Contact us:
If it's not 999, report it online
Social media: @CambsCops
Website: www.cambs.police.uk

#safercambs

Cambridgeshire Constabulary Anti-Social Behaviour Action Plan

To: Police Accountability Board
For consideration by: Chief Officers team and OPCC
Senior responsible officer: Superintendent Paul Rogerson
Period: April to September 2026

1. Purpose of the report

This report provides a high-level quarterly update on progress against the Cambridgeshire Constabulary Anti-Social Behaviour Action Plan 2026-28. It focuses on what has been delivered, what evidence supports that assessment, where there are areas of concern and what further work is being owned through the ASB delivery group.

The report also shows how the plan supports the Police Assessment Framework 2025-27, particularly the expectations around leadership and governance, use of high-quality data, prevention and deterrence, neighbourhood visibility, responding to the public, vulnerability, safeguarding, partnership working and victim care.

The plan's central public pledge is:

> "Listen when you contact us, respond quickly, resolve the problem."

This is supported by five commitments covering prompt response, effective investigation with partners, visible policing, support for victims and witnesses and action with partners to address the root causes of ASB.
The five commitments are:

1. We will respond to reports of ASB quickly.
2. We will listen and thoroughly investigate ASB with partner agencies.
3. We will be visible to you in your community.
4. We will support victims and witnesses of ASB.
5. We will work with partners to tackle the root causes of ASB.

2. Executive summary

ASB demand has increased by 3.0% year on year, rising from 22,082 to 22,750 incidents. This is an increase of 668 incidents and has moved daily demand from 40 to 42 incidents per day. The increase is primarily driven by nuisance and environmental ASB rather than higher-risk personal ASB. Growth is most apparent in Fenland, particularly March, South Cambridgeshire and parts of Huntingdonshire, while Peterborough has reduced overall.

The overall assessment is that the force has maintained a broadly stable response to ASB during a period of wider summer demand pressure. Attendance to higher-risk incidents has remained broadly consistent, but scheduled and appointment-based ASB responses require closer oversight. Following this quarterly review this will be taken forward by the ASB delivery group, working through the neighbourhood policing and performance governance structure.

2.1 Tactical delivery: Overall assessment is amber.

Delivery progress has been affected by a change in availability within the tactical delivery structure. The lead officer is currently unwell and absent from the workplace. Work has been redistributed across a number of individuals to maintain momentum and oversight, but this has inevitably affected the pace of some activity. As a result, some tactical group actions are not as far forward as initially hoped, although ownership remains in place and the delivery group will continue to manage these through the neighbourhood policing and performance governance structure.

The supporting delivery plan shows that most ASB actions are either complete or allocated and in progress, with no high-risk delivery issues currently identified. Completed work includes publication of the Force ASB Action Plan and review of the HMICFRS PEEL spotlight recommendations. Live work includes ASB recording, statutory powers, support for vulnerable people, data and insight, staff training, risk assessment, problem solving and the sustainable visibility model. This report also identifies new actions arising from this quarterly review.

2.2 Respect Orders: Overall assessment is green. The force is ready for implementation.

Preparation for the introduction of Respect Orders is progressing well, with Inspector Matt Bill leading this work for the force. The orders are expected to provide a new civil power for adults, with breach dealt with as a criminal offence. Our assessment is that the practical skills, knowledge and case management required for Respect Orders are closely aligned to existing work on Criminal Behaviour Orders and ASB injunctions. This means the force should be well placed to transition to the new framework, provided case selection, risk assessment, drafting, supervision and breach evidence are properly managed.

Although there are some differences between the powers, these appear marginal in operational terms. The more significant change is likely to be the level of scrutiny applied to suitability, particularly where the individual subject to the order is vulnerable or where offending behaviour is linked to addiction, mental ill health, homelessness or wider unmet need. In those cases, the introduction of Respect Orders should not be seen as a route to criminalise vulnerability. It should instead strengthen the need for health, mental health, housing and wider support services to step in at the right stage, before enforcement becomes the only available option.

Inspector Bill and I are engaging with partners to ensure the current balance between council-led and police-led use of ASB powers is maintained. This will be particularly important with the ICB, as the effective use of Respect Orders will test whether the wider partnership can respond to the underlying causes of ASB as well as the visible behaviour. Expectations around the use of Respect Orders to address street drinking may also be overstated nationally. Many of these cases are likely to involve complex dependency, vulnerability and health-related issues, meaning a partnership-led response will often be required before enforcement can be considered proportionate, realistic or effective.

2.3 PAF readiness: The ASB action plan is broadly aligned to the PAF. It supports Question 1 by creating a clear governance route for delivery and improvement, Question 4 through prevention, problem-solving, visibility and partnership working, Question 5 through response to the public and risk at first contact, Question 6 through investigative quality and victim outcomes, and Question 7 through the identification and support of vulnerable people. The delivery group will own the evidence base for these areas so that future updates can show not only activity, but also the difference being made.

2.4 Demand assessment: The force is not currently experiencing a significant rise in high-risk ASB. Instead, there is a moderate increase in overall demand driven by nuisance and environmental issues, particularly within Fenland, South Cambridgeshire and parts of Huntingdonshire. The most notable area requiring further understanding is March, where growth accounts for over a third of the entire force-wide increase.

Further detail is provided in Annex A.

3. Progress against the public pledge

3.1 We will respond to reports of ASB quickly

ASB attendance performance has remained broadly stable over the last 12 months. The median time taken to attend ASB incidents is currently 34 minutes, which is unchanged from the same period last year. This provides assurance that the force has maintained a consistent overall response, despite increased wider demand during the summer period.

Performance was generally stable throughout the quarter, although attendance times increased during June and July before improving again in August. This suggests the deterioration was temporary rather than evidence of a sustained decline. The available data indicates that Immediate and Priority incidents continued to receive a consistent response, with the main pressure appearing to sit within lower-priority scheduled and appointment-based attendances.

Force-wide attendance to Immediate Grade ASB incidents within 15 mins was 59.1%. Performance was strongest overnight and during periods of lower demand, but reduced during afternoon and evening peak demand periods. This pattern suggests that ASB attendance performance is closely linked to wider response demand and resource availability during peak operating periods.

This assessment needs to hold two points in tension. ASB attendance performance did not improve during the reporting period, but the Constabulary sustained broadly static performance while managing increased operational demand and maintaining focus on immediate incidents, outstanding suspects and high-harm offenders. The issue for the next quarter is therefore not simply whether the median attendance time improves, but whether scheduled and appointment-based ASB incidents are being actively managed so they do not drift during periods of high demand.

The next quarter should also strengthen assurance around ASB identification at first point of contact. This links directly to the delivery plan action to improve ASB identification and recording in line with the National Standard for Incident Recording. Correct identification, risk assessment and recording at the point of contact will help ensure victims receive the right level of service and the force has a reliable picture of demand, risk and vulnerability.

The way forward is for the ASB tactical group, through the NHP steering group, to review the causes of the June and July deterioration and establish whether delays were driven by demand, abstractions, appointment capacity, deployment decisions or a combination of these factors. The group should also improve oversight of scheduled and appointment-based ASB incidents, continue to prioritise immediate and high-harm incidents, use tasking and performance meetings to identify local problem locations and repeat victims, and monitor ASB attendance alongside wider response demand to

ensure the balance between emergency response and neighbourhood concern remains appropriate.

3.2 We will listen and thoroughly investigate ASB with partner agencies.

3.2.1 Listen.

Both North and South have undertaken significant community engagement, including community events, surgeries and meetings. During the reporting period, 1,231 engagement activities were recorded across both areas, with 782 in South and 449 in North. Most activity was police initiated, although community-initiated activity also formed a substantial proportion. These events range from coffee with a cop or PCSO to attendance at village fayres, and also provide visible neighbourhood policing.
The figures demonstrate regular community engagement, but activity varied considerably by month. South recorded higher volumes than North, although both areas reduced towards the end of the reporting period. This reflects direction from both Area Commanders to scale back some engagement activity focus effort on responding to the public in peak demand periods.

The next stage is to strengthen the link between community feedback and operational activity. During this reporting period, each Neighbourhood Policing Team maintained publicly available local priorities on the Cambridgeshire Police website. These priorities are informed by crime and incident data, the Level 1 National Intelligence Model process, partner information and feedback from community meetings and wider engagement by neighbourhood officers and PCSOs. This provides a structured route for residents, businesses and partners to influence local policing priorities and helps ensure activity is focused on the issues causing the greatest harm, concern or vulnerability.
These local priorities provide an opportunity to demonstrate that community concerns translate into action. Each current priority is tasked and coordinated through an Athena case.

3.2.2 Awareness of action taken survey:

For this pledge, the focus has been on ensuring community concerns are identified, understood and acted upon with partner agencies. While awareness data does not directly measure how well we listen, it indicates whether communities can see the action taken in response to their concerns. Across Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire, around 45% of respondents reported being aware of police activity to tackle crime and anti-social behaviour, with social media and community messaging remaining the most effective ways of communicating outcomes. An action has been raised to consider how we now strengthen the link between community feedback, partnership problem solving and visible action, so residents can see how their concerns have shaped activity.

3.2.3 Investigate:

During the reporting period, both North and South Areas continued to investigate ASB concerns through Problem Management Plans (PMPs), working alongside local authorities and other partner agencies to understand and address community concerns. There are currently 128 live PMPs across North and South, including 46 specifically linked to ASB, demonstrating an ongoing commitment to tackling issues that matter most to local communities. A further 9 live Civil Order PMPs support the use of preventative and enforcement powers where appropriate.

The data shows that ASB and wider community concerns continue to form a significant proportion of problem-solving activity. Community and Neighbourhood PMPs account for the majority of live plans, reflecting a preventative approach focused on identifying root causes, engaging partners and delivering sustainable solutions. Civil Order activity has increased significantly over the last 12 months, indicating greater use of legislative powers to disrupt persistent anti-social behaviour and protect communities.

The delivery plan also identifies ongoing work to improve the recording and use of statutory ASB powers, including dispersals, Community Protection Notices, closure powers and injunctions. This is important because the PAF will require the force to show that it is not only recording ASB and managing problem locations, but selecting the most appropriate intervention to deal with repeat and persistent offending. Future reporting should therefore include a short assessment of whether civil powers are being used consistently, whether applications are recorded accurately and whether outcomes are reducing repeat demand.

Annex B provides further detail on civil and criminal orders.

Supervisory oversight remains an important area for improvement. Across local policing teams, 30.1% of North Area PMP reviews and 38.2% of South Area PMP reviews are currently overdue, with performance varying considerably between teams. Prevention Hubs are performing more strongly, with only 10.4% of reviews overdue across both areas. While the majority of live plans continue to progress, these figures highlight the need to strengthen supervisory governance and ensure regular reviews take place so that activity remains focused, proportionate and responsive to changing community needs.

Overall, the volume of active PMPs demonstrates that community concerns are being managed and investigated. However, overdue supervisory reviews reduce assurance that investigations remain effective, partnership activity is progressing and victims and communities are receiving an appropriate service. This supports the PAF by evidencing active investigation, structured problem management, partner involvement, supervisory oversight, use of civil orders and governance of investigative quality.

The main gap against the PAF requirements is the level of overdue supervisory reviews. Whilst large numbers of live investigations are being managed, the overdue review rates indicate that assurance processes are not yet consistently applied across all teams.

3.3 We will be visible to you in your community:

Work continues to develop a long-term performance measure for the visibility commitment. The Constabulary is currently exploring Blackberry AtHoc as the preferred technical solution to provide a more robust and scalable method of capturing visibility activity and community perceptions. At present, however, the force does not have a consistent automated data set that can accurately measure visibility across all neighbourhood policing activity.

In the interim, a potential way forward has been identified through the monitoring arrangements already used within Op Dante and the Knife Crime Concentration Fund hotspot patrol programme. In those locations, officers record patrol activity and associated outcomes, allowing detailed analysis of patrol numbers, patrol hours, community engagements and enforcement activity. This provides useful insight into the level of visible policing being delivered and demonstrates that meaningful visibility data can be collected where resources and governance arrangements support it.

This approach has limitations, particularly its reliance on officer self-recording and manual data entry, but it may provide an interim visibility measure while Blackberry AtHoc is explored. Further work will assess whether elements of hotspot monitoring can be applied more widely across neighbourhood policing. This would improve understanding of visibility levels, while recognising that activity measures alone cannot show whether communities feel police are visible and accessible.

The way forward is to continue developing Blackberry AtHoc as the preferred technical solution and, in the meantime, our hotspot patrol recording can capture patrol activity in key areas. This will allow us to record patrol time within geofenced beat areas for any police resource or specific neighbourhood policing officers.

The sustainable visibility model remains a key delivery plan workstream and has been approved through Change Board, with a pilot agreed for South officers. Progress has been significantly slower than anticipated because the lead officer is unwell. However, the work continues to provide an important link between hotspot patrol activity, the conclusion of hotspot funding and the force's longer-term approach to maintaining community visibility.

3.4 We will support victims and witnesses of ASB

3.4.1 “3 in 30”

The force continues to use the 3 in 30 process to identify addresses associated with repeat ASB reports. However, the current data provides tagged addresses rather than a

clear assessment of repeat victimisation and harm. It is not yet possible to reliably link these addresses to the highest-harm locations, individual victims, ASB investigations or problem-solving plans. As a result, Local Policing cannot yet provide sufficient assurance that all repeat and vulnerable victims are being consistently identified and supported, or that activity is directed towards the cases causing greatest harm.

In the interim, detailed data is being provided to NHP officers and local policing teams, who review what can be a large volume of incidents and act where risk, harm or vulnerability is identified.

The direction of change is to develop the current demand report into a more systematic dashboard that connects 3 in 30 tags with incident, victim, vulnerability, investigation, location and problem-solving data. This will enable the force to identify and prioritise the highest-harm repeat ASB cases, check whether appropriate support and problem-solving activity has taken place, and provide a more meaningful performance measure for future PAB reports.

As strategic lead, Superintendent Paul Rogerson will oversee delivery through the ASB tactical delivery group. The improved dashboard and reporting approach will be developed by 31 December 2026.

3.4.2 Victim satisfaction:
Victim satisfaction remains strong, with overall satisfaction at 80.2% and both North and South Areas achieving their highest rates of the year. However, follow-up and ongoing communication remain the weakest aspect of the victim experience and continue to require improvement.
Whilst confidence in policing remains broadly positive, fewer residents believe the police are effectively addressing local concerns and perceptions that ASB is increasing have grown. This highlights the importance of maintaining meaningful engagement with victims, providing updates and demonstrating the outcomes achieved.

The Victim and Witness Hub has received 12 ASB referrals during the past 12 months, none of which are recorded on its case management system as involving repeat victims. This should be treated with some caution, as cases may not always carry an ASB marker and further work is needed to test the position. The low referral volume nevertheless indicates an opportunity to strengthen how appropriate ASB victims, particularly repeat and vulnerable victims, are identified and referred for support.

The Victim and Witness Hub manager is keen to work more closely with Neighbourhood Policing Teams to increase appropriate referrals, recognising the significant and lasting effect ASB can have on victims' sense of safety, wellbeing and quality of life. Initial Victim Needs Assessment completion has improved significantly in the Southern Neighbourhood Team and currently stands at 97.9%, while the Northern Team is at

55.3% and requires further improvement. Northern policing command has a live action plan using ongoing targeted training to improve the quality and completion of Victim Needs Assessments, with progress monitored through its district performance process. Opportunities should also be explored for neighbourhood officers to work periodically from the co-located Hub office to improve awareness of the service, strengthen working relationships and support earlier referrals.

The delivery plan includes specific actions on identifying and protecting vulnerable people, ASB risk assessments, the ASB risk matrix and the Initial Victim Needs Assessment. These actions will strengthen future reporting under this pledge. The next report should provide assurance that repeat and vulnerable victims are being identified through 3 in 30, incident review and risk assessment processes, that appropriate referrals are being made to the Victim and Witness Hub, and that referral volumes, repeat-victim identification and Initial Victim Needs Assessment completion are monitored across neighbourhood teams.

3.5 We will work with partners to tackle the root causes of ASB

The delivery plan provides a stronger basis for reporting progress against this commitment. It identifies work through problem-solving panels, OSARA, repeat-location activity and partnership work to understand root causes. This includes links to Op FulfordGate for retail crime and town centre ASB, Op Shotgun for vehicle nuisance, e-scooters and nuisance driving, and Op Farmington for people affected by mental health, substance misuse or vulnerability. These examples show the force moving beyond attendance and investigation towards prevention, problem solving and partnership intervention.

The key theme from this quarterly review is that partnership structures are focusing on the right issues. Partnership, People and Peer Group arrangements, alongside ASB task and finish activity, show that the force and partners are considering the causes behind ASB rather than treating incidents in isolation. This is particularly important where ASB is linked to vulnerability, substance misuse, mental health, youth nuisance, repeat locations or wider community tension. This provides assurance that the response is not solely enforcement-led, but also seeks to prevent further harm through joint work with policing, local authorities, housing, health and other partners.

The main area for development is not the existence of partnership activity, but how clearly it is communicated, recorded and converted into visible outcomes. The evidence suggests that the right conversations are taking place and the right themes are being addressed, but the public-facing and governance narrative is not always as strong as the activity itself. Future reporting should show the practical difference made by partnership intervention, including the problem identified, partner contribution, action taken and impact on repeat demand, harm or community concern.

This provides useful PAF evidence because it demonstrates leadership grip, prevention, partnership problem solving and the use of local insight to address harm. The strongest future evidence will be short case examples or problem-solving summaries showing a clear line from community concern, through partnership assessment and activity, to measurable impact. This should include positive outcomes and areas for further work, giving the Police Accountability Board a balanced and credible assessment of progress.

For the next reporting period, the tactical group will provide a short assurance summary showing how many ASB problem-solving plans are active, whether plans meet the required standard, what partner activity has taken place and whether interventions are being evaluated. This will help evidence both the PEEL and Police and Crime Commissioners expectation that the force has a problem-solving culture supported by governance, effective partnership working and assessment of outcomes.

4. Conclusion and way forward

The Constabulary has made steady progress against the ASB Action Plan during a period of increased wider demand. ASB demand has risen moderately, but there is no current evidence of a significant increase in high-risk ASB. The main pressure sits within nuisance and environmental ASB, with particular localised increases in Fenland, South Cambridgeshire and parts of Huntingdonshire.

The report provides assurance that the delivery plan is broadly aligned to the Police Assessment Framework and that activity is in place across response, investigation, visibility, victim care, vulnerability and partnership problem solving. The key issue for the next quarter is to move from evidence of activity to stronger evidence of impact through the delivery group. **This means showing that community concerns are being converted into local priorities, PMPs and partner action, that repeat and vulnerable victims are being identified consistently, and that problem-solving activity is reducing repeat demand, harm and community concern.**

The ASB delivery group will maintain grip of the improvement areas set out in Annex C, with clear ownership, timescales and reporting through the neighbourhood policing and performance governance structure. Priority should be given to understanding the summer deterioration in attendance times, improving oversight of scheduled ASB responses, reducing overdue PMP reviews, strengthening the 3 in 30 approach, developing a practical visibility measure and preparing for Respect Orders. Respect Orders should be introduced carefully, with Inspector Matt Bill continuing to lead the operational work, and with a clear partnership position that enforcement powers are used proportionately alongside health, mental health and wider support interventions where vulnerability is a significant factor.

How I have used AI

I have used AI to support the preparation of this report by helping me organise information, test the structure of the document, identify duplication and improve readability. I have also used AI to ask questions of the data, helping me identify possible themes, gaps and areas that may need further assurance through the ASB delivery group.

Annex A - ASB demand overview

Total ASB incidents have increased by 668 incidents (+3.0%), rising from 22,082 to 22,750. Daily demand has increased from 40 incidents per day to 42 incidents per day across the force.

From a geographical perspective, the growth is concentrated in South Area and Fenland:

- South Cambridgeshire shows the largest increase in South Area, up 148 incidents (+5.2%), with daily demand increasing from 5 to 6 incidents per day.
- Cambridge City has increased by 124 incidents (+3.2%), although daily demand remains broadly stable at 7 incidents per day.
- Huntingdonshire has increased by 113 incidents (+3.0%), but this masks variation within the district. Huntingdon & Yaxley is up 144 incidents, while St Ives/Ramsey and St Neots have both reduced slightly.
- Fenland has seen the most significant increase across the force, up 303 incidents (+12.3%). The majority of this sits within March (+255 incidents), suggesting a localised demand issue which may warrant closer examination.
- Peterborough is the only district showing an overall reduction, down 127 incidents (-1.7%). This reduction is largely driven by decreases in Eastern and Southern sectors.

Looking at ASB type, the increase is overwhelmingly attributable to nuisance ASB:

- Nuisance ASB has increased by 482 incidents and accounts for approximately 72% of the total force increase.
- Environmental ASB has increased by 186 incidents and accounts for most of the remaining growth.
- Personal ASB categories remain low volume. Whilst there are increases in High Risk (+7), Medium Risk (+49) and Standard Risk (+23), the actual numbers remain comparatively small.
- Personal ASB with "No Risk" grading has reduced by 79 incidents, which may indicate improved risk assessment, improved resolution pathways or a shift towards more accurate categorisation.

Annex B civil and criminal orders

Between April and September 2026, a total of 189 Community and Neighbourhood orders, 142 Civil Orders and 56 Vulnerability-related orders were recorded. Community and Neighbourhood orders remained consistently high throughout the reporting period, peaking in June 2026 (34 orders) before reducing to 16 in September 2026. This level of activity reflects continued proactive use of policing powers to address local concerns and support neighbourhood problem solving.

The most significant trend during the reporting period was the increased use of Civil Orders. Usage rose from 6 orders in April 2026 to a peak of 60 in July 2026 before reducing to 22 in August and 15 in September. This follows a wider annual trend, with civil order activity increasing significantly during 2026 compared with the latter part of 2025. The increase suggests greater confidence and focus on using longer-term civil powers to tackle persistent anti-social behaviour and prevent repeat harm.
Vulnerability-related orders also demonstrated an upward trend during the reporting period, increasing from 3 in April 2026 to a peak of 16 in July 2026 and remaining comparatively high thereafter. This reflects continued emphasis on identifying and protecting vulnerable individuals affected by anti-social behaviour.
Across the wider annual data set, Local Policing accounted for the majority of order activity (316 orders), supported by Prevention, Custody and Partnerships (196 orders). These totals cover a broader period than the April to September 2026 reporting period above and should not be treated as directly comparable. This highlights the importance of combining enforcement activity with partnership-led problem solving and safeguarding approaches.
Overall, the reporting period demonstrates increasing use of civil and protective powers alongside traditional enforcement activity. The growth in Civil Orders during 2026 is particularly encouraging, indicating a stronger focus on addressing root causes, preventing repeat victimisation and delivering sustainable solutions to anti-social behaviour concerns.

Annex C actions for delivery group

Area	**Action for tactical group**	**Why it matters**	**Suggested owner**
ASB response times	Review the June and July deterioration in ASB attendance times and establish whether delays were driven by demand, abstractions, appointment capacity, deployment decisions or a combination of these factors.	The report suggests immediate and priority incidents were broadly protected, but scheduled and appointment-based responses were more vulnerable to delay.	Response / local policing lead
Scheduled and appointment-based ASB	Agree what level of delay is acceptable, how it will be monitored and what escalation route is needed when	This is the main area where ASB response performance appears less resilient during peak demand.	Tactical group

	appointments are repeatedly slipping.		
ASB recording at first contact	Check that ASB is being correctly identified, risk assessed and recorded at first point of contact in line with the National Standard for Incident Recording.	This links to PAF expectations around vulnerability, structured triage, correct recording and appropriate response.	Contact / demand lead
Community feedback into action	Agree a simple way for teams to evidence how community concerns become local priorities, PMPs, tasking activity or partner action.	Engagement activity is strong, but the report needs clearer evidence that public concerns are being converted into operational activity.	NHP leads
PMP review timeliness	Address overdue PMP reviews, particularly where 30.1% of North Area reviews and 38.2% of South Area reviews are overdue.	This is the clearest governance weakness in the report and affects assurance around investigation, supervision and partnership activity.	Area commanders / NHP supervisors
Use of statutory ASB powers	Review the recording and use of dispersals, Community Protection Notices, closure powers and injunctions.	The issue is not just whether powers are being used, but whether the right powers are selected, recorded and reviewed for impact.	ASB / civil orders lead
Visibility and patrol activity	Oversee progress of the sustainable visibility model and South pilot, and consider whether hotspot patrol recording can be used as an interim visibility measure.	The force needs to show visible patrol activity is directed to the right places, at the right times and in response to community concern.	Visibility / NHP lead

3 in 30 and repeat ASB victims	Turn the 3 in 30 address list into an actionable repeat-victim and repeat-location product.	At present the data identifies tagged addresses but does not yet provide enough assurance around victim vulnerability, harm, investigations or outcomes.	Performance / analytical lead
Victim contact and updates	Agree what good victim contact looks like in ASB cases, especially for repeat and vulnerable victims, and strengthen the pathway for appropriate referrals from Neighbourhood Policing Teams into the Victim and Witness Hub. This should include monitoring referral volumes and exploring periodic co-location to improve awareness and joint working.	Only 12 ASB referrals were recorded by the Hub in the past 12 months, with none marked as involving repeat victims, although recording limitations may affect this picture. Southern Neighbourhood Team Initial Victim Needs Assessment completion is 97.9%, but Northern Team performance is 55.3%, showing both progress and a continuing need for improvement.	Victim and Witness Hub / NHP leads
Risk assessment and vulnerability	Check consistent use of ASB risk assessments, the ASB risk matrix and the Initial Victim Needs Assessment.	This supports PAF expectations around identifying vulnerability, understanding ongoing risk and safeguarding vulnerable people.	ASB lead / safeguarding lead
Problem solving and OSARA	Provide a short assurance summary on active ASB problem-solving plans, whether they meet the required standard, what partner activity is taking place and whether	This will evidence whether the force is moving beyond activity and showing impact on repeat demand, harm and community concern.	Problem-solving lead

	interventions are being evaluated.		
Partner-led root-cause activity	Maintain oversight of key delivery-plan areas such as problem-solving panels, repeat locations, Op FulfordGate, Op Shotgun and Op Farmington, ensuring each has a clear partnership record showing the problem identified, partner contribution, action taken and impact on repeat demand, harm or community concern.	These are important examples of partnership activity aimed at prevention and the root causes of ASB, but the report needs stronger evidence of outcomes and clearer communication of what partners have achieved together.	Tactical group
Communication of partnership outcomes	Develop a simple method for communicating partnership activity and outcomes back into governance, to victims and to communities where appropriate.	The review found strong evidence that partners are focusing on the right issues, but the communication of that activity is not always as strong as the activity itself.	Tactical group / communications lead
Data and performance reporting	Agree the small number of measures required for future PAB reporting, including ASB demand, attendance, appointment delay, repeat victims, PMP timeliness, use of powers, satisfaction and visibility activity.	This will keep the PAB report focused and prevent future updates becoming too broad or activity-heavy.	Performance lead
Delivery group ownership	Confirm that each improvement area has	This shows that areas of concern are being	ASB delivery group chair

	an owner, timescale and reporting route back to the ASB delivery group.	actively gripped through governance rather than simply noted in the PAB report.	