

**Joint Consultation Response from: Waveney District Council and Suffolk Coastal District Council**

**Provided By: Richard Best**

**Date received: 15 February 2013**

There is much to be positive about in the Plan. The Plan covers relevant areas and priorities including victim and vulnerable persons, mental health issues in terms of both victims and offenders, addressing substance misuse, domestic violence, nighttime economy, burglary, Crime and support of the Troubled Families initiative to make a positive sustainable difference to some of the most dysfunctional families across the County. The Plan also includes recognition of the need to address low level ASB. These priority issues and others are discussed and explained within the Plan and the reasoning for performance improvement in these areas.

The Plan does however lack particular focus or vision and reflects the "General" approach suggested within the Police and Crime Plans interim Guidance and practice Advice. This approach to the plan development also incorporates some of the inherent and associated risks including dilution of the vision, competing priorities, less accountability and potential to measure success at this time. The guidelines also suggest SMART principles, clear understanding of the Commissioners objectives, clear and relative performance expectations, which are not clearly reflected within the Plan.

It is suggested within the Plan that more time needs to be afforded to developing specific issues including commissioning and the grants process. Interim measures and processes are proposed to maintain project delivery and delivery of actions. Reference is made that in certain areas performance needs to be improved, but this has not been specifically detailed or 'SMART' actions and targets developed or stated at this time.

Too much of the overall sense of the Plan is to maintain the status quo rather than to continue to challenge ourselves (both police & partners) to improve and to be more creative in terms of preventative measures. Page 3 highlights three key areas where the police force needs to improve (violence with injuries, solve rates, victim focus). In addition however at a more strategic level greater improvement is needed in terms of Crime Prevention, Repeat Offending, and addressing the Root Causes of Offending.

There is also no sense within the Plan of Suffolk being made up of various different places with different local priorities as recognised through each of the Community Safety Partnerships. As a result there is no recognition of different needs in different parts of Suffolk, which would support and recognise the Localism ethos.

Page 5 sets out a confusing position with regard to Crime & Disorder Reduction Grants. Whilst we fully understand that the PCC has not had sufficient time to put in place a commissioning model, would it not be better as an interim arrangement to allocate the majority of the funds to the CSPs with an undertaking that they adopt a commissioning approach (if not already doing so) with clear measurable, transparent and "crisp" outcomes as a pre-requisite of the commissioning process?

Alternatively if a grants model is to be maintained at this time, a more "specific" framework with a robust measureable performance framework needs to be in place to inform project and bid submission. The current Appendix (Performance Assessment Framework) to the Plan again creates some ambiguity with regard to such grants, but in terms of the Localism

ethos some flexibility may need to be maintained in terms of outcome driven or specific activities and targets. Some of the criteria is correctly identifying the outcomes that are sought and welcomes grant applications to commission activity that will deliver those outcomes. In other areas of this document however specific activities are identified that could receive grant funding.

The Plan makes some commitment towards crime prevention, however this needs to be given much greater emphasis or runs the risk of simply repeating old activities, stifling innovation and address of the true root cause of crime and its prevention.

The monies available for Crime Reduction Grants is also far too small. If the PCC truly wants, with partners, to prevent crime then far more than 0.5% of the overall police budget needs to be spent on such Grants (pg 23).

Several areas of the Plan need to emphasise the importance of partnership working, for example Page 11 and 'Creating a Safer Night-time Economy'. It is widely accepted by the night-time economy working groups that sustainable improvement against a number of the police targets, can only be achieved through a collective, broader partnering approach. It is also noticeable and concerning throughout the Plan that no reference is made to District and Borough Councils and their positive involvement as an effective and key community safety partner.

As suggested above, the recognition of partnership working appears to be under-developed throughout the Plan. For example reference is made to partners match funding PCSO's. Whilst PCSO's are undoubtedly important it is clear that different communities may be better served by different officers rather than a PSCO e.g. ASB officer, FIP officer, Youth Worker etc. Localism and Partnership working is about collectively and flexibly targeting the right resources in the right places (e.g. Troubled Families) rather than partners match funding a police resource.

The table on page 18 makes reference to "Dealing with the Public", it would be helpful to rephrase this term.

Reference is made to this being a medium term Plan that will be reviewed in order to set out the PCC's longer term vision. It would be helpful to understand when this longer term Plan will be developed for consultation. Furthermore the Town and parish councils are keen to also contribute to the consultation and further opportunities and extended consultation periods would be welcomed. This is essential for communities to feel that they have also been truly consulted and to gain some ownership of the Plan.