

# Cambridge Community Safety Partnership

3 May 2011  
10:00 – 12:15

Committee Room 1  
The Guildhall, Cambridge

## MINUTES

### Board

Liz Bisset (Chair)	Cambridge City Council (Customer & Community Services)
Sarah Ferguson	Cambridgeshire County Council (Children & Young People's Services)
Julian Fountain	Cambridgeshire Fire & Rescue Service
Ruth McCallum	Cambridge Council for Voluntary Service
Inger O'Meara	NHS Cambridgeshire
Dave Sargent	Cambridgeshire Constabulary
Graeme Seddon	Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Probation Trust

### Members

Tim Bick	Executive Councillor for Community Development & Health
Vickie Crompton	Cambridgeshire Drug & Alcohol Action Team
Michael Hendy	Cambridge Magistrates
Vicky Hornsby	Cambridge Business Against Crime (CAMBAC)
Steve Kerridge	Cambridgeshire Constabulary
Simon Keress	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)
Helen Turner	Cambridgeshire County Council (Community Safety Team)
Tom Kingsley (Minutes)	Cambridge City Council (Safer Communities Section)

### In Attendance

Mark Alexander	Cambridgeshire Constabulary
Matt Deacon	Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Road Safety Partnership

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

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed everyone and introductions were made for both Mark Alexander and Matt Deacon. There were no attending members of the public.
- 1.2 Apologies were received from Peter Lester and Kevin Wilkins.

### 2. Integrated Offender Management: Presentation

- 2.1 DCI Mark Alexander gave a PowerPoint presentation on Integrated Offender Management (IOM) in response to the action point 02/03 for an update on project work, particularly in Peterborough. The presentation touched on what is IOM and current provision, before highlighting the recent IOM review and the recommendations arising from that. The presentation concluded on how IOM operates, in relation to Peterborough, which deals with 120 offenders under the framework.
- 2.2 A number of questions were raised regarding the operation of IOM in relation to its integration and how offenders were assessed. It was acknowledged that IOM is

progressing slowly in Cambridgeshire, but there would be integration with service providers as the framework progressed: assessment was along the same lines as that undertaken by the probation service: a directory of services was being compiled. It was noted that IOM is not being separately funded, but is having to be developed from existing resources. Michael Hendy explained that the courts were issuing suspended sentences with community orders so that offenders would be brought into the framework and given a chance to cease re-offending. Dick Moore further explained that there was a legal obligation on community safety partnerships to develop IOM and it was agreed that he would bring updates on the introduction of IOM in Cambridgeshire to future meetings, including the identification of any gaps in service. Tom Kingsley was asked to make this a standing item on future agendas.

Action point 05/01

Ruth McCallum referred back to the question of integration and developing links with other agencies, suggesting that there could be valuable links established with the voluntary sector. It was agreed that Dick Moore and Ruth McCallum would meet outside the meeting to discuss.

Action point 05/02

It was noted that in Peterborough, where IOM is more developed, that it was seen as having contributed to a reduction in dwelling burglaries there.

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

3.1 There were no pre-advised questions.

### **4. Minutes of 11 March 2011 meeting: Agreement.**

4.1 The Minutes were agreed, with one small amendment to paragraph 12.5 (with the removal of the words "to reflect alignment to the five district areas", which was incorrect), and would go forward for publication.

### **5. Action points: Review**

5.1 Two (08/03 and 02/02) of the eleven action points from previous meetings were discussed: both were still ongoing and would be closed at the August 2011 meeting.

5.2 Tim Bick questioned the closure of the action point (02/01) relating to engagement and requested a report from the Officer Support Group, to which it had been assigned.

### **6. Performance report: Q4 2010/11**

6.1 Michael Soper spoke to the performance report, summarising the achievements and the areas of concern

6.2 In summarising the achievements, it was noted that the targets for alcohol-related violent crime, anti-social behaviour, serious acquisitive crime and personal robbery had been met.

- Special mention was made of the recorded statistics for alcohol-related violent crime (825 compared to the baseline of 885 crimes) and Cambridge's 9<sup>th</sup> position within the 15 similar community safety partnerships.
- The number of attendances at Addenbrooke's A&E Department had seen a 17% reduction in the year.

6.3 The main areas of concern were:

- Burglary of homes had seen a 20.9% increase in the year 2010/11, meaning the 10% reduction target had not been met. The background to the 10% reduction was explained (arising from a Local Area Agreement). As the target had not been met and dwelling burglary was no longer a priority for the Partnership, there were concerns as to how this could be managed. It was agreed that the performance report would still cover dwelling burglary and that a 'task and finish' group would oversee activity and report under a standing agenda item.

- The 28% repeat incidence rate for domestic violence had not been met. Simon Kerss stated that the performance indicator relating to the domestic violence indicator (NI 32) was unrealistic; however, the targets set for this year using data from the Independent Domestic Violence Advocacy Service would be more realistic.
- Cycle theft had increased 11%, meaning the reduction target had not been met. Burglary of homes and the long-term domestic violence target would be monitored.

Action point 05/03
--------------------

## 7. Priority area monitoring reports: Q4 2010/11

### 7.1 Alcohol-related violent crime & anti-social behaviour

Dave Sargent spoke to the relevant report, highlighting the creation of the new central neighbourhood policing team as from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2011 and the positive impact this would have. Further to what was reported during the previous agenda item, the work of Addenbrooke's A&E Department staff in achieving the lowest recorded number of assault victims since 2007 was recognised at an awards ceremony held on 18<sup>th</sup> March.

### 7.2 Burglary of homes

Steve Kerridge spoke to the relevant report, highlighting the disappointment in the target not being met, but stressing that the detection rate was running at 1 in 3 at present. Although no longer a Partnership priority, dwelling burglary remained a police priority and work would be focussed in October, which was generally seen as the start to winter activity. Burglary would still be picked up at Area Committees at a local level.

### 7.3 Cycle theft

Steve Kerridge spoke to the relevant report, highlighting that cycle crime in Market ward saw a reduction and that it was anticipated that the new central neighbourhood policing team would take on board this activity, as it was no longer a Partnership priority.

### 7.4 Domestic violence (DV) (including Domestic Violence Homicide Review process)

Dave Sargent spoke to the relevant report, highlighting the proposal to set up a small focussed task group for Cambridge, as it was the only district within the Southern Cambridgeshire enclave to retain DV as a priority. The existing task group would meet every six months, whilst the new Cambridge task group would meet bi-monthly. Cambridge had seen a 37.9% rise in DV; this would be taken on as a priority with county partners.

Simon Kerss spoke to a report circulated earlier regarding the implementation of Domestic Violence Homicide Reviews (DHR). It was noted that the likelihood of a DV homicide occurring in Cambridge was high and that each review would take around 7 months to complete. The report proposed 5 recommendations, being:

- 14.1 It is recommended that each Cambridgeshire CSP and relevant partner agency reviews and understands this report, appendices and associated statutory guidance and that this is acknowledged through discussion and recording at the earliest possible relevant CSP meeting.
- 14.2 It is recommended that the five Cambridgeshire CSPs begin the process of identifying relevant individuals to sit on DHR Review Panels for their District and that these individuals undertake the associated DHR e-learning at [www.homeoffice.gov.uk](http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk).
- 14.3 It is recommended that the five Cambridgeshire CSPs each identify two potential 'independent' Chairs from their cohort of Counsellors and that these individuals undertake the e-learning training on DHRs provided via the Home Office.
- 14.4 It is recommended that the Domestic Abuse Partnership Manager identifies relevant training for Overview Report authors and that each CSP identifies two individuals from partners agencies that would act as Overview Authors in future DHRs.
- 14.5 It is recommended that Cambridgeshire Constabulary develop a pro-forma letter that the SIO in any future DV-related homicide would use to advise the relevant CSP Chair of the homicide."

Recommendations 14.1 and 14.5 were accepted, but further work was needed to take them forward. Partnership members were asked to identify a suitable pool of resource to undertake the DHRs, noting that the chief workload would fall upon the Overview Authors.

Action point 05/04

Questions were asked about the level of seniority for those undertaking the roles highlighted in the report and whether counties could work on a reciprocal basis. The level of seniority was not set in statute and whilst reciprocal arrangements with other areas had been discussed, it was not agreed as a way forward.

#### 7.5 Personal robbery

Steve Kerridge spoke to the relevant report, highlighting the fall in the number of street robberies (24 compared to 46 in the previous quarter and 34 in the same quarter the previous year). The new central neighbourhood policing team would be looking at this crime type and the seasonal fluctuations as a priority.

#### 7.6 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) in the light of the earlier presentation. There had been a disappointment, with one client returning to crime. As part of the focus upon IOM, the Chair requested that future reports include outcomes.

Action point 05/05

### 8. Drug and Alcohol Action Team report: Q4 2010/11

8.1 Vickie Crompton spoke briefly to the relevant report: the re-tendering work for contracts due for renewal on 1<sup>st</sup> April 2012 was underway. DAAT needs assessments had now been completed.

### 9. Performance Champion: Comments

9.1 Julian Fountain summed up the good works that had been achieved during the year, but reminded the Partnership that it needed to keep an eye on dwelling burglary (even though it was no longer a priority) and domestic violence targets.

### 10. Community Safety Plan 2011-14: Target scrutiny

10.1 Lynda Kilkelly spoke to the report, which had been prepared following agreement that the targets in the (now agreed) Community Safety Plan would be publicly scrutinised to ensure transparency and confirm they were challenging. Jennifer Massie spoke to the alcohol-related violent crime targets; Lynda Kilkelly to those on anti-social behaviour; Dave Sargent to those on domestic violence; and Dick Moore to those on re-offending. Vickie Crompton raised a query with regards the fact that Addenbrooke's Hospital was now the major trauma centre for the Eastern region and that this may have an impact upon specific assault statistics for Cambridge. Michael Soper took an action to have the Research Group clarify this issue.

Action point 05/06

Tim Bick was concerned that the anti-social behaviour targets were focussing on customer satisfaction and that their effectiveness would have to be closely monitored. The targets were approved, but it was recommended that each task group's action plans be presented at the same time as the forthcoming Spend Plan.

Action point 05/07

### 11. New Board member

11.1 The Chair asked that the current Board members approve the appointment of the portfolio holder for community safety as a Board member. This was done unanimously. Tim Bick was duly welcomed as the current holder of that post. It was confirmed that the appointment would not affect voting rights as set out in paragraph 7(b) of the Partnership's Terms of Reference, i.e. each agency will have only one vote.

**12. Public and media information: Revisions**

12.1 Tom Kingsley presented his report, which contained a revision to the 'information for the general public and media representatives' on the reverse of each Agenda. At the previous meeting, there were concerns that the wording was too formal and not engaging. The Board approved the revised wording, which would come into use for the 2<sup>nd</sup> August meeting.

**13. Citizen Focus Champion: Comments**

13.1 In Kevin Wilkins's absence, there were no comments.

**14. Any other business**

14.1 Tim Bick asked that the meeting schedule be revisited in order to ensure that decisions by e-mail are avoided. The Chair requested that the OSG take this task on board.

Action point 05/08

14.2 The Chair highlighted the Tilley Awards (an annual competition to celebrate long term, effective crime reduction projects) and requested that the OSG look at potential schemes for submission.

Action point 05/09

14.3 There being no other business, the meeting closed at 12:15