



REPORT TO: CRIME & DISORDER (O&S) COMMITTEE

DATE: 7 OCTOBER 2010

REPORT OF THE: HEAD OF TRANSFORMATION
CLARE SLATER

TITLE OF REPORT: FUTURE ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE CRIME AND
DISORDER (O&S) COMMITTEE

WARDS AFFECTED: ALL

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 To present members of the committee with options for the future operation of the Crime and Disorder Committee

2.0 RECOMMENDATION

2.1 That members of the committee:

- (i) Agree their preferred option for involving the Police Authority in the work of the Crime and Disorder Committee; and
- (ii) Agree the reporting format and a schedule for performance information relating to Crime and Disorder.

3.0 REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION

3.1 The Crime and Disorder (Overview and Scrutiny) Regulations 2009 are attached at annex A. These cover the following areas:

- co- option
- frequency
- information
- attendance
- reports and recommendations

This committee has decided how it wishes to operate to meet most of these requirements however there are two outstanding items to be resolved in relation to co-option of members from responsible authorities, and the format and frequency of the information it wishes to receive. The recommendations made in relation to these two issues will enable the committee to fulfill the requirements placed upon the Council by these regulations.

4.0 SIGNIFICANT RISKS

4.1 There is a risk that the Council could fail to meet its duties in relation to the overview and scrutiny of Crime and Disorder matters in Ryedale, this risk can be mitigated by fulfilling the requirements laid down in the regulations. The minimum action required

to meet these requirements is that the Crime and Disorder Committee meets at least annually to discuss matters relating to the performance of the Crime and Disorder Partnership.

REPORT

5.0 BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION

5.1 Councils were given new powers in relation to the Overview and Scrutiny of Crime and Disorder by sections 19 and 20 of the Police and Justice Act 2006 ('the Act') – as amended by section 126 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007. There have also been regulations passed under section 20 of the Police and Justice Act. These provisions provide local authorities with a framework for the development of an ongoing relationship between Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRP's) and scrutiny bodies.

5.2 The powers this scrutiny committee has in relation to Crime and Disorder are:

- to scrutinise how the partnership members are discharging their crime and disorder functions;
- to require information to be provided by partners, and require attendance at meetings;
- to require partners (responsible authorities and the co-operating partners) to respond to reports within 28 days, and 'have regard' to recommendations.

These new powers have been integrated into the Councils' existing arrangements for overview and scrutiny.

5.3 In order to identify and deliver on the priorities that matter the most to local communities, CDRPs are required to carry out a number of main tasks. These include:

- preparing an annual strategic assessment (The Joint Strategic Intelligence Assessment). This is a document identifying the crime and community safety priorities in the area, through analysis of information provided by partner agencies and the community.
- producing a partnership plan (the Safer Ryedale Partnership Plan), laying out the approach for addressing those priorities;
- undertaking community consultation and engagement on crime and disorder issues; and
- Sharing information among the responsible authorities within the CDRP (Safer Ryedale Partnership).

6.0 POLICY CONTEXT

6.1 The Crime and Disorder (Overview and Scrutiny) Regulations 2009 are attached at annex A.

7.0 CONSULTATION

7.1 The Safer Ryedale Partnership Plan is developed following a programme of community engagement. As a result the plan reflects the community's priorities for the work of the Safer Ryedale Partnership.

8.0 REPORT DETAILS

8.1 The North Yorkshire Police Authority has recommended to all the District Councils in North Yorkshire that each Council should co-opt a member of the Police Authority onto the committee to act in the role as expert advisor on any matters relating to the performance of the police. This request is in line with in line with the

recommendations made in the statutory guidance, the relevant extracts are included at annex B

8.2 Members have been asked to decide on their preferred option for involving the Police Authority. By implication this would become the preferred approach to involving any other of the responsible authorities or co-operating bodies, in the work of the Crime and Disorder (Overview and Scrutiny) Committee.

8.3 The responsible authorities in relation to Crime and Disorder are

- The council
- The police force
- The police authority
- The fire and rescue authority
- The primary care trust

The responsible authorities have a duty to work in co-operation with the cooperating bodies who are:

- parish councils
- NHS Trusts
- NHS Foundation Trusts
- proprietors of independent schools and governing bodies of an institution within the further education sector.
- Probation authorities (may soon become a responsible authority)

8.4 The scrutiny committee dealing with crime and disorder issues can choose to co-opt additional people to become part of the committee. These could be long-term co-options, or for the purpose of a specific review. The Crime and Disorder (Overview and Scrutiny) Regulations 2009 allow the designated committee to co-opt people and to give them voting rights. There should not be a greater number of these co-optees than the number of councillors voted onto the committee by the council.

8.4 The LGA guidance on effective scrutiny of Crime and Disorder states:

‘The Association of Police Authorities has urged councils to consider co-option of a member of the police authority onto the scrutiny committee. Openness, dialogue, and clarity of function with the police authority are vital, but bear in mind there are other ways in which these could be achieved, not only co-option. Different voices can be heard in scrutiny as expert advisors, observers, through planned consultation and public meetings of various kinds, visits, and inviting witnesses to scrutiny hearings.’

Source: LGA publication, Crime watch - effective scrutiny of police and crime October 2009

8.5 **Options:**

The requirement to co-opt a member of the Police Authority onto the Ryedale Crime and Disorder Committee was discussed at the previous meeting of this committee. The three options recommended in the statutory guidance are:

1. One member of the Crime and Disorder Committee should be a member of the Police Authority - An option for counties and unitary councils only.
2. Appoint as a non-voting expert advisor to attend the committee only when Police or Crime and Disorder matters are being discussed
3. Appoint as above but as a voting member – this would require a change to the Councils constitution.

8.6 **Reporting schedule:**

The Police Authority has offered to prepare and present performance reports for policing in Ryedale. An example of the reports which could be considered are attached at annex C and include:

- **Safer Neighbourhoods Team priorities and progress**, twice a year in

September and April

- **Policing pledge priorities and progress**, twice a year in September and April. Reports attached for illustration of content and format at annex C.

Other reports which could be considered by the Committee on request are as follows:

- **Safer Ryedale Partnership Plan progress** reporting – mid year performance annually in September and annual performance in April
- **Draft Safer Ryedale Partnership Plan** – annually for comments in February.
- **Joint Strategic Intelligence Assessment** – Briefing on findings and how these inform Safer Ryedale Partnership Plan and Neighbourhood Policing Priorities
- **Final Safer Ryedale Partnership Plan**, including priorities and targets, annually in April.

8.7 The reporting organisation should be invited to present each of these reports to the committee and respond to any questions. The reporting organisations would be the Safer Ryedale Partnership for their plan and the police and police authority for the Safer Neighbourhoods Team priorities and progress and Policing Pledge priorities and progress.

9.0 IMPLICATIONS

9.1 The following implications have been identified:

- a) Financial
None identified
- b) Legal
Meeting the requirement of the regulations
- c) Other (Equalities, Staffing, Planning, Health & Safety, Environmental, Crime & Disorder)
None at this stage other than those under legal above for community safety

Clare Slater
Head of Transformation

Author: Clare Slater, Head of Transformation
Telephone No: 01653 600666 ext: 347
E-Mail Address: clare.slater@ryedale.gov.uk

Background Papers:
Statutory guidance

Background Papers are available for inspection at:
Excerpts attached to this report

STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS
2009 No. 942
CRIMINAL LAW, ENGLAND AND WALES

The Crime and Disorder (Overview and Scrutiny)
Regulations 2009

Made 6th April 2009

Laid before Parliament 8th April 2009

Coming into force in accordance with regulation 1(2)

The Secretary of State makes the following Regulations in exercise of the powers conferred by section 20(3) and (4) of the Police and Justice Act 2006⁽¹⁾.

In accordance with section 20(4) of that Act, the Secretary of State has consulted with the Welsh Ministers⁽²⁾ regarding the provisions in relation to local authorities in Wales.

Citation and commencement

1.—(1) These Regulations may be cited as the Crime and Disorder (Overview and Scrutiny) Regulations 2009.

(2) These Regulations shall come into force in respect of local authorities in England on 30th April 2009 and in respect of local authorities in Wales on 1st October 2009.

Interpretation

2. In these Regulations—

“2006 Act” means the Police and Justice Act 2006;

“depersonalised information” means information which does not constitute personal data within the meaning of the Data Protection Act 1998⁽³⁾.

Co-opting of additional members

3.—(1) The crime and disorder committee of a local authority may co-opt additional members to serve on the committee subject to paragraphs (2), (3), (4) and (5).

(2) A person co-opted to serve on a crime and disorder committee shall not be entitled to vote on any particular matter, unless the committee so determines.

(3) A co-opted person’s membership may be limited to the exercise of the committee’s powers in relation to a particular matter or type of matter.

(4) A crime and disorder committee shall only co-opt a person to serve on the committee who—

(a) is an employee, officer or member of a responsible authority or of a co-operating person or body; and

(b) is not a member of the executive of the committee’s local authority (or authorities).

(5) The membership of a person co-opted to serve on a crime and disorder committee may be withdrawn at any time by the committee.

Frequency of meetings

4. A crime and disorder committee shall meet to review or scrutinise decisions made, or other action taken, in connection with the discharge by the responsible authorities of their crime and disorder functions as the committee considers appropriate but no less than once in every twelve month period.

Information

5.—(1) Where a crime and disorder committee makes a request in writing for information, as defined in section 20(6A) of the 2006 Act(4), to the responsible authorities or the co-operating persons or bodies, the authorities, or persons or bodies (as applicable) must provide such information in accordance with paragraphs (2) and (3).

(2) The information referred to in paragraph (1) must be provided no later than the date indicated in the request save that if some or all of the information cannot reasonably be provided on such date, that information must be provided as soon as reasonably possible.

(3) The information referred to in paragraph (1)—

(a) shall be depersonalised information, unless (subject to sub-paragraph (b)) the identification of an individual is necessary or appropriate in order to enable the crime and disorder committee to properly exercise its powers; and

(b) shall not include information that would be reasonably likely to prejudice legal proceedings or current or future operations of the responsible authorities, whether acting together or individually, or of the co-operating persons or bodies.

Attendance at committee meetings

6.—(1) Subject to paragraph (2), a crime and disorder committee may require the attendance before it of an officer or employee of a responsible authority or of a co-operating person or body in order to answer questions.

(2) The crime and disorder committee may not require a person to attend in accordance with paragraph (1) unless reasonable notice of the intended date of attendance has been given to that person.

Reports and recommendations

7. Where a crime and disorder committee makes a report or recommendations to a responsible authority or to a co-operating person or body in accordance with section 19(8)(b) of the 2006 Act, the responses to such report or recommendations of each relevant authority, body or person shall be—

(a) in writing; and

(b) submitted to the crime and disorder committee within a period of 28 days from the date of the report or recommendations or, if this is not reasonably possible, as soon as reasonably possible thereafter.

Vernon Coaker
Minister of State
Home Office

EXPLANATORY NOTE

(This note is not part of the Regulations)

These Regulations are made under section 20(3) (in respect of local authorities in England) and 20(4) (in respect of local authorities in Wales) of the Police and Justice Act 2006. The Regulations supplement the provisions in section 19 of that Act by making provision for the exercise of powers by crime and disorder committees of local authorities.

Regulation 3 provides that crime and disorder committees may co-opt additional members from those persons and bodies who are responsible authorities within the meaning of section 5 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, and from those persons and bodies with whom the responsible authorities have a duty to co-operate under section 5(2) of that Act (the “co-operating persons and bodies”) subject to the provisions set out in that regulation.

Regulation 4 provides that a crime and disorder committee shall meet to review or scrutinise decisions made, or other action taken, in connection with the discharge by the responsible authorities of their crime and disorder functions, no less than once in every twelve month period.

Regulation 5 provides that responsible authorities or co-operating persons or bodies must provide such information as is requested of them by the crime and disorder committee, subject to the provisions in that regulation.

Regulation 6 provides that a crime and disorder committee may require the attendance before it of a representative of a responsible authority or of a co-operating person or body in order to answer questions, subject to the provisions in that regulation.

Regulation 7 provides that where a crime and disorder committee makes a report or recommendations to responsible authorities or co-operating persons or bodies in accordance with section 19(8)(b) of the Police and Justice Act 2006, the responses to such report or recommendations of each relevant authority, body or person shall be in writing and within 28 days of the date of the report or recommendations or, if this is not reasonably possible, as soon as reasonably possible thereafter.

(1)

[2006, c. 48](#). Section 20 has been amended by section 121 and has been prospectively amended by sections 126 and 241, and part 6 of Schedule 18 to the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act [2007 \(c. 28\)](#).

(2)

The functions of the National Assembly for Wales were transferred to the Welsh Ministers by virtue of paragraph 30 of Schedule 11 to the Government of Wales Act [2006 \(c.32\)](#).

(3)

[2008 c.29](#).

(4)

Section 20(6A) was inserted by section 121(2) of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act [2007 \(c. 28\)](#).

Section 3.4

Co-option

The regulations allow crime and disorder committees to co-opt additional members to serve on the committee. These co-optees can be specialists in particular areas and can bring great value and expertise to the committee's work. Members can be co-opted in accordance with the Regulations, which allow a committee to co-opt additional persons provided that they are an employee, officer or member of a responsible authority or of a co-operating person or body and are not a member of the executive of the local authority.

The committee can decide whether they should have the right to vote. However, the decision to allow them to vote should be taken in accordance with any scheme in place under Schedule 1 to the Local Government Act 2000. Membership can be limited to membership in respect of certain issues only. The council should take care to clarify the role of such a co-optee, who may be expected, as part of the committee, to hold his or her own organisation to account.

There is also a general power to include additional non voting members under section 21(10) LGA and paragraph 5 of Schedule 8 to the Police Justice Act.

Co-option and Schedule 1 to the Local Government Act 2000

Under Schedule 1 of the Local Government Act 2000, councils can put in place a formal scheme (similar to the council's scheme of delegations) to allow a co-opted member to have full voting rights. If you already have a scheme, your co-option plans for community safety must comply with it. Local authorities may prefer ask people [to contribute informally to small task and finish groups or to participate as non-voting members, rather than as full voting members of committees, to ensure that co-optees' work and contribution is focused on areas where they can add most value. So the council and its partners may agree that, although co-option to a committee might be appropriate, the co-optee should not have voting rights.

Co-option and police authorities

Police authorities occupy a unique position within the landscape of community safety partnerships. They have a clear, statutory role to hold to account the police. In this context, it is vital that local authorities' community safety scrutiny compliments this role. Local authorities should, in all instances, presume that the police authority should play an active part at committee when community safety matters are being discussed – and particularly when the police are to be present.

Local authorities should take the following steps to involve police authorities in work undertaken by their committees.

Option 1

One member of the crime and disorder committee should be a member of the police authority. We envisage this being the approach that will be adopted by most (but not necessarily all) counties and unitaries. However, there are a number of circumstances where this will not be possible. In many authorities (unitaries, counties and districts alike) there may be no member appropriate to sit on the committee in this capacity. The principal reasons would be:

- If the relevant local authority representative on the police authority is a member of the executive; or
- If the local authority has no direct member representation on the police authority. There are many areas for which this will be the case, given that most police authorities cover large areas but only have 9 local councillor members.

Option 2

The second option is for all other circumstances – covering most districts, and those counties and unitaries where having a police authority member on the committee will not be possible. In these circumstances, a member of the police authority should be issued with a standing invitation to attend the committee as an “expert adviser”. Ideally this would be a police authority member, but subject to local agreement there may be some circumstances, and meetings, where a police authority officer would be more appropriate. For example, care will need to be taken when inviting police authority members to attend when they are also councillors.

Such an advisor would not be a formal member of the committee, but would be able to participate in committee discussion as an expert witness. Steps should also be taken to ensure that, where appropriate, the police authority have a direct input into the delivery of task and finish reviews that involve the police. The level of involvement in such work that is appropriate can be decided between the police authority and the local authority, the authorities delivering the work.

Agreement over these issues should – as we suggested at the beginning of this section – form part of a protocol between the local authority and its partners. This will allow for local differences, and for agreement over further methods of engagement and involvement – the sharing of work programmes and delivery of joint work pertaining to the police, for example.

The vital thing to remember is that clear and sustained engagement between the police authority and the local authority, as equals, will be necessary to make sure that their roles complement each other. This goes beyond attendance at committee, which should be treated as only one element of this engagement.

These arrangements, and the unique relationship which is necessary between councils and police authorities, should not divert scrutiny bodies or their partners from the fact that the scrutiny of community safety is about much more than the police force and their activities, as we made clear in earlier sections.

Option 3

The third option would be for committees to consider co-opting a police authority member onto the committee when policing matters are being considered, and it would be for the police authority to decide the most appropriate member to appoint – this can be an independent or councillor member. This would provide a more direct link between the police authority and overview and scrutiny committee and would be particularly relevant if the committee is considering matters directly relevant to policing.

North Yorkshire Police Force Policing Pledge and Ryedale District Performance Report / Crime Statistics – July 2010

The Policing Pledge sets ten areas of service standards including service fields such as answering calls promptly to how local people can have a say over how their neighbourhood is policed. It is envisaged this will improve community confidence and community engagement in local service delivery

The following is a summary comparison of North Yorkshire Police Force Policing Pledge and Ryedale District Performance for July 2010. The report only compares those areas where there is a direct comparison for the Force and Ryedale District.

NB. No comparison information is available for pledges 4, 7 and 10

Pledge 1: Always treat you fairly with dignity and respect ensuring you have fair access to our services at a time that is reasonable and suitable for you					Ryedale	Green
					Force	Amber
Indicator		Jul-10	Jul-09	Change	Comparison to 2009/10 Average	Comment
The % of victims who were satisfied with how easy it was to contact someone who could assist them?	R	88.5	88.4	-0.1%	90%	Decrease
	F	92.6	93.1	-0.5	93%	Decrease
The % of victims who were satisfied with the way they were treated by the police officers and staff that dealt with them	R	92.7 %	88.6%	+4.1 %	90%	Increase
	F	93.7	92.9	-0.8	93%	Increase

Overall Comment: Ryedale higher performance than the Force (Green compared to Amber)

The performance by Ryedale has increased for one indicator when comparing July 2009 to July 2010 with the largest increase in performance being Ryedale regarding the % of victims who were satisfied with the way they were treated by the police officers and staff that dealt with them.

Pledge 2: Provide you with information so you know who your dedicated Safer Neighbourhood Policing Team is, where they are based, how to contact them and how to work with them					Ryedale	Amber
					Force	Amber
Indicator		Jul-10	Jul -09	Change	Comparison to 2009/10 Average	Comment
The % of people who are aware of their Safer Neighbourhood Team	R	41.5%	53.0%	-11.5	47%	Large Decrease
	F	42.8%	55.5%	-12.7	51%	Decrease
The % of people who know how to contact their Safer Neighbourhood Team	R	40.5%	68.0%	-27.5	47%	Large Decrease
	F	42.8%	46.5%	- 3.7	43%	Decrease

Overall Comment: Ryedale same performance as the Force (Both on Amber)

The performance by Ryedale and the Force has decreased for the first indicator when comparing July 2009 to July 2010 with the largest decrease in performance being for Ryedale regarding the % of people who know how to contact their Safer Neighbourhood Team of -27.5%.

Pledge 3: Ensure your Safer Neighbourhood Team and other police patrols are visible and on your patch at times when they will be most effective and when you tell us you most need them. We will ensure your team are not taken away from neighbourhood business more than is absolutely necessary. They will spend at least 80% of their time visibly working in your neighbourhood, tackling your priorities. Staff turnover will be minimized					Ryedale	Green
					Force	Green
Indicator		Jul -10	Jul -09	Change	Comparison to 2009/10 Average	Comment
% of people who never see a police officer or PCSO patrolling their area.	R	47.4	46.5	+0.9	46%	Increase
	F	44.1	43.6	+0.5%	44%	Increase

Overall comment: Ryedale same performance as the Force (Both on Green)

The performance by the force for this indicator is higher than districts implying other areas are within the County and City of York are performing at a lower level.

Pledge 5: Aim to answer 999 calls within 10 seconds deploying to emergencies immediately giving an estimated time of arrival, getting to you safely, and as quickly as possible. In urban areas, we will aim to get to you within [15] minutes and in rural areas within [20] minutes.					Ryedale	Green
					Force	Green
Indicator		Jul - 10	Jul - 09	Change	Comparison to 2009/10 Average	Comment
% of 'Immediate Urban' incidents attended within 15 minutes	R	81%	80.4%	+0.6%	79%	Increase
	F	78.6%	79%	-0.4%	78%	Decrease
% of 'Immediate Rural' incidents attended within 20 minutes	R	73.3%	71.2%	+2.1%	69%	Increase
	F	75.5%	74.3%	1.2%	73%	Increase
Amount of time spent at Call Handling stage taking initial details (minutes)	R	1.3	1.5	-0.2	1	
	F	1.3	1.3	0.0	1	
Amount of time taken at Dispatch stage before a resource is proceeded (minutes)	R	4.0	6.0	-2	5	
	F	4.2	4.3	-0.1	5	

Overall comment: Ryedale same performance as the Force (Both on Green)

The performance for Ryedale and the Force had increased generally for all indicators when comparing July 2009 to July 2010.

Pledge 6: Answer all non-emergency calls promptly. If attendance is needed, send a patrol giving you an estimated time of arrival and: If you are vulnerable/upset or calling about an issue that we have agreed with your community will be a neighbourhood priority and attendance is required, we will aim to be with you within 60 mins. Alternatively, if appropriate, we will make an appointment to see you at a time that fits in with your life and within 48 hours. If agreed that attendance is not necessary we will give you advice, answer your questions and / or put you in touch with someone who can help.					Ryedale	Green
					Force	Green
Indicator		Jul 10	Jul 09	Change	Comparison to 2009/10 Average	Comment
% of Incidents attended within 60 minutes (Vulnerable)	R	63.7%	56.7%	+8%	59%	Increase
	F	65.3%	61.0%	+4%	62%	Increase
% of Incidents attended within 60 minutes (Priority)	R	84.3%	60.0%	+24%	75%	Increase
	F	79.0%	76.6%	+2%	79%	Increase

Overall comment: Ryedale same performance as the Force (Both on Green)

Pledge 8: Provide monthly updates on progress, and on local crime and policing issues. This will include the provision of crime maps, information on specific crimes and what happened to those brought to justice, details of what action we and our partners are taking to make your neighbourhood safer and information on how your force is performing.					Ryedale	Green
					Force	Green
Indicator		June 10	June 09	Change	Comparison to 2009/10 Average	Comment
% of people who feel well informed about what the police have been doing over the last 12 months	R	65.0%	68.4%	-3%	45%	Decrease
	F	63.3%	44.9%	+18%	44%	Increase
% of people who think that the police keep people informed about what they are doing to tackle local crime and ASB Selby	R	50.0%	50.2%	0%	50%	Decrease
	F	48.8%	48.4%	0%	48%	Decrease

Overall comment: Ryedale same performance as the Force (Both on Green)

The performance for the % of people who feel well informed about what the police have been doing over the last 12 months has increased for the Force and Decreased Ryedale when comparing July 2010 with July 2009. Ryedale remains above the force current outturns.

Pledge 9: If you have been a victim of crime agree with you how often you would like to be kept informed of progress in your case and for how long. You have the right to be kept informed at least every month if you wish and for as long as is reasonable.					Ryedale	Green
					Force	Green
Indicator		June 10	June 09	Change	Comparison to 2009/10 Average	Comment
% victims who were provided with progress updates without asking	R	51.4%	59.1%	-8%	58%	Decrease
	F	54.6%	47.8%	-7%	52%	Decrease
The % of victims who were satisfied with how they were kept informed of progress	R	58.0%	55.0%	-4%	59%	Decrease
	F	67.0%	63.0%	-4%	64%	Decrease

Overall comment: Ryedale lower performance than the Force

The performance for the % victims who were provided with progress updates without asking has decreased for both the Force and Ryedale when comparing July 2010 with July 2009.

The performance for the % of victims who were satisfied with how they were kept informed of progress when comparing July 2010 with July 2009 has decreased for Ryedale and the Force by 4%

Crime Rates Ryedale District

The average number of burglaries in this area has increased from 9.7 to 14.7 (51.7%) (compared to the same three month period last year) . The level of Burglary in this area is above average (compared with the rest of North Yorkshire)				
	June	July	Aug	Average
2009	7	13	9	9.7
2010	14	13	17	14.7
The average number of robberies in this area has increased from 0 to 0.3 (100%) (compared to the same three month period last year). The level of Robbery in this area is average (compared with the rest of North Yorkshire)				
	June	July	Aug	Average
2009	0	0	0	0

2010	1	0	0	0.3
The average number of vehicle crimes in this area has increased from 6 to 7.7 (27.8%) (compared to the same three month period last year). The level of Vehicle crime in this area is average (compared with the rest of North Yorkshire)				
	June	July	Aug	Average
2009	5	4	9	6
2010	4	12	7	7.7
The average number of violent crimes in this area has decreased from 14 to 11.3 (19%) (compared to the same three month period last year). The level of Violence in this area is average (compared with the rest of North Yorkshire)				
	June	July	Aug	Average
2009	13	14	15	14
2010	14	7	13	11.3
The average number of anti-social behaviour incidents in this area has decreased from 89.3 to 72 (19.4%) (compared to the same three month period last year). The level of Anti-social behaviour in this area is average (compared with the rest of North Yorkshire)				
	June	July	Aug	Average
2009	75	80	113	89.3
2010	55	91	70	72

All Crime – Ryedale District

The average number of crimes in this area has increased from 70 to 76 (8.6%) (compared to the same three month period last year)				
	June	July	Aug	Average
2009	61	72	77	70
2010	60	88	80	76

Safer Neighbourhood Team Priority Settings

Recommendations

Members are invited to consider and comment on the priorities, past and present that have been set for this district.

Summary

This report summarises the North Yorkshire Police, Safer Neighbourhood Teams Priority Settings.

Background

As part of the Policing Pledge and the national agenda for Safer Neighbourhoods, every quarter the Safer Neighbourhood Teams identify three key policing priorities for an inspector led area, this is done in consultation with the local community.

Introduction

North Yorkshire Safer Neighbourhood Teams must to target community safety issues that matter most to the public and focus resources to ensure positive community outcomes. Safer Neighbourhood Priority settings identify concerns raised by the residents in the area, enabling local consultation to influence policing when tackling local issues. Issues that are not resolved within the quartile time span are subsequently rolled forward to the next quartile until successfully actioned.

Safer Neighbourhood Priorities

See attached Table A

Background Papers

Safer Ryedale Partnership Plan

Table A

Safer Neighbourhood Area	Quarter 1 09/10	Quarter 2 09/10	Quarter 3 09/10	Quarter 4 09/10	Quarter 1 10/11	Quarter 2 10/11	Priority Status
	Priorities	Priorities	Priorities	Priorities	Priorities	Priorities	
Ryedale	1. Rowdy inconsiderate behaviour in Scotts Hill and Blazely Lane, Norton	1. Youth-related ASB - school children travelling on school transport	1. ASB by school children on buses in the Malton & Norton areas	1. ASB by school children on buses in the Malton & Norton areas	1. ASB and crime in St Peters St, Norton	1. ASB and crime in St Peters St, Norton	Priority rolled over once In place over 6 months
	2. Criminal Damage - graffiti caused by youths with spray paint cans to wooden fences and vehicles in Malton Town	2. Anti-social vehicle use by youths in Wentworth Street Car Park	2. Anti-social vehicle use in and around Wentworth Sreet car park in Malton	2. Anti-social vehicle use in and around Wentworth Sreet car park in Malton	2. Anti-social vehicle use in and around Wentworth Sreet car park in Malton	2. Anti-social vehicle use in and around Wentworth Sreet car park in Malton	Priority rolled over five times In place one year and three month
	3. Rowdy inconsiderate behaviour in Market Court, Eastgate Sq and Eastgate car park, Pickering	3. Youth and alcohol related rowdy inconsiderate behaviour in Market Court, Eastgate Sq and Eastgate car park, Pickering	3. ASB & crime in Eastgate car park, Market Court and Eastgate Sq , Pickering	3. ASB & crime in Eastgate car park, Market Court and Eastgate Sq , Pickering	3. Anti Social Behaviour linked to under age consumption of alcohol in Pickering	3. Anti Social Behaviour linked to under age consumption of alcohol in Pickering	Priority rolled over once In place over 6 months