Purpose of this report

1. As part of the Council Savings Programme 2014-2020 the budget for the Anti-social Behaviour and Community Safety Team (ASB Team) is to be reduced by £277k per annum (£142k from 1 April 2016; and £135k from 1 April 2017). This will reduce the service budget from £1,078,400 to £801,400 (all figures rounded to nearest £100 and may not add exactly).

2. This matter was considered by the Communities Committee in January 2015 following public consultation. At that time the decision was taken to defer implementation of a decision for a year. The savings are now scheduled to be implemented from 01 October 2016.

3. Due to the change to implementation dates and the passage of time since the previous public consultation it is necessary to conduct a further public consultation on the options available. This document reflects the results of the previous exercise and the recommendation to Communities Committee in January 2015 following that consultation.

4. The current preferred option for achieving the required level of saving is to withdraw the funding paid to the Police for the provision of 9 additional Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs) in South Gloucestershire.

Anti-social Behaviour & and Community Safety Service

5. The Anti-social Behaviour & and Community Safety service brings together the support for community safety related functions including:
   - Anti-social Behaviour
   - Domestic Abuse and Hate Crime
   - Community Safety CCTV

6. While the Police respond to immediate and urgent issues of crime or anti-social behaviour, the Council’s team work over a period of time with victims; perpetrators; and communities in order to prevent reoccurrence and future anti-social behaviour. The team also co-ordinates and supports the work of other agencies (such as social landlords), equipping them to deal directly with ASB carried out by their tenants etc; and leads on securing essential early intervention and enforcement action within the local area.
7. The Anti-Social Behaviour element of the service operates on a geographical basis with Case Officers taking the lead on work in their areas including the preparation and application for Acceptable Behaviour Contracts (ABCs) and use of appropriate tools and powers as outlined in the ASB Crime and Policing Act 2014. This area also includes responsibility for management and monitoring of the Council’s Taxi Marshalls.

8. The Community Safety Function has two elements.
   i. A community safety CCTV function responsible for the Council’s Community Safety CCTV Cameras, the review suite at Kingswood and the monitoring contract with Bristol City Council.
   ii. The second element comprises 2.6 FTE staff working on a flexible project basis. They lead on the Domestic Abuse and Hate Crime support and manage significant contracts for refuge provision and floating perpetrator support. The Community Safety Officers are flexible and designed to be able to respond to new and emerging, and un-resourced, issues of community safety need in our communities. Current high profile areas that are relevant include trafficking and human slavery.

   This budget also pays for 9 extra PCSOs in South Gloucestershire funded by the Council.

9. The total service currently comprises 8.6 (FTE) staff and has an annual budget of £1,078,400 direct costs made up as follows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Net budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staffing costs</td>
<td>£320,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Funding (Including PCSO contracts)</td>
<td>£701,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies and Services</td>
<td>£56,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£1,078,400</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. The current staffing structure is as follows:

```
  Strong, Safer Communities Manager
    ASB & Community Safety Team Leader HAY 4
      CCTV Officer HAY 7
      Senior ASB Case Officer HAY 6 *
      Senior Community Safety Project Officer HAY 8 *
        ASB Case Officers 2 fte HAY 7
        ASB Technical Support Officer HAY 10
        Community Safety Support Officer HAY 10 *
          Community Safety Project Officer 0.6 fte HAY 7 *
```

11. The main subject areas of work delivered or commissioned by the team, together with an estimate of staff involvement and of the cost of that time is shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Estimated costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding of PCSOs</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>£287,400</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Abuse Refuge</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>£162,200</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Funding of PCSOs**: The Community Safety Budget currently funds 9 PCSOs working in South Gloucestershire.
- This allocation is 9 more than the Police believe is necessary under their target operating model.

- **Domestic Abuse Refuge Provision**: Funding of domestic abuse refuge through a contracted provider.
- This refuge currently utilises 16 units of accommodation in three separate properties in South Gloucestershire. One property is owned by the Council (4 units and for women only) the other two by a housing association (6 units in each able to accommodate women and their children).
- The three properties support over 60 high risk victims and their children per year who have suffered domestic abuse and who need to move away from their homes to prevent further domestic violence.
- Their stay in the properties is aimed to be on a short term temporary basis until victims are ready to move on.
- The helpline also deals with over 1500 calls per annum.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Estimated costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| High Risk Floating Support     | • Funding of rehabilitation support for ~ 10 high level sex offenders convicted through the courts. Support is delivered by external contractor.  
  • Re-offending rates for these offenders are 18% or less, compared the national reoffending rate of 66%. The number of serious sexual assaults against South Gloucestershire residents prevented through this service is therefore significantly reduced. | £28,500                              |
| Provision of Taxi Marshalls     | • Funding of Street Marshalls in Kingswood and Chipping Sodbury who prevent crime and violence against people leaving pubs and clubs on Friday and Saturday night.  
  • Facilitate the use of Taxis to move people away from flash points in the night time economy  
  • Service is delivered by external contractor following tender. | £31,000                              |
| Community Safety Domestic Abuse Support | • Co-ordination of domestic abuse Multi Agency Risk Assessment Conference (MARAC) which works with over 300 of the most high risk and vulnerable victims to prevent further abuse and violence, protecting adults and children.  
  • Working with Partners and other agencies to agree and implement policies and procedures including a contribution to Sexual exploitation; Female Genital Mutilation.  
  • Supporting statutory Domestic Homicide Reviews which are required by legislation. | 2 FTE  
  £64,700  
  Project Costs of  
  £14,900  
  Provision of housing for DA victims £23,000  
  Contribution toward Independent Domestic Violence Advisor of £18,000 |
| Community Safety Hate Crime     | • Provide a coordination role for identification of high risk victims of hate crime and prejudice motivated incident; monitoring and reviewing outcomes for those individuals  
  • Organise and run the process for support high risk victims of hate crime (The case work itself is separately funded through a three year grant and through the Police and Crime Commissioner.)  
  • Tension monitoring  
  • Working with communities to identify emerging trends and co-ordinate responses of agencies to respond to issues | 0.6 FTE  
  £20,000  
  Project Costs of  
  £3,700 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Estimated costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Community Safety CCTV | • Ensuring that the Council’s Community Safety CCTV service operates effectively and efficiently within legal requirements and best practice.  
• Contract payment to Bristol City Council who monitor the Community Safety CCTV cameras on the Council’s behalf.  
• The Council’s Community Safety CCTV service includes 44 permanently mounted cameras in town centres and strategic locations;  
• Police are called to ~ 120 incidents a year identified through the monitoring, resulting in ~ 25 prosecutions and 15 cautions as well as preventing incidents escalating.  
• Mobile cameras for recording Anti-Social Behaviour; and covert cameras for protecting vulnerable individuals.  
• Technical advice to other services within Environment and Community Services; and to provide technical advice in responding to planning applications where appropriate. | 1 FTE  
£38,600  
£131,600 for property, maintenance, servicing, and including a 24hr monitoring contract with Bristol City Council (£70,000) |
| ASB Support | • Identification of vulnerable victims and associated victim Support  
• Tackling ASB through use of prevention, early intervention and enforcement Action.  
• Co-ordinating other agencies to deal with ASB  
• Training for professionals  
• Agreeing and implementing partnership policies and procedures to ensure delivery against PCC and S&S targets  
• The Strategic Assessment of Crime and Disorder in 2014 showed ASB has increased for the first time in six years, with 8,724 reports of ASB to the Police and the Council’s ASB team. | 5 fte staff  
£210,000 Staffing costs  
Project costs of £37,000 |

**Identified Options**

12. Following previous public consultation a range of options for reducing the cost of the service have been identified.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Estimated saving (rounded to nearest £100)</th>
<th>Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding of PCSOs</td>
<td>a) Continue funding 9 PCSOs.</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>• This figure includes current 33% match funding from the PCC which she has agreed to continue to provide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Fund 6 PCSOs.</td>
<td>£85,400</td>
<td>• This figure includes current 33% match funding from the PCC which she has agreed to continue to provide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Further £191,600 savings will need to be met from other service areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Fund 3 PCSOs.</td>
<td>£95,800</td>
<td>• This figure includes current 33% match funding from the PCC which she has agreed to continue to provide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Level of savings not made here (£181,200) will need to be met from other service areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) Terminate all funding for PCSOs</td>
<td>£287,400</td>
<td>• The Police Target Operating Model (TOM) suggests that there should be 40 PCSOs provided without these 9 PCSOs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The Police will continue to provide 40 PCSOs in South Gloucestershire under the new TOM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• This will meet the full savings target and make a contribution of £10,400 to other service delivery or savings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding of domestic abuse refuge</td>
<td>a) Continue funding at current level</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>• Currently fund service provision across three properties (4 units, 6 units with children, 6 units with children) in South Gloucestershire one of which is owned by the Council, the other two by Knightstone who have a contract with Survive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Survive run and manage the three properties and support victims and their children through domestic abuse. Stay in the properties is on a temporary basis until victims are ready to move on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Over 60 women and their children are supported a year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Over 1500 helpline calls are dealt with.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Option</td>
<td>Estimated saving (rounded to nearest £100)</td>
<td>Considerations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Funding of domestic abuse refuge          | b) Reduce funding by 4 units        | £54,000                                     | • Level of provision for victims of domestic abuse in South Gloucestershire Council is already significantly below recommended levels. Reduction in level of resource will leave 15 high risk vulnerable victims a year without a safe refuge.  
• This will leave 12 units for parents and children.  
• This option will leave a further £223k per annum saving to be realised elsewhere in the service.                                                                 |
|                                           | c) Reduce funding by 10 units       | £108,000                                    | • Level of provision for victims of domestic abuse in South Gloucestershire Council is already significantly below recommended levels. Reduction in level of resource will leave 38 high risk vulnerable victims (including 23 with children) without a safe refuge.  
• This option will leave a further £169k per annum saving to be realised elsewhere in the service.                                                                                                           |
|                                           | d) Close all domestic violence       | £162,200                                    | • Level of provision for victims of domestic abuse in South Gloucestershire Council is already significantly below recommended levels. Reduction in level of resource will leave 60 high risk vulnerable victims per annum without a safe refuge.  
• There would be no funding to purchase provision outside South Gloucestershire.  
• This option will leave a further £114,800 annum saving to be realised elsewhere in the service.                                                                                                                     |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Estimated saving (rounded to nearest £100)</th>
<th>Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Funding of rehabilitation support for high level sex offenders | a)  Continue to maintain funding at the present level                   | £0                                         | • This is currently the only provision in South Gloucestershire for these highest risk offenders  
• Funding of housing and rehabilitation support for ~ 10 high level sex offenders convicted through the courts.  
• Re-offending rates are 18% or less resulting in fewer victims of the most serious crimes against a national rate for offenders at 66%.  
• This option will leave the full £277k per annum saving to be realised elsewhere in the service.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
|                                               | b)  Cease funding – current level of funding considered lowest level practically possible to maintain the service. | £28,500                                    | • Ceasing funding would leave South Gloucestershire with no dedicated resource to support rehabilitation of these highest risk offenders.  
• Number of serious sexual assaults against South Gloucestershire residents would increase as the service would no longer work with high risk offenders to prevent them.  
• This option will leave £248,500 per annum saving to be realised elsewhere in the service.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| Provision of Street Marshalls                | a)  Continue to fund at current level.                                  | £0                                         | • This option will leave the full £277k per annum saving to be realised elsewhere in the service.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
|                                               | b)  Seek alternative funding. This could be through a levy on providers, or by extending the role of doormen required through licensing policies. | £??                                        | • It may be possible to include this in Licensing Act Fees when locally set fees are introduced. The rules for setting local fees have not yet been published and it may not be legally possible to include these costs here. There is therefore a high risk with this option.  
• This option will leave remaining savings to be realised elsewhere in the service.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Estimated saving (rounded to nearest £100)</th>
<th>Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|      | c)     | £15,000                                    | • Provide Taxi Marshals only in the priority area of Kingswood, where the rate of violence connected with the night time economy is greatest.  
• This option will leave a further £262k per annum saving to be realised elsewhere in the service. |
|      | d)     | £31,000                                    | • This option will leave a further £246k per annum saving to be realised elsewhere in the service. |
| Community Safety Team – Domestic Abuse | a) Continue to fund the service at the current level. | £0 | • This option will leave the full £277k per annum saving to be realised elsewhere in the service. |
|      | b) Remove funding | £120,500 | • This will leave 295 victims at high risk of repeat violence unsupported by the MARAC per annum. Current success rates indicate some 245 of these would experience repeat violence as a consequence of the withdrawal of the service. CAADA expectations are that we should be seeing 400 victims per annum.  
• The MARAC deals with highest risk victims. There is therefore potential for increase in number of Domestic Homicide Reviews (DHRs), which are statutory and costly to support. MARAC is considered to be a best practice model by the home office to risk manage and protect those considered to be high risk of serious harm or death and it may become a statutory function.  
• The team also provides training to professionals on using the national DASH risk assessment, referring to MARAC and also domestic abuse awareness training.  
• This option will leave £156,500 per annum saving to be realised elsewhere in the service. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Estimated saving (rounded to nearest £100)</th>
<th>Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Community Safety Team – Hate Crime| a) Maintain current level of funding.                                   | £0                                          | • This option will leave the full £277k per annum saving to be realised elsewhere in the service.  
• This resource also researches and develop responses to other community safety initiatives such as the current human trafficking and slavery work expected by Govt.                                                                                               |
|                                   | b) Reduce funding and potentially seek funding through external grants | £0                                          | • No known source of external funding at this level available.  
• Risk that appropriate external provider does not bid for work.  
• This option will leave significant further savings to be realised elsewhere in the service.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
|                                   | c) Cease funding                                                       | £23,700                                     | • Victims are not identified at the earliest opportunity and support plans put in place. Could lead to increase in risk of harm to vulnerable victims. Example would be Fiona Pilkington case or closer to home the Ibrahimi case.  
• There is a risk that at times of increased tension within communities there will be a lack of co-ordination between agencies to mitigate any risk.  
• This option will leave a further £253,300 per annum saving to be realised elsewhere in the service.                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Estimated saving (rounded to nearest £100)</th>
<th>Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| CCTV | a) Continue broadly as at present. | £0 | • Provides public reassurance, though this cannot be quantified.  
• Police are called to ~ 120 incidents a year identified through the monitoring, resulting in ~ 25 prosecutions and 15 cautions as well as preventing incidents escalating  
• Ability to respond to further expansion and development of Councils Community Safety CCTV infrastructure linked to the night time economy.  
• This option will leave a further £277k per annum saving to be realised elsewhere in the service. |
| CCTV | b) Purchase service directly from Bristol City Council (who already do our monitoring for us). | £20,000 | • Saving is by losing 1 member of staff (though Bristol City Council would need paying for their work)  
• Sole supplier  
• Loss of client side expertise (may be relevant for other CCTV activity such as enforcing bus lane traffic violations)  
• This option will leave a further £257k per annum saving to be realised elsewhere in the service. |
| CCTV | c) Terminate the service | £170,200 | • Will be one-off costs in removing equipment.  
• Increases in crime and in the fear of crime  
• This option will leave a further £106,800 per annum saving to be realised elsewhere in the service. |
<p>| ASB | a) Maintain service level provision | £0 | • This option will leave the full £277k per annum saving to be realised elsewhere in the service. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Estimated saving (rounded to nearest £100)</th>
<th>Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|      | b) Reduce the current level of service      | £??                                         | • Significant pressure on workloads and quality of service provided as the service is already working at capacity  
• Much of our success comes from the close working relationships with other SGC services which would need to be maintained.  
• Current demands mean the ASB team could not be spread any more thinly than at present without identifying actions the Council will withdraw from.  
• This option will leave further savings to be realised elsewhere in the service.                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
|      | c) Withdraw from the service                | £258,200                                    | • 551 intelligence reports, 346 contacts from Members of the public, 38 ABCs and 8 ASBOs per annum will no longer be supported / responded  
• 29 High Impact perpetrators will not be managed through the multi-agency panels resulting in sustained levels of ASB and criminality.  
• All front line delivery stops leading to increase in ASB, crime and disorder.  
• Young people will be at greater risk of entering criminal justice system  
• Vulnerable victims less likely to be identified early  
• There will be no early identification of victims, prevention and early intervention preventing escalation  
• We already operate service jointly with Police so would need to negotiate change with them in sufficient time to properly manage changes. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Estimated saving (rounded to nearest £100)</th>
<th>Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Council would not have the capacity to implement Tools and Powers for responding to ASB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Additional £30k per annum saving will need to be identified elsewhere.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consultation Results from 2014

13. The Council consulted the public and partners on these same options in 2014. In total 83 completed responses to this consultation were received, and the results can be found at http://council.southglos.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=408&MId=6819

14. Following the consultation it was clear that, although not universally supported, the option of removing funding for PCSOs was regarded as the least damaging option by respondents.

15. Survey respondents tended to agree with the option to continue to provide council funded PCSO’s at the current level. However many respondents noted that reducing council funding for PCSO posts would cause less damage to services than reductions or termination of funding the other services mentioned.

16. Survey respondents strongly agreed with continuing to provide domestic violence refuge places at the current level and respondents also disagreed with the option to cease funding which provides support to tackle domestic abuse.

17. The majority of all comments made by respondents during the consultation related to services around tackling domestic violence and domestic abuse and support for victims. There were concerns about the negative impact any cuts would have on vulnerable women and children and that any cuts to this service are would lead to higher costs for the other public service areas. Several of those responding argued that present funding levels for these services was already reduced and, if anything, should be increased.

18. Overall respondents tended to disagree with ceasing funding to tackle hate crimes, or a reduction in funding for CCTV.

19. There was general agreement that funding which supports the rehabilitation of high level sex offenders should continue at the current level.

20. There were mixed views about the future options presented for the street marshal service with the level of agreement and disagreement unclear from survey responses. Comments were more clearly in favour of ceasing this service to protect other more important service areas.

21. Respondents tended to agree that funding to support work to tackle ASB should be continued at the current level. A number of respondents considered this service to be essential, noting its value in working with communities to resolve issues and in supporting town and parish councils.
Preferred option

22. The current preferred option for achieving the required level of saving is to withdraw the funding paid to the Police for the provision of 9 additional PCSOs in South Gloucestershire.

Find out more and have your say

We welcome comments on the proposals outlined in this options paper between 1 October and 24 December 2015

We are particularly keen to find out if you feel that all relevant areas are being considered and whether you think there are any specific impacts or alternatives that the council should consider.

A copy of the initial draft equality impact assessment is available and we would also welcome comments on this.

Further information is available on our consultation webpage: [www.southglos.gov.uk/consultation](http://www.southglos.gov.uk/consultation) or from your local South Gloucestershire library and One Stop Shop.

You can find out more or tell us your views by:

- Email: consultation@southglos.gov.uk
- Write to: FREEPOST RTCT-JXLE-EET, South Gloucestershire Council, Corporate Research & Consultation Team, ASB and Community Safety Consultation, Civic Centre, High Street, Kingswood, BRISTOL, BS15 9TR
- Phone: 01454 868154

If you would like someone to talk to your group or organisation about these proposals, please contact us using the details above to arrange.