

Cambridge City Community Safety Partnership

- 21 October 2025
- 10:00 - 13:00
- Conference Room 2, Parkside Place Community Fire Station, Cambridge CB1 1JF with a hybrid option for CCSP Members
- The public can submit pre-advised questions before 10am on Monday 20 October to email address: Community.safety@cambridge.gov.uk

AGENDA

No	Item	Lead Officer(s)	Time (Mins)
1	Closed session for CSP Board and Members Welcome, housekeeping / introductions and apologies	Samantha Shimmon (Chair)	10
2	Closed session for CSP Board and Members Domestic Abuse Related Death Review (DARDR) Report for Jessica	Deborah Cartwright (Independent Chair)	20
3	Meeting open to the public Welcome, housekeeping / introductions and apologies The Joint CSP Information Sharing Agreement	Chair Adam Brown (3C Shared Services)	20
4	Presentation: Raising awareness about E-scooter charger and battery fires	Gareth Boyd / Hannah Archdeacon (Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service)	25
5	Minutes of 01 July 2025 meeting: Agreement	Board / members	5
6	Action points: Review	Board / members	5
7	Pre-advised questions from the general public	Chair	5
	Comfort break (halfway in meeting)		10
8	First Deep Dive report 2025/26: Reoffending draft	Michael Yates (Policy and Insight Team) / Chair / Board / members	25

9	Update on CCSP Strategic Priorities 2025-2027: Priority 1: Preventing Violence and Exploitation Priority 2: A Neighbourhood Approach Priority 3: Tackling Acquisitive Crime	Keryn Jalli (City Council) / Chair / Board / members	15
10	Update from the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner including Serious Violence Duty, Cambridgeshire Countywide High Harms Board	Shona McKenzie	10
11	Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Against Scams Partnership: Scams awareness raising week 20 October – 2 November	Scott Liddle (Cambridgeshire County Council)	10
12	Domestic Abuse Related Death Reviews (DARDRs) Update	Keryn Jalli (City Council)	5
13	Updating Partnership Terms of Reference: Agreement	Louise Walker / Board / members	5
14	Any other business	Chair / Board / members	5
	<i>Written reports circulated</i>		
15	County Domestic Abuse and Sexual Violence Report Q1 2025/26 – To note	County DASV Partnership	<i>Written reports</i>
	<i>Verbal information to be noted</i>		
16	National Hate Crime Awareness Week 11 -18 October Launch of Cambridge City Council video	Chair / Board / members	5
17	Date of next Cambridge CSP meeting	24 February 2026	180

Information for the general public and media representatives

Public attendance

You are welcome to attend this meeting as an observer, and to ask questions or make statements during the relevant item on the agenda. It may be necessary to request that you leave the room during the discussion of matters that are classed as confidential.

Public questions

1. Questions are invited towards the beginning of the meeting.
2. You are requested to restrict questions or statements to matters set out in the meeting's agenda. If you wish to raise a question or make a statement concerning a matter that is on the agenda, then please notify your intention to speak with the Community Safety Partnership Support Officer before the start of the meeting.
3. If you wish to raise a question or make a statement on a matter that is not on the agenda, then please ensure that notice of the question or subject matter is given to the Community Safety Partnership Support Officer on 01223 457808 or via e-mail (community.safety@cambridge.gov.uk) by 10am on the working day preceding the meeting.
4. Questions and statements should be directed to the Chair in all cases; the Chair will then either respond directly or request that the appropriate member of the Partnership to respond.
5. Please be brief and keep to the question or statement, as advised.
6. Please be aware that you may not get a verbal response to your question, especially if the question is detailed; a written response will be offered in such cases.
7. If your question raises issues that should be correctly addressed in a request under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, the Chair will advise you of this.
8. The Chair may refuse to reply to a question and may refuse to refer the question to another member at their discretion. The Chair may also refuse to permit questions or statements if the matter has already been put or made to a meeting of a Council committee or other body.
9. The Chair's decision is final.
10. The use of audio and visual recording equipment is permitted.

Emergency evacuation

1. In the event of a fire or other emergency, you will hear a continuous ringing alarm. You should leave the building by the nearest exit and proceed to the assembly point on Parkers Piece.

Cambridge Community Safety Partnership

- 01 July 2025
- 10:00-12:35
- Hybrid at Parkside Place Community Fire Station, Cambridge CB1 1JF

Draft Minutes

Board

Scott Fretwell (Chair)	Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service
Agata Ciesielska	Probation Service – Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Probation Delivery Unit (PDU)
Rebecca Cooke	Integrated Care Board (ICB) - Safeguarding People for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough
Mark Freeman	Cambridge Council For Voluntary Service (CCVS)
Chief Inspector Mike Jackman	Cambridgeshire Constabulary
Keryn Jalli	Cambridge City Council (Communities)
Scott Liddle	Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Mike Todd-Jones	Cambridge City Council (Cabinet Member for Safety, Wellbeing and Tackling Homelessness)

Members

Hannah Hancock	Cambridge Business Against Crime (CAMBAC)
Nick Morris	Anglia Ruskin University
Michelle Reynolds	University of Cambridge
Louise Walker (Minutes)	Cambridge City Council (Communities)
Michael Yates	Cambridgeshire County Council (Policy and Insight Team)

Guests

Hannah Archdeacon	Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service
Annabelle Goodenough	Crimestoppers Trust
Cherryl Henry-Leach	Domestic Abuse Related Death Review (DARDR) Independent Chair
Sergeant Alice Jeffery	Cambridgeshire Constabulary
Shona McKenzie	Office of Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC)
Rachel Speechley	Cambridgeshire County Council Missing and Exploitation Team
Anne Wolf	Department of Work and Pensions (DWP)

1. Welcome, housekeeping, introductions, and apologies

- 1.1 Scott Fretwell, Cambridge Community Safety Partnership (CCSP) Vice Chair, chaired the meeting on behalf of Samantha Shimmon, and welcomed everyone to the meeting hosted at the Fire Station. There were two members of the public who attended after the closed session.

- 1.2 Apologies were received from Board members: Samantha Shimmon, (Cambridge City Council / CCSP Chair) represented by Keryn Jalli, Diane Lane (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Integrated Care System (ICS)), Inspector Shawn Emms represented by Sergeant Alice Jeffery (Cambridgeshire Constabulary), Cambridgeshire County Councillor David Levien replacing Philippa Slatter, and Jenny Thompson (Designated Nurse Safeguarding Nurse for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough (Integrated Care Board (ICB)) represented by Rebecca Cooke (Deputy Designated Safeguarding people for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough ICB). There were apologies from members: Richard Humphries (British Transport Police), and Susie Talbot (Cambridgeshire County Council Public Health Team Commissioning (Drugs and Alcohol)) as well as Mark Kirby (Olive Academies). It was noted that new Board representatives for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust and a new member representative for Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust are awaited.
- 1.3 The Chair welcomed Councillor Mike Todd-Jones, who was replacing Cameron Holloway - now Leader of Cambridge City Council, and Anne Wolf, who was replacing George Bateman (DWP). The Chair thanked George Bateman, Cameron Holloway, and Philippa Slatter for their valuable contributions to the CCSP. The Chair read out a message from Philippa Slatter, who did not stand for re-election as a Cambridgeshire County Councillor, saying: 'It has been a privilege to have been able to attend Cambridge CSP meetings in my capacity as the County's Community Safety Champion. The practitioners you have assembled around the table, and the expert contributions the Cambridge CSP has received has been truly impressive. Please thank the Partnership.'

2. Domestic Abuse Related Death Review Report

- 2.1 Independent Chair, Cherryl Henry-Leach provided an update on the Domestic Abuse Related Death Review (DARDR) for B. who had died in 2018. There had been a delayed start to his DARDR, which started in November 2023. Recommendations to be included in an action plan were around record keeping and domestic abuse training for male victims. Also, for there to be routine enquiry in all organisations, and for GPs to take an annual review of patients with long term illnesses.
- 2.2 Cherryl Henry-Leach said that a lot of work had been going on in the partnership organically and as part of the national agenda. The report would be finalised later that week and the family will be supported to go through the report. In the meantime, the report would also be sent to the coroner and may change.

- 2.3 The Chair thanked Cherryl Henry-Leach for the update. Following this agenda item, the Chair opened the meeting to the public.

3. Vision Zero Partnership

- 3.1 Chris Mills gave a presentation on the Vision Zero Partnership, which is dedicated to eliminating road deaths across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. The partnership also aims to significantly reduce the severity of injuries and the associated social and economic impacts of road traffic collisions.
- 3.2 Mike Todd-Jones thanked Chris Mills for his presentation and acknowledged the contributions of former Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Mayor Nik Johnson and Deputy Mayor Anna Smith in supporting the Vision Zero initiative.
- 3.3 Keryn Jalli noted that Cambridge CSP has previously engaged in Vision Zero events with a tailored approach for Cambridge City. She asked whether any upcoming events were planned. Chris responded that the Partnership works collaboratively and is open to supporting local campaigns and initiatives. He is launching a newsletter and recognises that Cambridge City requires a different strategy compared to other districts.
- 3.4 Keryn highlighted that the Police conduct monthly bike marking events in Cambridge, which effectively engages cyclists. She asked how drivers could be better educated to improve cyclist safety. Chris confirmed that driver awareness is a key part of the Vision Zero strategy.
- 3.5 Nick Morris asked whether data is available on car and cyclist collisions and who is typically at fault. Chris Mills explained that the Partnership is developing a data framework to identify offenders. Sergeant Alice Jeffery added that the Police can provide supporting data. Hannah Hancock asked whether the data includes alcohol and drug-related incidents and suggested a seasonal campaign on drink driving in the summer as well as over Christmas and New Year, especially in Cambridge City and Huntingdonshire.
- 3.6 Mark Freeman asked if the Partnership is working with Camcycle, a charity promoting safer and better cycling in Cambridge, where around half the population cycles at least once a month. Chris said the Partnership is open to engaging with Camcycle.
- 3.7 Rachel Speechley asked whether Vision Zero Partnership is connected

with the two universities to reach students. Chris said they are currently engaging with schools and plan to include universities. Scott Liddle offered to connect Chris with local schools and the University of Cambridge, while Nick Morris offered to link him with Anglia Ruskin University. Hannah Hancock noted that many cyclists ride without lights in the darker months and offered to promote Vision Zero at both universities Freshers Fairs, where CAMBAC will be attending.

- 3.8 The Chair thanked Chris Mills for his presentation. It was agreed that CCSP contact details would be shared with him to support further collaboration. Chris Mills then left the meeting. Action point 07/01

4. Minutes of 25 February 2025 meeting: Agreement

- 4.1 The Minutes of 25 February 2025 were agreed and would go forward for publication.

5. Action points: Review

- 5.1 The action points from the previous meeting in February were closed apart from two regarding the E-scooter charger / battery Co-ordinating Group and funding for Street Pastors / NightLite, which would be carried forward to the next meeting. Action points 07/02 and 07/03

6. Pre-advised questions from the general public

- 6.1 There was one pre-advised question received from a member of the public, which was asked in person at the meeting as well. The question was about the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Domestic Abuse and Sexual Violence Partnership restructure, which is in Appendix 1. It was agreed for a response by the Cambridgeshire County Council Domestic Abuse and Sexual Violence Partnership to be requested. Action point 07/04
- 6.2 Keryn Jalli confirmed that Cambridge City Council and Cambridge CSP submitted a formal response to the consultation on the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Domestic Abuse and Sexual Violence (DASV) Service decoupling and restructure before the deadline of 27 March. The response included asking about an Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA).
- 6.3 Mike Todd-Jones expressed concern about the reduction in Independent Domestic Violence Advisors (IDVAs). While acknowledging the County Council's financial pressures, he suggested that both the County Council and the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC) explore funding options to mitigate service cuts. He welcomed the opportunity to work with the OPCC to increase IDVA provision. Shona McKenzie (OPCC) offered to arrange a separate meeting with Mike and the OPCC Commissioning Service.

She said that the Police and Crime Commissioner is planning to commission two services to support victims of Violence Against Women and Girls (VAWG).

Action point 07/05

7. Second Deep Dive report to investigate E-scooters and battery fires

- 7.1 Michael Yates presented the deep dive report on e-scooters and battery fires, which was developed in collaboration with Scott Fretwell and Amanda Shepherd at Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service.
- 7.2 Keryn Jalli asked whether County Council Trading Standards is involved in the E-scooter charger / battery Co-ordinating Group, which can deliver as a CCSP subgroup. Scott Fretwell confirmed that his colleague Gareth Boyd is leading the group, and it was agreed that Trading Standards and Nick Morris would be included to engage Anglia Ruskin University (ARU) students.

Action point 07/06

- 7.3 Mike Todd-Jones asked whether the data considers vulnerable residents who may require tailored awareness approaches. Mark Freeman raised concerns about the demographics of e-bike and e-scooter users, noting that their use is illegal except on private property. He recommended a dual approach of education and enforcement. Chief Inspector Mike Jackman cautioned against enforcement that could undermine educational efforts. Mark suggested the E-scooter charger / battery Co-ordinating Group contacts Tower Hamlets for communications advice. Becca Cooke highlighted the link to public health and offered to share the report with colleagues.
- 7.4 It was agreed that the E-scooter charger / battery Co-ordinating Group would review the report's recommendations and present at the next Cambridge CSP meeting on 21 October. The presentation will advise on public awareness strategies, including a potential campaign. The CCSP will also explore ways to reach diverse communities, such as through *Cambridge Matters*, which is delivered to every household in the city.

Action point 07/07

8. Update on CCSP Plan 2025-2027

- 8.1 Keryn Jalli provided an update on the CCSP Strategic Priorities for 2025-2027:
- Priority 1: Preventing Violence and Exploitation
 - Priority 2: A Neighbourhood Approach
 - Priority 3: Tackling Acquisitive Crime.

She noted the ROTH (Risk Outside The Home) presentation by Rachel Speechley at the previous CCSP meeting raised concerns into a multi-agency setting about children and young people out late at night. For the 2025/2026

Serious Violence Duty Funding from the OPCC, Romsey Mill will continue to deliver after-school diversionary activities and build trusted relationships with young people. A collaborative project between Cambridge Rape Crisis Centre and Cambridge United Foundation will also work with Romsey Mill to address VAWG, allowing for dual tracking of impact.

- 8.2 Keryn Jalli said that a Cambridge CSP funding application is being prepared for the OPCC's Home Office Hotspot Action Funding 2025–26. The application will support additional hours for Open Space Guardians, Taxi Marshals, and Cambridge Street Pastors to run NightLite from July to September 2025.

Action point 07/08

- 8.3 It was noted that the 2025/26 Policy and Insight Team's deep dive reports for Cambridge CSP will focus on:

- 1) Reoffending
- 2) Children and Violence.

Due to an emergency, Chair Scott Fretwell left the meeting, and Keryn Jalli chaired the remainder.

9. Funding future projects

- 9.1 Hannah Hancock shared updates on initiatives linked to the city's Purple Flag accreditation, which recognises excellence in managing the evening and night-time economy. These include Open Space Guardians, Taxi Marshals, and Cambridge Street Pastors' NightLite. She presented a report on St John's Ambulance (SJA), which has supported two December dates since 2023. The report showed a reduction in A&E incidents, supporting the case for SJA involvement in future key dates and the need for further funding.
- 9.2 Keryn Jalli emphasised the importance of impact, noting that funding for SJA around Halloween, Christmas, and New Year totals £5,240 and provides savings to the health service. She invited ideas from partners. Becca Cooke offered to share the report with health colleagues, though noted challenges due to government changes. Mark Freeman asked whether SJA could seek independent funding. Keryn confirmed that SJA could apply for funding not directly tied to the night-time economy.

10. Update from the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner

- 10.1 Shona McKenzie thanked the CSP Board for its support of the Home Office Safer Streets Summer Initiative and acknowledged the contributions of Keryn Jalli and Louise Walker in sharing planned activities for Cambridge City Centre and the Grafton area. She praised Cambridge City's responsiveness and monitoring efforts. Shona announced a new **Prevention Fund** created by

Police and Crime Commissioner Darryl Preston, using proceeds of crime. The fund offers small grants (up to £5,000) to reinvest in communities and prevent crimes such as VAWG and anti-social behaviour. She suggested Hannah Hancock consider applying for SJA provision.

- 10.2 Scott Liddle asked about longer-term funding for the Street Pastors' NightLite, which operates on many Saturday nights 22:00 to 03:00 to provide a safe drop-in space in the city centre. Keryn Jalli said that the CCSP could apply to the Prevention Fund and asked whether there was a limit on applications. Shona confirmed there is no cap on the number of bids from CSPs.

11. Domestic Abuse Related Death Reviews (DARDRs) Update

- 11.1 Keryn Jalli provided an update on DARDRs. The review for B. was presented earlier in the meeting, and the review for Diya was presented in February. Both are being finalised with action plans and will be brought back to the CCSP. A review by the Died by Suicide Panel is ongoing and will also be shared once completed.

12. Annual Review 2025: Agreement

- 12.1 Louise Walker spoke to a draft version of the Annual Review, which provides an overview of the work of the partnership, priorities, and projects. The CCSP Board agreed for the Annual Review to be published on the CCSP webpage.

13. Community Safety Fund 2024/25: End of Year Financial Report

- 13.1 Louise Walker spoke about the report and available funding. The Board noted the report.

14. Partnership Terms of Reference: Agreement

- 14.1 As the priorities for 2025/27 were finalised, the updated Partnership Terms of Reference was agreed.

15. Future Cambridge CSP meeting dates: Agreement

- 15.1 Louise Walker spoke about the report, and the timeline of meetings was agreed.

16. Written reports noted

- 16.1 The County Domestic Abuse and Sexual Violence Report for Q4 2024/25, and the document about Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Domestic Abuse and Sexual Violence Partnership Restructure and Decoupling were noted.

17. Any other business

- 17.1 As there was no other business, the Chair thanked the Board and Members for their constructive contributions and the meeting was closed at 12:35.

Appendix 1

Agenda Item 6. Pre-advised questions from the general public

A pre-advised question was received from the public:

‘ I would like to know if a proper impact assessment has been done regarding the proposed reduction in IDVA's, such as:

- **Identifying who is affected:** This includes victims of domestic abuse, their families, and the professionals who support them.
- **Assessing risks and consequences:** What happens if IDVA support is reduced? Will victims be less safe? Will fewer cases go to court? Will survivors disengage from services?
- **Equality and Human Rights considerations:** Does the reduction disproportionately affect women, disabled people, or ethnic minorities?
- **Consultation with stakeholders:** This should include survivors, frontline workers, and partner agencies. Their insights are vital.
- **Exploring alternatives:** Could efficiencies be found elsewhere? Could funding be reallocated without cutting frontline support?
- **Evidence-based decision-making:** The assessment should draw on data—like how IDVAs reduce repeat victimisation and improve justice outcomes.

Taking the wrong decision, by relying for instance on a superficial survey of an impact assessment, could unintentionally harm the very people services are meant to protect. ’

Response:

Cambridgeshire County Council response:

‘ The recent restructure of the IDVA Service was undertaken following the reduction in grant funding from national government, that was provided for specific roles within the service. This was intended to be short term funding, originally linked to COVID planning, but had been extended several times. The decision was taken to decouple the service from Peterborough City Council at the same time.

A full Equality Impact Assessment was undertaken at the time, which included the impact on service users and staff. A full consultation was undertaken with

staff affected and with wider partners, which was cognisant of the recent local Violence Against Women and Girls Needs Assessment.

Although there have been some reductions in the numbers of IDVAs in Cambridgeshire, these have been offset by some IDVAS moving to the Peterborough team. As part of the restructure, referral pathways have been refined to ensure that ALL victims and survivors are still able to access a service. The IDVA Service has revised its focus to those at highest risk of serious harm. A new pathway for those at medium risk reporting to the police has been commissioned by the OPCC, delivered by Peterborough Women's Aid in consultation with the Victim and Witness Hub. The countywide outreach service, delivered by DASS (Domestic Abuse Support Service) continues to offer support to all victims of domestic abuse.

As part of the response to this question we have contacted the resident directly offering the opportunity to discuss further. For any further queries, please contact Julia Cullum, Head of Service – Domestic Abuse and Sexual Violence, at Julia.cullum@cambridgeshire.gov.uk ‘

Cambridge Community Safety Partnership

- 21 October 2025

ACTION POINTS

MONTH / NUMBER	ACTION POINT	ACTION
07/01	Louise Walker to share contact details with Chris Mills, Vision Zero Partnership, for Mark Freeman, Scott Liddle, Nick Morris, Hannah Hancock, Inspector Shawn Emms and Sergeant Alice Jeffery.	Closed: Contact details shared on 1 July 2025.
07/02	Scott Fretwell to update about the writing of the Terms of Reference for an E-scooter charger / battery Co-ordinating Group, which can deliver as a CCSP subgroup.	Carried over from July 2025 meeting and update to be shared.
07/03	For Priority 1: Preventing Violence and Exploitation – CCSP to explore potential additional funding for Street Pastors / NightLite.	Carried over from July 2025 meeting and update to be shared.
07/04	Scott Liddle, CCSP representative for Cambridgeshire County Council, to follow up the pre-advised question from the public regarding the	Closed: Response in Appendix 1 of the draft 1 July CCSP Meeting Minutes.

	Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Domestic Abuse and Sexual Violence Partnership Restructure.	
07/05	Louise Walker to share contact details for Shona McKenzie (OPCC) and Mike Todd-Jones regarding the OPCC Commissioning Service.	Closed: Contact details shared on 1 July.
07/06	Scott Liddle to provide the details for the County Council Trading Standards contact and Nick Morris to be linked in with Scott Fretwell.	Closed: Contact details shared on 2 July.
07/07	The E-scooter charger / battery Co-ordinating Group to provide a presentation to the Cambridge CSP at the next meeting on 21 October to advise how the CSP can progress raising awareness with the public, such as with a campaign.	Closed: Agenda Item.
07/08	Keryn Jalli to submit a Cambridge CSP funding application to the OPCC for the Home Office Hotspot Action Funding for summer 2025.	Closed: Application submitted, and Cambridge City were successful in receiving funding.

Reoffending Deep Dive

Cambridge City

Draft v.05

Published 2025

The Policy and Insight Team (PIT) is a multi-disciplinary team that fulfils the research function for Cambridgeshire County Council. The team continues to take on a range of work commissioned by other public sector bodies within both Cambridgeshire and beyond.

We publish publicly available data and reports on our dedicated website:

[Cambridgeshire Insight \(http://www.cambridgeshireinsight.org.uk/\)](http://www.cambridgeshireinsight.org.uk/)

For more information about the team phone 01223 715300.

Document Details

Title: Reoffending deep dive – Cambridge City

Date Published: 2025

Description: A deep dive into reoffending in Cambridge City

Language: English. Please contact the research group for translations in other languages (policyandinsight@cambridgeshire.gov.uk)

Produced by: The Policy and Insight Team, Cambridgeshire County Council (the PIT)

Additional Contributions:

- Cambridgeshire Constabulary
- Cambridgeshire County Council
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Probation Service
- Cambridge City Council
- Youth Justice Service

On behalf of: The document has been produced by the PIT, on behalf of Cambridge City CSP and is available to download from [Cambridgeshire Insight](http://www.cambridgeshireinsight.org.uk/)

Geographic Coverage: Cambridge City

Time Period: January 2021 to December 2024

Format: Microsoft Word

Status: Draft v0.5

Usage Statement: This product is the property of the Policy and Insight Team, Cambridgeshire County Council. If you wish to reproduce this document either in whole, or in part, please acknowledge the source and the author(s).

Disclaimer: Cambridgeshire County Council, while believing the information in this publication to be correct, does not guarantee its accuracy nor does the County Council accept any liability for any direct or indirect loss or damage or other consequences, however arising from the use of such information supplied.

Table of Contents

Document Details	2
Table of Contents	3
1. Executive Summary	5
1.1. Introduction	5
1.2. Recommendations	5
1.3. Summary of Key Findings	7
2. Probation and IOM Data	10
2.1. Probation	10
2.2. Integrated Offender Management (IOM)	14
3. Youth Justice Service (YJS) Data	15
5.1 Overview	15
3.2. Offences and Outcomes	16
3.3. Demographics	18
3.4. Assetplus profile	19
4. Police Data	20
4.1. Summary	20
4.2. Technical note	20
4.3. Repeat suspects in Cambridge City	21
4.4. Shoplifting	22
4.5. Violence without injury	23
4.6. Stalking and harassment	24
4.7. Violence with injury	25
5. PSG and PGPM Analysis	26
5.1. Adult PSG	26
5.2. Peer Group and Places Meetings (PGPM)	28
6. Glossary	32
Appendix A: Technical Notes	33
General	33

Police data.....	33
Probation data.....	33
Appendix B: Appendix Tables	34
References	36

DRAFT

1. Executive Summary

1.1. Introduction

Community Safety Partnerships (CSP) have a range of statutory duties. One specific duty for CSPs relates directly to reducing reoffending - laid out below:

- Formulate and implement a strategy for the reduction of reoffending in the area as per the Crime and Disorder Act, 1998 (Section 6).

The mechanism in which it should achieve this statutory duty is up to local decision makers. In Cambridgeshire a range of initiatives are in place. Due to the two-tier nature of the local structures, the integrated offender management programme (IOM) is delivered at a force level. CSPs can determine other activity locally to tackle specific local issues.

In order to determine what specific local issues are pertinent to the duty to reduce reoffending, the CSP commissioned a deep dive to provide an updated evidence base. The strictest definition of 'reoffending' would only include those individuals who have a proven history of reoffending. Given the limitations of only tackling those with a proven history e.g. the time lag from committing an offence to completing a criminal justice outcome, this report lays out a range of analysis from the broadest issues surrounding 'reoffending' for the partnership to consider.

The report seeks to answer the following questions:

- What does reoffending mean in the context of Cambridge City?
- How are people causing concern through repeat offending?
- What types of community safety issues can be prioritised to reduce reoffending?
- Who is known to reoffend and what interventions can be targeted to reduce reoffending?

To answer these questions, this report draws on data from the Cambridge City Community Safety Partnership (CSP) Adult Problem Solving Group (PSG) and Peer Group and Places Meeting (PGPM), police data, probation and integrated offender management (IOM) data, and youth justice service (YJS) data. Given the disparate nature of the datasets and issued examined, the executive summary and report groups them or takes them separately as appropriate.

1.2. Recommendations

Strategic Recommendations

When making decisions about prioritisation and action planning, the CSP should consider the following:

- The resources and capacity it currently has to prevent or reduce reoffending.
- Does the current work delivered through the IOM scheme meet the requirements of the statutory duty?
 - What information does the partnership require to understand the impact of the scheme and monitor it over time?
- Are there opportunities for the CSP to work 'upstream'?
 - This could include prioritising children at risk of offending or who have offended.
 - Working adults who have offended and are at risk of reoffending.
- Does the partnership have specific issues or locations it wants to prioritise?
 - Are there particular concerns relating to violent crimes and the level of harm that the partnership should prioritise?

Operational Recommendations

1. Given that analysis shows the complex needs of children in the PGPM minutes, it is recommended that the CSP continue with the integrated multi-agency support at these meetings. It is recommended that
 - Engagement with secondary schools be prioritised given the common age of 14 to 15 for YJS data and ages 14 to 15 for the PGPM data.
 - Those known to the PGPM who go on to offend and become open to YJS be monitored in order to better understand triggers and potential interventions.
 - The CSP evaluate how to best work with wider partners such as YJS colleagues to provide support to those youth people to move them away from further offending.
2. Given that the method of recording PSG and PGPM meetings does not lend itself to either statistical or detailed analysis, it is recommended that the CSP review the format of the PSG and PGPM monthly minutes notes to aid any future analysis.
 - A move from ECINS recording to Microsoft Word minutes for the Adult PSG made analysis easier because all connected information was more accessible for analysis.
 - Adult PSG minutes are structured around locations. While individual information is recorded, it can be limited and difficult to draw out conclusions. Greater emphasis should be on the recording of individuals to encourage the recording of needs – this would help to identify possible support pathways. A move to this person-centred recording approach for Adult PSG minutes will help to support and strengthen the multi-agency approach of the PSG.

3. Given the importance of place and peer networks in PGPM minutes, it is recommended that the CSP continue with the Risk Outside the Home (ROTH) approach of peer groups and place in its PGPM minutes format.
4. Furthermore, given that deep dive reports on reoffending have also been commissioned for the South Cambridgeshire CSP and the East Cambridgeshire CSP, this may be an opportunity to find standardised elements to aid cross comparison and support county wide initiatives such ROTH.

1.3. Summary of Key Findings

1.3.1. Adults who have reoffended

Probation

Three probation cohorts that are residents in Cambridge City were analysed: those sentenced in 2022, those sentenced in 2023, and those sentenced in 2024. Males accounted for the majority of both the total cohort and the repeat offenders cohort, and the majority within the cohorts were below 40 years old. All cohort years showed that acquisitive offences were more likely to be associated with reoffences.

When analysed by the cohort sentenced year, the number of adults who reoffended between 2022 and 2024 ranged between 19 and 69. Those more recently sentenced had fewer recorded reoffences as expected because with each subsequent cohort, there is a smaller time window to reoffend.

IOM

As of July 2025, the registered cohort of those residing in Cambridge City was 18 IOM adults who have reoffended. Within the historic cohort of those registered at some point between October 2021 and December 2024, there were 23 people in total residing in Cambridge City, and this accounted for 11% of the total historic IOM cohort for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough.

The majority of offenders were aged between 30 to 39 at the first offence recorded in IOM (43%), and this was followed by 25 to 29 years (26%). Insight from the data provider suggested that burglary is a key offence type in Cambridge and more specifically, domestic burglary.

1.3.2. Children who have reoffended

Youth Justice Service (YJS)

Four YJS cohorts were analysed: 2021, 2022, 2023 and 2024. These cohorts are determined by grouping children who reoffended by their first outcome date. The number of children who reoffended between 2021 and 2024 ranged between 10 and 17. The proportion of children who reoffended decreased with each yearly cohort, and this is expected because with each subsequent cohort, there is a smaller time window to reoffend.

Across the four cohorts, most children who reoffended were aged between 14 to 15 (48%).

1.3.3. Wider community issues

Monthly Adult PSG and PGPM were analysed to understand the wider community issues of Cambridge City.

The Adult PSG had 24 locations that had multiple community safety incidents per location. The PGPM had 21 individuals with multiple community safety incidents and 10 locations with multiple community safety incidents for a combined cohort of 31 for the PGPM.

First, almost all the analysed individuals cohort in the PGPM were associated with multiple locations, and this data highlighted the importance of place. Second, most of the analysed individuals cohort in the PGPM were networked with other individuals in the PGPM and highlighted the importance of peer groups.

Both the Adult PSG and PGPM had similar community safety issues. Mentions of drugs was a top 3 issue for both PSGs, and both had community safety issues related to violence - this included threatening behaviour, assault, harassment, and weapons.

Community safety incidents were also analysed based on impact to the individual, the community, or the physical environment. The PGPM had a higher proportion of individuals impacted (95% (20 out of 21) vs 63% (15 out of 24)) compared to the Adult PSG. Both the Adult PSG and PGPM had a similar impact on the community (90% (19 out of 21) vs 83% (20 out of 24)).

1.3.4. Thematic Issues highlighted by analysis

1.3.4.1. The needs of children

Analysis of the PGPM and YJS data show common themes in terms of children's needs and the highlight the complex interconnected nature of these needs. These issues include similar ages, school disruption, mentions of drugs and substance

misuse, children's social care engagement, and overlap of individuals between the PGPM and YJS.

Age

First, both data sets point to slightly older students in secondary school. 52% of the analysed cohort in the PGPM were between age 14 and 15. For the YJS data, most children who reoffended over the four years were aged between 14 to 15 (48%).

School disruption

From the PGPM, 48% of the analysed individuals cohort (10 out of 21) experienced some form of disruption to school including a managed move from another school, waiting for managed move to a new school, in an alternative school provision, attending school offsite, or being permanently excluded during 2024.

Drugs and Substance misuse

For the PGPM, 31% of the analysed individuals cohort (7 out of 21) had mention of drugs.

For the YJS data, there were assetplus assessments for 36 of the 56 children who reoffended (45%) over the four years. 58% of this cohort had evidence of substance misuse (21 people), and the majority were only using cannabis (62%).

Children's social care

For the PGPM data, 57% of the analysed cohort (12 out of 21) had mention of children's social care services. For YJS, across all cohorts, 32% of children who reoffended had social care status. This indicates wider issues of need for those children and highlighting their level of vulnerability.

Overlap of individuals in both PGPM and YJS

There is an overlap of 8 individuals that are both in the PGPM analysed cohort and the YJS cohort.

1.3.4.2. Geographic priority areas

Trumpington, Arbury, and King's Hedges were the wards that stood out among both the analysed Adult PSG and PGPM data sets.

For the YJS data, numbers were very small, and analysis was limited. When the four yearly cohorts were combined, King's Hedges was the ward with the highest number of children who reoffend.

1.3.4.3. Higher harm crimes

Violence was the common theme across most of the data sets analysed. For PSG analysis, the notes and incidents were reviewed and categorised into similar 'types', and these do not translate directly into police recorded crimes or incidents.

Adults

For the Adult PSG, community safety issues related to violence included threatening behaviour (46%; 11 out of 24), assault (29%; 7 out of 24), harassment (29%; 7 out of 24), and weapons (25%; 6 out of 24).

From the Police suspects data, the crime types which had the highest volumes of repeat suspects were violence without injury, shoplifting, stalking and harassment, violence with injury, and criminal damage.

Children

For the PGPM, community safety issues related to violence included threatening behaviour (65%; 20 out of 31), assault (29%; 9 out of 31), weapons (19%; 6 out of 31), and harassment (16%; 5 out of 31).

For YJS, violence against the person (VAP) made up 42% of first offences of the total cohort of children who offend. Of those children who reoffend, the majority of first offences of the reoffending cohort across the four years was VAP (43%, 24). VAP consistently remained the highest across all four yearly cohorts.

In terms of the most serious further offence in the reoffending cohort, VAP offences also accounted for the highest proportion of the most serious further offence (38%, 21).

2. Probation and IOM Data

2.1. Probation

This section focuses on adult offenders who are supervised and managed by the Probation Service and whose latest known address is in Cambridge, see Appendix A Note. The Probation Service supervises offenders who are either serving community sentences or who are released to the community from prison; it is a statutory service. Data was provided from the Probation Service through the collation of case management data, offender assessment system data (OASys) and Office of National Statistics (ONS) postcode data.

The dataset provided is based on a snapshot from 17/07/2025 and is inclusive of those who were active on probation on 17/07/2025 or those who had had an active

case at some point from April 2021 onwards. Any events that ended prior to April 2021 are not included.

For this analysis, three cohorts were established and analysed: those sentenced in 2022, those sentenced in 2023 and those sentenced in 2024. Duplicates between each cohort were removed, with 2022 cohort as the index. Further methodology notes can be found in Appendix A: Technical Notes - Probation data.

Several factors will influence the analysis in this section, particularly when measuring reoffending in the way that it has been. Whilst it provides an indication, it isn't possible to see such notable reoffending patterns over a short time period. It should be noted that results may be skewed slightly due to there only being a 3.5 year time period between when the data was extracted and the start date of the first cohort. This skew will be particularly noticeable in the 2024 cohort. Due to the smaller time period, those who were sentenced for more serious crimes tend to receive longer sentences, and therefore there is less opportunity to reoffend. Also, the time from offending to sentencing is largely impacted by the justice process. Both habitual low-level crime (mostly acquisitive) and targeted initiatives (shoplifting, drug-related etc.) should also be considered when understanding repeat offending. These caveats and details have been provided through communication with Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Probation Service.

2.1.1. Key Themes

- White/ White British are largely overrepresented in the reoffending cohort compared to the total cohort across all years.
- Most reoffenders are male across all years; this is a similar picture to the total cohort.
- Often majority of cohorts are below 40 years old.
- All cohort years showed acquisitive offences were more likely to be associated with reoffences.

2.1.1.1. Offenders sentenced in 2022

This cohort includes offenders residing in Cambridge who were sentenced in 2022. More specifically, a sub-set of offenders, who proceeded to commit further offences, are analysed as the cohort of repeat offenders.

There were 176 offenders in total, 39% of which committed further offences after their first recorded offence in 2022 (69 offenders). There was an average of 1.8 offences per repeat offender.

Some demographic information on the subset of repeat offenders is below:

- Most of the cohort were male (88%). This is slightly higher than the proportion for the total cohort at 85%.
- 72% of the cohort are White/ White British.
- Age at the time of latest offence – 33% were aged between 20 and 29, followed by 29% aged between 30 to 39.

Offence types were analysed across two cohorts: 1) those who had only committed one offence and what this offence was and 2) those who committed multiple offences and the percentage share of all these offences associated with repeat offenders.

Most offences committed by the 2022 cohort were violence (33%) followed by other (25%). Other can include offences such as public order and criminal damage.

Of the offences which were associated with repeat offenders, 34% of the offences were violence. This proportion slightly differs to that seen of the offences where only one offence was committed (31%).

Acquisitive offences had a notably higher proportion in repeat offenders (26%) compared with one offence only (8%).

Contrastingly, drug offences saw a higher proportion of offences attributed to those who committed one offence from this cohort compared with repeat offenders (14% vs 5% respectively).

Table 1: Proportion of offence types associated with offenders who committed one offence or multiple offences, residing in Cambridge, 2022 cohort

Offence Type	One offence only	Multiple offences	Total offences
Acquisitive	8%	26%	20%
Drugs	14%	5%	8%
Motoring	7%	9%	8%
Other (incl. Robbery)	27%	24%	25%
Sexual	13%	<3%	<7%
Violence	31%	34%	33%

Note: Table produced by Cambridgeshire County Council Policy and Insight Team, using data provide by Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Probation Service (CPPS).

2.1.1.2. Offenders sentenced in 2023

This cohort includes offenders residing in Cambridge who were sentenced in 2023. More specifically, a sub-set of offenders, who proceeded to commit further offences, are analysed as the cohort of repeat offenders.

There were 169 offenders in total - 28% of which committed further offences after their first recorded offence in 2023 (47 offenders). There was an average of 1.5 offences per repeat offender.

Some demographic information on the subset of repeat offenders is below:

- 81% of the cohort are male.
- Most of the cohort were aged between 30 to 39 years (age at last offence) (49%), followed by 20 to 29 years (21%).
- 77% of the cohort were White/ White British; this proportion was larger than the proportion of White/ White British in the total cohort (63%).

Offence types were analysed across two cohorts: 1) those who had only committed one offence and what this offence was and 2) those who committed multiple offences and the percentage share of all these offences associated with repeat offenders.

Most offences committed by the 2023 cohort were violence (27%).

Of the offences which were associated with repeat offenders, 29% of the offences were violence. This proportion slightly differs to that seen of the offences where only one offence was committed (26%).

Acquisitive offences had a notably higher proportion in reoffenders (21%) compared with one offence only (9%). This is similar to what was seen in the 2022 cohort.

In contrast, sexual offences saw a higher proportion of offences attributed to those who committed one offence from this cohort compared with reoffenders (15% vs <5% respectively).

Table 2: Proportion of offence types associated with offenders who committed one offence or multiple offences, residing in Cambridge, 2023 cohort

Offence Type	One offence only	Multiple offences	Total offences
Acquisitive	9%	21%	15%
Drugs	17%	12%	15%
Motoring	11%	15%	13%
Other (incl. Robbery)	21%	22%	22%
Sexual	15%	<5%	<9%
Violence	26%	29%	27%

Note: Table produced by Cambridgeshire County Council Policy and Insight Team, using data provide by Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Probation Service (CPPS).

2.1.1.3. Offenders sentenced in 2024

This cohort includes offenders residing in Cambridge who were sentenced in 2024. More specifically, a sub-set of offenders, who proceeded to commit further offences, are analysed as the cohort of repeat offenders. It should be noted that numbers for this cohort are a lot smaller; this could be due to the length of time between the extraction of the data and the start of 2024. Due to the small numbers, analysis is limited.

There were 132 offenders in total, 14% of which committed further offences after their first recorded offence in 2024 (19 offenders). There was an average of 1.4 offences per repeat offender.

Some demographic information on the subset of repeat offenders is below:

- Most of the cohort are male.
- Most of the cohort are aged between 30 to 39 (37%).
- 68% of the cohort were White/ White British.

Offence types were analysed across two cohorts: 1) those who had only committed one offence and what this offence was and 2) those who committed multiple offences and the percentage share of all these offences associated with repeat offenders.

Most offences committed by the 2024 cohort were violent offences (28%).

Most offences associated with repeat offenders were acquisitive (38%). This proportion was notably higher than that seen of the proportion associated with one offence (12%).

2.2. Integrated Offender Management (IOM)

The following summary has been compiled from notes and data provided by the Probation Service. Integrated Offender Management (IOM) is a multi-agency response to neighbourhood crime, in particular targeting the most prolific offenders. These agencies include probation, police and local authorities. IOM was introduced in 2009, and the IOM Refresh Strategy was published in December 2020 and adopted by Cambridgeshire and Peterborough in October 2021.

Data was provided by the Probation Service from the IOM scheme detailing those currently registered for the month of July 2025 and those who were registered at some point between October 2021 and December 2024; these cohorts can be described as current and historic, respectively. The analysis below is inclusive of those offenders residing in Cambridge.

As of July 2025, there are 18 registered IOM offenders. Within the historic cohort, there were 23 offenders in total, accounting for 11% of the total historic IOM cohort for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. Most offenders were aged between 30 to 39 at the first offence recorded in IOM (43%), followed by 25 to 29 years (26%). Insight from the data provider suggested that burglary is a key offence type in Cambridge, more specifically, domestic burglary.

3. Youth Justice Service (YJS) Data

5.1 Overview

This section of the report draws upon data from Cambridgeshire Youth Justice Service and aims to pull together the scale of the numbers of children aged 10 to 17 years olds in contact with the criminal justice system in Cambridge City.


For this analysis, four cohorts were established and analysed: 2021, 2022, 2023 and 2024. These cohorts are determined by grouping children who reoffend by their first outcome date. The year of this outcome date is the determinant of the cohort. If a child has multiple outcome dates, the earliest one in the year will be used. A child can only appear once in across all cohorts to avoid duplicates.

3.1.1. Children who have reoffended

Across the four years (2021 to 2024), there were 250 children who offend managed in Cambridge City. Of those 250, 56 children reoffended (22%) with a total of 235 reoffences (not including the first offence). The cohort in 2021 had the largest number of children who offend (69 people), and 2023 had the smallest cohort (57 people).

In 2021, 25% of children who entered the cohort at some point in the year went on to reoffend. In 2024, 17% of the cohort reoffended. It is expected that the proportion of those who reoffend will decrease between each cohort from 2021 and 2024 because with each subsequent cohort, there is a smaller time window to reoffend.

Figure 1: Children who reoffend in Cambridge City, from January 2021 to December 2024



Note: Chart produced by Cambridgeshire County Council Policy and Insight Team, using data sourced from CCC Child Youth Justice Management System

3.2. Offences and Outcomes

3.2.1. Type of offences

First offence (total cohort)

For context, analysis has been done on the first offence of those within each cohort regardless of whether the child went onto reoffend. Table 3 below shows that the majority of the first offences were violence against the person offences (42%). This was reflected in each cohort.

Drugs accounted for the second highest proportion of first offences across all cohorts.

Across the four cohorts, sexual offences, as the first offence, has increased in proportion from 0% in 2021 to 14% in 2024. Overall, sexual offences accounted for the fourth highest proportion of first offences across all for cohorts (6%).

Table 3: First offence type for children who have offended in Cambridge City, 2021 to 2024

First Offence Type	2021	2022	2023	2024	Total (4 years)
Violence Against The Person	45%	39%	49%	34%	42%

First Offence Type	2021	2022	2023	2024	Total (4 years)
Drugs	20%	6%	14%	<9%	12%
Theft And Handling Stolen Goods	<7%	12%	12%	16%	11%
Sexual Offences	0%	8%	<9%	14%	6%
Criminal Damage	<7%	<8%	<9%	9%	6%
Motoring Offences	<7%	<8%	<9%	<9%	4%
Public Order	0%	<8%	<9%	9%	4%
Vehicle Theft / Unauthorised Taking	<7%	<8%	<9%	<9%	4%
Other	<7%	<8%	<9%	<9%	3%
Racially Aggravated	7%	<8%	<9%	0%	3%
Robbery	0%	<8%	0%	<9%	2%
Arson	<7%	<8%	0%	0%	2%
Domestic Burglary	0%	<8%	<9%	0%	<2%
Non Domestic Burglary	0%	<8%	<9%	0%	<2%

Note: Table produced by Cambridgeshire County Council Policy and Insight Team, using data sourced from CCC Child Youth Justice Management System.

First offence (reoffending cohort)

Across the four years, violence against the person (VAP) offences accounted for the highest proportion of first offences at almost half (43%, 24). This was followed by theft and handling of stolen goods offences (14%, 8).

In 2021, 65% of the first offences were VAP; this is notably higher than seen in the other yearly cohorts where VAP ranges between 30% and 38%. VAP did consistently remain the highest across all four cohorts.

Most serious further offence (reoffending cohort)

Across the four years, violence against the person (VAP) offences also accounted for the highest proportion of the most serious further offence (38%, 21). This was followed by theft and handling stolen goods offences (21%, 12).

3.2.2. Number of further offences

Table 4 below shows that the 2023 cohort went on to commit on average a further 7.2 offences. It should be noted that a small number of the cohort in 2023 went on to commit a minimum of 15 further offences, and this could explain the large average number in 2023.

Table 4: Average number of further offences by cohort, 2021 to 2024

Cohort	2021	2022	2023	2024
Average number of further offences per child who reoffends	3.2	4.5	7.2	1.4

Note: Table produced by Cambridgeshire County Council Policy and Insight Team, using data sourced from CCC Child Youth Justice Management System.

Across four cohorts (out of 250), 13 children who have reoffended went on to commit a further 13+ offences.

3.2.3. Time between first and second offence

Across the four cohorts, over a half reoffended within 6 months of their first offence (57%), and 82% reoffended within a year of their first offence. Most of the 2021 cohort reoffended between 7 to 12 months (47%), and 71% reoffended within the year. The proportions of those who reoffended within a year for each cohort between 2021 and 2024 were 71%, 75%, 92%, and 100% respectively.

3.2.4. Outcomes

First offence outcome (reoffending cohort)

Across the four years, 'Community Resolution Police Facilitated' accounted for the highest proportion of first offence outcomes at 46% (26). This was followed by 'Referral Order' with 23% (13).

Most serious further offence outcome (reoffending cohort)

Across the four years, 'Community Resolution Police Facilitated' also accounted for the highest proportion of the most serious further offence outcome (30%, 17). This was followed by 'Referral Order' and 'Youth Restorative Disposal', both at 13% (7 each).

3.3. Demographics

Gender

- Across the four cohorts, most children who reoffend were male (80%).

Age group

- Across the four cohorts, most children who reoffend were aged between 14 to 15 (48%).
- In the 2022 cohort, 14- to 15-year-olds made up 69% of the cohort.
- In the 2024 cohort, 16- to 17-year-olds made up most of the cohort with 60%.

Ethnicity

- Across all four cohorts, most children who reoffend were White British (64%) – this is overrepresented compared to 10 to 17 Cambridge City population (53%).
- Both White Other (11%) and Asian, Black and Other (25%) were underrepresented across the four reoffending cohorts compared to the 10 to 17 Cambridge City population, at 15% and 33% respectively.
- In 2021, Asian, Black and Other accounted for 35% of the reoffending cohort, whilst White British accounted for 47%.

Social care status

- Across all cohorts, 32% of children who reoffended had social care status. Social care status includes children in care, children in need or those under child protection.

Home address – Ward

Due to small numbers, the four cohorts have been combined. King's Hedges was the ward with the highest number of children who reoffend at 9 (16%). This is followed by Cherry Hinton (14%).

3.4. Assetplus profile

Assetplus is the main assessment tool in the Youth Justice Service. Not every child who offends will have an assessment. For this analysis, all children who reoffend over the four cohorts have been grouped and only those with assetplus assessments have been analysed. A person with assetplus can have multiple assessments, and therefore, their latest assessment has been used for the analysis below. 36 of the 56 children who reoffend were on asset plus (45%).

- 36% had contact with mental health services at the time of their latest assessment (13 people).
- 28% had identified disabilities or SEND (10 people).
- 36% had 'very high' and 'high' safety and wellbeing ratings at their latest assessment (13 people).
- 58% of the cohort had evidence of substance misuse (21 people).
- The majority were only using cannabis (62%).

Since a person can be using multiple substances at once, analysis has been done by counting the mentions of each drug type and then looking at the percentage share of the total of mentions. There were 31 mentions of drugs, 61% of these mentions were cannabis, followed by alcohol (19%). Of the cohort, 29% were using two or more drugs (6 people).

4. Police Data

4.1. Summary

Shoplifting had the highest proportion of suspects who were repeat offenders of any crime type, and the second highest volume of associated suspects.

- A small number of offenders of this crime type were linked with high numbers of offences, of 20 or more.
- The maximum number of offences in Cambridge City associated with a single suspect in 2024 was 43.
- Most shoplifting suspects were male (71%), and the most common age group was 35 to 44 (37%), followed by 25 to 34 (25%).
- For shoplifting suspects with known home districts, most came from within Cambridge City.

Violence without injury had a notable proportion of repeat suspects, and the highest volume of repeat suspects.

- Most violence without injury suspects were also male (75%), and aged 25-34 or 35 to 44, though a notable portion were aged 18 to 24.
- Most violence without injury suspects with a recorded home district were from within Cambridge City, with a small number coming from other Cambridgeshire districts, or from outside Cambridgeshire.

4.2. Technical note

The following section analyses data of suspects recorded by Cambridgeshire Constabulary for offences in Cambridge City recorded in 2024. Whilst this may provide some insight into activity and demographics of suspects, it is important to be aware that the data is first and foremost a reflection of the data held by the police. It reflects just a subset of the crimes recorded by the police, as not all crimes will have an associated suspect record. Some crime types may be more likely to have associated suspect records, and individuals with certain characteristics may be more likely to be detected by the police. Moreover, this analysis refers to suspects of crimes, who may or may not have since been confirmed as offenders. Therefore, those that are referred to as “repeat suspects” are not necessarily “repeat offenders” but rather than suspects linked with multiple crime records.

Further technical notes about suspects and crime data can be seen in Appendix A: Technical Notes.

4.3. Repeat suspects in Cambridge City

A suspect is someone that is suspected by the police of being involved in a crime. This can be as the result of an allegation or can arise through the course of an investigation (MET, 2024).

- 33% of the 2996 suspects associated with crimes in Cambridge City recorded in 2024 were associated with multiple offences (1002 suspects).
- These 1002 suspects were linked with 71% (4367) of crimes (recorded in suspect records) over this period (of 6145 crimes).
- 46% of shoplifting suspects were associated with multiple shoplifting offences, a higher proportion of repeat suspects than any other crime type.
- 27% of violence without injury suspects were associated with multiple violence without injury offences; this was the fifth highest proportion of any crime type.
- Other crime types in the top 5 (for proportion of repeat suspects) were lower in volume (see Table 11 in Appendix B: Appendix Tables).

The offence types with the largest volumes of suspects associated with multiple offences of the same type are shown in Table 5.

Table 5: Suspects associated with multiple offences of the same crime type, for suspects of offences in Cambridge City recorded in 2024: Top 5 by volume of repeat suspects

Crime type	Suspect count	Suspect count (all) rank	Repeat suspect (within crime type) count	Repeat suspect count (within crime type) rank	repeat % (within crime type)	% of suspects who were repeat (within crime type) rank
Violence without injury	973	1	258	1	27%	5
Shoplifting	350	4	161	2	46%	1
Stalking and harassment	505	3	72	3	14%	15
Violence with injury	520	2	65	4	13%	16
Criminal damage	346	5	54	5	16%	13

Note: The full table of all crime types, including statistics on suspects associated with multiple offences of any type, can be found in Table 11 in Appendix B: Appendix Tables.

Table created by CCC PIT using suspect records provided by Cambridgeshire Constabulary.

Further analysis, including demographic profiles, have been provided below for the 4 crime types with the highest volumes of suspects associated with multiple offences (of those crime types), as shown in Table 5. Data refers only to crimes known to be in Cambridge City, recorded in 2024, with associated suspect records.


4.4. Shoplifting

- As noted in the previous section, shoplifting had the highest proportion of repeat suspects.
- Overall, there were 350 suspects present in suspect records for shoplifting offences recorded in Cambridge City in 2024, which were associated with 1184 offences.
- The 46% of suspects (161 suspects) who were associated with multiple offences, accounted for 88% of these offences.
- 10% of shoplifting suspects (35 suspects) were associated with 10 or more shoplifting offences in 2024.
 - These suspects accounted for 54% of shoplifting offences (638 offences).
- 3% of suspects (12 suspects) were associated with at least 20 shoplifting offences. These suspects were associated with 29% of shoplifting offences (343 offences).
- The maximum number of shoplifting offences associated with a single suspect in 2024 was 43.

Demographics

- Age and gender were recorded for all suspects.
- Almost three quarters of suspects were male (71%, 115 suspects).
- The largest age groups were those aged 35 to 44, accounting for 37% of suspects; those aged 25 to 34 accounted for 25% of suspects.
- The home district was unknown for 34% of suspects.
- As shown in Figure 2, the majority of suspects came from within Cambridge City, accounting for 43% of all shoplifting repeat suspects. For those where the home district was known, Cambridge City accounted for 65%.

Figure 2: Suspects of multiple shoplifting offences in Cambridge City recorded in 2024, by home district of suspect



Note: Chart created by CCC PIT using suspect records provided by Cambridgeshire Constabulary.

4.5. Violence without injury

- Overall, there were 973 suspects present within 1371 suspect records for violence without injury offences recorded in Cambridge City in 2024.
- Of these, 27% of suspects were associated with multiple violence without injury offences.
 - This 27% of suspects accounted for just over half of violence without injury offences (50%, 687 offences).
- 2% of suspects (19 suspects) were associated with 5 or more offences, accounting for 9% of violence without injury offences (130 offences).
- The maximum number of violence without injury offences associated with a single suspect was 14.


Demographics

- Age and gender were recorded for all suspects associated with multiple violence without injury offences.
- Three quarters of these suspects were male (75%, 194 suspects).
- Those aged 25 to 34 (25%) and those aged 35 to 44 (24%) each accounted for approximately a quarter of suspects. Those aged 18 to 24 accounted for almost a fifth (19%).

The home district was unknown for almost a quarter (24%) of suspects associated with multiple violence without injury offences.

- For the remaining 195 suspects with a recorded home district, more than three quarters were from within Cambridge City (77%, 150 suspects).
 - 13% were from another Cambridgeshire district, and 10% were from outside of Cambridgeshire.

Figure 3: Suspects associated with multiple violence without injury offences recorded in Cambridge City in 2024, by home suspect home district



Note: Chart created by CCC PIT using suspect records provided by Cambridgeshire Constabulary.

4.6. Stalking and harassment

- Overall, 505 suspects were associated with a total of 564 stalking and harassment offences recorded in Cambridge City in 2024.
- Of these, 14% of suspects were associated with multiple stalking and harassment offences.
 - This indicates that the high volume of repeat suspects in this category is primarily due to the high overall volume of suspects for this crime category.
 - These repeat suspects accounted for 29% of offences within these records.
- 3% of suspects (17 suspects) were associated with 3 or more stalking and harassment offences; this accounted for 10% of stalking and harassment offences (58 offences) over this period.
- The maximum number of offences of this type associated with a single suspect was 5.

Demographics

- Gender was not recorded for 1 suspect. Of the 71 suspects with age and gender recorded, 85% were male.
- The most common age groups were those aged 35 to 44 (32%), and those aged 25 to 34 (27%).
- Home district was not recorded for a quarter (25%) of the 72 suspects associated with multiple stalking and harassment offences.
- Of the remaining 54 suspects, most (81%, 44 suspects) were from within Cambridge City.
- 17% were from other Cambridgeshire districts.

4.7. Violence with injury

- Overall, there were 520 suspects present in suspect records for violence with injury offences recorded in Cambridge City in 2024, covering 552 offences.
- Of these, 13% were repeat suspects. This rated 16th in terms of the proportion accounted for by repeat suspects.
 - This indicates that the high volume of repeat suspects is primarily due to the overall high volume of suspects associated with these offences rather than a high proportion of suspects being associated with multiple offences.
 - These suspects were associated with 27% of violence with injury offences within the suspect records.
- 4% of suspects (19 suspects) were associated with 3 or more violence with injury offences; these were linked with for 11% of violence with injury offences (60 offences) within the suspect records.
- The maximum number of violence with injury offences associated with a single suspect, was 5.

Demographics

- Age and gender were recorded for all 65 suspects associated with multiple violence with injury offences.
- More than three quarters of these suspects were male (77%, 50 suspects).
- Those aged 35 to 44 accounted for a quarter of suspects (25%, 16 suspects); all of whom were male.
- The next most common age groups were those aged 25 to 34, and those aged 18 to 24, both accounted for a fifth of suspects each (20%, 13 suspects).
- The home district was not recorded for 10 suspects (15%).
- For the remaining 55 suspects, the majority (80%, 44 suspects) came from within Cambridge City.
- A further 16% were from other Cambridgeshire districts.

5. PSG and PGPM Analysis

Monthly minutes from the Adult PSG and PGPM were analysed to understand the wider community issues of Cambridge City. The method of recording the Adult PSG and PGPM meetings did not lend itself to either statistical or detailed analysis. The data was recorded in the form of notes; therefore, in the time available a single year's worth of data was reviewed between January and December 2024.

A focus of the analysis was to identify either individuals or locations with more than one community safety incident to align with the report's aim of understanding what reoffending looks like in the broadest sense.

5.1. Adult PSG

5.1.1. Overview

Unlike the PGPM minutes, locations of community safety incidents were the main organisation structure of monthly meeting minutes of the Adult PSG. There were 24 unique locations recorded for the Adult PSG in 2024, and these locations were analysed as to whether there was a single community safety incident in the location or if there were multiple community safety incidents associated with the location. For example, locations that were categorised with multiple community safety incidents could have a burglary incident and then a separate assault incident.

All 24 locations had multiple community safety incidents associated with each location. The large representation of multiple incidents per location could be due to only substantial cases with multiple incidents surfacing to the PSG agenda while single incidents that are fleeting do not make the PSG agenda.

These 24 locations will be referred to as the analysed cohort and will be analysed in the following subsections of geography and type and impact of community safety issues.

5.1.2. Geography

East Chesterton and Petersfield stood out as the top wards of residential locations. 25% of the analysed cohort (6 out of 24) resided in East Chesterton, and 21% of the analysed cohort (5 out of 24) resided in Petersfield. Abbey, Arbury, King's Hedges, and Trumpington made up 41% of the analysed cohort (10 out of 24).

Cases were also analysed by whether they were associated with localised area or in multiple locations. For example, a localised area may refer to just an individual's residence or the neighbours surrounding an individual's residence. Multiple locations

could include the localised area as well as parks and other public places. Table 6 below shows that most incidents were localised to one area with 71% of the analysed cohort (17 out of 24).

Table 6: Geographical spread of incidents of individuals in the analysed cohort, January to December 2024

Geographical spread	Number of individuals	% of the total
Localised	17	71%
Multiple locations	7	29%
Total	24	100%

Note: Table produced by Cambridgeshire County Council Policy and Insight Team, using data sourced from Cambridge City Community Safety Partnership.

5.1.3. Type and impact of community safety issues

The notes and incidents were reviewed and categorised into similar ‘types’; these do not translate directly into police recorded crimes or incidents.

The locations of the analysed cohort can be involved in different community safety issues, and thus, the total percentage will exceed 100%.

Table 7 below shows the top community safety issues of locations in the analysed cohort. Mentions of noise and drugs stood out as the top 2 community safety issues. Violence was also a theme with mentions of threatening behaviour, assault, harassment, and weapons.

Table 7: Top community safety issues in locations of the analysed cohort, January to December 2024

Community Safety Issue	Number of locations	% of the total
Noise	19	79%
Drugs	14	58%
Threatening behaviour	11	46%
Criminal damage	9	38%
Assault	7	29%
Harassment	7	29%
Weapons	6	25%

Note: Table produced by Cambridgeshire County Council Policy and Insight Team, using data sourced from Cambridge City Community Safety Partnership.

In terms of impact, the monthly minutes were analysed by whether the community safety incidents impacted an individual, a community, or the physical environment. Individuals can have multiple impacts, and thus, the total percentage will exceed 100%.

Table 8 shows that impact on an individual makes up 63% of the analysed cohort (15 out of 24), and impact to a community makes up 83% of the analysed cohort (20 out of 24). Impact to the physical environment is smaller at 46% of the analysed cohort (11 out of 24).

Table 8: Type of impact by individuals in the analysed cohort, January to December 2024

Type of Impact	Number of individuals	% of total
Individual	15	63%
Community	20	83%
Physical environment	11	46%
Total	24	N/A

Note: Table produced by Cambridgeshire County Council Policy and Insight Team, using data sourced from Cambridge City Community Safety Partnership.

5.2. Peer Group and Places Meetings (PGPM)

5.2.1. Overview

Individuals, groups, and locations were tracked across the monthly meeting minutes of the Peer Group and Places Meetings (PGPM) in 2024. Locations refer to areas without a specific address and with minimal information on individuals – for examples, locations could refer to a street or park where community safety issues are occurring.

There were 45 unique cases of individuals, groups, locations, and those categorised “other”. 56% of these cases (25 out of 45) were individuals, and 29% were locations (13 out of 45).

Individuals and locations were then each categorised into those with a single community safety incident and those with multiple community safety incidents.

84% of the individuals (21 out of 25) and 77% of locations (10 out of 13) were associated with multiple community safety incidents. Multiple community safety incidents can include different types of community safety issues or all the same community safety issue.

This cohort of 21 individuals will be referred to as the analysed individuals cohort, and the cohort of 10 locations will be referred to as the analysed locations cohort.

5.2.2. Geography

The analysed individuals cohort and the analysed locations cohort were combined to conduct ward analysis.

Of the combined cohort of 31, 19% (6 of 31) resided in Trumpington or on the border of Trumpington and Harston & Comberton. Arbury, King's Hedges, and Queen Edith's made up 32% (10 of 31).

The ward representation may be due to who attends PGPM meetings or where current activities and initiatives are taking place. This is especially relevant for schools who may not regularly attend PGPM meetings.

The analysed individual cohort was also analysed by whether they were associated with a localised area or in multiple locations. For the PGPM, 62% occurred in multiple locations (13 out of 21). This reflects a key difference with the Adult PSG where most adult individuals were localised. This is partly due to the added location of school, but there are also more mentions of public locations such as parks and youth clubs.

5.2.3. Characteristics of individuals

The analysed individuals cohort was analysed by the following characteristics: age, gender, type of housing, alcohol, mental health concerns, SEND/neurodiversity, mentions of children's social care, and mentions of school disruption.

Ages were calculated using birth dates in the monthly meeting minutes and their age as of 31 December 2024. 52% of the analysed individuals cohort (11 out of 21) were between ages 14 and 15, and 38% of the analysed individuals cohort (8 out of 21) were between ages 16 and 17.

In terms of gender, males made up 71% of the analysed individuals cohort (15 out of 21), and the remainder were female or unknown.

In terms of type of housing, 43% of the analysed individuals cohort (9 out of 21) were in a residence owned by Cambridge City Council Housing. However, it was not possible to determine the type of housing for the remainder of the analysed individuals cohort, and these were categorised "unknown".

Monthly meetings minutes were also analysed for mention of alcohol, mental health concerns, and SEND/neurodiversity. There were no mentions of alcohol in the analysed individuals cohort (0 out of 21), and mentions of mental health concerns and SEND/neurodiversity had very small numbers that were each less than five.

Mentions of children's social care support were analysed. 57% of the analysed individuals cohort (12 out of 21) had some mention of children's social care services. This included targeted support, children in need, and children in care.

When schools were analysed, 48% of the analysed individuals cohort (10 out of 21) experienced some form of disruption to school including a managed move from another school, waiting for managed move to a new school, in an alternative school provision, attending school offsite, or being permanently excluded during 2024.

5.2.4. Type and impact of community safety issues

The notes and incidents were reviewed and categorised into similar 'types'; these do not translate directly into police recorded crimes or incidents.

To analyse the type of community safety issues, the analysed individuals cohort and the analysed locations cohort were combined. The combined cohort can be involved in different community safety issues, and thus, the total percentage will exceed 100%.

Table 9 below shows the top community safety issues of the combined analysed cohort of 31. Mentions of threatening behaviour stood out as the top community safety issue. Similar to the Adult PSG, violence was also a theme with mentions of threatening behaviour, assault, harassment, and weapons. Mentions of drugs were in the top 3 with 26% of the combined cohort (8 out of 31). Numbers of other community safety issues were small and were each less than five.

Table 9: Top community safety issues in locations of the combined analysed individuals and locations cohort, January to December 2024

Community Safety Issue	Number of locations	% of the total
Threatening behaviour	20	65%
Assault	9	29%
Drugs	8	26%
Criminal damage	7	23%
Weapons	6	19%
Harassment	5	16%
Theft	5	16%

Note: Table produced by Cambridgeshire County Council Policy and Insight Team, using data sourced from Cambridge City Community Safety Partnership.

In terms of impact, only the analysed individuals cohort was analysed, and these were categorised as to whether the community safety incidents impacted an individual, a community, or the physical environment. Individuals can have multiple impacts, and thus, the total percentage will exceed 100%.

Table 10 shows that impact on an individual makes up 95% of the analysed individuals cohort (20 out of 21), and impact to a community makes up 90% of the analysed individuals cohort (19 out of 21). Similar to the Adult PSG, impact to the physical environment is smaller at 24% of the analysed cohort (5 out of 21).

Table 10: Type of impact by analysed individuals cohort, January to December 2024

Type of Impact	Number of individuals	% of total
Individual	20	95%
Community	19	90%
Physical environment	5	24%
Total	21	N/A

Note: Table produced by Cambridgeshire County Council Policy and Insight Team, using data sourced from Cambridge City Community Safety Partnership.

6. Glossary

Term/abbreviation	Definition
Asset	Assessment used in Youth Justice
CCC	Cambridgeshire County Council
FOI	Freedom of Information. Part of the Freedom of Information Act. Information about this is available on the Information Commissioner's Office: What is the FOI Act and are we covered? ICO
IOM	Integrated Offender Management
MET	Metropolitan police
PIT (or CCC PIT)	Policy and Insight Team (part of Cambridgeshire County Council)
PSG	Problem Solving Group
YJS	Youth Justice Service

Appendix A: Technical Notes

General

1. Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

Police data

1. Volume of offences was calculated based on the number of incident numbers associated with suspects. Offences with no associated suspect record were not included in this analysis.
2. Analysis of crime and suspect records is based on a snapshot of records held by the police at the time it was sent to CCC PIT. Records may be subject to change, as crimes are updated, corrected, or “uncrimed”.
3. Analysis of suspect records is based on a subset of crimes which have associated suspect records, and so should be treated with caution. Biases in data may be present. For example, some crime types may be more likely to have suspects associated, and some suspect demographics may be more or less likely to be detected by the police.
4. Suspects are not confirmed offenders.
5. Information on what evidence is required for the police to record someone as a suspect is available on the Metropolitan Police website, in the form of an FOI response: [Evidence needed to mark some a suspect | Metropolitan Police](#).

Probation data

District

The location was determined using the postcode provided by the Probation Service. This postcode is the person on probation’s current or most recently known residential address. The district was established by using the Policy and Insight Team’s internal updated address lookup from Address Base Premium.

Methodology

Three cohorts were established and analysed; those sentenced in 2022, those sentenced in 2023 and those sentenced in 2024. Duplicates across cohorts were removed with 2022 as an index. If an offender was in 2022 cohort and also present in 2023 and 2024 cohorts, they were excluded from the latter. If the offender was

sentenced multiple times in the calendar year, their first offence in the year was the first offence used. Repeat offenders (within the Probation Service) were then classed as anyone with subsequent offence(s).

In terms of the offences analysis, it was looking at what types of offences are associated with those who only had one sentence, and then what types of offences are associated with those who had multiple subsequent sentences.

Age Groups

Age groups were based on their latest offence; therefore some caution should be taken. However, due to the nature of analysis there is only a difference of 3 ½ years maximum between the first date in the 2022 cohort and when the data was extracted so ages may not vary too much but may influence the proportions of age groups slightly.

Appendix B: Appendix Tables

Table 11: Suspects who were repeat suspects of crimes in Cambridge City recorded in 2024, within crime type, and for any crime type, by count, rank, and percentage of suspects who were associated with multiple offences

Crime type	Suspect count	Suspect count rank	Repeat suspect count (within crime type)	Repeat suspect count (within crime type) rank	Suspects who were repeat % (within crime type)	Suspects who were repeat % (within crime type) rank
Shoplifting	350	4	161	2	46%	1
Theft from a vehicle	22	22	10	15	45%	2
Bicycle theft	60	18	20	9	33%	3
Burglary - business and community	44	19	12	14	27%	4
Violence without injury	973	1	258	1	27%	5
Robbery of business property	8	24	2	22	25%	6
Theft or unauth taking of a motor veh	37	20	9	16	24%	7
Residential burglary-home	62	17	14	12	23%	8
Other offences public order	115	12	25	7	22%	9
Public fear, alarm or distress	205	7	38	6	19%	10
Residential burglary-unconnected build	12	23	2	22	17%	11
Other theft	148	9	24	8	16%	12
Criminal damage	346	5	54	5	16%	13

Crime type	Suspect count	Suspect count rank	Repeat suspect count (within crime type)	Repeat suspect count (within crime type) rank	Suspects who were repeat % (within crime type)	Suspects who were repeat % (within crime type) rank
Arson	7	25	1	25	14%	14
Stalking and harassment	505	3	72	3	14%	15
Violence with injury	520	2	65	4	13%	16
Robbery of personal property	66	15	8	18	12%	17
Possession of weapons	134	11	16	10	12%	18
Race or religious agg public fear	64	16	7	19	11%	19
Other sexual offences	137	10	13	13	9%	20
Trafficking of drugs	98	13	7	19	7%	21
Possession of drugs	233	6	16	10	7%	22
Theft from the person	37	20	2	22	5%	23
Misc crimes against society	183	8	9	16	5%	24
Rape	88	14	4	21	5%	25
Aggravated vehicle taking	7	25	0	26	0%	26
Homicide	5	28	0	26	0%	26
Interfering with a motor vehicle	6	27	0	26	0%	26

Source: Table created by CCC PIT using suspect records provided by Cambridgeshire Constabulary

References

MET. (2024, August). *Evidence needed to mark some a suspect. Freedom of information request no: 01.FOI.24.039567*. Retrieved from <https://www.met.police.uk/foi-ai/metropolitan-police/disclosure-2024/august-2024/evidence-needed-mark-some-suspect/>

CAMBRIDGE COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP

TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. Foreword

a) The following values and strategic drivers are key to the Cambridge Community Safety Partnership (“Cambridge CSP”):

- ❑ We will be responsible for an overarching strategic framework¹ for reducing crime and improving community safety in Cambridge;
- ❑ We will ensure that all partner agencies² work together and ensure the work of each agency is “joined up” and that our performance is effectively managed;
- ❑ We will ensure that our work is linked to national and county priorities and research, including the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011, the Localism Act 2011, Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014, and Police, Crime, Sentencing and Courts Act 2022, with particular reference to the Serious Violence Duty, to best serves the people of Cambridge;
- ❑ We will take an intelligence-led process to our business and ensure problem solving³ is a tool used to address issues;
- ❑ We will engage⁴ with the community as a whole, encouraging people to become involved with reporting and tackling crime and disorder in Cambridge;
- ❑ We will also engage with other partnerships on issues that relate to Cambridge both at the area and citywide level;

¹ Senior managers will be responsible for ensuring their organisations and agencies deliver against this framework.

² Anglia Ruskin University, British Transport Police, Cambridge Business Against Crime, **Cambridge City Council**, Support Cambridgeshire (merger of Cambridge Council for Voluntary Service (CCVS) and Hunts Forum), Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Cambridgeshire & Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust, **Cambridgeshire Constabulary**, **Cambridgeshire County Council**, **Cambridgeshire Fire & Rescue Service**, **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Integrated Care Systems**, Office of the Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Commissioner, **Probation Service** and University of Cambridge. Those shown in **bold** are the statutory agencies.

³ Problem solving is a means of harnessing all agencies and the community (including the two Cambridge Universities) itself to reduce crime, disorder and anti-social behaviour by identifying the root cause of problems, finding a sustainable solution that removes the cause and thus ultimately reducing the demands made on the Cambridge CSP.

⁴ Policing and Safer Neighbourhoods is the driving force for the Cambridge CSP’s engagement work.

- ❑ We will allocate funding using transparent procedures and based on available evidence; and
- ❑ We will work to ensure that our human and financial resources are used as effectively as possible, by monitoring and evaluating our work.

b) The following is the priority of the Cambridge CSP for 2025-27.

The detail for the priority is in the Cambridge Community Safety Plan 2025-27:

- Priority 1: Preventing Violence and Exploitation
- Priority 2: A Neighbourhood Approach
- Priority 3: Tackling Acquisitive Crime

2. Agencies represented on the Cambridge CSP are responsible for:

- a) Appointing a representative (“member”) to attend meetings and events hosted by the Cambridge CSP, and to act as the contact point between other agencies;
- b) Ensuring that their member is well briefed on their roles and responsibilities and has received a proper handover briefing when there has been a change of membership; and
- c) Contributing to multi-agency problem solving on the crime and disorder issues identified within the Community Safety Plan 2025-27 (“CS Plan”), ensuring that relevant members contribute to any working groups set up by the Cambridge CSP.

3. Members⁵ are responsible for:

- a) Contributing to the work and development of the Cambridge CSP;
- b) Ensuring their respective agency is effectively considering community safety in the way it delivers its services;
- c) Identifying the resources their agency can bring to bear on the problems identified by the Cambridge CSP;
- d) Attending all Cambridge CSP meetings, ensuring that all relevant agenda papers are read and understood;

⁵ Some members will be Board members – see “Voting”.

- e) Ensuring that any reports for discussion by the Cambridge CSP are forwarded to the Community Safety Partnership Support Officer by whatever deadline is set, advising of any that are confidential and require appropriate handling;
- f) Feeding back from Cambridge CSP meetings to their respective agency, ensuring all relevant people are aware of its work and the Plan;
- g) Advising the Cambridge CSP of any community safety issues arising from their respective agencies; and
- h) Ensuring that their respective agency complies with requirements of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 and the Police and Justice Act 2006 to supply non-personal data to the Policy and Insight Team, Cambridgeshire County Council, and other member agencies in order to deliver evidence-based decision making.

4. The Cambridge CSP is responsible for:

- a) Commissioning the Policy and Insight Team to undertake Strategic Assessments;
- b) Agreeing the annual refresh of the CS Plan, using the Strategic Assessments as a basis for decision-making;
- c) Setting objectives and targets within the CS Plan that are SMART⁶ and based on a problem-solving approach;
- d) Commissioning and financing projects to tackle problems identified by the Strategic Assessments;
- e) Allocating grant funding, awarded to the Cambridge CSP, in line with the conditions of grant, in order to further the objectives of the CS Plan;
- f) Monitoring achievement against the objectives and targets identified in each Task Group's Action Plan and challenging lack of progress, where appropriate⁷;
- g) Evaluating the success of Cambridge CSP initiatives and disseminating the lessons learnt; and
- h) Working with the Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Commissioner to ensure that the Community Strategy and CS Plan are complementary to each other.

⁶ Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-based

⁷ See role of the "Vice Chair"

5. The Chair is responsible for:

- a) Convening and the procedural role of chairing meetings of the Cambridge CSP, ensuring that it gets through the business on the agenda and takes clear decisions on recommendations made by majority vote;
- b) Ensuring that, prior to conducting the business of each meeting, the general public (where present) are reminded of the “Information for the general public and media representatives” printed on the back of the Agenda;
- c) Representing⁸ the Cambridge CSP at other meetings and acting as the “public face” of the Cambridge CSP when dealing with the media.

In the absence of both the **Chair and Vice Chair**, an alternative Board Member will be nominated and approved by the Cambridge CSP members to chair the Cambridge CSP meeting.

6. The Vice Chair is responsible for:

- a) Chairing meetings of the Cambridge CSP in the absence of the Chair;
- b) Representing the Chair at other meetings and acting as the public face of the Cambridge CSP when dealing with the media, where appropriate and advised;
- c) Conducting preparatory work, with the Policy and Insight Team, to contextualise current Cambridge CSP performance;
- d) Acting as a “Champion” for the Strategic Assessment process to ensure that information required to build a profile of the community and its needs is available to the Policy and Insight Team;
- e) Taking ownership of the performance management process and reviewing this at Cambridge CSP meetings; and
- f) Working to improve business processes that support delivery against the agreed priorities.

7. Voting

- a) The Chair will, where a report seeks Board approval of a recommendation, call for a show of hands of those Board members present, taking into account any votes

⁸ The Chair may delegate to the Vice Chair or an appropriate member where potential conflicts of interest or dual roles may occur.

notified to the Community Safety Partnership Support Officer from those Board members not present and not represented⁹;

- b) Each representative agency is entitled to **one vote only**; and
- c) In the event of a tie, the Chair has the deciding vote.
- d) **A quorum for decision-making shall consist of a minimum of five Board Members.**

8. The Multi-Agency Steering Group, which consists of representatives for Cambridge City Council, Cambridgeshire Constabulary, Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service, Cambridgeshire County Council, their Policy and Insight Team, and includes Priority Lead Officers, is responsible for:

- a) Leadership and governance of the Cambridge CSP;
- b) Providing professional advice, support and recommendations to the Cambridge CSP to enable it to fulfil the responsibilities outlined above;
- c) Managing the agenda for Cambridge CSP meetings (in consultation with the Chair) to ensure that work is sensibly programmed throughout the year and that Board members have the briefings they need to make informed decisions;
- d) Managing the bidding and commissioning process for any grant funding streams available to the Cambridge CSP, making recommendations to Board members on the projects to be funded in line with the conditions of grant and the objectives set out in the CS Plan;
- e) Drafting the annual refresh of the CS Plan and providing advice on relevant SMART objectives and targets;
- f) Providing advice and support to any working groups set up by the Cambridge CSP.

9. The Community Safety Partnership Support Officer is responsible for (in addition to the usual secretariat duties):

- a) Ensuring Cambridge CSP meetings are advertised on the City Council's website in good time and that the agenda and reports are posted within five working days of each meeting;
- b) Ensuring that the Chair is notified of any questions to be raised prior to each meeting;

⁹ For the purposes of voting, representatives attending meetings on behalf of absent Board members will be deemed as Board members

- c) Ensuring agreed actions are taken forward between meetings;
- d) Writing an Annual Review on the work of the Cambridge CSP and making sure that information about the Cambridge CSP is publicised via the web and other appropriate mechanisms;
- e) Providing induction support and materials for new members; and
- f) Monitoring the performance of working groups to enable the Vice Chair to have up to date information to either inform assessment of their achievements or to provide evidence to challenge failings, where appropriate.

10. For further information, visit [Cambridge Community Safety Partnership](#).

Domestic Abuse Quarterly Performance Report 2025-26

Quarter 1: April to June 2025

Q1 Total referral data

	Total Referrals	Referral criteria met	Engagement % of criteria met referrals	Repeats of total referrals
IDVA Referrals	500	428	312 73%	149 30%

For comparison, in Q1 2024-25 there were 619 referrals to the Cambridgeshire IDVA Service

Q1 2025-26 Data all risk level IDVAs

	Total Referrals	Referral criteria met	Engagement % of criteria met referrals	Repeats of total referrals	Referrals Q1 24-25	Referrals Q1 23-24
City	103	88	78%	39	96	51
East	56	47	84%	13	50	58
Fenland	81	70	73%	21	74	61
Hunts	141	124	69%	45	140	89
South	83	73	68%	24	72	58
Out of Area	36	27	78%	7		
Total	500	428	73%	30%	619	438

*Including Medium Risk

	Total Referrals	Referral criteria met	Engagement % of criteria met referrals	Repeat of total referrals	Referrals Q1 24-25	Referrals Q1 23-24
CYP Cambs 13 –17 (Children Young People)	18	18 / 21	62%	5 / 21	24	26
CYP Peterborough Excluding MARAC referrals	3				5	12
Housing	25	21	71%	0	51	N/A
Ethnic Minority	52	45	87%	10	55	12
Stalking (All – Cambs and Peterborough)	20	20	90%	9	42	35
OOCD (Out of Court Disposals)	0	0	0	0	10	36

Other relevant Q1 data

Agency	Q1 2025/26 Cambridgeshire	Q1 2024/25	Q1 2023/24
Number of Daily MARAC	230	270 (C&P)	260 (C&P)
Police DA Incidents Cambs	2431	2073 (C&P)	1969 (C&P)
Police DA Crimes Cambs	1842	80% (C&P)	84% (C&P)
Male Victims	47	47 (C&P)	38 (C&P)
Disability	156	332 (C&P)	36 (C&P)
LGBT	Lesbian 6 Gay 3 Bi 3 Asexual 1 Total 13	11 (C&P)	9 (C&P)

(C&P) – Cambridgeshire and Peterborough

Other relevant information:

Quarter one sees this first data since the decoupling of the IDVA Service across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. Since this happened in May, some data is included from Peterborough, as out of county referrals.

Quarter one also sees a number of significant changes in referral pathways to the IDVA Service, which have impacted as below:

- Medium risk referrals from the police are no longer referred to the IDVA Service but are instead responded to via the Victim and Witness Hub. This has hugely decreased the total number of referrals but has meant that engagement rates have improved.
- The IDVA Service no longer accepts Health and A&E referrals. In the transition there have been a large number of referrals that do not meet the high-risk criteria of referral to service and these have been removed when calculating engagement rates.
- Stalking referrals – A new role of Independent Stalking Advocacy Caseworker (ISAC) now responds to both domestic abuse and non-domestic abuse related stalking referrals, across both Cambridgeshire and Peterborough.
- The threshold for referral to Young Person's IDVAs have changed to any risk level for young people aged 13-17 and up to 21 for care leavers. These roles also cover Peterborough, although high-risk MARAC referrals will be supported through the Peterborough IDVA Service.

The restructure of the DASV Partnership has also seen a few new posts or postholders:-

- Lesley Rich becomes Domestic Abuse and MARAC Manager
- Vickie Crompton has moved to Peterborough City Council as DASV Partnership Manager
- Shelley Morris and Deirdre Reed are both IDVA Team Managers
- Amanda Warburton moves into the role of Domestic Abuse Health Strategic Lead
- Sarah Fines becomes Domestic Abuse Review Co-ordinator
- Karen Hedger moves into the DASV Partnership Officer role

The full report for Safe Lives review of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough MARAC is expected in late September 2025 and will form the basis for the October DASV Champions sessions.

Dates for the sessions: 6th October 2025 10.00 - 12.00, 16th October 2025 14.00 - 16.00

21st October 2025 12.00 - 14.00. Link to book a place to join a session is below:

<https://buytickets.at/cambridgeshirepeterboroughdomesticabusesexualviolencepartnership/1816146>