

## CRIME & DISORDER OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY PANEL

TUESDAY, 27 OCTOBER 2015

PRESENT: Councillors David Hilton (Chairman), John Story (Vice-Chairman), John Bowden, Hari Sharma, Lisa Targowska and Malcolm Beer (sub for Simon Werner).

Also in attendance: Councillor David Coppinger (Lead Member for Adult Services and Health (including Sustainability)) and Parish Councillor Margaret Lenton (Wraysbury Parish Council).

Officers: Tanya Leftwich, Brian Martin, Nick Davies and Sue Longden.

### APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillors Hashim Bhatti and Simon Werner.

Apologies were also received from the Thames Valley Police, Craig Miller, Parish Councillor Spike Humphrey (Sunninghill & Ascot) and Parish Councillor Pat McDonald (White Waltham Parish Council).

It was announced by the Chairman that the meeting was being recorded and that the audio would be published to the RBWM website.

### DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

### MINUTES

The minutes from the Crime and Disorder Overview and Scrutiny Panel held on the 6 July & 10 September 2015 were agreed as correct records subject to the Chairman checking with the new Superintendent the point about 'whilst less car parking would be available at the new premise less staff would be moving across' regarding the new Windsor Police Station premise was correct.

The Chairman stated that it was disappointing to see no stakeholders present despite the letter that had been sent out in advance of the meeting.

### DAAT CONSULTATION AND REVIEW TIMETABLE

Members considered the report that was being submitted to the 29 October 2015 Cabinet which could be found on pages 1-10 in the agenda.

The Lead Member for Adult Services and Health (including Sustainability), Councillor David Coppinger, informed Members that this was the second time they had seen a paper on the DAAT services and after getting it wrong last time they had listened to the criticisms from everyone and re-written the paper which was before the Panel tonight.

The Interim Head of Public Health, Sue Longden, gave a brief overview of the report and explained that the report requested approval for a fundamental review of all RBWM drug and alcohol (DAAT) services, the DAAT function, to support the development of a future

commissioning model for drug and alcohol services that was innovative, cost-effective and tackled local health inequalities.

Members were informed that it was proposed that costs and outcomes for RBWM's services were benchmarked against drug and alcohol services in other Local Authorities and that RBWM officers worked in collaboration with partners and key stakeholders to review national and international best practice and opportunities for local innovation.

The Interim Head of Public Health went on to explain that benchmarking and review of best practice evidence would be used to provide options for local implementation. It was noted that these options would be modelled for population health impact and that an integral part of the review would be assessment and analysis of risk and the development of rigorous risk mitigation plans.

Members were informed that a comprehensive consultation strategy would be developed and implemented to ensure that all key stakeholders and service users were effectively engaged in service transformation.

It was noted that a thorough impact assessment of the recommended option, including health and crime and disorder implications, would be conducted.

Members were informed that if the report was approved, a task and finish group would be established to run until the end of December / early January under the leadership of the Deputy Lead Member for Public Health. It was noted that this would provide the governance framework for the review.

The Head of Strategic Commissioning for Adult Social Care and Housing, Nick Davies, added that the services would remain in place for the time being to ensure continuity and that the timetable could be found on page 7 of the agenda. Members were informed that if approved a report would come back to the Panel in March once the consultation period had finished.

In the ensuing discussion, the following points were noted:

- That Councillor Carroll would Chair the Task & Finish Group.
- That Councillor Hilton would be proposed to be a member of the Task & Finish Group along with a representative from the Thames Valley Police, a representative from the Clinical Commissioning Group and a representative from the Adult Services and Health Overview & Scrutiny Panel. It was noted that Councillor Saunders would also be invited to join the membership.
- That Councillor Coppinger would not be involved in the Task & Finish Group.
- That the timescales were felt to be very short but admirable.
- That if approved by Cabinet there would be two stakeholder workshops held.
- That some benchmarking work had already taken place which could be fed into the Task & Finish Group.
- That in 2014/15 there were a total of 515 adults in treatment, with 300 of those being new referrals. It was noted that in terms of the breakdown of the new referrals the largest group were the 122 alcohol clients (41%) (an increase from 89 (36%) in 2013/14) with 95 opiate users following closely behind (32%). Members were informed that one hundred and eleven service users (22%) successfully completed their treatment and that completion was assessed as the number of service users not re-presenting themselves within six months of leaving their treatment.
- That the tender process would involve a number of competitive agencies in the market.
- That the services currently provided were not in-house.
- That the Council wanted to explore and capture innovative schemes with other countries.
- That para 2.16 stated the scope of the Task & Finish Group which included the ability / scope to transform the service.

- That the current DAAT budget was £1.1m, funded by a £1.047m contribution from the Public Health grant and £63k from the Police & Crime Commissioner. It was noted that there was no current budget impact to be reported prior to the review.
- That the Chairman felt the Council had had an integrated service since SMART had started.
- That the quartile national data could be provided for benchmarking to the Panel by the Head of Strategic Commissioning for Adult Social Care and Housing as the data had been published.
- It was requested that the consultation dates at the end of the report be completed.

**RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That the Crime & Disorder Overview & Scrutiny Panel endorsed the paper going to Cabinet and stated that they fully supported the service the Drug and Alcohol Team (DAAT) provided.**

**It was highlighted that the 2013/14 data was missing from the report which would be rectified before it was presented to Cabinet.**

The Chairman thanked the Lead Member for Adult Services and Health (including Sustainability), the Interim Head of Public Health and the Head of Strategic Commissioning for Adult Social Care and Housing for attending the meeting and addressing the Panel.

### THE DOMESTIC ABUSE REVIEW

The Community Safety Manager, Brian Martin, gave Members a presentation on the Domestic Abuse Review. The Clerk was requested to email a copy of the presentation to Members with the minutes.

The presentation covered the following areas:

- Top ten facts about Domestic Abuse in England and Wales.
- National Issues with Domestic Abuse.
- Successful & Unsuccessful Outcomes.
- Local Statistics.
- Domestic Abuse Governance Improved.
- ‘Yasmin’s Journey’ – The true story of a domestic violence survivor and what could have been.
- Where does support come from locally.
- Initiatives.
- Support for Victims of Domestic Abuse.

In the ensuing discussion, the following points were noted:

- That two to three years ago at a November Panel meeting Members had looked at a paper by the Domestic Abuse Co-ordinator and one conclusion was that the Domestic Abuse services provided by the Royal Borough were felt to be a bit dysfunctional. It was noted that one of the recommendations had been to set up a Domestic Abuse Executive Group which was now in place.
- That the Domestic Abuse Executive Group was a multi agency group that had taken ownership of the problems linked to Domestic Abuse.
- That a gap analysis regarding service provision had taken place and amongst other things identified that the Royal Borough did not have a perpetrator programme. That in turn had led to a more detailed look at all facets of Domestic Abuse work in the borough.
- That it would be very difficult to rank outcomes as different individuals had different outcomes / needs.
- That whilst the level of crime overall was reducing Domestic Abuse was not.
- That the review was seeking to identify costs, resources and the level usage of services. Full findings had yet to be presented to the Domestic Abuse Executive Group.

- That with regard to Yasmin's journey (an example provided by National Women's Aid) a needs-led intervention opportunity of £13,700 per annum had been missed and instead £47,323.50 per annum was being spent on supported housing for the rest of her life.
- That the Council had strong links with schools in the Royal Borough where they could raise awareness about Domestic Abuse at specific events.
- That a challenge the Royal Borough faced was to encourage more agencies to refer people on via the MARAC and DASH training.
- That the Community Safety Manager could provide Members outside of the meeting with figures about the number of families at risk in the Royal Borough.
- That the Royal Borough did not have a refuge resource.
- That whilst it was confirmed that non-crime cases were registered it was felt that the Thames Valley Police would be better equipped to answer any questions about the numbers of crimes and non-crimes in and outside of the Royal Borough.
- That it was hoped that the gap analysis would provide a quantitative outcome regarding measuring success.
- That MARAC hold agencies to account.
- That the Community Safety Manager could provide Members outside of the meeting with an indication of the Royal Borough's current spend.

The Chairman thanked the Community Safety Manager for his presentation.

### METHODOLOGY FOR ADDRESSING PSPOS

The Community Safety Manager, Brian Martin, referred Members to the 'to follow' report which identified a methodology for assessing whether an area could be considered for an alcohol-related Public Space Protection Order.

The Community Safety Manager explained that the 30 July 2015 Cabinet Meeting had received a paper regarding replacement of the borough's two Designated Public Place Orders with one Public Space Protection Order. It was noted that the proposal had been agreed to and it was recommended that it should be adopted to the 24 September Council Meeting. The Community Safety Manager went on to explain the Cabinet paper had also covered the procedures that should be put in place for consideration as to whether areas should be made PSPOs which too was put forward for Council for approval.

It was noted that the Cabinet paper recognised that DPPOs had been established when data on alcohol related Anti-Social Behaviour incidents was readily available and it was quite straightforward to map areas and assess whether a particular location was regularly experiencing issues. However, there was an acknowledgement that it was potentially no longer possible to easily get geographically based data which could identify a 'hot-spot'. The Community Safety Manager was therefore asked to present criteria to the November 2015 Crime and Disorder Overview and Scrutiny Panel for assessing whether a location could be considered for an alcohol related PSPO.

The Community Safety Manager informed the Panel that discussions with Thames Valley Police HQ Performance Management Team had established that geographically based data could be provided on alcohol related ASB and a specific data format had been agreed. It was noted that a year's worth of ASB data had been provided and it had been agreed that such data could be requested on an ad-hoc basis as long as the Thames Valley Police HQ Performance Management Team were given sufficient notice.

It was noted that a decision to consider an area for an alcohol-related PSPO should be triggered by one or more of the criteria below:

- in a one year period, 5 or more ASB incidents attributable to a particular location;
- within one year, 3 or more complaints from residents about a location; and
- Exceptionally, an urgent request from the local area requesting an area be given urgent consideration, thereby allowing the flexibility to 'fast-track' a particular location.

Members were informed that if one or more of the above criteria were fulfilled the borough's Community Safety Team would carry out a consultation with the public and other interested parties and present the findings to either full council or the PSPO Panel as appropriate.

In the ensuing discussion the following points were noted:

- That the inherited PSPOs had been combined as one as of the 31 October 2015 and would likely be reviewed in a years time.
- That the Anti-Social Behaviour Crime and Policing Act (2014) required that new PSPOs were reviewed after one year's operation and thereafter every 3 years. It was suggested that any review used the dataset described in 3.5 of the report.
- That the Council would be introducing some new resident friendly flexible signs in the future.
- That if enforcement of PSPOs were not being seen then representations should be made to the Thames Valley Police.

**RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That the Crime and Disorder Overview and Scrutiny Panel agreed:**

- i) **the criteria / process for assessing whether a proposed PSPO relating to alcohol should be considered by the Council's PSPO Panel / full Council; and**
- ii) **agreed that similar data in conjunction with advice from relevant agencies should be used for assessing whether to continue with PSPOs at the one year and three year review points.**

The Chairman thanked the Community Safety Manager for his update.

#### A.O.B

Parish Councillor Margaret Lenton questioned how the Council was helping to raise awareness to the elderly, particularly those suffering from Alzheimer's, regarding cold calling, scams, etc. The Chairman responded by stating that the issue was looking at how the Council could communicate to the elderly on issues. It was suggested that an article be placed in the next edition of the Around the Royal Borough newsletter. It was noted that the Community Safety Manager had an advice pack available on the subject. It was suggested that advice packs could be provided to support carers and senior support groups.

#### DATE OF FUTURE MEETINGS

Members noted that the next meetings were scheduled for (6.15pm start):

- Tuesday 24 November 2015.
- Monday 18 January 2016.
- Tuesday 12 April 2016.

#### FUTURE AGENDA ITEM SUGGESTIONS

The Chairman informed the Panel that Parish Councillor Margaret Lenton had emailed him on the 22 October 2015 raising a number of issues which she would be added to a future agenda:

- Honour killings.
- FGM.
- Forced Marriage.
- Domestic Violence – *on todays agenda.*

The Chairman requested that the Thames Valley Police be asked by the Community Safety Manager to update the Panel at a future meeting on cyber crime and priority based budgeting (and how it impacts the Royal Borough).

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 - EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

**RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY:** That under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting whilst discussion took place on item 8 on the grounds that it involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of part I of Schedule 12A of the Act.

The meeting, which began at 18:15, finished at 20:20.

CHAIRMAN.....

DATE.....