

## **SAFER COMMUNITIES BOARD**

**Wednesday 12 December 2012  
9.30am – New Conference Room, Police HQ, Ripley**

### **A G E N D A**

#### **Open Session**

- |   |                                   |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Presentation ASB Victims First Project/ECINS<br>(Empowering Communities Inclusion Neighbourhood<br>Management System) | Insp Barry Thacker<br>Andy Waldie |
| 1) Apologies  | Chair                             |
| 2) Minutes of Safer Communities Board meeting 6 June 2012 and<br>Matters arising                                      | Chair                             |
| 3) Welcome & Introduction Police & Crime Commissioner<br>• Crime & Disorder (Amendment) Regulations 2012              | Chair<br>Sally Goodwin            |
| 4) Threat & Risk Process  | Sally Goodwin                     |
| 5) CSA Action Plan 2012/13 Update   | Sally Goodwin                     |
| 6) Hate Crime Strategy for Derbyshire   | Supt Russ Foster                  |
| 7) Violence Alcohol & Licensing Groups Update   | Supt Russ Foster                  |
| 8) Integrated Offender Management Update  | Sally Goodwin                     |
| 9) Child Sexual Exploitation Action Plan  | Sally Goodwin                     |
| 10) LGA Briefing – Health Reps / GP Clinical<br>Commissioning Groups (CCGs) on CSPs                                   | Sally Goodwin                     |
| 11) Drug & Alcohol Action Team (DAAT)<br>Business Plan Proposal   | Sally Goodwin                     |
| 12) Any Other Business  |                                   |

#### **Closed Session**

- |   |               |
|---|---------------|
| Domestic Violence Homicide Reviews                                | Sally Goodwin |
| • CDNCH/11 Sign off Overview Report for submission to Home Office |               |
| • DDNCH/12 New review update                                      |               |

**Dates of future meetings:**

27 February 2013 – 9.30am New Conference Room, Police HQ

05 June 2013 – 9.30am New Conference Room, Police HQ

**MINUTES** of a meeting of the **DERBYSHIRE SAFER COMMUNITIES BOARD** held on 19 June 2012 at Police Headquarters, Ripley

**PRESENT**

Councillor Mrs C A Hart – in the Chair  
(Derbyshire County Council)

<b><u>Amber Valley Borough Council</u></b> Councillor C Short P Carney	<b><u>Derbyshire Fire and Rescue</u></b> A Waldie
<b><u>Bolsover District Council</u></b> Councillor B Murray-Carr W Lumley	<b><u>Derbyshire Police Authority</u></b> H Boffy
<b><u>Chesterfield Borough Council</u></b> J Moran	<b><u>Derbyshire Probation Trust</u></b> J Mead M Self
<b><u>Derbyshire Constabulary</u></b> D Collins M Creedon R Foster	<b><u>Erewash Borough Council</u></b> P Wright
<b><u>Derbyshire County Council</u></b> S Goodwin D Lowe	<b><u>North East Derbyshire District Council</u></b> Councillor L Robinson
<b><u>Derbyshire County PCT</u></b> S Pintus	<b><u>South Derbyshire District Council</u></b> Councillor R J Wheeler
<b><u>Derbyshire Dales District Council</u></b> Councillor G Stevens D Bunton	<b><u>3D Infrastructure Consortium</u></b> L Allison

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillor S Blank (Chesterfield Borough Council), P Hickson (Derbyshire Police Authority), J Jaroszek (Erewash Borough Council), F McArdle (South Derbyshire District Council), and D Smith (High Peak Borough Council)

**15/12** **MINUTES RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting of the Safer Communities Board held on 7 March 2012 be confirmed as a correct record.

**16/12** **UPDATED TERMS OF REFERENCE** The Board was presented with the updated Terms of Reference for the Safer Communities Board.

These were agreed, with one additional amendment for membership to include the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) or their deputy from November 2012. It was also felt that membership should include the PCC's Chief Executive in an officer capacity, which would not attract voting rights.

**17/12**      **PERFORMANCE OVERVIEW – QUARTER 4/END OF YEAR 2011/12** The Board received an update of key performance indicators for the eleven Board priorities. The majority were either on target or within 5% of the target, with the exception of Domestic Violence and the key performance indicator of percentage of repeat referrals to MARAC. A summary was provided for all priorities, along with a performance overview.

In terms of alcohol specific admissions, the latest available data had showed that alcohol specific hospital admissions were increasing for males, females and under 18s. There were still four districts in the top ten for the highest rates of under 18 admissions, three of which were in the top five- High Peak, Chesterfield and Bolsover. However, an additional paper highlighting utilising local raw health data had portrayed a more positive picture.

There had been a request at the last SCTAG meeting to undertake a more detailed examination of the indicator relating to MARAC referrals. Derbyshire had a key performance indicator of 27% repeat referrals into the MARAC, and this target had not been met for the last two years, with County levels consistently being between 20-25%. However, this was largely in line with local authorities in the region. This key performance indicator was a legacy from the LAA.

It had generally been agreed that the key performance indicator for repeat referrals into the MARAC be removed as a key performance indicator, but that the number of referrals be monitored as supporting indicators.

The report prompted a debate, led by the Chief Constable, about the approach, particularly in relation to the use of targets and it was agreed to review this as part of this year's threat and risk prioritisation process.

**RESOLVED** (1) to note the report; and

(2) that the approach to performance management be reviewed as part of this year's threat and risk process.

**ACTION: Sally Goodwin and Supt Russ Foster**

**18/12**      **POLICE REFORM AND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT – PCC UPDATE** Much time had been spent attempting to produce a joint City and County Community Safety briefing document for prospective Police and Crime

Commissioner candidates, but it had now been agreed to produce separate briefing documents.

The Board was presented with the proposed briefing document. This identified the strategic community safety arrangements across the county, the Board's priorities in relation to community safety, funding streams transferring to the PCC, as well as the role of the District/Borough Community Safety Partnerships. The briefing linked to a number of case studies from all eight Community Safety Partnerships, as well as other case studies highlighting positive outcomes. A link to the case studies would be provided via the Safer Derbyshire website.

The Chief Constable was to hold a briefing session for candidates in order to present a range of complex information relating to policing across the county, together with regional and national policing commitments. The briefing had therefore remained fairly simple, with single points of contact for further information.

The Board was also presented with the latest Home Office bulletin, for information. It was clarified that the Home Office had established a professional body via the Association of Police Authorities to represent PCCs until 2013. This was separate to the body established by the Local Government Association to represent PCCs, which had not been officially supported by the Home Office.

**RESOLVED** to note the report, and to approve the briefing document for Police and Crime Commissioner candidates.

**19/12**      **MINISTRY OF JUSTICE – CONSULTATION ON EFFECTIVE PROBATION SERVICES AND COMMUNITY SENTENCES** The Board received a presentation from Mark Self, Derbyshire Probation Trust, on consultation relating to Effective Probation Services and Effective Community Sentences. Both documents would shape the future structure and delivery of Probation services in Derbyshire. The consultation period for both of these documents ended on 22 June, and partners were therefore invited to make any comments before this date.

The presentation primarily detailed the opportunities and challenges faced by the service. The key proposals across the documents were highlighted, and included more competition, Probation Trusts becoming commissioners of some service delivery, a future involvement of PCCs and local authorities, and a more punitive focus for community sentences.

It was felt that there was a real opportunity to provide solutions to improve the service, with a focus on local delivery. There was the potential for innovation in service design, with the opportunity for local collaboration to

increase effectiveness and also to build on local arrangements to provide value for money. It was stated that these opportunities would provide greater confidence in community sentences.

There were, however, a number of challenges associated with some of the proposals. There was the potential fragmentation of offender management, given that risk was a dynamic process and offenders could move between low to high risk during their sentence. Whilst some core functions would remain with the service, others would go out to competition, and there was the potential for a number of different providers delivering throughout an offender's sentence, leading to inconsistencies and the possibility of falling through gaps. A further challenge was that there could be fewer Trusts delivering over larger areas, and it was felt that this would be a real threat to the ability to maintain local delivery. There was also thought to be threats to local partnerships, although this could also provide an opportunity to strengthen these.

As previously stated, the consultation period ended on 22 June, after which the comments would be collated and recommendations made. It was the intention to have produced a final document by the end of the year.

**20/12 COMMUNITY BUDGET PLAN/TROUBLED FAMILIES** An update was provided on the Community Budget Plans. The Troubled Families Initiative was one part of wider Community Budget plans for Derbyshire. New ways of working with families would be tested during a second phase, through a small number of geographical pilots, and this would commence in September. It was stated that involving professionals, practitioners, local partners and the families themselves at the earliest stages of the process was a priority, and evidence gathered and lessons learnt from the first and second phases would support the potential redesign and reshaping of existing services from April 2013.

The Government's Troubled Families Team expected local areas to deliver on three key outcomes – reduced youth offending and anti-social behaviour, improved attendance at school, and increased numbers of adults into work. It was estimated that Derbyshire had 1,355 troubled families and would pay the Council up to a maximum of £4,000 per family for 1,129 families. This was split into an attachment fee and a payment by results element. There was an expectation that local areas would use existing Government funding to work with one fifth of the total cohort of families. The Government would provide approximately 40% of the cost of working with a family facing multiple problems, and local authorities and their partners were expected to provide the remaining 60% from existing resources.

The Derbyshire Project Group had already made progress on a range of tasks, including the development of a draft work plan to guide work on both

the Community Budget and Troubled Families Initiative, the identification and mapping of potential families using a range of agreed criteria and the establishment of a partnership Information Group to support this work, the development of a Troubled Families Business Plan, and the development of potential models of working to roll out the initiative across the county.

A number of possible options for rolling out the Troubled Families Initiative had been discussed. Current approaches and existing practices had been considered, and the current key worker model used by the Intensive Family Support Service was one which could be replicated at a locality level, working through the Multi-Agency teams. Further work on the development of the initiative would be required prior to it being rolled out.

Work was underway to ensure that all agencies had an understanding of the scope of the project. Further information was available from Sarah Eaton, Head of Policy and Research, Derbyshire County Council

**RESOLVED** to note the report.

**21/12**        **DOMESTIC ABUSE AND SEXUAL VIOLENCE STRATEGY** The Board was presented with the Derbyshire Domestic Abuse and Sexual Violence Strategy 2011-2014. This had been produced by the County and City Community Safety Partnerships and third sector organisations. There had previously been very wide consultation on the strategy, and it was the intention to fully implement the document by way of an action plan in July.

Contained within the strategy was the national and local context, along with the key successes and key outcomes of the work that had been undertaken throughout the county.

The key outcomes that the strategy aimed to achieve included:-

- Ensuring that victims of domestic abuse and sexual violence are able to access support and feel safer as a result
- Ensuring that all children, who have experienced or are at risk of domestic abuse or sexual violence have access to appropriate advice and services, and consistent, proportionate and timely action to ensure their safety and wellbeing
- Ensuring that adults at risk/vulnerable adults who have experienced domestic abuse or sexual violence have access to appropriate advice and services to ensure their safety and wellbeing
- Ensuring that victims of domestic abuse and sexual violence are protected and that perpetrators are held to account
- Working to prevent domestic abuse and sexual violence by having a more informed and skilled workforce and community that is better able to support victims and perpetrators

The strategy would be supported by a delivery plan, and this would be monitored by the Domestic Abuse and Serious Sexual Violence Governance Board on an annual basis. Performance monitoring would be undertaken on a quarterly basis by the Co-ordinating Group, and a number of key performance indicators would form part of the monitoring process.

**22/12**      **COMMUNITY SAFETY AGREEMENT ACTION 2011/12 – FINAL UPDATE** The Board was provided with a final updated Community Safety Agreement Action Plan for 2011/12, before moving to the 2012/13 Action Plan that had been agreed at the last meeting.

The list of jointly agreed actions for 2011/12 was presented, with final updates and status reports. The majority of actions had been fully completed, but twelve actions would be fully completed over the next few weeks. As such, these would not need to move forward into the 2012/13 action plan.

One action was at red status, and this was in relation to the requirement to develop a partnership response to the Government's review of anti-social behaviour tools and powers. This was entirely due to a delay in the Government's response to the consultation, and it was now stated this would not be legislation until 2014. It was agreed that this action for 2012/13 should reflect the outcome and recommendations highlighted in the HMIC's recent inspection of ASB.

**RESOLVED** to note the final updated plan and the proposed addition to the 2012/13 plan.

**23/12**      **NATIONAL ALCOHOL STRATEGY 2012** On 23 March 2012, the Government had published its Alcohol Strategy, which set out proposals to crackdown on the 'binge drinking' culture, cut alcohol fuelled violence and disorder, and reduce the number of people drinking to damaging levels.

A key element of the strategy was that health, in the form of the PCT, became a responsible authority under the Licensing Act 2003. This meant that health had to receive copies of all licensing applications, and had to make objections to the applications. There was no definitive description as to who 'health' related to in the strategy, and it had therefore been agreed that this would be Public Health. Alison Pritchard, a Senior Public Health Consultant, had been designated at the single point of contact for the County. It would be virtually impossible to review all licensing matters, and colleagues had therefore been advised to flag cases of specific interest and requiring a health perspective to Alison directly.

**RESOLVED** to note the report.

**24/12**      **CHALLENGE IT, REPORT IT, STOP IT – THE GOVERNMENT PLAN TO TACKLE HATE CRIME** The Board was informed of a link to the Home Office document, and further details were expected shortly. Locally, information was being pulled together in terms of what was already being done, and this would be combined with the national strategy when it was received.

**25/12**      **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC RESOLVED** that the public be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of the remaining items on the agenda to avoid the disclosure of the kind of information detailed in the following summary of proceedings:-

**SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS CONDUCTED AFTER THE PUBLIC HAD BEEN EXCLUDED FROM THE MEETING**

1.      Domestic Violence Homicide Review - Update

STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS

2012 No. 2660

CRIMINAL LAW, ENGLAND

The Crime and Disorder (Formulation and Implementation of Strategy) (Amendment) Regulations  
2012

*Made*

*22nd October 2012*

*Laid before Parliament*

*25th October 2012*

*Coming into force*

*22nd November 2012*

The Secretary of State makes the following Regulations in exercise of the powers conferred by section 6(2), (3), (4) and (4A) of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998([1](#)).

**Citation, commencement and application**

1.—(1) These Regulations may be cited as the Crime and Disorder (Formulation and Implementation of Strategy) (Amendment) Regulations 2012 and come into force on 22nd November 2012.

(2) These Regulations apply to England only.

**Amendments to the Crime and Disorder (Formulation and Implementation of Strategy) Regulations 2007**

2.—(1) The Crime and Disorder (Formulation and Implementation of Strategy) Regulations 2007([2](#)) are amended as follows.

(2) After regulation 9 insert—

“9A. The county strategy group shall send a copy of the community safety agreement to the elected local policing body for the police area which comprises or includes the county area.”.

(3) After regulation 13 insert—

“13A. The strategy group for each area with the exception of the City of London shall send a copy of the partnership plan to the elected local policing body for the police area which comprises or includes the strategy group’s area.”.

(4) After regulation 14 insert—

“14A.—(1) A police and crime commissioner may require representatives of the responsible authorities for any area that lies within the police area to attend a meeting for the purpose of assisting in the formulation and implementation of any strategy (or strategies) that relate to any part of the police area.

(2) The police and crime commissioner may specify—

(a) the responsible authorities which are to send representatives to a meeting held under paragraph (1);

(b) the number of representatives that each responsible authority is, or the responsible authorities together are, to send to the meeting; and

(c) the strategy (or strategies) which is (or are) to be discussed at the meeting.

(3) The police and crime commissioner may exercise the powers in paragraphs (1) and (2) only—

(a) after consulting with any responsible authority affected; and

(b) to the extent that the commissioner, having taken account of the views of the affected responsible authorities, considers reasonable and proportionate in all the circumstances.

(4) In this regulation “strategy” means a strategy under section 6(1) of the 1998 Act.”.

*Damian Green*  
Minister of State

Home Office

22nd October 2012

## EXPLANATORY NOTE

*(This note is not part of the Regulations)*

The Crime and Disorder (Formulation and Implementation of Strategy) Regulations 2007 (“the 2007 Regulations”) provide for the formulation and implementation, by the responsible authorities in a local government area, of strategies for the reduction of re-offending and crime and disorder and for combating substance misuse. Regulation 9 provides for the preparation of a community safety agreement by the county strategy group formed by the responsible authorities in a county area under regulation 8. Regulation 10 provides for the preparation of a partnership plan by the strategy group formed by the responsible authorities in a local government area under regulation 3.

These Regulations insert new provision into the 2007 Regulations requiring the county strategy group to send a copy of the community safety agreement to the elected local policing body in whose police area the county is to be found. Provision is also inserted requiring the strategy group for every local government area except the City of London to send a copy of the partnership plan to the elected local policing body in whose police area the group’s local government area is to be found. The elected local policing body for a police area outside London is the police and crime commissioner; in the metropolitan police district, it is the Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime.

These Regulations also insert new provision into the 2007 Regulations allowing a police and crime commissioner to require representatives of the responsible authorities to attend a force level meeting to assist in the formulation and implementation of strategies.

**(1)**

[1998 c. 37](#), Section 6 was substituted by section 22 of, and paragraph 3 of Schedule 9 to, the Police and Justice Act [2006 \(c. 48\)](#) and was amended by section 108(4) and (5) of the Policing and Crime Act [2009 \(c. 26\)](#) and section 88 of, and paragraph 4 of Schedule 11 to, the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act [2011 \(c. 13\)](#). The Secretary of State is the appropriate national authority by virtue of section 6(9).

**(2)**

[S.I. 2007/1830](#), as amended by [S.I. 2010/647](#) and [S.I. 2011/1230](#).