

TILLEY AWARDS 2010 APPLICATION FORM, NATIONAL COMPETITION SECTION TWO

Applications made to this year's Tilley Awards must be submitted through the Effective Practice Database which is available at

<http://www.crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/cgi-bin/epd/index.cgi>

This questionnaire forms part two of your application form. You should have already completed part one on the Effective Practice Database. Please make sure you tick the box provided on the database to indicate that you are entering your project into the Tilley Awards.

Please ensure that you have read the guidance before completing this form. Guidance is available at

www.crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/tilley/tilley2010.htm

By submitting an application to the awards, entrants are agreeing to abide by the conditions set out in the guidance. Failure to adhere to the requirements set out in the 2010 Awards Guidance will result in your entry being rejected from the competition.

All entries must be received by **1:00pm on Friday 30th April 2010**. No entries will be accepted after the 30th April. Hard copies of the application form are not required.

Any queries on the application process should be directed to Darren Kristiansen on 0207 035 3228.

Project Name: Hamilton Safer Streets Initiative

Location: Strathclyde Police

SCANNING

In South Lanarkshire the Community Safety Partnership has the strategic responsibility, under the overarching Community Planning Partnership, for dealing with matters of anti social behaviour/violence/safer environments/community wellbeing and injury prevention. This portfolio provides direct accountability for National Outcome 9 – we live our lives safe from crime, disorder and danger; and sits directly under the agreed local outcome, specified in the new Single Outcome Agreement, of a safer South Lanarkshire. Membership of the Community Safety Partnership includes:- All Local Authority departments and services, Strathclyde Police, Strathclyde Fire & Rescue, NHS Lanarkshire and has the capacity to co-opt any relevant partner to specific problems.

In 2006 the Community Safety Partnership lead officers group received reports from its Safer Environments sub group, membership mirrors the Community Safety Partnership, of complaints by town centre management groups identifying Hamilton Town Centre as an area causing concern in relation to violence and antisocial behaviour over the festive period of Dec 05 into the first week of Jan 06, there were also reports from Licensing forums complaining of an unsafe environment within Hamilton Town centre during this time. Statistics provided by Strathclyde Police for the festive period in South Lanarkshire (Fig.1) were able to illustrate the reality of reported crime in Hamilton Town Centre over this period.

(Fig. 1) 01 Dec 2005 until 03 Jan 2006.

Crimes & Offences	Beat 16	QB	Q
Breach of the Peace	64	209	489
Civic Government (S) Act 1982 s. 47	9	18	50
Criminal Law (Consolidation) (S) Act 1995 s. 52	16	216	570
Criminal Law (Consolidation) (Scotland) Act 1995 s. 47(1)	1	15	32
Criminal Law (Consolidation) (Scotland) Act 1995 s. 49(1)	1	11	23
Misuse of Drugs Act 1971 s. 5(2)	17	107	205
Police (S) Act 1967 s. 41(1)(a)(pty asslt)	2	15	40
Police (S) Act 1967 s. 41(1)(a)(res arrst)	3	19	54
Serious Assault *	6	21	45
Simple Assault	24	107	341
SLC (Prohibition of Consumption of Alcohol) Bye-Laws 1996	19	171	293
Theft not elsewhere classified	14	60	173
Total	176	969	2315

Hamilton Town centre is within beat 16 of 83 beat areas across South Lanarkshire. The above stats showed that Hamilton town centre and surrounds contributed over 13% of all serious assaults and 7 % of all simple assaults, making persons using the Hamilton town centre area over the festive period 24 times more likely to be the victim of a serious assault

than the South Lanarkshire average. In addition to the problems relating to violent crime Fig.1 identified that the instance of anti social crimes was much higher than the South Lanarkshire average.

With this in mind and as part of the ongoing analysis of policing deployment in town centres and local communities, local police commanders in conjunction with South Lanarkshire Community Safety Partnership recognised the need to pull together partners resources to tackle the identified problems in a joint problem solving manner; all partners recognised that the historic method of working in isolation, with individual resources trying to work to their own agendas with their own priorities, had failed to tackle problems in a sustained manner.

ANALYSIS

Hamilton was at this time highlighted by the then Scottish Executive, alongside seven other town centres and four cities, as being hardest hit by alcohol related violence and disorder in Scotland over the festive period from the first weekend in December to the first weekend of the New Year.

Statistics were provided for the 2005/06 festive period (Fig.2) by the Scottish Executive for Hamilton town centre, these figures tied in with the findings from the commissioned problem profile and they were adopted as the baseline from which results would be measured, the identified problems as defined by the Scottish Executive were:

Fig.2

Recorded Crime

Breach of the peace	62
Misuse of Drugs Act 1971 s. 5(2)	16
SLC Alcohol Bye-Law 1996 s. 3(1)	19
Civic Government Act 1982 s.47	03
Police (s) Act 1967 (res arrst)	04
Criminal Law (C.S.) Act 1995 S. 52	14
Simple Assault	23
Serious Assault	06
Total	147

The Scottish Executive released monies to target the problem with a view to making a recognisable and lasting impact. Within the Hamilton area this money was administered through the Community Safety Partnership, who delegated the delivery and reporting of improvements to its Safer Environments group.

Strathclyde Police were given the lead by the Community Safety Partnership on delivering the project through a Joint Problem Solving approach, and partner resources were made available to augment existing activity and/or allow the partnership to carry out joint interventions to reduce town centre alcohol related violence and disorder within Hamilton Town centre over the festive period.

Partners at this planning stage set themselves one key objective:

1. An overall reduction of at least 2% of Average (29) crime figures supplied by Scottish Executive in terms of violent crime.

The full analytical problem profile identifying the times, days, locations and demographic of victim/perpetrator for the problems identified during scanning was produced by Strathclyde Police analysts, circulated to, and discussed within the Safer Environments group.

Partners realised that this was not new information and that various attempts to address the identified problems using traditional policing methods had been unsuccessful in the past. Simply throwing resources at the perceived problem had not worked.

A new approach was required which utilised information from the locus of the identified problems; we needed specific data surrounding the cause and background to these problems which could be used to identify new possibilities for interventions and service delivery.

The decision was taken by the CSP to recruit a Key Individual Network (KIN), comprising of different types of licensees working in the area, which would inform the partners of their perceptions as to the underlying and causal factors leading to the identified problems; and also provide feedback as to the effectiveness of partner interventions. This KIN group was based on the United Kingdom pilot models used for community engagement in England, covering the demographics of licensees including on/off sales, restaurants, fast food outlets and Taxi licensees, and at the time was the first of its kind in Scotland.

Survey work was carried out with this KIN group and they identified entirely new locations for low level acts of anti social behaviour which they believed were leading to the later problems and recorded crime, the KIN group believed that resources placed within their identified locations would have a greater likelihood of addressing the levels of crime rather than placing resources at the locus of historic crime data.

The KIN group also identified various actions which they thought would reduce the potential for violence and disorder, measures such as a direct contact to Police Officers within the area during the identified times and days, a quicker system for people wishing to leave the town centre area to avoid congregation and improved lighting at specific locations.

The new problem definition supplied by the KIN group, identifying low level alcohol related violence and disorder as the underlying cause of more serious violence, was accepted by partners within the Safer Environments group and interventions were planned in response;

Key outcome No.2 was added to the project at this point:

2. Greater public/business reassurance in the service provided by partners

Initially it was thought that the KIN group would only be contacted on a Monthly basis during planning and after the Festive period to provide partners with feedback on service provision; however, the decision was taken as a result of the KIN groups impressive input to involve them continuously before, during and after the initiative, giving them a direct say on the deployment of partner resources. This decision to empower the local business community was designed to give them ongoing ownership and involvement with the problems causing them the most concern.

RESPONSE

The partnerships response to our new problem definition provided by the KIN group took the form of interventions designed to impact on the root causes of alcohol related violence and disorder within Hamilton Town Centre. The initial interventions for year 1 2006/07 of the project were as follows:

- Town Centre High Profile Policing as directed by KIN group findings and ongoing direct contact on the ground.
- Taxi Marshalling service to increase the speed with which people leaving the town centre area can do so, reducing congregation.
- Road Policing campaign to reduce ant social driving and increase perceptions of safety within Hamilton town centre

- Radio/CCTV Public Space Links providing better coverage of ongoing incidents
- Media Campaign to highlight actions being taken and inform public of partner interventions. Including local radio broadcasts, local papers and poster campaign within Hamilton Town centre.
- Targeting Off Sales Premises with education and guidance for Licensees on legislation and responsibilities
- Public Survey carried out during the identified times over the weekends involved to gauge the perceptions of service providers, interventions and fear of crime by those actually using Hamilton Town centre
- Scottish Ambulance Service on site to provide further public reassurance and reduce implications for health service and victims of violent crime.
- Improved lighting at identified locations to reduce opportunity and likelihood of crime
- Restorative Justice Programme in place for referral of suitable persons involved in crime and disorder within Hamilton Town centre over the festive period
- Pride youth alcohol event designed to increase the awareness of the dangers alcohol related violence and disorder can have for young people
- Public Reassurance/Key Individual network maintained and visited on daily/weekly basis to validate the method of intervention delivery and identify any emerging problems or need for different service provision

Interventions in response of the causal factors for identified problems have evolved, been removed or been added to, after review in each year of the project to identify interventions which sustainably tackle problems and allow us to reach our key outcomes.

An example of an intervention not working was the radio link system put in place to monitor and update ongoing incidents; feedback from Licensees stated they felt the system was not manageable and during busy times it was inoperable. This was replaced with a direct phone line for the KIN group to the Police supervisor on duty within Hamilton town centre for swift allocation of resources and conflict resolution to ongoing issues or problems.

Additional interventions now being used include:

- Ferroguard metal detection poles to reduce the opportunity and likelihood of persons carrying offensive weapons within Hamilton Town Centre
- Drug Trace Detection Equipment Pilots to educate licensees to drug taking opportunity within premises and reduce the likelihood of persons carrying drugs within Hamilton town centre
- Potraloos provided to reduce instances of public urination and increase community safety and wellbeing
- Fire Safety Education packages included in education for licensees

Each intervention was costed in terms of man hours needed to deliver the service on the ground for partners best placed to do so, or to deliver the required service to the area from external contractors. Where services could be delivered from within core duties of the service providers this was done, where additional service provision was needed this was costed as per the man hours involved and paid for from the money released from the Scottish Executive. Where man hours were allocated from within partner resources this provided an activity analysis as proof of work for accountability and evaluation analysis, as well as an evidence base for any identified best practise.

Whilst there were no material problems with the development of this initiative amongst the partners in the Community Safety Partnership and Safer Environments group, it would be

fair to say that some of the new strategies to tackle the identified problems required a total buy in to this new method of working across partner organisations, putting aside established practise in an effort to achieve the joint objectives.

For example Police officers working within a busy town centre area would perhaps not in the past have taken specific direction from Licensees as to where they should or should not deploy resources, where their own intelligence told them otherwise.

The Community Wardens service would perhaps not have been willing to work outwith their mandated hours and areas, to complete public surveys the results of which they could not claim as specifically their own.

Any discomfort felt by partner organisations in tackling objectives outwith their specific remit were dealt with round the table by all partners involved, and it was this willingness to work together in new ways which allowed the initiative to proceed.

The success of this specific methodology in joint problem solving work is undoubted in South Lanarkshire. The partner buy in has strengthened to such an extent that this specific methodology is now used across all of South Lanarkshire, as detailed in the local outcome 'a Safer South Lanarkshire' under the Single Outcome Agreement. Further, the methodology as a whole has been accepted across all of Lanarkshire as well as other areas of Strathclyde and Scotland.

The Community Safety Partnership and all of its members are committed to continuing and improving on the Hamilton Safer Streets initiative, provision has already been made to ensure future service provision as per the Anti Social Behaviour strategy and Single Outcome Agreement documents to the Scottish Government.

ASSESSMENT

The first evaluation of Hamilton Safer Streets was reported by the Community Safety Partnership to the then Scottish Executive in April 2007 using the baseline measures provided by the Scottish Executive at Fig.2. The CSP found that all objectives had been met and surpassed in terms of % reduction in violent crime, see Fig.3 below; the surprising element of the evaluation was the extent of perception change amongst the members of the KIN group and members of the public as to fear of crime and service providers. All partners of the Community Safety Partnership were impressed by the difference this new methodology in Joint Problem Solving could make.

However it was recognised that there was room for improvement. Planning began within the Community Safety Partnership and its Safer Environments group for future Hamilton Safer Streets Initiatives to be implemented and improved upon. To ensure its continued existence monies were set aside from within the Community Safety Partnership budget to allow implementation even if central funding was withdrawn from the Scottish Government.

This Joint Problem Solving review process continues to date within the Community Safety Partnership and Safer Environments group, with partners fully committed to the initiative, its continued success, and future development. The most recent plan for the 09/10 Hamilton Festive Initiative shows its evolution with an increased number of interventions, KIN group stability, improved surveys and Scottish Ministers attending on site to view how the reductions in crime and fear of crime are achieved in practise on the ground. It now sits within the overall objectives of a Safer, Stronger Scotland and is clearly set against the shared National Outcome:

"We live our lives free from crime, disorder and danger".

Outcomes relate directly to specific objectives of the Single Outcome Agreement (SOA):

- Reducing crime (particularly violent crime)
- Tackling alcohol related antisocial behaviour and disorder
- Reducing the fear of crime and increasing public reassurance

The Hamilton Safer Streets Initiative is now embedded by name within the South Lanarkshire Single Outcome Agreement and Anti-social Behaviour Strategy submitted to the Scottish Government.

This breadth of planning, methodology, innovation and commitment to sustainability means nothing if our results; quantitative, qualitative and financial don't prove success, the following are the results for Hamilton Town Centre over the festive period since the initiative started in 06/07.

Fig.3

Recorded Crime	2005 Baseline	2006	2007	2008	2009	% Diff
Breach of the peace	62	38	20	9	5	-92%
Misuse of Drugs Act 1971 s. 5(2)	16	10	22	4	6	-63%
SLC Alcohol Bye-Law 1996 s. 3(1)	19	27	3	1	0	-100%
Civic Government Act 1982 s.47	03	17	2	0	1	-66%
Police (s) Act 1967 (res arrst)	4	7	4	2	2	-50%
Criminal Law (C.S.) Act 1995 S. 52	14	6	2	2	2	-86%
Simple Assault	23	8	4	10	3	-87%
Serious Assault	06	1	1	2	1	-83%
Total	147	114	58	29	20	-86%

As can be clearly seen there have been significant year on year reductions, especially where it relates to crimes of violence, with both simple and serious assault substantially reduced, and perhaps more importantly this reduction has been sustained over the four year period of these interventions.

Whilst it is clear from the data above that the initiative has been a year-on-year success, we had to be sure that the community was also benefiting from, and seeing the impact of the actions the partnership were taking. This was assessed by seeking the perceptions of the users of the night-time economy within Hamilton town centre and the local business community. Again there had never been a survey of this kind done so we had no baseline from which to measure data obtained.

Public Perceptions

The first public survey was carried out over the festive period of 2006/07.

Over 300 members of the public were surveyed within Hamilton town centre between 2100hrs and 0100hrs on Friday and Saturday evenings. These times and days were specifically chosen to produce the most realistic views possible from persons actually out and about in the night time economy, thus matching our required demographic.

The Public Survey was conducted on a total of four nights. The surveys were carried out with the assistance of six Community Wardens, who were shadowed in the area by two Police Officers. Analysis was undertaken by the Council's Central Policy Unit, who produced the SNAP analysis survey forms used for the questionnaires.

Results obtained were as follows:

Fig.4

% of respondents who	2006/07
were aware of a higher police presence when visiting the Town Centre	51%
felt the initiative had made a difference to them.	49%
felt there was a safer atmosphere in the places visited during the initiative	57%
felt the level of anti social incidents had reduced since the initiative began.	34%
would be more likely to visit Hamilton town centre rather than other surrounding locations due to Police presence.	52%

The public survey is repeated every year of the initiative, to date all of the results have been positive and we look to maintain this decrease in fear of crime. As this is a live programme capable of changing to meet new and emerging requirements the survey has evolved along with interventions and service delivery. The most recent analysis provided a 25 page report produced by South Lanarkshire Council's corporate resources, a snapshot for public reassurance results this year is as follows:

Personal Safety:

- 61% of respondents felt the programme had made a difference to them. The remaining 39% of respondents felt the programme had not made a difference to them.
- 73% of respondents felt there was a safer atmosphere in the places they visited during the programme.

Impact on anti-social incidents:

- 46% of respondents felt the level of anti-social incidents occurring in Hamilton town centre had stayed the same as before the programme started.
- 29% of respondents felt the level of anti-social incidents occurring in Hamilton town centre was a bit less since the programme started
- 23% of respondents felt the level of anti-social incidents occurring in Hamilton town centre had been much less since the programme started.
- 2% of respondents felt the level of anti-social incidents occurring in Hamilton town centre had increased since the programme started.

Attractiveness of Hamilton town centre:

- 64% of respondents would be more likely to visit Hamilton town centre rather than other locations such as Glasgow, East Kilbride, and Motherwell etc due to the increased police presence.

Key Individual Network

The KIN group set up for the Hamilton Festive Initiative was the first of its kind within Scotland and remains in place to this day although membership may change over time given the nature of night time economies.

Initial findings for the group were as follows:

All outcome targets were met and provided the basis for service provision and feedback on effectiveness of services. This was ongoing throughout the duration of the Initiative.

All respondents rated the service provided during the Initiative as either good (16) or very good (20). 47% of respondents (17) also felt that levels of violence and disorder were less; with 50% (18) feeling it was about the same, 1 respondent felt there had been a slight increase.

Qualitative feedback was also asked for by KIN group members, some of the comments made were as follows:

- We now have good relations with Police.
- Policing in this area has improved dramatically and we have had fewer disturbances than before, where we used to have bother every week and the Police turned up half an hour after we called; now the Police arrive promptly.

Financial Savings

As can be clearly seen there have been significant year on year reductions, especially where it relates to crimes of violence, with both simple and serious assault substantially reduced, and perhaps more importantly this reduction has been sustained over the four year period of these interventions.

Figures for the costs of violent crime are quantified from Home Office research study 217 'the social and economic costs of crime' and have been more recently updated by the National Violence Reduction Unit; the Chief Medical Officer for Scotland, Dr Harry Burns, also quotes these figures for the cost of crime in his report to the Scottish Executive of November 2007.

When we apply the financial formula for serious and simple assaults (quantifiable costs) to our sustained reductions it provides savings as follows over the four year period:

Serious Assault (£23,000 average end to end cost): £437,000

Simple Assault (£2,000 average end to end cost): £134,000

Total savings on crimes of violence over the period: £571,000

These are the known quantifiable savings for Criminal Justice and Health Service savings, the actual savings for the unquantifiable costs far outweigh this. The partnership is currently involved in a survey to further analyse average costs for all after care costs as a result of serious assaults, this figure is expected to dwarf the above quantifiable.

The formal protocol to share information between the Police and South Lanarkshire Council, completed in 2004, under the umbrella of the Community Safety Partnership, has been key to the cementing of this new way of working. The use of effective information technology is increasing the ability of the partnership to respond to community concerns and address local issues at a local level. The results achieved from this initiative led to the establishment of other successful projects such as 'Safer South Lanarkshire' and 'Safer Lanarkshire' as well as the introduction of an Alcohol related anti social behaviour working group within South Lanarkshire. Hamilton Safer Streets has been accepted as best practise locally, at force level and nationally and has been recognised with awards at both the inaugural Scottish Government Policing awards and Strathclyde Police excellence awards.

PART TWO - CONDITIONS OF ENTRY

Information requested within this section of the application form is compulsory. Each question should be answered. This section is not assessed as part of the Tilley Awards but failure to answer all the questions may result in your application being rejected from the competition

Q: Can you confirm that the partners listed carried out the project as stated?

Yes

Q: Can you confirm that the details stated are factually correct?

Yes

Q: Is there any reason why the contents of this application should not be made publicly available? If so please state the reason/s and refer to guidance concerning sharing Tilley application submissions.

No

Please mark the box below with an X to indicate that all organisations involved in the project have been notified of this entry (this is to prevent duplicate entries of the same project):

☒

Please mark the box below with an X to indicate that your CDRP/CSP Chair is content for this project to be entered into the Tilley Awards

☒

PART THREE – SHARING LEARNING

This section is not assessed as part of the Tilley Awards. The information contained within this section of the application form will be used to share information about your project with interested stakeholders. You should use this space to provide a summary of your project under the stated headings.

Failure to complete this section could reduce the likelihood of your project being shared with interested parties.

Q: How have you ensured that the project contributes to improving public confidence that the police and local agencies are dealing with the issues that matter locally? What evidence do you have that this has had a direct measurable impact on this measure?

Q: Did your project have a direct measurable impact on public perceptions of anti-social behaviour, including perceptions of drug use or drug dealing and perceptions of drunk or rowdy behaviour as a problem locally? If so, please provide details below.

Q: Did your project provide a measurable contribution to the delivery of any Local Area Agreement targets? If so, please state which indicators below and how your project's contribution can be measured

Q: Question three of section one of this application form asks for details of which partners were involved in your project. Please use the space below to set out how partners were engaged and involved in developing and/or delivering your project. Please make reference to the way in which your project links with partners' strategies, such as Sustainable Community Strategy or CDRP Community Safety Strategy.

Q: Did your project engage schools, Pupil Referral Units and/or Family Intervention Projects? if so please provided details below including how and details of the impact of engaging these partners?

Q: Please describe how local NHS partners have been engaged in your project's partnership.

Q: Were any strategic partnerships involved in the identification and need for your project and/or involved in supporting its delivery? If so, please provide details below.

Q: Question four of section one of this application form asks for an indication of which hallmarks of effective practice your project demonstrates. If you have ticked the more than one box please provide details here of which hallmarks your project demonstrates and how.

Q: Did you engage third sector bodies in your project? If so, please provide details of why, how and any benefits your project received as a consequence of engaging the third sector. If not please provide reasons below.

Q: Did you use any anti-social behaviour tools or powers? If so please say which ones you used and how you used them

Q: How did you secure funding for your project and which funding did your project utilise?

Q: Specifically, did your project receive any funding from Youth Crime Action Plan?

Q: How have you been able to evaluate your project and assess the Value for Money it offers?

Q: Who do you think would have a direct interest in learning about your project? Please list them below.

Q: Did your project overcome any barriers that someone setting up a similar project may wish to consider? We are particularly interested in how you identified or overcame barriers to effective co-operation horizontally between different partners or agencies.

Q: Drawing on your experience what would you do differently next time?

Q: Has your project already been formally recognised for its achievements? Has it been referred to positively in the CAA or other assessment of any of the partner bodies? If so please provide details below of how and when.

Q: How has your project considered how it can contribute to improving health outcomes?

Q: What specific improvements do you expect to achieve in health outcomes?

Q: Please describe how you will monitor your project's contribution to improving health outcomes.

Q: How do you expect your project's contribution to improving health outcomes¹ to be sustained beyond 2010?

Q: What is your partnership doing differently in order to achieve positive outcomes for offenders through Integrated Offender Management?

Q: How have you been able to measure a reduction in re-offending by offenders prioritised through Integrated Offender Management?

Q: Has a local problem profile of offenders and crime been conducted to ensure the right offenders are being prioritised?