

Safer Stockton Partnership

A meeting of the Safer Stockton Partnership was held on Tuesday 24th October 2006.

Present: Gary Gamesby (Chairman) (Stockton Police); Councillor Cherrett (Western Area Partnership Board), Councillor Coombs, Joanne Hodgkinson (Cleveland Police Authority), Marilyn Davies, Sue Maddison, Mike Batty, Fiona Shayler, Jane Humphreys (Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council), Paul Kirton (Stockton on Tees Borough Council/ Cleveland Fire Brigade), John Bentley (Safe in Tees Valley), Ray Graham (Teesside CAMHS, Tees, Esk and Wear Valley NHS Trust), Bernice Wilkinson (Victim Support), Ian Garrett (Eastern Area Partnership Board), Sue Cash (North Tees Primary Care Trust).

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Superintendent Dave Brunskill, Matt Spencer, Lucia Saiger, Councillor Mrs Fletcher, Mike Picknett, Councillor Womphrey.

186 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 12 September, 2006 were agreed as a correct record.

187 Matters Arising

Criminal Damage Reporting

All Districts have an action plan with regard to reporting incidents of criminal damage. Generally the individual will make a judgement on whether to report the incident, many minor incidents are not reported, the individual will look at cost to repair and repeat of incident. It can also be difficult to determine whether the criminal damage was accidental or malicious. As stated previously the Council has no formal policy. Tristar Homes have their own policy/procedures with regard to Council Houses which highlights what they will repair or expect the tenant to repair.

GONE

The Visit had taken place on 6th October 2006 and was well received by visitors. Two letters of thanks had been received from Judith Million (GONE) and Stephen Cahill (Home Office) which were circulated around Members.

Notes of YOS Management Board 5th September 2006

The Notes of the YOS Management Board of 5th September were received.

Notes of Scanning and Challenge Group 19th October 2006

The notes would be presented to the next meeting of SSP.

188 Any Other Business

Street Lighting – Environment and Regeneration Select Committee Review

Members were informed that the final report for the Review of Street Lighting conducted by the Environment and Regeneration Select Committee was near completion and would be presented to the next meeting of SSP.

189 Target Monitoring Chart

Members were presented with the updated Target Monitoring Chart and attention was paid to the amber/red areas. Particular concern regarding the secondary deliberate fires figure was highlighted (Target 6.5), it was felt that this figure was due to the hot/dry weather this year. Members requested that a member of the Fire Service provide an update at the next meeting.

Members also held discussion on Target 3.8 and 3.9 with regard to drug testing. Target 3.9 was is now outdated as the drugs tests were now being carried out at arrest and not at charge as from 31/03/06.

AGREED that a member of the Fire Service update Members on the target with regard to secondary deliberate fires at the next meeting.

190 Youth Offending Service Performance

This report highlighted areas of exception (amber/red) performance scores and how these areas are being addressed. Discussion was held on the performance of remands and it was stated that regular meetings were being held to consider issues in this area. There was a need to look at figures nationally to compare.

AGREED that the update be noted.

191 Feedback on Partnership Assessment and Delivery System (PADS)

The results from the self-assessment session at the meeting on 12 September, 2006 were provided for Members information. The vast majority of the assessments made were located in the upper categories of 'Doing Well' and 'Some Success', but there were a few exceptions which were highlighted to Members.

It had previously been agreed to use this process to generate a future 'Partnership Improvement Plan', as in 2004. In order to make this of manageable size, and to concentrate effort in the areas where it was most needed, it was proposed to focus on the four indicators for which the combined scores in the top 2 categories totalled less than 50% (Indicator 11, 20, 23 28).

With regard to Indicator 20 as discussed at the last meeting this indicator was more likely to be aimed at DATs than Community Safety Partnerships, but, having been identified by the process, as in need of some attention, it was proposed to prepare a draft Commissioning Framework for consideration at a future meeting of the Partnership.

Discussion was held on competing financial pressures for all partnerships and the difficulties when partner contributions were requested. There have been some examples of where negotiations have worked to part fund a project, but on some occasions communications have broken down. Partners need to work together as often joint working can save on costs. However, there were some concerns on ownership of projects as it was felt the responsibility lay with the lead organisation and details of the other partners were not always identified.

Indicator 23 – Need to look at the way in which performance was reported, further information on red areas could be highlighted in a covering report which the lead partnership member could detail further at the meeting. Need to concentrate efforts on targets that can be improved and look at what task groups exist. Further information on this matter be provided at a future meeting.

Indicator 28 – It was felt that awareness of the various plans such as the Community Safety Plan needed to be raised amongst staff of all levels. Gaps need to be identified. Links on partner organisation websites would be useful.

Concluded that:-

1. The proposal to concentrate on the 'worst four' indicators be endorsed.
2. The proposal to receive a draft Commissioning Framework at a future meeting be endorsed.
3. Prepare a simple Partnership Improvement Plan addressing the 'worst four' indicators.
4. Members comments be noted.

192 Consultation Strategy 3 2007

At the meeting on September 12th 2006 there was consensus that Option 3 was the preferred choice for the partnership to use as the main consultation in 2007. Members also agreed the aims and principles of the consultation, which reaffirmed the validity of using a bottom up consultation process to confirm local priorities.

Option 3 was to produce a consultation document in reduced numbers (10,000) with additional survey sheets and use other methods to encourage responses such as the web, be-spoke Viewpoint survey and also incorporate the survey into partner's established consultation. Each partner would have a minimum target for responses. It was also agreed to target hard to reach areas, the targets were as follows:-

- a) Obtain a response rate of at least 10 per 1,000 population per ward
- b) Maintain the BME response rate to at least the representative level of the Borough which is 2.8%
- c) Increase the overall response rate by 10% to at least 4,000
- d) Increase responses from the 16-34 age range.

The additional costs to partners for 2007/08 were detailed to Members. The additional cost did not include the JSU additional resource requirement for additional data and analysis of crime and disorder incidents and statistics. Without further contributions from the partners this would need to be obtained from the Partnership

Investment Plan which would result in a realignment of current projects which were funded from this stream.

Discussion was held on how the amount of funding requested from each partner was derived. Marilyn Davies would send a request and breakdown of funding to each of the partners with the 2004 figures. A list would be submitted to the next meeting indicating which partners had agreed to the funding.

AGREED that:-

1. The minimum target for responses for each partner be noted.
2. The target to improve responses from hard to reach groups and areas be noted.
3. The request for additional costs with a breakdown together with the 2004 funding figures be sent out to each partner.
4. A list be provided to the next meeting confirming what partners had committed to the funding required.

193 Crime Reporting Rates – Stockton Compared to National Averages

Members will recall that a paper was discussed at Safer Stockton Partnership in October 2004 that compared the results of the British Crime Survey (BCS) and a local residents survey in Stockton. The report found that residents in Stockton were much more likely to report crime to the Police than the national rate. This was the case for all crime with the exception of theft of Motor Vehicle offences, which were reported less.

The original report followed on from the work of Police colleagues which analysed violent crime in Stockton to identify if the increase we are experiencing related to actual crime or reporting rates, due to the changes in recording rules. The report was an update of the 2004 paper with BCS 2005/06 and a local survey carried out in 2006.

Analysis of reporting figures was shown for Criminal Damage, Burglary, Vehicle Crime and Violent Crime between 2004/05 and 2005/06.

The analysis appeared to show that Stockton residents were more likely to report all crimes, except those who were a victim of theft of Motor Vehicle who report in line with the national picture. This crime type was the only difference to the 2004 findings. The Police view was that residents of the borough were happy to report crime and the Police were happy to record the information. Cleveland Police were in the top 4 nationally for crime recording.

AGREED that the report be noted.

194 Stockton Domestic Violence Executive Group – Terms of Reference

The purpose of the Stockton Domestic Violence Executive Group was to provide strategic leadership and impetus to the reduction and prevention of domestic violence in Stockton. It planned to achieve this through the ongoing development, implementation and evaluation of the Stockton Domestic Violence Strategy and supporting Action Plans. The key themes of the strategy were detailed to Members.

The Membership of the Executive Group were outlined but had not been formalised. It was requested that Gary Gamesby (Stockton Police) and that an appropriate Councillor/s be added to the Membership. It was suggested that a report be prepared and submitted to Cabinet to nominate an appropriate Councillor/s.

AGREED that:-

1. The report be noted.
2. Gary Gamesby (Stockton Police) be added to the Membership.
3. A report be submitted to Cabinet to appoint a Council Member/s to the Executive Group.

195 Cleveland Criminal Justice Board – Relationship with Community Safety Partnerships

Members were provided with this report for information purposes. It highlighted how partnerships can work better together following issues identified at an LCJB/CDRP workshop. Any comments on the report to be submitted to Mike Batty.

AGREED that the report be noted and any comments be submitted to Mike Batty.

196 PCSO Funding

An update was provided by Mike Batty on the Funding of additional PCSOs. Informal discussions had taken place and the Council had now been asked to contribute towards an extra 62 PCSOs, but the Council had suggested that the further 32 (over and above the previously agreed figure of 30) should be 'gap funded' by the Police Authority. This would take Stockton to a total of 86 PCSO's which would meet the recommended figure by the Home Office who had recommended 309 PCSOs across Cleveland. A further meeting would be held in Nov/Dec with the Police Authority and all four authorities. It was hoped that the figures would be firmed up in the near future.

AGREED that the update be noted.

197 Communications Update

Members were provided with a list of press releases for the period from 26 August to 10th October 2006. Discussion was held on the Tackling Drugs campaign, the second round of which was to be launched on 1st November, 2006. Publicity regarding people receiving Anti Social Behaviour Orders (ASBOs) was discussed.

It was felt that it would be useful for future reports to be split into positive and negative stories.

AGREED that the comments be noted and that future reports be split to show positive and negative stories separately.

198 Recorded Crime Update

The reported crime figures for April to September 2006 compared with April to September 2005. It was noted that the figures in the report were the best results in the last 18 months of recording.

AGREED that the comparison be noted.

199 Reports Back

Children's Fund

A meeting was due in the next few weeks and an update would be provided at the next meeting of SSP.

Renaissance

Members were advised on the outcome of the Neighbourhood Renewal Performance Management Framework 2005/06. An amendment was required to the information provided that stated that the internet based tool used by Community Safety was 'IQUANTA' this was an error and should have read 'Profiler'.

Safe in Tees Valley Management Committee

It was stated that Hartlepool Policing was to be evaluated and a report would be brought back in November.

200 Other Business

Joint Area Review (JAR)

JAR would take place week beginning 3rd and 10th December, therefore it was identified that an Inspection of the Youth Offending Service would take place between August to end of November 2007, but no definite date had been provided as yet.