TO: **ENVIRONMENT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE –**
Wednesday 8th September, 2004

SUBJECT: **COMMUNITY SAFETY - CREATING A SAFER ENVIRONMENT**

FROM: **WORK GROUPS 1 , 2 & 3**

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 To present a summary of the findings of the above work groups.

1.2 To seek approval of the recommendations set out in Appendices 2b and 4a and 4b

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 At the March 30th meeting of this committee it was agreed to scrutinize three important aspects of community safety utilising 3 work groups:

- 1. How community safety issues at ward level can be properly communicated and addressed.
- 2. The membership, operation and effectiveness of the Communities & Fear of Crime Group.
- 3. How we can minimize the risk to elected members and staff as they go about their duties.

2.2 This Authority has statutory duty to work in partnership with other agencies to reduce crime and disorder. The statutory body in this district is the Warwick District Crime & Disorder Reduction Partnership which has six groups addressing the action points in the Crime & Disorder Reduction Strategy. Each group has a lead agency; this authority is the lead agency for the Communities & Fear of Crime Group.

2.3 For the first time the Crime & Disorder Reduction Strategy identified three priority areas, each with an action group being the Police Beats in Brunswick, Leamington Town Centre and Lillington. The Communities & Fear of Crime Group monitors and supports these groups and there is plenty of evidence available showing that this focussed approach has been successful with excellent performance results in reducing crime and disorder and the fear of crime.

2.4 The timing of this review was well received by key partners and joint meetings with the Police and County Council have facilitated understanding. A summary of the review process is attached in Appendix 1 together with the findings of Work Group 1 & 2 (Appendix 2).

3. POLICY AND BUDGET FRAMEWORK

For the first time community safety is a stated priority in the Corporate Strategy 2003 -2007 *Creating a safer environment (CO3).* The budget for 2004/05 is £30,200.

4. **OUTCOME(S) REQUIRED**

4.1 To note the findings of Work Groups 1 , 2 & 3

4.2 To agree the recommendations made in Appendix 2(b) and 4A & 4B.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Communities & Fear of Crime Summary and Progress Report
Fear Of Crime Summary
Towards a Safer Warwick District – Crime & Disorder Reduction Strategy 2002 -2005

Areas in District Affected: All

Executive Portfolio Area and Holder: Environment – Cllr Mrs Margaret Begg

APPENDIX 1

THE REVIEW PROCESS

1. Councillors quickly identified that the work of the first two groups was inter-related and in order to further clarify the role of the Communities & Fear of Crime Group (Work Group 2) it was essential to first have clear agreement on a way forward at the community action groups.

2. It was agreed to undertake a survey before convening the third group to identify when and where Councillors and officers are concerned for their safety. The survey design was informed by Unions, Health & safety Officer and the Lone Workers Group. The survey was circulated in July and the results circulated to the work group for comment in order to make recommendations to the September meeting of this committee.

3. Councillors on the first two groups brought enthusiasm and a wide range of experience on community safety issues representing very different wards. The work groups met separately with the Community Safety Officer and Work Group 2 convened a second meeting with the District Police Commander.

4. Meetings with key partners informed the process but Councillors were keen to convene an additional meeting of the whole committee to be carried out in a select committee format and invite key officers and partners in order to properly challenge the service and secure ownership of the developing proposals.

5. The first two groups completed their work culminating in the select committee meeting on Tuesday 29th June. Councilors and support officers met in advance to agree questions. In order to facilitate understanding an organizational diagram was produced showing the structure of community safety and reporting relationships.

6. A wide range of partners were invited and there was excellent attendance. Again, to facilitate understanding a brief biography on each guest was produced detailing their organization and responsibilities particularly in relation to where they fitted in to the community safety structure.

7. Invited partners included:

    *   C.I Chris Jackson, District Commander & Chair of the Crime Priority Action Group
    *   Chris Donnachie, Chair of Association Leamington Licensees & Chair of the Leamington Town Centre Priority Area Action Group.
    *   Paul Haynes, Leamington Town Centre Manager and support for the above group
    *   P.C Marcus Franklin, Community Beat Manger for Brunswick Beat a Priority Area.
    *   Simon Lieberman, Regenesis and support officer to the Brunswick Priority Area Action Group
    *   Julie Sullivan. Policy Development Officer (Crime) at Warwickshire County Council
    *   Peter Hunter, Area Officer for this district, Warwickshire County Council
    *   Barry Armitage, South Warwickshire Neighbourhood Watch Coordinator

8.	Questions were asked of all partners over one and three quarter hours. Our partners left but the committee remained to summarise the discussion and to make recommendations to Executive.

9.	 Letters of thanks were sent to all those partners who attended and we resolved to share the results in order to move forward together and to create a safer environment.

FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS FOR WORK GROUPS 1 & 2

Creating a safer environment is our aim and public reassurance is the area that this authority leads on when addressing the six principle areas of concern expressed in the consultation on the audit of crime and disorder.

A)   MAIN FINDINGS

- There were excellent results in terms of performance as result of a focused approach from this authority and key partners with crime down in the priority areas and fear of crime down significantly.
- The relative safety is not widely understood and the fear of crime is disproportionate to the actual levels of crime.
- Fear of crime is higher in the priority areas.
- Councillors acknowledged excellent working relationships with Police, County Council and key partners.
- In spite of results and relationships Councillors quickly identified that there were issues re communication, management of expectations and roles and responsibilities.
- Good communication is vital between Councillors and Police, the responsibility is a shared one. Communication is not helped by the more frequent changes in Police personnel.
- Capacity is clearly an issue but the consequence of a focused approach is that some areas receive less attention.
- A range of groups were recognised where community safety was the single or a significant agenda item including the 3 priority area action groups. It is not possible to produce a one-size-fits-all model.
- Capacity to lead and support existing groups is not an issue but if we are to roll out the good practice it requires careful thought and joint commitment.
- Communities are unaware of some of these groups and local people cannot easily identify who can provide support. This is further confused as ward and beat boundaries are not co-terminous.
- Local solutions needs local knowledge and local residents are essential to a successful action group.
- Only be agreeing how local action groups work can the Communities & Fear of Crime Group achieve its full potential. Membership will become clearer.
- Although this group had done some good work it was felt that it had turned into a reporting group, attendance was inconsistent and the priority action groups were not accessing the support or funding available.

(B)   MAIN RECOMMENDATIONS

- To recommend that the Executive endorses the recommendations below and in so doing recognises that this authority is the most appropriate agency to lead the Communities & Fear Of Crime element of the Crime & Disorder Reduction Strategy and that our elected members are a vital ingredient to the success of local action groups including chairing the meetings where possible.
- The Environment & Overview Scrutiny committee then to make recommendations to the Warwick Crime & Disorder Reduction Partnership and ask key partners to commit to a model for future working attached at appendix 3.
- Local knowledge is the key factor in identifying who should attend local action groups.
- Elected members should chair local action groups.
- A Warwick District Councillor should chair the Communities & Fear of Crime Group supported by the Community Safety Officer.

- Local groups should agree membership but these should include:

  Local residents, Neighbourhood Watch, local councillors, clerks to local authorities, officers of local authorities, Police, local business, young person's representatives and Fire & Rescue Service.

- Local Groups should meet at least quarterly. The operation and commitment of partners should facilitate an action orientated and outcome focussed approach.
- Where community safety is not the sole agenda item existing groups should make it their first agenda item allowing and encouraging the attendance of the local Police Officer.
- It is the groups responsibility to induct any new member to the group but particularly Police Officers so that existing support systems and networks were properly accessed.
- Where there is a change of police officer there should be a period of overlap with previous officer wherever possible.
- Each local action group should set up e-groups to improve communication, notify changes, contact details and share information.
- Each local group to agree how it will share information with its community and make use of the existing Neighbourhood Watch messaging service.
- A time limited facility be offered to any local concerned person to comment on a specific problem or contribution to problem solving.

(C)   WORK GROUP 1: DETAILED FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

HOW ISSUES AT A WARD LEVEL CAN BE PROPERLY COMMUNICATED AND ADDRESSED.

Councillors Compton, Copping and Short

The fact that councillors represented three very different areas of the district and are long serving helped considerably in identifying problems and possible solutions.

Findings

1. We noted that there was some overlap with the working group looking at the effectiveness and operation of the Communities & Fear of Crime Group.

2. We discussed a range of issues that affect people's perception of their area and how concerned they are about being a victim of crime. These included a visible police presence, CCTV, lighting, levels of domestic burglary and anti social behaviour. We discussed the impact on fear of crime of the appearance of an area or GRIME including abandoned vehicles, fly tipping, graffiti, and broken windows.

3. We recognised that there are a number of groups already meeting where safety is the sole or one of the main topics. We discussed the different groups in the district, their membership and effectiveness. We recognised that there is no *one size fits all* but there were some common elements that we could apply.

4. We discussed who the key partners were and what they must bring to the group. Local knowledge was identified as the key factor and councillors were key partners.

5. Attendance by specific groups was inconsistent.

6. We discussed that changes in police personnel were more frequent than with Cllrs and Officers and this can lead to break downs in communication. We recognised that all partners had to commit to a minimum standard.

7. Communication re accessibility but also sharing of information needed to be improved.

Recommendations

1. (a) Joint working principles needed to be developed and adopted at the action group or community level first. The parent group (Communities & Fear Of Crime Group) would then have a clearer idea about its core membership, reporting and support systems. (There are around 10 groups including the 3 priority local action groups already meeting)

2. (a) Each action group should understand the drivers of the fear of crime and develop action plans to address these including the prompt reporting and removal of GRIME and regular joint environmental and lighting audits of the area utilising those people trained by *Living Streets*. A briefing paper will be prepared by the Community Safety Officer.

3. (a) Existing and any new groups would benefit from a proforma setting out the business of the group, a focus on action, roles and responsibilities.

   (b) Elected members should chair the group.

   (c) The groups should meet at least quarterly with an agreed membership based on local knowledge and experience.

   (d) Where possible the agenda should allow community safety issues as a first item to ensure efficient use of a Police Officers time.

4. (a) The key partners include:

   Local residents
   Neighbourhood Watch
   Local councillors
   Clerks to local authorities
   Officers of local authorities
   Police
   Local business
   Young person's representatives
   Fire & Rescue Service

5. (a) This committee would make recommendations to Executive re the attendance and support of District Councillors at local action group level.

   (b) This committee would make recommendations to the Warwick District Crime & Disorder Reduction Partnership and ask key partners to sign up to this way of working and the proforma.

6. (a) It was important that each local action group helped to induct any new member to the group but particularly Police Officers so that existing support systems and networks were properly accessed.

   (b) Where there is a change of police officer there should be a period of overlap with previous officer wherever possible.

7 (a) Each local action group should utilise an e-mail group to share information but particularly to keep updated re changes in contact details. Voicemail and e-mail details should be circulated.

   (b) This Authority should promote and develop the community safety service on its' web site to provide core information including contact details, ward and beat maps,

distribution and coverage provided by both Police Special Officers and the Police Community Support Officers, Park Ranger and recorded crime figures.

(c)   Each local action group should receive reports on the patterns of crime and disorder from the designate Police Officer and identify an action and person responsible for each issue.

(d)   We should look to extend the Neighbourhood Watch messaging system to alert residents to crime patterns utilising the Southern Area Neighbourhood Watch Coordinator and contacts from local schemes.

(D)   WORK GROUP 2: DETAILED FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

MEMBERSHIP, OPERATION AND EFFECTIVENESS OF THE COMMUNITIES & FEAR OF CRIME GROUP

Councillors Blacklock, Gill and Hatfield

Findings

8.   The group is currently chaired by the Warwick District Council Community Safety Officer (Peter Cutts). The group has 3 action groups in the 3 priority areas and each has a Liaison Officer also provided by this Authority: Simon Lieberman of Regenesis in Brunswick, Town Centre Manager Paul Haynes for Leamington and Community Development Officer Linda Price in Lillington.

9.   Current Communities & Fear Of Crime Group membership is:

Pete Cutts – Chair

Brunswick	Community Beat Manager
	Leamington Town Cllr Karamjit Rajput
	Simon Lieberman.

Leamington Town	Town Centre Sgt
	Leamington Town Cllr Sarah Davies
	Paul Haynes

Lillington	Community Beat Manager
	Leamington Town Cllr Sarah Boad
	Linda Price

N'hbhood Watch   Barry Armitage…Co-ordinator

Assoc Town &   Lois Sparling
Parish Councils

Business Rep   Paul Haynes has identified a representative.

10.   The group meets and reports quarterly to the Crime & Disorder Reduction Partnership on progress against targets in the Crime & Disorder Reduction Strategy.

11. There is excellent progress against the targets set for this group. A view had been expressed that it had turned into a reporting group. It has a clear focus and knows which players are needed but the role of the group needs redefining and relationship between itself and the action groups.

12. We discussed membership of action groups and the inconsistency in attendance from all but the Police. The accepted principle was that local knowledge was needed at the action group level. Key players could include:

   Local Councillors   –   District, Town and County.
   Police   –   Community Beat Manager, CBO & PCSO
   Residents and Community representatives including Neighbourhood Watch

13. We discussed what the role and responsibilities of the group were and we listed:

   (i)   Devising strategies and action plans in order to meet the targets set in the Crime & Disorder Reduction Strategy
   (ii)   Reporting quarterly to the Crime & Disorder Reduction Partnership on progress.
   (iii)   Receiving bids from and making awards to the 3 Action Groups that address specific issues in their own action plans.
   (iv)   Co-ordinating annual bids to the Building Safer Communities Fund in order to progress key issues.
   (v)   Acting as a conduit to ensure that local issues can be effectively communicated to the Crime & Disorder Reduction Partnership.

14. We thought that it would help considerably if the role and responsibilities were spelt out for each organisation and individual.

   Recommendations

   - We felt that in order to identify who should serve on the parent group it was necessary to agree membership of the action groups and then revisit this.
   - We would meet with key partners to test our understanding further.

   Councillors Blacklock, Hatfield and District Commander Chief Inspector Chris Jackson.

   Findings

15. We discussed the number of existing groups where community safety is the sole or a significant topic, these include:

   Brunswick Local Action Group
   Leamington Town Centre Safety Group
   Lillington Community Action Forum
   Whitnash Community Safety Panel
   Warwick Gates
   Electoral Division Panels
   Hatton Park
   Kenilworth Police Liaison Group

16. We also stated that other groups could be forming shortly including Packmores, West Warwick and Woodloes.

17. Chris Jackson emphasised that communication was an issue and that he had to strike a balance between national performance priorities and local citizen focus. There is a great

and increasing demand to access Police Officers face to face. A minimum requirement agreed through this process would help all by maximising the time of the Police officer on the beat.

18.   For a number of reasons the elected member is the best and most appropriate person to lead and chair the groups. We needed a protocol for effective operation and it was suggested that the length of meetings should be fixed.

19.   We thought a proforma for Minutes would help keep the paperwork down and ensure the group is outcome orientated.

20.   It became increasingly apparent that the good Chairing of the meeting is critical. The Chair will set the tone of the meeting and should ensure that a culture of blame does not prevail.

21.   Chris Jackson thought the idea of an e-group was very helpful and e-mails should go to the assigned officer for that group and where possible others in the team policing structure. Chris thought that this would facilitate communication because having an e-group would ensure that he knew who to contact when an emergency or significant issue arose.

22.   We asked Chris who he thought the key players were and after some debate together we listed:

Elected representatives
Neighbourhood Watch
Resident associations or representatives
Police
Local Authority Officers
A young persons representative
Fire and rescue service

23.   We thought it would be useful to offer a time limited facility for any local concerned person to comment on a specific problem or contribution to problem solving.

24.   Following this process we though that the initial meeting of any new or existing group should necessitate an introduction by the Chair to set the scene and ensure each person understood their role and responsibilities.

25.   We recognised that the group needed to understand the structure for community safety to ensure it could access support.

Recommendations

8.   (a)   The Communities & Fear Of Crime Group be chaired by a Warwick District Councillor

        (b)   Principal support to the Communities & Fear Of Crime Group be provided by the Community Safety Officer

9.   (a)   Representatives be revisited following a review of the action groups

10.   (a)   The group should continue to meet quarterly dictated by the availability of the analysis of recorded crime.

11.   (a)   Roles and responsibilities are re-stated following agreement of the terms of reference for the Warwick District Crime & Disorder Reduction Partnership.

12.   (a)   See 9a

13. (a) That the purpose of the group be restated.

14. (a) See 11a.

15. (a) n/a

16. (a) A Packmores Group be convened to address the steep rise in crime and disorder witnessed on 2003/04. An initial meeting with Key partners has taken place. The Community Safety Officer will meet with Police before convening the first meeting inviting ward councillors.

17. (a) see 8 (a).

18. (a) A proforma to be produced.

19. (a) The Community Safety Officer will produce a briefing note setting out the role of the Chair.

20. (a) n/a

21. (a) The group should be the reference point for local community safety concerns advertising meetings via newsletters and noticeboards.

22. (a) A time limited facility should be made available for a member of the community to speak at the start of each meeting.

23. (a) Induction for the Communities & Fear Of Crime Group to be carried out by the Community Safety Officer.

24. (a) The Communities & Fear of Crime group to promote its supporting role of the local action groups through a briefing papers provided by the Community Safety Officer and at each meeting through representatives of the local action groups serving on the parent group.

PROFORMA FOR COMMUNITY SAFETY ACTION GROUPS IN WARWICK DISTRICT

This proforma has been developed to further improve partnership working at community level. It is recognised that there are several different forums where community safety forms the whole or a significant part of the agenda. It is not proposed to produce a one size fits all model but to agree common goals and procedures whereby key partners understand their role, responsibilities and commit to minimum standards.

Individual groups will be at different stages and may wish to enhance and amend but this should only be agreed where it increases effectiveness and does not undermine minimum standards or the management of expectations.

Where any organisation is not delivering against the commitment made this should be challenged by the group initially. If this is not resolved the matter should then be referred to the Communities & Fear Of Crime Group. Ultimately issues may be passed on to the Warwick District Crime & Disorder Reduction Partnership.

(name of) group is convened solely or mainly to reduce crime and disorder, drugs misuse and the fear of crime in the **(name of)** community. Our aim is to create a safer environment where all sections of the community feel safe as they live in, work in or visit the area.

Key partners are those that add value to the group through bringing local knowledge, expertise and or experience and a shared commitment to delivering actions to address specific issues, they include:

Local residents
Neighbourhood Watch
Local councillors
Clerks to local authorities
Officers of local authorities
Police
Local business
Young person's representatives
Fire & Rescue Service

Representatives should each have a specific role and contribution but members of the public should also be encouraged to attend if they wish to speak on a specific item, this should be time limited and at an agreed point in the agenda.

The group agrees to meet at least quarterly and will identify individuals from the above key partners. The group will identify a chairperson, vice chair and minute taker. The chairperson and any substitute will be an elected member. All group members will identify a substitute and ensure that all actions assigned to them are reported in full.

Where the group is not solely convened for community safety the first substantive agenda item will be community safety facilitating the attendance of the local Police representative and ensuring that the maximum time is spent on the beat.

A template for minutes will be used to ensure the principal actions are recorded together with the person responsible and timescale. All actions will be reported back to the next meeting of the group.

The picture of local crime and disorder trends and levels will be a substantive part of the meeting utilising:

- the most recent recorded crime figures
- the most recent incident data
- Police analysis of the above verbal and or written
- local knowledge and experience.

The group will produce a communications concordat detailing the contact details and availability of key partners and to improve the sharing of information to help local people feel safer. This should include an e-group where possible but should also build on and support existing communication systems eg the messaging system available through the NHW Coordinators, Business Watch and Rural Watch.

The group recognises the key factors in driving the fear of crime include levels of domestic burglary, disorder, anti social behaviour and the appearance of the environment. The group will devise plans to help people feel safer through measures including:

- **Providing a multi agency reference point for concerned local people**
- **Providing a network of mutual support and community safety champions**
- **Increased/more visible policing**
- **Increased CCTV**
- **Improved lighting**
- **Signposting help**
- **More and stronger Neighbourhood Watch**
- **Improved messaging system**
- **Engaging and positively occupying young people**
- **Prompt reporting and removal of GRIME including sharps, abandoned vehicles, fly tipping, graffiti**
- **Positive news stories in the media and responding to negative news stories**

ENVIRONMENT & OVERVIEW SCRUTINY OF COMMUNITY SAFETY

WORK GROUP 3 : How we can minimise the risk to elected members and staff as they go about their duties.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS FROM THE WHOSE AFRAID QUESTIONNAIRES COMPLETED BY COUNCILLORS.

As part of the above review a questionnaire was produced and made available to all elected members and staff. A total of 14 (21%) of the 67 forms completed were from councillors. The response is representative (30%) of all councillors replied.

Of those that indicated 6 of 17 first time councillors responded and 6 had more than 9 years experience. The Councillors that responded included the four towns and, one semi rural area. Of the 14 Female councillors 5 responded (35%) and 9 of the 32 male Councillors responded (28%).

All those that responded used their car for their duties, 4 also used a range of other transport including cycling, bike, bus and walking. Only 4 councillors used a mobile phone as part of their duties and none use a personal alarm.

One councillor reported being a victim of crime when being stalked by a constituent, the councillor believes the person had mental health issues.

Assessing the concerns of councillors reveals more about the risks faced. Councillors all work unsocial hours, all use the Town Hall and have contact with members of the public in their wards formally and informally.

Some general comments were made about being a victim of crime but two councillors detailed specific concerns when asking a group of young people to disperse and the perceived threat of violence when visiting a constituent in their home.

One councillor commented that they found the SIPS software system useful in identifying persons who have been violent or present a threat. There is a problem here in that the new Council Tax system means that we will no longer be able to track individuals.

The level of concern about being a victim of crime is very low. Two councillors completed the 'very' box but one was a general concern and neither had being a victim or ever felt at risk. Two councillors expressed a higher level of concern, ie 'fairly' when travelling home.

One repeated concern was simply the unknown and identifying those persons more likely to present a problem. Another comment made by more than one councillor was how to deal with aggressive people.

One fear expressed was the threat to councillors from groups of angry people and I read this to be a Town Hall issue eg protester on a Planning Matter. The suggestion was that security needed to be tighter at the Town Hall and a barrier should be put in place.

Recommendations

In spite of the low level of incidents and a relatively low level of concern it is clear that there is a risk and we can take some small steps to minimise that risk.

- An advice note be produced for all Councillors utilising the experience of the Suzy Lamplugh Trust.
- Councillors to be provided with a mobile phone to be used for work purposes.
- Councillors to be provided with a key ring personal alarm
- Councillors to be provided with training on dealing with aggressive people
- Ask for a review of Town Hall security during meetings
- Ask for a review of the impact of the new Council Tax system on the SIPS facility

Pete Cutts

ENVIRONMENT & OVERVIEW SCRUTINY OF COMMUNITY SAFETY

WORK GROUP 3: How we can minimise the risk to elected members and staff as they go about their duties.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS FROM THE WHOSE AFRAID QUESTIONNAIRES COMPLETED BY STAFF

As part of the above review a questionnaire was produced and made available to all elected members and staff. A total of 53 (79%) of the 67 forms completed were from staff. The response rate (9.6%) is lower than the rate for councillors (30%) but still a significant sample.

Of the 49 who indicated 44% were male and 56% female. There were responses from all business units with the exception of Council Tax and Legal. Over 81% worked at Riverside House with a good range of ages and experience ranging from 1yr to 3 years (15) and over 34 with 10 years or more.

The large majority of staff travelled into work by car alone and nearly twice as many (26) used their car for work purposes compared to those who did not (14). Unsurprisingly the large majority parked at Riverside House but more people parked on the street than used our other car parks including St Peter's. Only 24 of 50 ((48%) used a mobile phone as part of their duties and only 3 of 53 (5.6%) use a personal alarm. These figures are surprising given that over 46% of those that responded worked unsocial hours.

Three members of staff (7.5%) reported being a victim of crime including car window being shot out whilst visiting, grabbed by a drunk and vandalism to a car. All reported the crime and there was a mixed response from those reported to and none were aware of any changes made by the authority to stop it happening again. By contrast the members of staff appear to have amended their procedures as a result.

A total of 14 members of staff (26%) detailed occasions when they felt at risk of being a victim of crime. Of these 9 related to aggression and the threat of violence, 2 to poor lighting when leaving work and one serious concern about lack of security in Riverside House with members of the public using a staff entrance.

Training had been made available to 5 of the 9 expressing concerns about being a victim of violence. Only one member of staff did not report their concerns and 8 of 11 rated the response from the authority as good or OK. The action taken included amending visits, providing training and providing panic alarms.

The overall level of concern about being a victim of crime is low. In each assessment 'not at all' and 'not very' far exceeds 'fairly' or 'very' concerned.
Unsurprisingly levels of concern are highest for visiting with new places (25.6%), specific places (20%) and specific people (17%).
Next highest is travelling between places of work (16.3%) followed closely by Riverside House reception areas. Car Parking and car parking at Riverside House also feature with 14.0% and 13.95% respectively.

Only 3 other geographic areas of concern were listed being flats, The Crest and St Peters Car Park. Several comments were made about visiting certain areas of the district, the experience of visiting known individuals and the lack of information about potentially violent clients.

Some concerns expressed will have to go back to Heads of Service.

Recommendations

In spite of the low level of incidents and a relatively low level of concern it is clear that there is a risk and we can take some small steps to minimise that risk.

- Review the security of receptions at Riverside House and make notices larger and more prominent.
- Review the lighting at Riverside House Car Park and close the bottom gate to reduce the risk to staff and their vehicles.
- The findings of this review to be passed to the Heads Of Service Health & Safety Officer, Lone Workers Group and Unions and task them to identify vulnerable members of staff and produce a protocol to include officers visiting.
- Review the security at the Town Hall
- Provide all vulnerable staff with a mobile phone to be used for work purposes.
- Provide all vulnerable staff with a key ring personal alarm
- Provide all vulnerable staff with training on dealing with aggressive people
- Ask for a review of the impact of the new Council Tax system on the SIPS facility
- Prosecute assaults on staff in all cases.

Pete Cutts