

Cambridge Community Safety Partnership

3 February 2011

10:00 – 11:50

Committee Room 1
The Guildhall, Cambridge

MINUTES

Board

Dave Sargent (Chair)	Cambridgeshire Constabulary
Liz Bisset	Cambridge City Council
Sarah Ferguson	Cambridgeshire County Council
Ruth McCallum	Cambridge Council for Voluntary Service
Inger O'Meara	NHS Cambridgeshire
Graeme Seddon	Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Probation Trust
Kevin Wilkins	Cambridgeshire Police Authority

Members

Tim Bick	Executive Councillor
Michael Hendy	Cambridge Magistrates
Vicky Hornsby	Cambridge Business Against Crime (CAMBAC)
Steve Kerridge	Cambridgeshire Constabulary
Lynda Kilkelly	Cambridge City Council
Peter Lester	Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust
Jennifer Massie	Cambridgeshire Constabulary
Dick Moore	Cambridgeshire Constabulary
Michael Soper	Cambridgeshire County Council (Research Group)
Tom Kingsley (Minutes)	Cambridge City Council

In Attendance

Vickie Crompton	Cambridgeshire County Council
-----------------	-------------------------------

1. Welcome, domestics, introductions and apologies.

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed everyone and introductions were made for the benefit of the four attending members of the public. Vickie Crompton was attending in place of Tina Le and Helen Turner.
- 1.2 Apologies were received from Julian Fountain, Simon Kerss, Tina Le and Helen Turner.

2. Pre-advised questions from the general public.

- 2.1 There were two pre-advised questions from Mr. R Taylor. Mr. R Price had advised that he wished to discuss alcohol-fuelled anti-social behaviour in the city centre, but did not provide any formal questions until the day of the meeting. His questions, along with those from Mr. Taylor appear at the end of these minutes.
- 2.2 Following a pre-agreement with Mr. Price, the Chair had agreed to defer response to all but one of his questions to the next West/Central Area Committee (to be held on 24th February) where a full report would be produced: Mr. Price was agreeable to this. However, the Chair was advised that it was protocol for all the questions to be read out and Mr. Price was invited to do so. In response to his questions regarding NHS statistics, Michael Soper said he would happily speak with Mr. Price outside the meeting on this matter. In response to question 7., it was highlighted that the Cambridge CSP was a partnership of professional

agencies, most of which were statutorily required to engage in partnership with others. It was felt, however, that the Partnership may benefit from the inclusion of a wider body of representation and the Officer Support Group would look at this later in the year.

Action point 02/01

In a general discussion over the other questions Mr. Price had asked, it was noted that the new Community Safety Plan 2011-14 would include alcohol-related violent crime in the city centre as a specific priority.

- 2.3 Mr. Taylor raised two questions: in response to his first, Lynda Kilkelly stated that the timetabling for the Plan meant that deadlines were very tight and did not leave much time to write the Plan: the Board had agreed to confirm the priorities via e-mail on that basis. The Plan, as presented to Partnership members today, was very much a first draft and it was felt this would not be of benefit to the general public. In response to his second question, Steve Kerridge advised that the divisional priorities were tactical objectives and part of police business to which the public had no access, however, any relevant information on activities was publicised via e-cops and through other engagement sessions. With regards the fear that priorities not adopted by the Partnership (chiefly robbery and burglary) would fall off the radar, this was not an issue as these crime types were core police activity and would always remain as such.

3. Minutes of 14 December 2010 meeting: Agreement.

- 3.1 The Minutes were agreed and would go forward for publication.

4. Action points: Review

- 4.1 Four of the eight action points from the December meeting were discussed and closed. The other action points remain ongoing due to human and financial resource issues.

- 4.2 With regards the peer review (action point 1207), Tom Kingsley gave further details on the make-up of the review team and that following a set-up meeting on 1 March, it will spend 3 hours with each of the district community safety partnerships. The Board was asked whether it wished to continue participating and was happy for the Officer Support Group (and volunteer members) to meet with the review team: the Board concurred.

5. Performance report: Q3 2010/11

- 5.1 Michael Soper spoke to the performance report and highlighted the areas of concern:
- Burglary of homes showed an increase of 19 crimes compared to the same quarter last year. This crime type accounts for 50% of all serious acquisitive crimes recorded.
 - Cycle theft remains very high, with 743 crimes in the quarter, despite a marked drop during December (possibly weather related).
 - There are still issues with the provision of data by the Ambulance Trust.
- 5.2 It was noted that the partnership was on track with regards alcohol-related violent crime, anti-social behaviour and personal robbery.

6. Priority area monitoring reports: Q3 2010/11

- 6.1 Alcohol-related violent crime & anti-social behaviour
Dave Sargent spoke to the relevant report, highlighting the work done by Addaction during Alcohol Awareness Week (18-24 October); the evening briefing on 15 October, hosted by CAMBAC/Pubwatch, with licensees (a further briefing was held on 14 January); the successful deployment of taxi marshals; the successful night time medical and care facility in operation on 17 and 31 December; and the additional street pastors patrols.
- 6.2 Burglary of homes
Steve Kerridge spoke to the relevant report, highlighting that despite the increase in offences, the detection rate had risen markedly to 32% from 13% during the same quarter last year; one offender had admitted to 10 burglaries. The Acquisitive Crime Task Group

(ACTG) has completed three of the planned six community engagement events in burglary hotspots.

6.3 Cycle theft

Steve Kerridge spoke to the relevant report, highlighting that cycle crime in Market ward was adopted as a Divisional Police Priority during the period, with further changes to policing in the city centre proposed for 2011/12. Although not falling in Q3, it was reported that members of the ACTG attended a national cycle crime conference in York in January, where it was noted that Cambridge was doing more than other partnerships in addressing cycle crime though this was offset by the high use of cycles. A question was asked about the use of "trap cycles" (cycles fitted with GPS tracking equipment) as reported in the local news recently. The Chair confirmed that these cycles were deployed following strict guidelines in order to avoid any question of entrapment. It was questioned whether the report should focus on assessing projects undertaken as opposed to focussing on statistics, which will always be high.

6.4 Domestic violence (DV)

Dave Sargent spoke to the relevant report, highlighting the online awareness-raising publicity materials distributed to Housing Associations; the commissioning of a theatre company to deliver awareness-raising sessions in secondary schools in sprint 2011; and the formation of the Multi Agency Risk Assessment Unit (MARU). Concerns were expressed over the possible reduction of administrative support to the Task Group and the repeat rate for the Southern area running at 35% (against a performance target of 28%).

6.5 Personal robbery

Steve Kerridge spoke to the relevant report, highlighting a stable picture with regards the number of robberies. There was a question raised on the work being done with young people to prevent them from becoming victims; Sarah Ferguson took an action to look into this.

Action point 02/02

6.6 Reducing offending & re-offending

Dick Moore spoke to the relevant report, highlighting the number of clients on the relevant parts of the Prolific & Priority Offender scheme and continuing work on Integrated Offender Management (IOM). The first client had been taken on the Chronically Excluded Adults Programme. A question was raised about the apparent lack of co-ordination by agencies when prisoners are released. Graeme Seddon was able to give a brief overview of the IOM system, which has been in operation in Peterborough for the past 18 months. They operate a "meet at the gate" system to assist offenders to access suitable accommodation and other services, including benefits. It was felt that a presentation on the Peterborough model might be useful.

Action point 02/03

7. Drug and Alcohol Action Team report: Q3 2010/11

7.1 In Tina Le's absence, Vickie Crompton spoke briefly to the relevant report, highlighting the update on treatment services in relation to young people and adults.

8. Performance Champion: Comments

8.1 In the absence of Julian Fountain and in order to finish the meeting on time, it was agreed to skip this agenda item.

9. Community Safety Plan 2011-14: Agreement

9.1 Lynda Kilkelly spoke to the report and draft Plan circulated to members, via e-mail, on 31 January. It was explained to the general public present that the Plan was very much an initial draft and therefore was not available to them. Several members questioned the

wisdom of this seeing as the meetings were open to the general public and it was agreed the draft Plan would be made available on the website as soon as possible.

Action point 02/04

- 9.2 The recommendation to the Board was that it considers the draft and offer comment and amendments for the Officer Support Group to work up into a final Plan for publication on 7 March (as part of the report papers for the Community Services Scrutiny Committee). Comments were raised that the initial draft contained no targets: these would be drawn up by the relevant Task Groups and should be challenging and testing. With regards the new priority for anti-social behaviour (ASB), it was agreed that separate Task Group would be needed along with a clarification of what a “repeat incident” of ASB was. The Plan should also focus on community engagement and preventative work. It was also felt that the Plan should include a brief section to show what work was being done to address those priorities that were not selected. The Board were reminded that they were still required to sign off the finalised Plan.

10. Funding: Update

- 10.1 Vickie Crompton spoke further to the letter from Mike Davey (Service Director, Community Engagement (Fenland)) dated 27 January, to every district Chief Executive. Basically, the County Council has agreed to assign each Area Based Grant (of which the Safer & Stronger Communities Fund was one) to its appropriate Directorate (in this case, Community Engagement). Whilst we still await final confirmation of the Home Office’s allocation to each county council, Cambridgeshire have assumed it will be the same as last year (£584,000). Following top slicing, the amount for allocation to the five district community safety partnerships (CSPs) should be £288,000. It was intimated that the money would be apportioned on the basis of volume of crime.
- 10.2 Concerns were raised over the lack of clarity from the County Council with regards the amount (percentage) of cuts to the assumed provision from the Home Office, how much was being top sliced and for what purpose, and how the final figure would be apportioned to each district CSP. It was pointed out that each district CSP had participated in lengthy discussions over a range of options and had agreed that the money would be apportioned on a “crimes per thousand” basis. The question was asked if this was still the case and the answer was yes. Further clarification was requested and so an action point was taken to provide this at the next meeting.

Action point 02/05

11. Citizen Focus Champion: Comments

- 11.1 Kevin Wilkins highlighted the discussions over the Plan and the recent media interest in the new www.police.uk website, which highlighted Peas Hill (erroneously) as a crime hot spot. It was noted that the website contained blind hyperlinks and no information on Area Committees. It was noted that both the Constabulary and Police Authority had written to the National Policing Improvement Agency (NPIA), the body responsible for the website, expressing concern over the clarity of the statistics being promoted.

12. Any other business

- 12.1 Inger O’Meara made general observations about the Partnership’s response to media items of this nature and its lack of promotion with the general public.
- 12.2 There being no other business, the meeting closed at 11:50

Questions from Mr. Price

1. Disturbance of city centre residents by late night alcohol-fuelled ASB: is this an under-reported problem? It seems likely that it is - we are a largely tolerant people. Many of us hesitate to worry the police when we know that they have what many would say are more important problems to tackle.
2. Has the council made use of all the available legislation to address the problem of late night alcohol-fuelled ASB in Cambridge?
3. The number of hospital admissions for alcohol-related harm in England increased by 47% (an increase of more than 800 a day) over the five years between 2004 and 2009 (British Medical Journal 11 September 2010, p 522). This includes chronic illness directly related to alcohol such as liver disease and mental health conditions but excludes acute injury or illness caused by alcohol (see 4 below). What are the figures for Cambridge NHS Trust?
4. A recent report (at www.nhsconfed.org) states that the cost to the NHS of treating alcohol related problems has doubled in the last five years (i.e. since the 2003 Licensing Act came into force in 2005) and now stands at £2.7billion a year. Quoted in the BMJ, it says that most of the cost to the NHS falls on hospitals and ambulance services which when added to the long term health problems (see 3 above) caused by heavy drinking over years “. . . puts an unacceptable strain on hospitals . . .” The report concludes that the burden on the NHS will be unsustainable. (BMJ 9 January 2010, page 67). What are the figures for Cambridge NHS Trust?
5. What are the social consequences in Cambridge of chronic drinking? See results of a YouGov poll, commissioned by the British Society of Gastroenterology, which challenge the drinks industry's claim that chronic drinking affects only a minority of people.
6. Do we shrug our shoulders and say that this is a national problem? If localism means anything then surely, if anywhere in the country has the resources to deal with the problem, it is Cambridge?
7. Does anyone represent city centre residents on the Partnership? If so who is it?
8. Is there a representative of Cambridge licensees on the Partnership? Licensees have to be 'on side' if this problem is to be addressed.

Richard Price
(Park Street Residents' Association)

Questions from Mr. Taylor

1. The North Area Committee was told last week that the partnership had agreed its priorities for the Community Safety Plan 2011-14 in private, by email, instead of waiting to do so at the formal public meeting. What was the reason the decision could not be delayed a few days until the meeting? I note no report/papers for Community Safety Plan item on the agenda have been published in advance of the meeting. Will any reports on this tabled at the meeting be placed online as soon as possible and will these include a record of the secret meeting conducted by email? Why is the partnership delaying publishing the priorities chosen online even though they were verbally announced at the North Area Committee?
2. Also on the subject of CSP priorities; the North Area Committee were told that burglary would remain a "divisional priority" for the police, so when it is dropped as a partnership priority they don't need to make it a local one. Where can the public find the divisional priorities? How can the public find out about the police's performance against those priorities? Who holds the police to account in respect to their performance against the divisional priorities?