Safer Stockton Partnership

A meeting of Safer Stockton Partnership was held on Tuesday, 5th May, 2015.

Present: Geoff Lee (Chair),Cllr Jim Beall, Steven Hume, Julie Nixon, Kerry Anderson, Emma Champley, A. Robinson (CFB), Gilly Marshall (Thirteen), Christine Goodman (Victim Support), John Bentley (Safe in Tees Valley), Miriam Sigsworth (Youth Offending Team), Dr. Neville Cameron (Cleveland Police and Crime Commissioner's Office), Ian Coates (Cleveland Police), Richard Poundford

Officers: Claire Sills (SBC), Daniel Childs (LD)

Also in attendance:

Apologies: Cllr Steve Nelson, John Bagley, Jane Humphreys, Caroline Wood, Steve Rose

1 Introductions/Apologies

Introductions and apologies given.

2 Declarations of Interest

There were no interests declared.

3 Minutes of Meeting 24 March 2015

The minutes of the meeting held on the 24th March were approved.

4 Matters Arising

A report update into the Easter Holiday Fire patrols had been delayed by the absence of an Officer from work.

Officers were awaiting a Youth Justice Report which would provide an overview of the situation in England and Wales.

The Safer Stockton Partnership website was now up active. Members were encouraged to visit the website and to contact Officers if they wished to add items to the website.

5 Any Other Business - identification only

There was no other business.

6 Minutes of Safeguarding Adults Board 8 April 2015

Members were presented with the minutes of the Safeguarding Adults Board 8 April 2015 for information.

AGREED that the minutes of the Safeguarding Adults Board 8 April 2015 be noted.

7 Community Safety Q4

Members received a presentation from Claire Sills on Community Safety Q4. The presentation covered the following key areas:-
* Social Behaviour Targets
* Violent Crime and Robbery
* Drug Related Offending
* Criminal Damage
* Alcohol Related Crime and ASB
* Domestic Abuse

AGREED that the presentation be received.

8 DAAT Q3

Members received a presentation on DAAT Q3. The presentation covered the following key areas:-
* Numbers of New Presentations and overall numbers of Clients in treatment
* Top ten substances for those in treatment
* Successful completions
* Re-presentation rates
* Arrest referrals
* Drug related arrest data
* Numbers of 18 year olds in treatment
* Housing needs
* Drug rehabilitations requirements
* Young People

AGREED that the presentation be noted.

9 YOT Q4

Members received a report from Miriam Sigsworth of the Youth Offending Team. The presentation covered the following key areas:-
* Indicators - Old Measurement
- First time entrants into the Youth Justice System aged 10-17
- Young People receiving a conviction in court who are sentenced to custody
- Rate of proven re-offending by young people who offend
* Indicators - New Measurement
- First Time Entrants PNC Rate per 100,000 of 10-17 population
- Use of Custody Rate per 1,000 of 10-17 population
- Re-offending rates after 12 months

AGREED that the presentation be noted.

10 Appointment of Independent SSP Chair

Members were informed that two candidates were to be interviewed for the position of Independent Safer Stockton Partnership Chair on Wednesday, 6th May, 2015.

The Chair would be appointed prior to the next meeting of the Partnership.

AGREED that the information be noted.

11 Planned Reports 2015/16

Members were presented with the dates for Planned Reports.

AGREED that the Planned Reports be noted.

12 Reports Back
a) Local Strategic Partnership
b) Adult Wellbeing Partnership

There were no reports back.

13 Date of next meeting - Tuesday 23rd June 2015 at 9.30 a.m.

The date of the next meeting was noted.

14 Police ASB Action Plan

Members received a presentation from Ian Coates of Cleveland Police on the force's Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB) Response.

Members were provided with the circumstances which led to the production of the ASB Response. Members heard that an inspection of Cleveland Police was conducted by HM Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) in September 2014 and that a report was published in November 2014. The report considered and graded the force's performance in three areas: How effective is the force at reducing crime and preventing offending?; How effective is the force at investigating offending?; and How effective is the force at tackling anti‑social behaviour?. They were graded as follows:
- How effective is the force at reducing crime and preventing offending? - Good
- How effective is the force at investigating offending? - Good
- How effective is the force at tackling anti‑social behaviour? - Requires improvement.

Recorded levels of ASB in Cleveland were the highest rate 1,000 population in the country and more than twice the England and Wales.

With regard to tackling ASB, Members were informed of HMIC conclusions, that: the force did not have a clear understanding of the reasons for high incidence of anti-social behaviour; the force could not demonstrate a strategic approach to tackling ASB; the force had limited capacity to engage communities to prevent and resolve anti-social behaviour problems; but that there was some evidence for positive work in tackling ASB.

Members heard that Cleveland Police had investigated possible reasons for such high levels of ASB issues. Some contributory factors included:
- A high number of public order officers were out of the area when the inspection took place. They were assisting with an international summit in Wales, and Neighbourhood Officers were backfilling for absent officers.
- Restructuring of the force under the ORBIS programme had left the force with 400 fewer officers. Tasks formerly done by specialists had been passed on to Neighbourhood teams.

In addition, Members were told that Durham University had been commissioned to conduct research into ASB in the area. The report would be funded via Police and Crime Commissioner funding and would consider a number of issues, such as:
- What were the causes of high ASB statistics?
- Was interpretation was incidents in the area consistent with interpretation in other parts of the country?

Members were provided with information regarding the force's current approach and possible changes to the way in which it policed CSE.

Ian Coates presented the ASB Response and drew attention to the following points:
- Work with partners to understand how to redefine engagement with communities to ensure that local priorities were identified and addressed in line with the New Neighbourhood Policing approach. Members heard that Neighbourhood Police would have a more narrowly defined remit.
- Instigate and evaluate corporate operations to tackle ASB and Violence linked through geographic areas.
- Research and benchmark good practice from other forces and implement in Cleveland as appropriate to local context. Members were provided with further information regarding which other forces would be included in the research and the reasoning behind their inclusion.
- Make best use of Police Constables and PCSO allocation and use of powers in light of new legislation in relation to ASB.
- Co-ordinate with partners early intervention in relation to Young People; Premises; Alcohol; Mental Health; Multi Agency Days of Action; Troubled Families; and Integrated Offender Management.

Members had the opportunity to raise questions and issues. The subsequent discussion could be summarised as follows:
- A further inspection had been conducted by HMIC since the September 2014 inspection, but the findings had not yet been published.
- Members stated that further communication with partners was required, and that raising awareness of police actions and priorities could lead to improved outcomes.
- Members questioned developing links between Troubled Families and Integrated Offender Management service (1.12.f). Members were told that the plan was to use the Integrated Offender Management model rather than linking the services.
- Members questioned whether excessive focus had been given to the number of ASB incidents and asked whether the seriousness of incidents was included in ASB data. Members stated the importance of discovering the underlying factors which led to ASB. Members were informed that the force deployed a number of sanctions, which varied according to the seriousness of the offence(s).
- Members asked for further information regarding the academic research being conducted by Durham University. The importance of independent academic research to discover the factors behind such high instances of ASB was reiterated and Members were informed that data would be shared with partners.

AGREED that the report be noted.

15 Recorded Crime & Disorder

Consideration was given to a report that provided an overview of Recorded Crime and Disorder between April 2014 and March 2015.

AGREED that the report be noted.

16 Update on Sex Workers Group/Police operation

Consideration was given to an update report from the Sex Workers Group/Police Operation. The report on Sex Work in Stockton included information on the following areas:

* Contextual information
* Process
* Information learned
* Effective approaches to resolve issues
* Current challenges
* Moving forward

AGREED that the report be noted.

17 Hate Crime Barriers

Consideration was given to a report addressing the barriers to reporting of hate crime affecting the LGBT+ communities of the policing area of Cleveland Police.

The report contained information on the following subjects:

* Contextual information
* Report methodology
* Issues affecting reporting of incidents
* Conclusions

AGREED that the report be noted.