

Safer Stockton Partnership

A meeting of Safer Stockton Partnership was held on Tuesday, 17th August, 2010.

Present: Jane Humphreys (In the Chair), Cllr Jim Beall, Mike Batty, Richard Poundford (SBC), Glenis Sanderson (Victim Support); John Bentley (Safe in Tees Valley); Joanne Hodgkinson, Chris Coombs (Cleveland Police Authority); Lucia Saiger (Probation); Paul Green (Adult Safeguarding Board); Tina Williams (Central Area Partnership Board); Allison Agius (Catalyst); Emma Champley, Ruth Hill (NHS/SBC); Ian Garrett (Eastern Area Partnership Board); Bert Smailes (Northern Area Partnership Board); Rob Donaghy (Stockton Police).

Officers: Fiona McKie (LD); Marilyn Davies (DNS)

Also in attendance: Reverend Derek Rosamond, Steve Brock (Stockton Town Pastors); John Coxon (GONE)

Apologies: were submitted on behalf of Julie Nixon, Ian Harrington, Geoff Lee, Ted Allen.

SSP 36/10 Minutes of the meeting held on 6th July 2010

The minutes of the meeting held on 6th July 2010.

SSP 37/10 Matters Arising

None

SSP 38/10 Minutes of YOS Management Board 13 July 2010

The minutes of the YOS Management Board of 13th July 2010 were agreed as a correct record.

SSP 39/10 Minutes of Safeguarding Adults Committee 20 May 2010

Members were informed that the draft report for the adult inspection was due to be received this week.

Tina Williams reported that the assessments for mental health patients were taking a long time to come back. It was stated that this was a matter for Tees Esk and Wear Valley NHS however Jane Humphreys would have a look at the query in more detail, if examples were provided.

AGREED that the minutes of the Safeguarding Adults Committee of 20th May 2010 were agreed as a correct record.

SSP 40/10 Action Notes from Scanning & Challenge Group 7 July 2010

It was requested that an update on the Home Office pilot scheme on payment by results for working with offenders in Peterborough be provided. It was explained that this was a six year pilot scheme.

AGREED that the Action Notes from the Scanning and Challenge Group of 7th July were agreed as a correct record.

SSP 41/10 Any other business - Identification Only

The Face the People Event would be held on 25th November at 2pm. Members were asked to note the new date.

It was requested that Partners encourage their staff etc. to complete the SSP Crime and Disorder questionnaire in the back of the booklet, that was handed out to Members.

SSP 42/10 Home Office update

Members were informed that a decision had been made to abolish the GONE network following a statement from the Home Office. GONE were currently looking at what aspects of their role could be transferred to other government departments. GONE were unable to offer any support to the

Partnership or discuss performance and stated that this would be the last meeting that they would be attending. However, if the partnership required any assistance they were able to contact GONE. A policy document had been produced and a copy would be emailed to the partnership.

The Partnership wished to thank GONE for attending the Partnership meetings and for their support and requested that a letter be sent on behalf of the partnership.

AGREED that the update be noted.

**SSP
43/10**

Providing Reassurance

Traditionally the British Crime Survey and locally MORI had been used to help us to identify how safe people feel. In 2008 a new element was introduced by government called the Place Survey which was linked to performance via national indicators. Police targets were also reviewed and a single national target was set to increase public confidence. Both of these had since been dropped by the new Coalition Government. Public confidence in how the police and council tackle anti social behaviour was not quite the same thing as providing reassurance and it was the latter that this partnership had focussed on.

Members would recall that we had considered a number of reports on this issue over the last year and that some in depth analysis was carried out in October 2009 and brought to our 3rd November meeting. To recap this analysis used both crime and anti social behaviour data and it highlighted a number of wards in the borough with low crime but higher levels of fear of crime. This analysis identified Roseworth followed by Village ward having the highest discrepancy between recorded crime and anti social behaviour against perceptions. The partnership decided to focus their efforts in the coming year on Roseworth and to use the lessons learned to expand the work into other areas at a later date.

Cllr Beall, Roseworth Ward Councillor, was pleased with the evidence received from Roseworth. The CCTV cameras that were put in operation at Roseworth shops had been part of a high profile launch and there had been no issues in this area since their implementation. It was felt a priority by the ward Councillor to maintain the CCTV and any financial assistance towards this would be a priority for Roseworth. It was also felt that the area lacked in youth provision in the area.

AGREED that the report be noted.

**SSP
44/10**

(a) Recorded Crime & Disorder (b) Recorded Crime - Long Term Performance

This report sets out the recorded crime figures, anti social behaviour disorder codes and Most Serious Violence figures for April – June 2010 compared with April – June 2009.

AGREED that the report be noted.

**SSP
45/10**

Community Safety Plan Q1

The report be deferred until the next meeting due to a printing error.

**SSP
46/10**

YOS Q1

Members were informed that there had been an increase in female first time entrants over a long period of time. It was requested that further analysis of offences by gender be presented to the next meeting.

AGREED that the report be noted and a further report be presented to the next meeting.

**SSP
47/10**

Spend against Partnership Investment Plan

Members were informed that they were online to spend everything that had been allocated and therefore there was no underspend.

AGREED that the report be noted.

**SSP
48/10**

Policing in the 21st Century - Reconnecting Police and the People

Members were provided with the Government White Paper and Home Office letter which required a response by 20 September.

A proposed response on behalf of the Partnership was also provided. Geoff Lee and Darren Best had sight of an earlier draft and their comments had been incorporated.

The draft response to date appears as a narrative critique of the White Paper, seeking to show a balance between supporting some elements of the proposals and opposing others. It will also be necessary to make specific comments against all or most of the 23 Consultation Questions, which had been reproduced in the text of the draft response. In most cases this would involve pulling together the most relevant points from other parts of the response text.

Joanne Hodgkinson would clarify a number of points in more detail with Mike Batty relating to para 4.2 and 4.8.

Members felt that if an elected commissioner was appointed then it would be useful to invite them to future partnership meetings.

AGREED that:-

1. The Partnership endorse the draft response, offers any amendments, and agrees the resulting text, for final approval by the Chair of the Partnership prior to submission.
2. Copies of the response be sent to Alex Cunningham MP and James Wharton MP.

**SSP
49/10**

Stockton Town Pastors: Evaluation

Members were provided with a 6 month update from Reverend Derek Rosamond and Steve Brock of Stockton Town Pastors (STP).

An internal review was carried out in June 2010 which included a:-

- comprehensive volunteer survey
- analysis of activity data
- assessment of progress against aims
- identified actions for development

It was reported that STP had been well received by those using the night time economy, partnerships with Police and Stockton Council had remained firm, volunteer commitment had remained strong, involvement in other public events were possibilities for the future.

It was reported that relationships with Taxi Drivers, the Police, Public Houses etc. had been established.

STP would like to have a premises on Stockton High Street.

It was suggested that STP feedback into the licensing review that was taking place.

AGREED that the update be noted.

**SSP
50/10**

Hallmarks of Effective Practice

At the last meeting, on 6 July, the Partnership received feedback on this process from John Tench.

John's general feedback was that we appeared to be a very strong Partnership, and in particular that

- (a) our results in the 'Lead & Guide' section were as strong as seen anywhere in the Region;
- (b) the sequence of moving from 'clear, evidenced priorities' via 'detailed strategies' to 'resources deployed.' was also exceptionally strong; and

(c) that the free text / open ended comments made by respondents to the survey were generally very positive, which was an indication of the prevailing culture within the Partnership.

John identified two leading questions for us, as follows:-

- (a) what is the deal with the public?; and
- (b) what is the deal with austerity?

Public Engagement

In discussion, it was suggested that our overall relationship with the public was along the lines of 'You tell us what the problems are, and we'll do something about them' rather than, for example, 'You tell us what the problems are and we'll empower and facilitate you to do something about them yourselves' (although, of course, we do draw on public involvement at the tactical level, in terms of community intelligence on issues including drug dealing and ASB, and by involving victims of ASB in compiling evidence for us to use on their behalf).

Some doubt was expressed about whether or not there was a groundswell of public enthusiasm for getting more involved, above and beyond the opportunities which already exist (e.g. special constabulary, police volunteer scheme, Neighbourhood Enforcement volunteer scheme, Neighbourhood Watch / Junior Neighbourhood Watch etc).

Successive governments had advocated providing more localised information on crime and disorder to enable 'the community' to hold the partners to account, but turnout at our Face the People sessions and the Chief Constable's annual consultation meeting does not suggest widespread dissatisfaction.

Ben Page of MORI, on his last visit to Stockton on 2009, made the point that the best way of securing community engagement was to provide very poor services, as in London Borough of Hackney in the 1980s. In terms of Community Safety we were currently at the opposite end of the spectrum.

One specific form of community involvement which we touched on in discussion was the involvement of Area Partnership Boards (APBs) in the work of SSP. Potential measures which we could adapt to make this link with residents more robust are

- (a) placing the standing agenda item on feedback from APBs in a more prominent position on the SSP agenda (it's currently at the end)
- (b) provide more training./support to APB reps to give them greater skills and confidence in their roles (SRCGA may have a role in this)
- (c) encouraging APBs (or even requiring them) to nominate a resident rep
- (d) feeding back to APBs on the attendance records of their reps at SSP in order to inform their nomination process (see Appendix A attached)
- (e) supplementing APB representation with representatives from the Community Engagement Network, as is the practice at other thematic partnerships.

Austerity

All partner agencies could expect to have their budgets severely squeezed over the next few years. In particular, there was a significant likelihood that Home Office allocations to the Partnership i.e. Basic Command Unit Fund (via Police) and Safer and Stronger Communities Fund (via Council) would be drastically reduced or eliminated.

There would be a potential challenge in terms of co-terminosity. For the Council it was relatively straightforward to involve and consult other partners on the impact of its decision-making, but less so for the partner agencies that are organised at 'county' level e.g. Police, Fire and Probation,

where decision-making ranges across Cleveland and beyond (in the case of Probation), and the PCT.

It was requested that the Community Empowerment Network would find it useful to receive a presentation from the partnership.

AGREED that the report be noted.

SSP 51/10 NHS White Paper: 'Equity & Excellence: Liberating the NHS'

Members were provided with a copy of the NHS White Paper. The following points were highlighted:-

- Organisational structures had been put out to consultation with a view to make 50% cuts.
- GP's would be the commissioners
- Connection with DAAT's
- Public Health Budget due in October
- Connectivity with partnerships/ safeguarding etc.
- Powers being transferred from PCT to GP's until 2012
- Proposal for public health function to come into local authority

AGREED that the update be noted.

SSP 52/10 Domestic Violence Awayday

Members were informed that the Safeguarding Board had discussed holding an away day to discuss the impact of domestic violence on children and adults. It was anticipated that the away day would be held in the autumn with a facilitator hosting the event.

AGREED that the update be noted.

SSP 53/10 Register of Interests

In May 2009 the Partnership agreed to establish an annual process of surveying the interests of members of the Partnership, and this had recently been undertaken.

By way of context, the purpose of this exercise was to make transparent any interests which members of the Partnership may have, which may be perceived to have a potential impact on decision-making.

It was also worth noting that Councillors (Members of Stockton Council) complete a register of interests, which was available for public inspection on the Council's website (www.stockton.gov.uk) by following the links 'standards and probity' and 'members interests and gifts and hospitality'.

AGREED that members of the partnership disclose any appropriate interests that they may have annually.

SSP 54/10 Counter Terrorism

No update.

SSP 55/10 Communications

Members were provided with the list of press releases from SSP for the period of the 23rd June 2010- 2nd August 2010 copies of the full articles were available from the Community Safety Team.

SSP 56/10 Reports Back
a) Renaissance
b) DAAT Groups
- Adults Commissioning
- Young Peoples Commissioning

- Reducing Supply Group
- Offender Management Group
- c) Area Partnership Boards
- d) Children's Fund
- e) Parkfield/Mill Lane Neighbourhood Management Board

(b) New alcohol treatment service, they would provide a presentation to Members in September. Discussion was held on the stimulant service and whether there was more that could be done to get patients into treatment. The drugs dog was going into public houses and any people found with drugs were being encouraged to go for a treatment assessment. Jeff Evans would be reporting on Integrated Offender Management at the December meeting.