**

- Preventing criminality through targeted work and early intervention
- Protecting and reassuring the public
- Intervening locally, especially to tackle anti-social behaviour
- Providing leadership and developing partnership processes for safer communities”
Objectives

Over the next three years the County Council’s particular priorities in working with district/borough CDRPs will be:

1. **Town Centres:** To concentrate County Council service actions on the six main town centres where there is a disproportionate incidence of crime, and concentrate service activity in those areas.

2. **Anti-social behaviour:** To reduce the rate of increase in anti-social behaviour to 12% in the first year, and 10% in years 2 and 3 (the current rate of increase is 17%).

3. **Traffic speeding/road safety:** To achieve a 40% reduction in the number of people killed or seriously injured in road accidents (baseline 931) and a 50% reduction in the number of children killed or seriously injured in road accidents, (baseline 83) through various actions to ensure compliance with speed limits.

4. **Drug and alcohol abuse:** To assist schools in ensuring that issues of drug and alcohol abuse and the consequences of them are addressed in the PSHE curriculum in every Primary and Secondary school in the County, and to promote an increase in the number of Healthy Schools from 203 to 228.

5. **Protection:** To protect Surrey’s most vulnerable citizens from abuse or exploitation. To increase the reporting of DV incidents, on the basis that victims should be encouraged to report crimes and gain protection, and to reduce the number of repeat victims.

6. **Race/hate crime:** To improve reporting of racist incidents recorded per 100,000 population (BVPI 174) by the County Council standardising its internal reporting system, and securing the introduction of a standard third party reporting form across the County.

7. **Prevention:** In pursuance of the Home Office’s Prevent and Deter policy, to work with the eleven CIAGs to identify people at high risk of offending so that they can be prevented and deterred from criminality, and to develop a programme of supportive services to high need families in at least one area of the county.

8. **Partnership processes:** To improve the way in which County Council services contribute to the crime and disorder agenda, and to address the weaknesses in current processes that hold back effective partnership between key public authorities.
Action plan

The detailed actions relating to these objectives are set out in the annual action plan appended to this strategy.

The Council already provides a range of services to address the issues, as is illustrated in Table 6 below. However, these are not provided universally across the county, and yet it is the quantum of service activity that CDRPs have asked for most particularly in the consultation process. In response to this, the action plan contains a map of both the standard quantum of resource (by county, area, borough) and how this may be differentiated between districts/boroughs to meet particular aims and objectives.

Table 6: Range of County Council actions being developed in relation to crime and disorder issues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Prevention</th>
<th>Protection</th>
<th>Local intervention</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anti-social behaviour</td>
<td>Improving attendance at school/reducing exclusions</td>
<td>Truancy patrols</td>
<td>“Surrey Together” project: four teams working with local communities to tackle ASB. Youth outreach work; youth inclusion work referred from CIAG or JAG. Firewise project (young arsonists); under age alcohol check; conducting joint Fire and Rescue Service/Police patrols of pubs and clubs Promoting “virtual networks” of multi-agency streetcare staff SCC funding 25% of cost of Youth PCSOs for every borough/district.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raising educational attainment levels; providing guidance on safe behaviour (alcohol, drugs, DV) through the PSHE curriculum, and Healthy Schools programme. Concentrating street scene environmental improvements in town centres and high need wards “Health Check” programme in 12 towns over 7 years.</td>
<td>Improved street lighting through PFI project Introduction of night bus schemes to encourage rapid and safe dispersal from pubs and clubs. Bogus caller rapid action team, on call.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic speed/road safety</td>
<td>Providing road safety education and training in schools and other establishments</td>
<td>Funding walking buses, and safe routes to school; developing the safety camera partnership</td>
<td>Casualty reduction measures at specific hot spots; safe driving measures aimed at ensuring compliance with speed limits.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs and alcohol</td>
<td>Healthy Schools programme</td>
<td>DIPSY programme in schools</td>
<td>Underage alcohol checks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Protecting:
#### a) Vulnerable adults
- Staff training and awareness programmes regarding Adult Protection and Domestic Violence
- Multi agency communications and publicity strategy to raise public awareness of Adult Protection issues.
- Funding support for DV refuges
- Provision of DV outreach workers (multi–agency funded) in every borough
- Joint training of Adult Protection investigators with Surrey Police

#### b) Children and young people
- Child Protection training and awareness programmes, including domestic violence.
- Multi-agency Communications and Publicity.
- Multi-agency working group under ACPC to review policy, practice and procedures.
- Funding for DV refugees.
- Advice, information and legal assistance.
- Provision of DV outreach services.
- Joint training of child protection workers within the police.
- Child protection conferences, plans and reviews.
- Direct services for children and families.

### Race/hate crimes
- “No racism here” schools racist incident reporting system; extend staff training programme to all front line services
- Introduce standard 3rd party racial incident reporting form.

### Partnership processes
- Standardise SCC attendance at CIAGs and JAGs through internal protocol.
- Standardise referral process from CIAG to Children &Young People assessment teams.
- Standardise practice across assessment teams re intervention in DV cases where children are involved.
- Commission annual ASB survey
- Secure future of SCADIS system

### Expenditure: 2005/06

The County Council has assigned £1.8 million of direct expenditure to crime and disorder reduction. Much of the direct expenditure of other services contributes to keeping this one of the lowest crime counties, but has been excluded from consideration here as it falls under other funding headings (e.g. truancy patrols in Education).
## Table 7: SCC – direct expenditure on crime and disorder 2005/06

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>SCC Base Budget £000</th>
<th>SCC One-off Budget £000</th>
<th>Total £000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surrey Community Safety Unit (see notes 1 &amp; 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>142.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Support Teams - £24k per local committee of which £12k is ring-fenced for domestic violence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>264.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to Police for Youth Police Community Support Officers (see note 3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>210.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Offending Team (YOT)</td>
<td>1,054.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,054.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Surrey Together”</td>
<td>210.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>210.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total: SCC</strong></td>
<td>1,670.5</td>
<td>210.0</td>
<td><strong>1,880.5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOSE grants: SSCF: DV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1,960.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes
1. The budget for the Surrey Community Safety Unit excludes internal recharges for support, asset rents and capital charges, as these are ring-fenced.
2. SCSU is co-funded by Surrey County Council, Surrey Police Authority and four District/Borough Councils.
3. This is a fixed term funding solution (£210k over 3 years) but it is not part of the base budget. The posts were recruited in October 2003 and the County Council’s funding is only agreed until October 2006.
4. GOSE also funds CDRPs and BCUs directly in Surrey, and in 2005/06 is allocating £100,000 to fund automatic number plate recognition (ANPR) cameras at Clackett Lane Service Station on the M25.
Implementation and monitoring

This strategy will be implemented over the next three years through an annual action plan detailing specific objectives, baseline figures and performance targets, and with financial and other resources attached.

The strategy will be monitored by the County Council’s Community Safety Select Committee, which will receive quarterly monitoring reports.

Progress will also be assessed through joint meetings between the Council’s Executive, the Surrey Police Authority and Surrey Police, and with other countywide partners. These meetings will address the wider coordination and implementation of strategies, and any emerging issues.

Surrey County Council jointly funds Surrey Community Safety Unit (SCSU) with Surrey Police Authority, and those Borough/District Councils that choose to contribute. SCSU is a resource that will be deployed to focus on the implementation of the strategy. Elements of the SCSU Business Plan have been included in the Action Plan for this strategy.
### Appendix 1: Issues raised in first preparatory consultation process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultation group</th>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>PROCESSES / ACTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surrey Heath</td>
<td>Anti-social behaviour</td>
<td>Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waverley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmbridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tandridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelthorne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guildford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equalities Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Parliament</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: Summary of issues in borough/district audits

This table identifies the main issues identified in the audits for each district or borough.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Elmbridge</th>
<th>Epsom &amp; Ewell</th>
<th>Guildford</th>
<th>Mole Valley</th>
<th>Reigate &amp; Banstead</th>
<th>Runnymede</th>
<th>Spelthorne</th>
<th>Surrey Heath</th>
<th>Tandridge</th>
<th>Waverley</th>
<th>Woking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BURGLARY/PROPERTY RELATED CRIME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail/Business Crime</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Burglary</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Crime</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft and Handling</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Social Behaviour generally</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise complaints</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town centre/public order incidents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Damage (including vandalism, graffiti &amp; fly-tipping)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young people hanging around</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandoned Vehicles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic, speeding &amp; Road Safety</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIOLENT CRIME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Crime Generally</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Abuse</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Offences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBSTANCE MISUSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Related crime</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRE RELATED CRIME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hate Crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing Offending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reassurance/FOC</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB: Where burglary is mentioned in general, both dwelling and non-dwelling have been checked. Where substance misuse is mentioned in general, both drugs and alcohol related crimes have been checked.