

# Cambridge Community Safety Partnership

2 August 2011

10:00 – 12:25

Committee Room 1  
The Guildhall, Cambridge

## MINUTES

### Board

Julian Fountain (Chair)	Cambridgeshire Fire & Rescue Service
Sarah Ferguson	Cambridgeshire County Council (Children & Young People's Services)
Ruth McCallum	Cambridge Council for Voluntary Service
Inger O'Meara	NHS Cambridgeshire
Kevin Wilkins	Cambridgeshire Police Authority

### Members

Michael Hendy	Cambridge Magistrates
Vicky Hornsby	Cambridge Business Against Crime (CAMBAC)
Simon Kerrs	Cambridgeshire County Council
Lynda Kilkelly	Cambridge City Council (Safer Communities Section)
Peter Lester	Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust
Jennifer Massie	Cambridgeshire Constabulary
Dick Moore	Cambridgeshire Constabulary
Michael Soper	Cambridgeshire County Council (Research & Performance Group)
Tom Kingsley (Minutes)	Cambridge City Council (Safer Communities Section)

### In Attendance (for Agenda Item 2 only)

Paula Mayes	Cambridgeshire County Council (Children & Young People's Services)
Louise Meats	Cambridgeshire County Council (Research & Performance Group)

### 1. Welcome, domestics, introductions and apologies.

- 1.1 Julian Fountain sat as Chair in Liz Bisset's absence and welcomed everyone. There were no attending members of the public.
- 1.2 Apologies were received from Tim Bick, Liz Bisset, Dave Sargent, Graeme Seddon, Steve Kerridge and Susie Talbot.

### 2. Provision of diversionary activities for young people: Presentation

- 2.1 Sarah Ferguson introduced this item with a brief background behind the Positive Engagement and Participation with Street Youth (PEPSY) project, which had received Local Public Service Agreement (LPSA) funding, and which focussed on providing a youth worker to engage with young males at risk of offending as well as their parents or carers and provide appropriate interventions. A video made of the work undertaken was then shown. Louise Meats then spoke to her report, highlighting the project's outcomes and the importance of continuity of care. Paula Mayes then highlighted the work done with parents or carers and the level of trust that was generated.
- 2.2 Simon Kerrs questioned the sustainability of the project in the light of reduced funding. It was explained that Youth Offending Service were participating and supporting and that the partnership had provided funding for this year. Michael Soper took an action to work with Sarah Ferguson in pulling together some long-term costings for the project for the next meeting.

Kevin Wilkins surmised what would have taken place had the PEPSY project not been in place; the strong likelihood being that many of the young men featured in the video would have seriously offended. Inger O'Meara asked about the work done with high demand families in this instance and suggested the video be more widely promoted as it showed a very positive view of working with young males.

### **3. Local Policing Plan: Presentation**

3.1 Dick Moore presented a brief PowerPoint presentation, which set out the policing priorities for Cambridgeshire, the drivers behind the change, use of the threat/risk/harm matrix, the communications plan and the five strategic priorities: maintain local police performance; deliver policing within the available budget; reduce crime & disorder; keeping people safe; and maintain the resilience of protective services.

3.2 Simon Kerss spoke of the work that was being undertaken within the domestic violence priority in terms of marketing (including "positive deviants") and rescoping the Independent Domestic Violence Advocacy Service to better co-ordinate with Operation Redesign (the Cambridgeshire Constabulary restructure operation). Inger O'Meara highlighted joint working and the health and welfare agenda. Sarah Ferguson questioned accountability and feedback from neighbourhood panels into the partnership; Lynda Kilkelly stated that matters could be channelled back to the partnership via the Neighbourhood Action Group.

### **4. Pre-advised questions from the general public.**

4.1 There were no pre-advised questions.

### **5. Minutes of 3 May and 1 July 2011 meetings: Agreement.**

5.1 The Minutes of the 3 May meeting were agreed and would go forward for publication.

5.2 Vicky Hornsby proposed an amendment<sup>1</sup> to the 1 July Minutes as she had made a comment regarding the street pastors and the fact that whilst the pastors were voluntary, the group has a paid co-ordinator for which the partnership had provided funding. This amendment and the remainder of the Minutes were agreed and would go forward for publication.

### **6. Action points: Review**

6.1 Five (08/03, 02/01, 05/04, 05/06 and 07/03) of the sixteen action points from previous meetings were discussed. All were still marked as ongoing and would be addressed at the December 2011 meeting.

### **7. Crime and disorder report: Q1 2011/12**

7.1 Michael Soper spoke to the new format crime and disorder report, tying in with the new Community Safety Plan and priorities. All recorded crime (except drug offences) has seen a reduction in the year to date. Although dwelling burglary and cycle theft is down by 50% and 24% respectively, the partnership was advised to be wary as there is generally a spike in these crime types in late September/October when new students arrive.

7.2 Kevin Wilkins wanted to confirm the 323 recorded drug offences in 2009 as this stood out amongst the other statistics; this was confirmed correct. A number of factors for the increase in drug offences were put forward in the report and discussed, including Strawberry Fair. Jennifer Massie highlighted the success of this year's event and took an action to bring offence statistics from this year's Fair to the next meeting.

---

<sup>1</sup> Outside the meeting, it was agreed to insert (in paragraph 3.7.2) the following text after "...international students.": "It was also pointed out that whilst the street pastors were voluntary, the group's co-ordinator was a paid post and funding had been provided for that."

Ruth McCallum asked what could explain the big reduction in burglary and Dick Moore explained that it could be that of the 21 offenders on their catch & convict list, 10 were currently in custody; or simply down to better policing.

## 8. Priority area progress reports: Q1 2011/12

### 8.1 Reducing alcohol-related violent crime in the city centre

Jennifer Massie spoke to the relevant report, highlighting the Safe Refuge pilot, the promotion of Validate UK cards by CAMBAC and the performance against targets (assaults with less serious injury and Addenbrooke's A&E assault data). There was still an issue with regards provision of redacted assault data from the East of England Ambulance Service; a new information sharing agreement had been drawn up and it was hoped statistics would be provided via the NHS. Inger O'Meara offered to help bring this to a conclusion if required.

### 8.2 Reducing repeat incidents of anti-social behaviour

Lynda Kilkelly spoke to the relevant report, highlighting the new tools in place to help ASB officers report on the targets set, including a risk assessment one to assist in identifying vulnerable individuals. Lynda reported that the data shown in the report was only from the City Council as the police have very different recording and referral systems and collating the data has been problematic. It was hoped to have worked out a reporting system in time for the next update.

Sarah Ferguson asked for more information on victims, complex cases and high demand families. Lynda explained that many of the complex ASB cases had no clear-cut victims and perpetrators, with individuals often fitting both categories. For this reason, cases are risk assessed on an individual basis with consideration given to vulnerabilities and aggravating circumstances. Lynda had developed a link with the County's Family Intervention Programme (FIP) Team to address concerns about high demand families.

### 8.3 Reducing repeat victims of domestic violence (including action plan and DHR update)

Simon Kerss spoke to the relevant report, highlighting that action plan (now circulated), the impact of the police's Operation Redesign on the long-term viability of the task group, and the agreed funding for DV projects. In his own report, Simon highlighted the IDVAS performance and that one of the officers had obtained 40 referrals from a period working at Addenbrooke's. There were issues with regards the number of DV-related incidents in Cambridge, which were the second highest (after Huntingdonshire) in Cambridgeshire, with four Wards being highlighted (West Chesterton, Abbey, East Chesterton and Kings Hedges). Simon had also confirmed with the Home Office that he was sufficiently independent to undertake the role of Overview Author in any Domestic Homicide Reviews. Sarah Ferguson highlighted a recent meeting held with professionals to look at domestic violence.

The report put forward three recommendations for the Board's consideration and approval:

- That the CSP explores opportunities to address the prevalence of domestic abuse in the above wards (5.1) through the sanctioning of offenders living in local accommodation; a police-led operation targeting known perpetrators in those wards and an awareness campaign across the City to flag up new DV services available to residents (victims and offenders).

**Not approved. It could not be confirmed that the police were in a position to resource such an operation. The recommendation would be revisited once further work had been done with the police and City Council.**

- That the CSP agrees that the Domestic Abuse Partnership Manager be responsible for potential future DHR Overview Reports, with the caveat that each Overview Report (district / countywide) takes no longer than 10 working days of that officer's time.

**Approved. The caveat was noted.**

- That the CSP identifies potential DHR Independent Chairs in Q2, 2011/12 to enable relevant training to be undertaken.

**Noted. This was an on-going issue and the Chair asked Board members to urgently address this.**

#### 8.4 Reducing re-offending (including action plan and IOM update)

Dick Moore spoke to the relevant report and also circulated a revised action plan; the latter was briefly discussed. Sarah Ferguson asked whether the action plan would include links to and involvement of family and children services. This matter had been considered during a meeting with Ruth McCallum to discuss the involvement of the voluntary services. Michael Soper questioned the '200 clients' figure in the plan; this was the maximum number the Integrated Offender Management scheme could manage. Simon Kerss highlighted the New Directions Service as another body that could be involved, especially regarding referrals. Dick Moore highlighted concerns about the potential impact of reduced or removed funding next year from the Community Safety Fund on the PPO Co-ordinator posts. Lynda Kilkelly advised that the County Council had asked each district CSP to provide a risk assessment based on the anticipated substantial reduction in the Community Safety Fund for 2012/13; this would be circulated to the partnership once completed.

### 9. Drug and Alcohol Action Team report: Update

- 9.1 Simon Kerss spoke briefly to the relevant report. Sarah Ferguson questioned why Cambridge had almost half less the number of young people in treatment compared to Huntingdonshire; this could possibly be due to the better engagement at schools and picking up problems early on. The DAAT were asked to provide a formal response at the next meeting.

Action point 08/03

### 10. Performance Champion: Comments and any task & finish updates

- 10.1 Julian Fountain summed up the good progressed being made on the priorities, and advised that partner agencies would be asked to set up task & finish groups as and when required to tackle issues as they arose. Julian requested that the police maintain vigilance on burglary and cycle crime, especially as these crime types tended to spike around autumn time.

### 11. Strategic Assessment 2011: Preparatory work

- 11.1 Michael Soper spoke to the report, which set out the proposed process, format, data sources, consultation and timescale for this year's Strategic Assessment. It was noted that extensive public consultation had been undertaken last year for the Community Safety Plan 2011-14, and that whilst there would be public consultation, this would have to be within a timescale agreed by the Board; this being the subject of discussion under the following agenda item. Lynda Kilkelly made it clear that the partnership needed to avoid the confusion of last year with the double round of consultation, leading to confusion between local, partnership and police priorities.

- 11.2 The report put forward four recommendations for the Board's consideration and approval:

- That the partnership support the proposed process and format changes for this year's strategic assessment
- That the partnership identifies a clear process and timescale to allow for consulting with the public in 2011.

- ❑ That partners contact the Research & Performance Group at their earliest convenience to discuss appropriate use of data sources.
- ❑ That the partnership commits to the process by supporting the sharing of information and notes the impact on resources for its partners and in particular the CSO's time.

**The Board approved all the above recommendations.**

## **12. Cambridge CSP: Timetable and meetings**

12.1 Tom Kingsley spoke to the relevant report, which set out the Partnership's timetable for the remainder of the financial year (chiefly the production of the annual refresh of the Community Safety Plan), the meetings schedule for next year (and venue), and agreement on the date of the Development Day 2011.

With regards the timetable, Tom highlighted the relevant dates on the supporting spreadsheet, starting with today's agreement of the process of the Strategic Assessment (SA) 2011 and ending with the endorsement and publication of the revised Plan. Following the discussion of the SA 2011 and agreement of priorities for 2012/13, there were four Area Committees where consultation could take place before the Plan was finalised and approved.

With regards the schedule of meetings for 2012/13, Tom proposed that only four fixed public meetings should take place, to discuss the quarterly crime & disorder and progress reports, with a separate Development Day to discuss the SA. Extraordinary meetings, following the proposed criteria, would handle any urgent business that required Board scrutiny and could not be delayed to the next quarterly meeting.

Lynda Kilkelly reiterated that, given the ruling that decisions could not be taken outside the public forum (i.e. by e-mail). It was imperative that the proposed timetable be agreed, with one round of consultation. Both Sarah Ferguson and Inger O'Meara questioned whether the Area Committee was an appropriate forum given the number and demographic of public attendees. Lynda Kilkelly stated that the North Area Committee pilot had introduced a new way of engaging with the public and that this, with other changes, should improve matters.

12.2 The report put forward four recommendations for the Board's consideration and approval:

- ❑ That the Board agrees the timetable of works and engagement as set out in the attached Appendix. (For the purpose of these minutes, attached).
- ❑ That the Board approves the schedule of meetings, as highlighted in paragraph 2.4; the date of the Development Day and the holding of extraordinary meetings as and when necessary. (For the purpose of these minutes, being 14 February, 1 May, 31 July and 30 October, with the Development Day on 6 November).
- ❑ That the Board approves the holding of the Partnership's Development Day on 1 November 2011, with matters that would have been discussed then being held over until the 14 December 2011 meeting.
- ❑ That the Board approves the continued use of The Guildhall facilities for its open meetings and to engage further, as appropriate, with the general public at Area Committees and other suitable fora.

**The Board approved all the above recommendations.**

### **13. Community Safety Accreditation Scheme: Update**

13.1 Jennifer Massie spoke to the relevant report, which informed the partnership of the extension of the Community Safety Accreditation Scheme (CSAS) and the consultation letter from the Chief Constable regarding further development of CSAS. A CSAS pilot was started at Addenbrooke's Hospital in July 2009, which was later confirmed (by the Constabulary's Force Executive Board in October 2010) and developed into 'business as usual'. Further accreditations have taken place within Addenbrooke's, with the number of trained personnel increased from the pilot's 8 to 21 (including APCOA personnel, the on-site security providers). The scheme will be relaunched in September. There was a further discussion over the Chief Constable's letter in which he stated he had agreed to accredit two traffic management companies for the duration of the Burghley Horse Trials.

Inger O'Meara asked how the CSAS scheme would be evaluated. The police would monitor and track the number of incidents, and gauge the scheme's success on a reduction in the number of police calls. A survey of staff had been conducted to assess the impact of the scheme on their health and welfare. Peter Lester confirmed the positive impact of the scheme on staff. Kevin Wilkins expressed concern over the scheme in that staff that were not police officers were dispensing justice. Jenny advised that over the two-year pilot only one Fixed Penalty Notice had been issued and that the scheme was more of a support to staff health and welfare, as well as a deterrent to potential perpetrators.

13.2 The report put forward two recommendations for the Board's consideration and approval:

- That the Partnership notes the content of the report regarding the extension of CSAS at Addenbrooke's Hospital.
- That the Partnership notes the content of the letter from the Chief Constable and submits any comments regarding the development of CSAS across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough to PC Karen Raine (as per the letter).

**The Board noted the above recommendations, with Kevin Wilkins reiterating his fundamental concern over the concept of non-police officers dispensing justice.**

### **14. County Community Safety Plan: Update**

14.1 This agenda item was reported on by Michael Soper, though there was uncertainty over what the partnership wanted in terms of an update. Lynda Kilkelly stated that a draft of the County's Community Safety Agreement had been circulated around the partnership on 19 May, requesting comments in time for the Agreement to be presented at a Public Service Board meeting on 2 June. The Agreement had been circulated to all five district CSPs. Lynda took an action point to research progress and report back.

Action point 08/04
--------------------

### **15. Citizen Focus Champion: Comments**

15.1 Kevin Wilkins praised the work done by the partnership to ensure the recent English Defence League's march took place with little impact on Cambridge residents and traders.

### **16. Any other business**

16.1 Tom Kingsley announced that the Annual Review 2011 had been published on-line on 19 July and that a small number of hard copy versions were being printed. An article promoting the publication of the Review would appear in the next issue of "Cambridge Matters".

16.2 Inger O'Meara highlighted the health profiles that are available via the NHS website (The Information Centre – [www.ic.nhs.uk](http://www.ic.nhs.uk)).

16.3 There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 12:25.

## Cambridge CSP Timetable 2011/12

August 2011	September 2011	October 2011	November 2011	December 2011	January 2012	February 2012	March 2012	April 2012	May 2012	June 2012	July 2012
Agree timetable and process for SA 2011 (2)		SA 2011 finalised	SA 2011 discussed at Development Day (1)  Consultation for Plan (Year 2) (24)	Consultation for Plan (Year 2) (15)	Consultation for Plan (Year 2) (5 & 9)	Revised Plan (Year 2) endorsed by Board (14)	Endorsement of Plan (Year 2) by CSSC (15) and publication				
Cambridge CSP: 2 RD: 26/07			Development Day: 1	Cambridge CSP: 14 RD: 7		Cambridge CSP: 14 RD: 7			Cambridge CSP: 1 RD: 24/04		Cambridge CSP: 31 RD: 24
		OSG: 10	OSG: 15	OSG: tbc				OSG: tbc		OSG: tbc	
		CSSC: 13 RD: 29/09			CSSC: 12 RD: 15/12		CSSC: 15 RD: 1				
<b>Area Committee (E): 18 RD: 9</b>  <b>Area Committee (W/C): 25 RD: 16</b>	<b>Area Committee (N): 22 RD: 13</b>  Area Committee (S): 26 RD: 15	Area Committee (E): 27 RD: 18	Area Committee (W/C): 3 RD: 25/10  <b>Area Committee (S): 7 RD: 27/10</b>  <i>Area Committee (N): 24 RD: 15</i>	<b>Area Committee (E): 15 RD: 7</b>	<b>Area Committee (W/C): 5 RD: 22/12</b>  <i>Area Committee (S): 9 RD: 28/12</i>  <b>Area Committee (N): 26 RD: 17</b>	Area Committee (E): 9 RD: 31/01	<b>Area Committee (S): 5 RD: 23/02</b>  Area Committee (N): 22 RD: 13	<b>Area Committee (E): 12 RD: 3</b>  Area Committee (W/C): 26 RD: 17	Area Committee (S): 10 RD: 30/04  <b>Area Committee (N): 17 RD: 8</b>		

Area Committees in **bold** are those where "Policing & Safer Neighbourhoods" is on the Agenda

Area Committees in *italics* are those where public consultation will be undertaken

### Key:

CSSC Community Services Scrutiny Committee

OSG Officer Support Group

RD Report Deadline

SA Strategy Assessment