

# COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP CALLOVER

## MINUTES

**Date:** 29 April 2016

**Time:** 9:30 – 12:00.

**Venue:** Conference Centre, Barking Learning Centre

Anne Bristow (Chair) – Deputy Chief Executive and Strategic Director for Service Development and Integration (LBBD)

Sean Wilson – Acting Chief Superintendent, Metropolitan Police Service (MPS)

Matthew Cole – Director of Public Health (LBBD)

Erika Jenkins – Chief Executive, Barking and Dagenham Council for Voluntary Service

**Present:** Rita Chadha – Chief Executive, Refugee and Migrant Forum for Essex and London (RAMFEL)

Douglas Charlton – Head of Stakeholders and Partnerships, Community Rehabilitation Company

Greg Tillet – Assistant Chief Officer, Barking, Dagenham, Havering and Newham, National Probation Service

Ayse Hassan – East London Area Manager, Victim Support

Stephen Norman – Borough Commander, London Fire Brigade

Karen Proudfoot – Interim Group Manager, Community Safety and Offender Management (LBBD)

**Advisory:** Dan James – Research and Analysis Officer, Community Safety and Offender Management (LBBD)

Henry Staples – Service Improvement Officer, Community Safety and Offender Management (LBBD)

Councillor Laila Butt – Cabinet Member for Crime and Enforcement

Steve Thompson – Chair of Safer Neighbourhood Board

David McClory – Civil Protection Manager (LBBD)

**Apologies:** James Goddard – Housing Strategy Manager, (LBBD)

Helen Jenner – Corporate Director, Children's Services (LBBD)

Sharon Morrow – Chief Operating Officer, Barking and Dagenham CCG

---

## 1. Introduction and Apologies for Absence

1.1 The apologies were noted.

## **2. Discussion of feedback from workshop and agreement of Community Safety Partnership Restructure and Terms Of Reference**

- 2.1 The Chair explained that this agenda item would provide an opportunity for members to comment on the Terms of Reference (TORs) of the Community Safety Partnership (CSP) and proposed sub-groups. It was noted that the TORs presented to CSP members had been updated to incorporate the feedback and comments provided during the workshop session on 14 March. It was agreed that the TORs were still in draft, and that members were still free to offer additional comment or amendments.
- 2.2 It was commented that the summary of feedback from the workshop should be viewed as an aide-mémoire and not as a reflection of the views of CSP members as a whole. It was further commented that crucial to the success of the CSP has been the ability of members from partner agencies to be able to voice disagreements, to offer each other effective challenge on issues, and to reach consensus in order to achieve shared goals.
- 2.3 The Chair noted that the covering report provides a useful overview of the statutory obligations of a Community Safety Partnership, as outlined within the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 and Police Reform Act 2002 amendments. It was noted that these Acts define the responsible authorities but allow for the CSP to have additional membership. It was noted that the Acts do not account for subsequent changes to the responsible authorities, including, for example, the division of the Probation service into two separate bodies (the National Probation Service and the Community Rehabilitation Company).
- 2.4 Members offered additional comment in relation to the proposed CSP Terms of Reference, including:
- Purpose and Responsibilities: *“The CSP is responsible for co-ordinating efforts across the partnership to reduce crime and disorder.”*
  - Purpose and Responsibilities; Point 2 to be amended to: *“To review the findings of the Strategic Assessment and develop strategies to address identified public safety issues.”*
  - Purpose and Responsibilities: Point 9 to be amended to: *“To receive, consider and respond to public safety concerns raised by Councillors through the Select Committee on behalf of any person who lives and /or works in Barking and Dagenham.”*
- 2.5 It was agreed that the Terms of Reference would be given a light touch review following the announcement of new mayoral priorities, in order to ensure that any significant changes to policy are accounted for.

### **Proposed Structure and Sub-Groups**

- 2.6 Members were asked to comment on the proposed structure of the CSP. Specific attention was given to the governance arrangements of existing operational groups in relation to the proposed sub-groups.
- 2.7 It was raised that the Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangement (MAPPA) meeting, which deals with serious and prolific offenders, is well placed to feed information to the Perpetrators Strategic Group, but that full oversight of MAPPA should continue to sit with the MAPPA executive office. It was agreed that the structure diagram would be amended to reflect this.
- 2.8 It was noted that the Hate Crime Strategy Group has been removed from the proposed structure. It was noted that the Stronger Communities partnership had previously taken responsibility for community cohesion issues, but this had subsequently merged with the CSP, and that community cohesion has received less emphasis in recent years. It was noted that the issue of how best to address and foster community cohesion has been subject to wider discussion within the Council. It was suggested that, in order to maintain focus on this issue a Hate Crime and Community Cohesion Group be re-established, which will report to the Prevention Strategic Group.
- 2.9 It was noted that the Safer Neighbourhood Board (SNB) does not appear on the proposed structure diagram presented. It was agreed that some level of relation between the CSP and SNB boards should be maintained, and that the CSP might be expected to provide update reports to the SNB (and vice versa) in order to ensure that communication and joint working continues. It was agreed to update the structure diagram to reflect this.
- 2.10 It was agreed that it would be useful for the structure diagram to be expanded to incorporate other 'related' groups, including the Health and Wellbeing Board (H&WBB), the Local Safeguarding Children Board (LSCB) and the Safeguarding Adults Board (SAB). This would also include a commitment to provide reports and updates to these boards if requested.
- 2.11 It was noted that the Safety Advisory Group (SAG) should be included within the proposed structure diagram, as this is an operational group which reports to the Borough Resilience Forum. It was agreed that the Borough Resilience Forum would report to the Protection sub-group, as indicated in the diagram.
- 2.12 It was commented that, although the Prevention sub-group has only one operational meeting reporting into it (the Community Tension Monitoring Group), under the proposed structure there will be a large body of work for the Sub-Group to undertake. This will include leading on educational campaigns and fostering civic responsibility around crime and disorder issues in the Borough, as well as building close linkages to other community organisations and bodies including, for example, local Neighbourhood Watches.
- 2.13 The theme of enforcement was discussed. It was suggested that enforcement is a cross-cutting theme across the Prevention, Protection and Perpetrators sub-groups. It was noted that enforcement measures usually form part of a wider

crime reduction strategy, which may (and often does) also include education of the public around their responsibilities. The example of the dog DNA testing initiative was raised as a successful example where education has been backed up by enforcement and these measures have together led to a positive outcome.

- 2.14 It was noted that, under the proposed structure, the overall responsibility for a specific topic or concern which is relevant to the CSP – such as illegal traveller encampments – may not sit with a specific sub-group. Instead, as these concerns often have multiple dimensions which are relevant to all three sub-groups, it may be the case that each sub-group is required to contribute towards an overall policy on the topic.
- 2.15 It was agreed that all CSP members will be asked to provide named deputies in order to ensure that scheduled sub-group meetings go ahead with full representation whenever possible. It was agreed that all deputies will need to be sufficiently competent and well-briefed in order to fulfil this role.
- 2.16 It was agreed that initial meetings of the sub-groups would be Chaired and Vice Chaired by the following colleagues:
- Prevention Sub-Group – Chair: Rita Chadha, Vice Chair: Stephen Norman
  - Protection Sub-Group – Chair: Matthew Cole, Vice Chair: T.B.C.
  - Perpetrator Sub-Group – Chair: Rick Tyson, Vice Chair: Greg Tillett
  - Intelligence and Analysis Board – Chair: Karen Proudfoot, Vice Chair: T.B.C

### **Performance Callover**

- 2.17 The current and future role of the Community Safety Partnership Callover meeting was discussed. It was reported that the Callover process had been established to reduce the amount of time dedicated to performance issues in the CSP meeting. However, it was noted that the Callover meeting has been poorly attended over the last year.
- 2.18 It was suggested that Callover should continue, but that its membership should be limited to the Chairs of the newly established sub-groups, along with the Chair and Vice Chair of the CSP. It was commented that a similar membership takes place in other boroughs and has shown to be effective. It was noted that there would be a continued expectation for the Callover to provide a report to the CSP on a quarterly basis. It was also agreed that the Callover would receive regular input from the newly established Intelligence and Analysis Board.

### **Membership and Decision Making**

- 2.19 The membership of the CSP Board and the proposed sub-groups was discussed. It was commented that the Council for Voluntary Service (CVS) currently has one seat on the CSP Board. It was agreed that, in future, the voluntary sector would be allocated up to 3 seats at the CSP (excluding Victim Support who would also

have a place ), and up to 2 seats at each of the newly established sub-groups. The CVS was invited to run its own internal process for selection from amongst its member organisations member organisations. It was noted that it would be important to ensure that any new voluntary sector organisation which joins the CSP is aware of the need for for a consistent representative who can commit to regular attendance at board meetings .

- 2.20 It was agreed that there needs to be a continued process for members to declare any specific interest at the start of CSP or sub-group meetings. This is particularly the case when commissioning is discussed. However, it was noted that this would not be a frequent issue, as the CSP is not a decision-making body for commissioning.
- 2.21 Members discussed the procedure for decision-making within the CSP. It was firstly noted that the CSP must take account of its partner bodies' differing governance arrangements, which will impact upon each member's ability to commit to a particular course of action or commit resources without conulsting within their organisation.
- 2.22 Members discussed the potential need for a voting procedure. It was commented that voting had rarely been used in practice within CSP meetings. It was suggested that key decision-making should proceed by majority consensus , and that key decisions will lie with the responsible authorities as named within the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 and Police Reform Act 2002, taking into account the advice of other partners.
- 2.23 Members discussed the potential need for a process for making urgent decisions. It was noted that the CSP has rarely been required to make an urgent decision, as it is usually concerned with issues which are strategic and/or longer-term. It was further noted that in the event of an emergency or critical issue, each member agency will have its own process in place for tackling this. It was suggested that in certain instances, an urgency committee may be established with the relevant organisation in attendance, but that this would not be the CSP. Following this, it was agreed to remove the reference to 'urgent decisions' within the CSP Terms of Reference.

### **Funding and Commissioning**

- 2.24 Members discussed the CSP's combined funding in relation to tackling crime and disorder. It was suggested that each partner body provide basic information regarding the approximate level of funding which is utilised for tackling crime and disorder issues. It was commented that this may be a complex calculation, for example in the case of the Police where borough-level spending may be easily provided, while estimating the proportion of UK- or London -wide Police spending which impacts Barking and Dagenham will be more difficult. It was suggested that organisations may also provide an 'Impact Statement' which provides a qualitative summary of the non-monetary impact of their work in the community. It was agreed that we would aim to present a rough summary of this data would

be presented to the CSP in June, with a more detailed report to be provided at the CSP in September.

2.25 It was agreed that the CSP should, ideally, be in the position of agreeing an overall commissioning plan which matches the findings of the annual Strategic Assessment. It was commented that developing a commissioning plan would require a considerable amount of resource. As a first step, it was suggested that partner agencies provide a summary of their currently commissioned services and any upcoming commissioning decisions.

2.26 The following specific actions were agreed in relation to this agenda item:

- **ACTION: Henry Staples to circulate an updated structure diagram incorporating the agreed changes.**
- **ACTION: All members to send final comments on the draft CSP and Sub-Group Terms of Reference, and proposed structure (deadline: Wednesday 18 May).**
- **ACTION: All members to provide named deputies for attendance at CSP / sub-groups (deadline: Wednesday 18 May).**
- **ACTION: All members to provide a brief summary of spending on crime and disorder by their organisation. This may also be in the form of an 'Impact Statement' summarising the impact in non-monetary terms. (Note: this should only include information which is suitable for the public domain - deadline: Wednesday 18 May).**
- **ACTION: All members to provide a summary of current service commissioning, as well as any upcoming commissioning decisions. (deadline: (Wednesday 18 May)).**

### 3. Performance Analysis

3.1 The quarterly Performance Report up to February 2016 was presented by Dan James (Research and Analysis Officer, LBBDD).

3.2 It was noted that Barking and Dagenham has achieved the MOPAC Target of a 20% reduction in the MOPAC 7 crime types within the current financial year, which can be attributed to continued reduction in theft from person, burglary, and theft from motor vehicles.

3.3 It was further reported that proven reoffending of juvenile offenders has reduced by 16.3% over the last 12 months. It was noted that this indicator tracks a cohort of offenders that have committed an offence approximately two years ago, and that the reduction can therefore be attributed to specific action to redress reoffending at that time. It was indicated that the reduction is likely to be a result of targeted work with female offenders, including principally the establishment of the Youth Offending Service Girls Group which has been running successfully for 2 years and which addresses offending behaviour and the specific issues faced by young women.

- 3.4 Crimes of specific concern were discussed and noted, including Violence With Injury which has increased 11% in the year to date (YTD) compared to the previous financial year; criminal damage which has increased 17%, and robbery which has increased by 22%. It was also noted that Barking and Dagenham's rate of First Time Entrants (FTE) per 100,000 population remains significantly higher (594) than the London rate (419) although this is impacted by the fact that the borough has a rapidly growing youth population.
- 3.5 Members discussed the recent increase in Vehicle Arson. It was reported that there have been 58 arsons in the YTD, compared to 43 in the full financial year 2014/15. The increase was reported as being due to a spate in incidents in December 2015. Although there is no specific reduction target for Vehicle Arson, the increase was reported as a concern. It was noted that the London Fire Brigade (LFB) have provided data to the police via the Victim Offender Location Time (VOLT) meeting on the specific offences, as well as through direct communication. It was noted that, while a proportion of the arson offences may be simple vandalism, a significant number of the vehicles have been linked to other offences such as burglary; with the arson therefore intended to destroy forensic evidence relating to that offence. It was further reported that the increase in vehicle arson associated with other crimes is also in line with other trends across London, including increased theft of mopeds, as well as increased use of mopeds in burglaries.
- 3.6 It was commented that there had been over 50 crimes and only 2 arrests. However, it was suggested that this may be appropriate if the offences are being committed by a small cohort of individuals and that more data would be required in order to determine this. It was further noted that the suspects of Vehicle Arson will not necessarily be residents of Barking and Dagenham.
- 3.7 It was agreed that a closer analysis of the causes of increased vehicle arson and other vehicle-related crime in the borough should be allocated as a tasking to the Intelligence and Analysis Board following its establishment, with a report to be presented to the CSP in September. It was noted that this report would need support from all partner agencies, in particular the provision of data on their activity in relation to vehicles and vehicle-associated crime. It was therefore agreed that:
- **ACTION: All members will provide a summary of their activity in relation to vehicle crime (Note: Dan James to set out a timetable of data requirements which will be circulated to members).**

### **Future Performance Reports**

- 3.8 The Chair invited members to comment on the format and content of the Performance Report. The following comments were noted:

- Further detail should be provided around specific actions to tackle domestic violence, which is a cross-cutting issue. This should include details around the outcomes of any commissioned work. It was also noted that the Domestic and Sexual Violence Strategy will be presented to the sub-groups once it is finalised.
- Increased use of indicators which show a clear link to the work of the newly established sub-groups. The example of the indicator: *“PHOF: Indicator 2.15 – Proportion of all in treatment, who successfully completed treatment and did not re-present within 6 months”* was given as having a clear link to successful preventative work around substance misuse. It was suggested that these links would be developed and further utilised by the Intelligence and Analysis Board.

#### **4. Youth Offending Service – HMIP Short Quality Screening (SQS) Inspection**

- 4.1 Karen Proudfoot (Interim Group Manager, Community Safety & Offender Management) gave a brief outline of the Short Quality Screening (SQS) Inspection of the Youth Offending Service carried out by Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Probation (HMIP) on 25-27 April. It was noted that no formal feedback had yet been provided, however that some positive feedback has already been informally given, in relation to the high quality of pre-sentence reports and assessments, as well as an acknowledgement that practitioners consistently demonstrate a high level of knowledge of their individual cases. It was reported that the Youth Offending Service has been undergoing an Improvement Journey over the last year which has involved a considerable amount of work and resource allocated to improving practices. This work is ongoing and the YOS continues to work closely with the Youth Justice Board to ensure these improvements continue. It was anticipated that HMIP are likely to provide recommendations on areas where improvement is required
- 4.2 It was noted that the report from HMIP will be presented to the Youth Offending Service Chief Officers Group meeting on 24 May, and will subsequently be shared with CSP members.

#### **5. Any other business**

- 5.1 Sean Wilson (Acting Chief Superintendent, Metropolitan Police Service) gave a brief outline of changes to police staffing due to the restructure of the Police, which are adopting a Basic Command Unit (BCU) model. It was reported that Martin Kirby will be stepping down as Chief Inspector, and Gary Learmonth and Tony Kirk will also be leaving the borough Police. It was further reported that Rob Bills will be taking on the role Chief Inspector, and Niall McSheffrey has been promoted to Deputy Chief Inspector.