

Cambridge Community Safety Partnership

1 July 2011
10:00 – 11:15

Committee Room 1
The Guildhall, Cambridge

MINUTES

Board

Liz Bisset (Chair)	Cambridge City Council (Customer & Community Services)
Tim Bick	Executive Councillor for Community Development & Health
Julian Fountain	Cambridgeshire Fire & Rescue Service
Kevin Wilkins	Cambridgeshire Police Authority

Members

Michael Hendy	Cambridge Magistrates
Vicky Hornsby	Cambridge Business Against Crime (CAMBAC)
Simon Kerss	Cambridgeshire County Council
Lynda Kilkelly	Cambridge City Council (Safer Communities Section)
Jennifer Massie	Cambridgeshire Constabulary
Dick Moore	Cambridgeshire Constabulary
Michael Soper	Cambridgeshire County Council (Research Group)
Tom Kingsley (Minutes)	Cambridge City Council (Safer Communities Section)

1. Welcome, domestics, introductions and apologies.

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed everyone. There were no attending members of the public.
- 1.2 Apologies were received from Sarah Ferguson, Ruth McCallum, Inger O'Meara, Dave Sargent, Graeme Seddon, Steve Kerridge, Peter Lester and Susie Talbot.
- 1.3 With the permission of the Chair, Dick Moore represented Dave Sargent as Board member.

2. Pre-advised questions from the general public.

- 2.1 There were no pre-advised questions.

3. Community Safety Fund (CSF) 2011/12: Spend Plan (with supporting Action Plans, where available)

- 3.1 The Chair requested that the Board look at the action plans first and then link them back to the Spend Plan. Lynda Kilkelly spoke to the covering report highlighting the background and the amount of funding available to spend (being £91,640). It was noted that the CSF was oversubscribed by £8,085 and cuts would have to be agreed by the Board. The report carried recommendations as to where the cuts could be made.
- 3.2 Jennifer Massie spoke to the alcohol-related violet crime action plan, stating that it was out of kilter with the financial year, being agreed at each annual seminar that the Task Group held in September of each year. The current action plan was endorsed in December 2010. Jennifer highlighted aspects of the action plan, including communication and promotion, business involvement (especially in the night time economy), reducing victims of violent crime, the introduction of the city centre police team, robust enforcement and improving intelligence (especially A&E data).

- 3.3 Lynda Kilkelly spoke to the anti-social behaviour action plan, which was still in draft form, highlighting the customer care focus of the majority of its targets. Lynda stated that the projects in the Spend Plan would look at addressing the target to have no more than 130 first time entrants to the criminal justice system from Cambridge for 2011/12.
- 3.4 Simon Kerss stated that the domestic violence action plan was still under consideration as there had been changes in the prioritisation of domestic violence within South and East Cambridgeshire (both part of the revised task group). It was expected that the action plan would be ready by 18th July.
- 3.5 Dick Moore stated that the reducing re-offending action plan had been completed in draft, but could not be submitted, as it required approval at a meeting of the working group on 27th July, following agreement by the strategic group w/c 4th July. Dick highlighted aspects of the plan, which focussed on communication, management and support.
- 3.6 The Chair requested that the outstanding action plans be presented at the next Cambridge CSP meeting (scheduled for 2nd August).

Action point 07/01

- 3.7 Lynda Kilkelly returned to the report covering the Spend Plan, highlighting the issues to be considered by the Board and the four recommendations. The Chair directed each priority lead officer to take the Board through each project and for comments to be made as this was done. The following points were noted:

3.7.1 Nightsafe Materials

Kevin Wilkins was uncomfortable with the number of civil banning orders issued being a performance measure. Vicky Hornsby stated that civil banning orders were under reported and had to be addressed; the performance measure could be rephrased, however.

3.7.2 ICE Safety Guardians

Tim Bick questioned whether the safety guardians were, on a professional level, providing a similar service to that provided by the voluntary street pastors and if funding here might be demotivating for the voluntary sector. Vicky Hornsby stated that the safety guardians were already working in the community, focussing on international students, and had the support of those language schools in Cambridge that they had visited. This project was a trade initiative that should be supported and provided a unique service to 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. It was proposed, and agreed, that the 3-month funding option for the project would be acceptable and the project could be reviewed after this period.

Tim Bick questioned whether the projects seeking funding under the alcohol-related violent crime priority focussed too much on the 'casualties' and that some balance should be made with better enforcement of alcohol licences. Jennifer Massie stated that the task group already had licensing as a standing agenda item. It was agreed, however, that licensing could be included in future quarterly reports.

Action point 07/02

3.7.3 Youth Work Prevention Programme

Lynda Kilkelly stated that based on data evidence from the County Research Group it was proposed to do two prevention projects with young people. The evidence indicates that running two separate groups for the different age ranges should result in better outcomes. Following discussion, it was suggested that in the interest of partnership working that the County Council should lead on the 13-16 age group project and the City Council should lead on the 10-12 age group project. The Research Group would provide statistical support to the project.

3.7.4 Freedom Programme for Women

Simon Kerss stated that the Freedom programme was currently being evaluated in Finland.

3.7.5 Sanctuary

Simon Kerss explained that the Luminus contract to provide sanctuary work expired in 2007 and that he was working with Simon Hunt at Cambridge City Council to refine alternative sources.

3.7.6 New Directions Service

The recommendation before the Board was to reduce the amount sought for this project from £20,000 to £12,000. There was an issue with regards the service working with men whilst in custody at Parkside Police Station, but it was noted that there were other referral avenues open to the service. Simon Kerss stated that due to the nature of the work, the Board would not see any evidence of the 65% reduction in offending for 2 years. It was agreed the performance measure would be amended with defined start and end dates.

Action point 07/03

Simon Kerss requested that the conditions of grant for the project made clear that the campaigning element was not included, as the service should work with the task group on this matter.

Action point 07/04

Julian Fountain, as the performance champion, reminded priority lead officers that the Board would be holding them to the performance measures set out in the Spend Plan.

3.7.7 Partnership Support Officer

Tom Kingsley was requested to leave the room whilst this project was discussed; consequently there are no minutes for this particular item.

3.8 Lynda Kilkelly sought approval from the Board on the 4 recommendations in the report, as follows:

“3.1 The New Directions Service project is funded for the reduced amount of £12,000 and that the project is evaluated, as it is an approach that the Task Group has not used before.”

Approved, taking into account the points agreed at paragraph 3.7.6 above.

“3.2 That apart from the amendment to the New Directions Service application the Board approve the spend plan (Appendix A)”

Approved, taking into account the funding change agreed with regards the ICE Safety Guardians, as stated in paragraph 3.7.2 above.

“3.3 That the balance of the pooled fund (£13,000) is held against potential need by Task and Finish groups for later in the year.”

Approved.

“3.4 That the Board agrees the recommendations as detailed or suggests alternatives.”

Approved.

3.9 There being no other business, the meeting closed at 11:15