

NOTICE
OF
MEETING



**CRIME & DISORDER OVERVIEW &
SCRUTINY PANEL**

will meet on

TUESDAY, 27TH OCTOBER, 2015

At 6.15 pm

in the

DESBOROUGH 4 - TOWN HALL, MAIDENHEAD SL6 1RF

TO: MEMBERS OF THE CRIME & DISORDER OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY PANEL

COUNCILLORS DAVID HILTON (CHAIRMAN), JOHN STORY (VICE-CHAIRMAN),
HASHIM BHATTI, JOHN BOWDEN, HARI SHARMA, LISA TARGOWSKA AND
SIMON WERNER

COUNCILLORS

SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

COUNCILLORS MALCOLM ALEXANDER, MALCOLM BEER, CLIVE BULLOCK,
MOHAMMED ILYAS, ANDREW JENNER, LYNNE JONES, GARY MUIR AND
SHAMSUL SHELM

Karen Shepherd - Democratic Services Manager - Issued: Monday, 19 October 2015

Members of the Press and Public are welcome to attend Part I of this meeting. The agenda is available on the Council's web site at www.rbwm.gov.uk or contact the Panel Administrator **Tanya Leftwich** 01628 796345

Fire Alarm - In the event of the fire alarm sounding or other emergency, please leave the building quickly and calmly by the nearest exit. Do not stop to collect personal belongings and do not use the lifts. Congregate in the Town Hall Car Park, Park Street, Maidenhead (immediately adjacent to the Town Hall) and do not re-enter the building until told to do so by a member of staff.

Recording of Meetings – The Council allows the filming, recording and photography of public Council meetings. This may be undertaken by the Council itself, or any person attending the meeting. By entering the meeting room you are acknowledging that you may be audio or video recorded and that this recording will be available for public viewing on the RBWM website. If you have any questions regarding the council's policy, please speak to the Democratic Services or Legal representative at the meeting.

AGENDA

PART I

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>PAGE NO</u>
1.	<u>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</u> To receive any apologies for absence.	
2.	<u>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</u> To receive Declarations of Interests from Members in respect of any items to be considered at the meeting.	5 - 6
3.	<u>MINUTES</u> To confirm the Part I minutes of the Crime & Disorder Overview & Scrutiny Panel held on the: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 6 July 2015• 10 September 2015.	7 - 20
4.	<u>DAAT CONSULTATION AND REVIEW TIMETABLE</u> To comment on the report to be considered by Cabinet on the 29 October 2015.	21 - 30
5.	<u>THE DOMESTIC ABUSE REVIEW</u> A presentation by the Community Safety Manager, Brian Martin.	
6.	<u>METHODOLOGY FOR ADRESSING PSPOS</u> By the Community Safety Manager, Brian Martin.	31 - 34
7.	<u>DATE OF FUTURE MEETINGS</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Tuesday 24 November 2015.• Monday 18 January 2016.• Tuesday 12 April 2016.	
8.	<u>EXEMPT WORDING</u> To consider passing the following resolution:- "That under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting whilst discussion takes place on item 8 on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of part I of Schedule 12A of the Act".	

This page is intentionally left blank

MEMBERS' GUIDANCE NOTE

DECLARING INTERESTS IN MEETINGS

DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS (DPIs)

DPIs include:

- Any employment, office, trade, profession or vocation carried on for profit or gain.
- Any payment or provision of any other financial benefit made in respect of any expenses occurred in carrying out member duties or election expenses.
- Any contract under which goods and services are to be provided/works to be executed which has not been fully discharged.
- Any beneficial interest in land within the area of the relevant authority.
- Any license to occupy land in the area of the relevant authority for a month or longer.
- Any tenancy where the landlord is the relevant authority, and the tenant is a body in which the relevant person has a beneficial interest.
- Any beneficial interest in securities of a body where
 - a) that body has a piece of business or land in the area of the relevant authority, and
 - b) either (i) the total nominal value of the securities exceeds £25,000 or one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that body **or** (ii) the total nominal value of the shares of any one class belonging to the relevant person exceeds one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that class.

PREJUDICIAL INTERESTS

This is an interest which a reasonable fair minded and informed member of the public would reasonably believe is so significant that it harms or impairs your ability to judge the public interest. That is, your decision making is influenced by your interest that you are not able to impartially consider only relevant issues.

DECLARING INTERESTS

If you have not disclosed your interest in the register, you **must make** the declaration of interest at the beginning of the meeting, or as soon as you are aware that you have a DPI or Prejudicial Interest. If you have already disclosed the interest in your Register of Interests you are still required to disclose this in the meeting if it relates to the matter being discussed. A member with a DPI or Prejudicial Interest **may make representations at the start of the item but must not take part in discussion or vote at a meeting.** The term 'discussion' has been taken to mean a discussion by the members of the committee or other body determining the issue. You should notify Democratic Services before the meeting of your intention to speak. In order to avoid any accusations of taking part in the discussion or vote, you must move to the public area, having made your representations.

If you have any queries then you should obtain advice from the Legal or Democratic Services Officer before participating in the meeting.

If the interest declared has not been entered on to your Register of Interests, you must notify the Monitoring Officer in writing within the next 28 days following the meeting.

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 3

CRIME AND DISORDER OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY PANEL

6 JULY 2015

PRESENT: Councillors Hashim Bhatti, John Bowden, David Hilton, John Story, Malcolm Beer and Hari Dev Sharma.

Also Present: Superintendent Kate Ford (Thames Valley Police), Parish Councillor Pat McDonald (White Waltham Parish Council).

Officers: Nick Davies, Brian Martin, Claire Gomm, David Cook, Michael Llewelyn, Craig Miller and Gabriel Amahwe (Thames Valley Community Rehabilitation Company).

PART I

ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN AND VICE-CHAIRMAN

Councillor David Hilton was elected Chairman and Councillor John Story was elected as Vice-Chairman.

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillors Targowska and Werner.

It was announced 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 14 April 2015 were agreed as a correct record.

ITEMS

5) MATTERS ARISING

Nothing was raised.

6) THAMES VALLEY COMMUNITY REHABILITATION COMPANY / INTEGRATED OFFENDER MANAGEMENT

Gabriel Amahwe, Head of Operations – TVCRC, attended the meeting to provide an update on the Thames Valley Community Rehabilitation Company.

The Panel received a presentation that informed that as of 1 June 2015 there were two probation services agencies:

- NPS – manages and supervises mappa cases, high risk of serious harm cases, and court services.
- TV CRC – manages high likelihood of re-offending cases, low to medium risk cases, prolific offenders, and a new “through the prison gate” resettlement service across England and Wales.

(Cllr Beer joined the meeting)

The Panel was informed that on 2 February 2015 there was the transfer of ownership of TV CRC to MTCnovo who were a brand new organisation made up of MTC, an American company who were a 50% shareholder and novo, which comprises of Amey, who were a 40% shareholder, with the remaining 10% being held by a group of third sector partners.

Under the new arrangements there was a transformation programme that resulted in a delivery model that focused on:

- Cohort model delivery;
- Focus on rehabilitation first and foremost;
- Offender management driven by joint venture between public, private and voluntary sector;
- Public protection and risk;
- Deliver against contract measures;

The new organisation would also look to embed the new probation services structure whilst still preserving or improving services to offender management; and supporting an efficient and effective criminal justice system for the local police area.

It was also important to ensure that strategic partners have links into both new organisations with engagement with key partnership working arrangements which make an important contribution to protecting the public and community safety.

It was noted that the payment methodology was performance orientated and if the delivery model was not achieved then the service would be financially penalised.

Councillor Story asked how often offenders going into probation were seen and who reviewed the companies' performance. The Panel was informed that a resettlement plan was established when they went to prison looking at areas such as having a place to live, substance misuse or employment. The aim was to reduce the link to re-offending and the intensity of contact would be judged on an individual basis. With regards to judging performance this was done by the National Offender Management Service within the Ministry of Justice.

Councillor Hilton asked how they would ensure partner agencies carried out prescribed services to help reduce re-offending and was informed that they understood the pressure on partner agencies but it was a matter of working with them to help reduce re-offending and also ensuring that the person has access to services. It was noted

that reliance on others meeting their obligations when judging your performance had always been an issue but was managed by working with partners for delivery.

The Chairman thanked Gabriel Amahwe for attending the meeting.

7) CHAOTIC LIFESTYLES UPDATE

Nick Davies informed the Panel that progress had been made over the last few months and cases were being looked at in a more detailed and intuitive way. Partners came together under safeguarding procedures and have met twice. They had focused on problem solving and creative ways of engagement to reduce risk. They had also looked at strategic planning such as social investment bonds.

In response to questions the Panel was informed that when dealing with cases you came across a lot of secondary issues and by agencies working together the routes causes can be identified and which service best meets the individual's needs. This new way of working brought together best practises and formalised work that was previously happening in an ad hoc way. It was noted that there were currently 10 active cases and progress would be monitored via this Panel and the Health and Wellbeing Board.

It was agreed that a progress report be brought back to the Panel in 12 months time.

8) REVIEW OF DESIGNATED PUBLIC PLACES ORDERS (DPPOS)

Brian Martin informed the Panel that as per the discussion at the last Panel Meeting Cabinet had requested a review of existing Designated Public Place Orders (DPPOs) and the report under consideration made recommendations for replacing them, as appropriate, with Public Space Protection Orders (PSPOs). In October 2014, Cabinet considered a report on the new Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 and requested a review of existing Designated Public Place Orders / Alcohol Free Zones.

The report recommended that the two existing DPPOs were replaced with one PSPO covering all the locations in the DPPOs. It also proposed that there be an amendment to the Constitution so that the current Alley Gating/Cold Calling Zone Panel was replaced with a Public Space Protection Order Panel to determine all new PSPO applications except for those covering multiple wards that would go to Council.

(Cllr Bhatti joined the meeting)

It was noted that the maps for Windsor did not include the Fox and Castle public house; the Panel was informed that the maps in the report were those that were consulted upon and officers would check the issue, however the maps would be reviewed in 12 months.

In response to questions on how the new order could prevent incidents such as those that occurred recently in Ascot the Panel was informed that there were already existing legislation to deal with incidents such as this with the local authority and police having legislative powers to act. The local authority could deal with issues regarding the

premises and its licence whilst the police could deal with alcohol related ASB. There would be a review of the event; however calls to the police on the night were low and historically a police presence had not been required. It was noted that the licence for the event could be called in for review at any time if there was concern.

It was questioned if the new orders would lower the house prices of the areas covered because of the negative perception of the areas covered. The Panel was informed that there was no evidence that such orders had had an negative effect on house prices or insurance prices and they should be seen as preventative measures.

Resolved that: The Crime and Disorder Overview and Scrutiny Panel considered the report regarding the Review of Designated Public Place Orders and fully endorsed the recommendations. The Panel noted that the zones shown on the maps would be reviewed in 12 months.

9) Thames Valley Police Update

Superintendent Kate Ford (Thames Valley Police), provided an update on recent police activities. The Panel was informed that:

- There was a slight increase in arrests at Royal Ascot;
- Overall crime was down; however violent crime was up nationally and locally.
- Theft of and from vehicles was down;
- Burglaries were up; however since the use of two Integrated Offender Management cases there has been a decrease;
- The force was looking at better ways of dealing with domestic abuse and the best use of night time resources.

In response to questions the Panel was informed that TVP were working with the British Transport Police on a regular basis, that there had been an increase in exploitation crime and that the force was having to re-evaluate its resources by looking at what they were statutory responsible for and what they traditionally undertook. Although they would be looking at demand the Panel was informed that community policing would be retained. Proposed changes would be brought to the Panel when they were finalised.

It was agreed that the Thames Valley delivery plan would be circulated to the Panel.

10) Date of next meeting

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

- Thursday 10 September 2015.
- Tuesday 10 November 2015.
- Monday 18 January 2016.
- Tuesday 12 April 2016.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 - EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

To consider passing the following resolution:-

“That under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting whilst discussion takes place on items 9-11 the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of part I of Schedule 12A of the Act”.

This page is intentionally left blank

CRIME AND DISORDER OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY PANEL

10 SEPTEMBER 2015

PRESENT: Councillors John Story (Vice-Chair & Acting Chairman), John Bowden, Gary Muir (sub for Hashim Bhatti) and Shamsul Shelim (sub for Hari Sharma).

Also Present: Councillors Colin Rayner, Samantha Rayner, and Marion Mills. Superintendent Kate Ford (Thames Valley Police), Chief Constable Francis Habgood (Thames Valley Police), Parish Councillor Pat McDonald (White Waltham Parish Council) and Parish Councillor Spike Humphrey (Sunninghill & Ascot).

Officers: Claire Gomm, Tanya Leftwich, Brian Martin, Craig Miller and Michaela Rizou.

PART I

TRIBUTE

The Acting Chairman, Councillor John Story, paid tribute to award-winning Royal Borough community warden, Ben Page, after his sudden death. It was noted that the 32-year-old was one of the borough's longest-serving community wardens and covered the area of Ascot, Sunningdale and Sunninghill. The Chairman stated that Ben would be greatly missed at the Royal Borough and passed his condolences to his family, which was echoed by the Panel.

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillors David Hilton, Lisa Targowska, Hari Sharma, Hashim Bhatti and Simon Werner.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

ITEMS

- i) Annual presentation by the Chief Constable Francis Habgood

The Acting Chairman welcomed the new Chief Constable, Francis Habgood, and Superintendent Kate Ford to the meeting and invited the Chief Constable to address the meeting.

The meeting commenced with a presentation to the Panel by the Chief Constable Francis Habgood. The Chief Constable informed the Members that an annual assessment (PEEL Programme) of police effectiveness, efficiency and legitimacy took place annually and that the first assessment had been published on 27 November

2014. It was noted that this assessment drew together evidence from force inspections so that the public could judge the performance of their force and policing as a whole. Members were informed that thematic inspections would continue to be used to complement and contribute to the PEEL assessment. Members noted the next set of results would be published in February 2016.

The Chief Constable explained that:

- The force had low overall crime levels and maintained high levels of victim satisfaction (89%), they had a good understanding of local priorities and targeted resources at fighting crimes that mattered most for local people and put extra staff in frontline roles and specialist teams investigating crimes such as child sexual exploitation and on-line grooming in spite of financial austerity.
- That the Thames Valley were on track to achieve its required savings of £58.9m over the spending review period, and were on track to meet its further financial challenge in 2015/16.
- The force was acting to achieve fairness and legitimacy in most of the practices that were examined. It was noted that the chief officer team provided strong leadership and their ethical stance was recognised across the force. Members were informed that the force was committed to embracing the Code of Ethics and that the process for identifying and addressing the risks posed by misconduct, unprofessional behaviour and corruption were effective.

The Chief Constable outlined the Police Delivery Plan Strategic Objectives 2015/16 which were as follows:

- To cut crimes that were of most concern to the community.
- To increase the visible presence of the police.
- To protect the communities from the most serious harm.
- To improve communication with the use of technology to build community confidence and cut crime.
- To increase the professionalism and capability of our people.
- To reduce costs and protect the frontline.

The Chief Constable explained that with regard to cutting crimes that were of most concern to the community (objective 1) the performance figures for 01 April – 10 September 2015 compared to the previous year were:

- Reducing crime – violence against the person (RBMW 11.4% & Thames Valley 10.6%)
- Reducing crime – burglary dwelling (RBMW -8.7% & Thames Valley -21.3%)
- Detecting crime – burglary dwelling (RBMW 11.9% & Thames Valley 19.3%)
- Detecting crime – violence against the person with injury (RBMW 45.2% & Thames Valley 46.8%)
- Detecting crime – rape offences (RBWM 29.8% & Thames Valley 21.9%)

It was noted that crime (dwelling burglary, violence against person and all other crime) was reducing year on year.

The Chief Constable explained to Members that the Delivery Plan Aims for 2015/16 were to reduce domestic burglary and increase the volume of rape investigation which resulted in prosecution, increase the percentage of rape prosecution files submitted to the Crown Prosecution Service assessed as trial ready, increase the volume of domestic abuse investigation which resulted in charge or caution and to increase the

percentage of violence with injury (excluding domestic abuse) prosecution files submitted to the Crown Prosecution Service assessed as trial ready.

Members were informed that the Diagnostic Indicators for 2015/16 were to monitor the repeat victimisation rate for domestic abuse related violent crime, to monitor the proportion of domestic abuse investigations and rape investigations which did not result in a prosecution, monitor levels of victim satisfaction, rural crime (based on NFU insurance claims) and dwelling burglaries / levels of violence at the CSP and force level.

The Chief Constable explained that with regard to increasing the visible presence of the police (objective 2) the number of Special Constables was 567 with 125,254 hours operational policing in 2015 with 4,308 hours in Windsor and Maidenhead. It was noted that the Police provided support to Major Crime investigations, maintained public order at local regattas and festivals, provided visible presence to night time economy operations and visited licensed premises, conducted force-wide operations to execute arrest warrants, set up a new rural team in South Oxfordshire and the Vale and had 19 Cadets in Windsor and Maidenhead.

Members were informed that with regard to increasing the visible presence of the police the force had put in place a Mental Health Crisis Care Concordat signed by 22 national bodies, had in the last twelve months detained 11,181 people under S136 of the Mental Health Act (a reduction of 6.3%) – 67 of those were detained in Windsor and Maidenhead (a reduction of 18.3%) and had launched Street Triage pilots in Berks West, Buckinghamshire and Milton Keynes.

The Chief Constable explained that with regard to protecting our communities from the most serious harm (objective 3) a significant issue for the TVP was tackling child sexual exploitation (CSE). It was noted that the TVP had:

- A comprehensive CSE action plan including awareness-raising and training.
- Invested over £3.5m in dedicated resources since 2011.
- MASH in Oxfordshire, Milton Keynes, Reading, Slough and Aylesbury.
- 190 cases under investigation Force-wide in June 2015.
- In 2014 – 250 referrals and 39 abduction notices in Berkshire.
- Berkshire Local Authorities had met to identify how they could work together.
- Police due to be co-located in Windsor and Maidenhead's MASH arrangements.

Members were informed that with regard to Organised Crime Groups there were:

- 153 organised crime groups mapped within the Thames Valley with 61 currently active.
- 59 disrupted in 2013/14, 37 in the last financial year.
- National Cyber Crime Unit Officers within the Regional Organised Crime Unit.
- Operation Litmus in Windsor and Maidenhead – an OCG involved in serious acquisitive crime and the illegal use of drugs. Two members sentenced to four years imprisonment for burglary and two remanded in custody – one pleaded guilty to burglary and the other was charged with two burglaries, theft from vehicles and shopliftings.

The Chief Constable explained that with regard to improving communications and the use of technology to build community confidence and cut crime (objective 4) the following was in place:

Social Media

- Targeted communications to inform the public about crimes in their neighbourhood, witness appeals and crime reduction advice.
- Provided information / reassurance to the public during large events (search for Jed Allen in May – 4 million, EDL marches and the Reading Festival).
- Thames Valley Alert – 93,256 people were signed up.
- 174, 076 Twitter followers.
- 10,473 Country Watch followers.
- 43,508 Facebook followers’.
- 705,287 YouTube viewings.

Members were informed that with regard to improving communications and the use of technology to build community confidence and cut crime one IT system to link crime, intelligence and missing persons had been in place from April 2015, a shared network services agreement equated to 20% savings, 15 body worn video cameras in Windsor and 15 in Maidenhead with eight docking stations, a pilot was taking place to enable officers / staff to give evidence remotely without having to attend court in person and new technology was being piloted to enable effective working away from police stations.

The Chief Constable explained that with regard to increasing professionalism and capability of the Police (objective 5) the TVP had a code of ethics which:

- Defined the principles and standards of acceptable behaviour expected.
- Became statutory Code of Practice on 15 July 2014.
- Was applicable to all police officers and police staff.
- Provided a framework to maintain the highest possible standards to uphold the reputation and legitimacy of the Police.
- Action plan to embed the Code included Ethical Leadership Conferences in Spring 2015 and Professional Decision Making training from May 2015.
- Misconduct hearings could be held in public from 1 May 2015.

The Chief Constable explained to Members that with regard to reducing costs and protecting the frontline (objective 6) the Force Strategy Group had in September 2014 agreed to adopt Priority Based Budgeting (PBB) and that its methodology would be used as far as possible within existing productivity work streams. It was noted that the PBB review of the force was to be carried out by September 2015 and opportunities would be explored to work with other partners or stakeholders to support the process.

The Chief Constable went onto explain to Members that with regard to reducing costs and protecting the frontline the Government Funding had £382.6m available in 2015/16. It was noted that overall percentage reduction would equate to -5% since 2010/11.

The Chief Constable concluded by informing Members that whilst he did not know what the budget would look like over the next four years he did know that cuts would have to be made. It was noted that the TVP were continuing to plan as carefully as possible for future budget savings.

(Full copies of the Chief Constable’s presentation are available on request – please contact Tanya Leftwich in Democratic Services).

The Chief Constable responded to a number of questions which had been submitted in advance of the meeting from Members:

Acting Chairman Councillor John Story asked the Chief Constable if RBWM residents who were victims of a burglary or an attempted burglary should always expect a police officer to come to their home to carry out an investigation. The Chief Constable responded by answering yes. It was noted that a press headline a few weeks ago had been reported incorrectly and assured the Panel that the Police expected to get to domestic burglaries within the hour, unless not convenient to the victim. It was noted that not all crimes were reported within 24 hours of them taking place.

Acting Chairman Councillor John Story asked the Chief Constable what more could be done to assist the Police in bringing prosecutions for offences relating to child sexual exploitation in the RBWM area. The Chief Constable responded by explaining that victims of child sexual exploitation often did not recognise themselves as victims and that an awful lot of work had to be done to support and give victims confidence to get through the process. The Chief Constable stated that everyone should not be complacent, that we must all work together to recognise the signs of child sexual exploitation and refer victims to statutory organisations. It was noted that the Police had done a lot of work with the Crown Prosecution Service both at national and local level.

Councillor Colin Rayner asked the Chief Constable to confirm the number of crimes he believed to have been rural and how many have been arrested / sent to prison for any crimes in the Thames Valley? The Chief Constable responded by explaining that the Police had changed over their crime recording system over the last year and as a result was only able to provide figures for April - August 2014 which had resulted in 12 cases. It was noted that since then there had been 20 cases of rural crime in the Royal Borough. Members were informed that the Police believed rural crime to be under reported and that they needed to build confidence levels so people came forward to report crimes. The Chief Constable informed the Panel that he did not have data on the number of prosecutions that had been made although he was able to say that the campaign had been a success.

Councillor Colin Rayner asked the Chief Constable a third question which was whether incidents could be reported on-line in order to be able to share information between areas. The Chief Constable responded by explaining that this was something that could already be done now although it was not publicised as the system was hoping to be improved by 2016.

Councillor David Hilton who had been unable to attend the meeting had submitted in writing a question to the Chief Constable which was as follows:

“The Home Secretary stated that, national targets, key performance indicators and reams of unnecessary bureaucracy have been stripped away and that this has saved much police time. Is this the experience on the ground and how has this contributed to reducing the cost of policing?” The Chief Constable responded by explaining that regarding national targets the need was to set local priorities at local and national levels and that this was now much better than it had been a few years ago. The Chief Constable went on to explain that with regard to bureaucracy and streamlining he had undertaken a piece of work called the journey to streamline the process and that work was being done at a national level to reduce the forms used by the force. It was noted that the Police were also streamlining a number of policies and that Chief Constable

believed that the use of technology would result in the biggest change especially through the criminal process.

The second question Councillor David Hilton had submitted in writing a question to the Chief Constable was as follows:

“In my capacity of Chairman of the Crime Overview & Scrutiny Panel I have spent time with Officers and saw firsthand how officers can spend hours caring for people who are upset, disorientated and potentially with mental health issues. The ambition is for police to reduce the amount of time they spend dealing with these people. How will that be achieved and assuming that this will be through wider partnership working are partners prepared to accept the cost?” The Chief Constable responded by explaining that by the Police and Ambulance Service working together they could reduce levels for each other. It was noted that currently if someone with mental health issues was arrested the Police would have to call specific services into their custody areas which in turn incurred big costs. The Chief Constable explained that a longer term process was needed in order for the Police to protect the public and provide a value for money.

The Acting Chairman then opened up the meeting to people who wanted to ask questions that had not been submitted in advance of the meeting, to which the Chief Constable had agreed. The following was noted:

Councillor John Bowden informed the Chief Constable that he had been a resident in the Royal Borough for 19 years and that he had heard via the Neighbourhood Watch alerts that Chief Inspector Lee Townsend was retiring. The Chief Constable responded by confirming this was the case but assured Councillor Bowden that Inspector Emily Roberts would be the new acting Neighbourhood Inspector. It was noted that Inspector Emily Roberts former role would be covered by Acting Sergeant Jo Buckley and that Sergeant Joe Buckley’s former role would be covered by Acting Sergeant Emily Evans.

Councillor John Bowden asked the Chief Constable what the plans were with regard to the Windsor Police Station. The Chief Constable responded by stating that the Windsor Police Station was still there and open and that the Police wanted to retain a Police Station in the centre of Windsor. It was noted that whilst less car parking would be available at the new premise less staff would be moving across. Members were informed that the Police would like to move to the new premise sooner rather than later due to the age of the boiler, etc.

Councillor Samantha Rayner asked whether frontline resources had been increased. Superintendent Kate Ford explained that the number of PCSOs had increased and that the patrol numbers were in a healthy position (ambition was to have 15 per team).

Councillor Samantha Rayner asked whether there were any plans to increase the number of frontline staff in the future. The Chief Constable responded by stating that there were currently no future plans to increase numbers on the frontline.

Councillor John Bowden asked the Chief Constable whether fraud crimes were reported to the Royal Borough or to a central office. The Chief Constable responded by explaining that all were reported to a central unit and distributed accordingly to specific areas. Superintendent Kate Ford confirmed that the Royal Borough had experienced a high level of courier fraud which the Police had done a lot of work around.

Acting Chairman Councillor John Story asked whether it was true that Superintendent Kate Ford was retiring next February. The Chief Constable responded by saying that whilst he was delighted for Superintendent Kate Ford she would be a great loss to the force. It was noted that the Chief Constable hoped to appoint a full-time Superintendent as soon as possible. Superintendent Kate Ford explained that next February would be her 30 years service but that she would be physically finishing her role this October. The Acting Chairman congratulated Superintendent Kate Ford on her distinguished career, thanked her on behalf of the Panel and wished her well.

The Chairman thanked the Chief Constable and Superintendent Kate Ford for attending the Panel and answering all the questions asked, which Members echoed.

iii) Date of next meeting

Members noted that the next meeting was scheduled for Tuesday 22 September 2015 (5pm in Desborough 2/3, Town Hall, Maidenhead).

iv) Meeting

The Chairman thanked everyone for attending the meeting.

The meeting, which opened at 6.00pm, closed at 7.00pm.

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 4

VERSION CONTROL

To keep track of the most recent version of Public Health papers in RBWM, I propose that we use version control. This will allow RBWM to track when and by whom changes are made to documents. It is important that the system is applied systematically and consistently. This will provide an audit trail of how a document developed during the drafting process. It will also provide confidence of the most up to date version of a document.

Each paper will have a lead author, who will take comments and feedback, amend the document accordingly and maintain version control

Drugs and Alcohol Cabinet Paper October 2015.

Version	Date	Author	Changes
0.1	05/10/15	Sue Longden	Circulated to Christabel Shawcross, Cllr Carroll, Cllr Coppinger, Alison Alexander, Michael Llewelyn, Christopher Targowski, Nick Davies, Naveed Mohammed, Claire Gomm
0.2	07/10/15	Sue Longden	Amended to incorporate comments from CS, Cllr Carroll, ND, CG, ML
0.3	07/10/15	Nick Davies	Amended to incorporate an Appx A detailing the procurement timetable
0.4	08/10/15	Nick Davies	Amended to incorporate comments from Cllrs Coppinger and Cllr Carroll

Report for: ACTION
Item Number:



Contains Confidential or Exempt Information	No
Title	Drug and Alcohol Service Review - Consultation Timetable
Responsible Officer(s)	Christabel Shawcross, Strategic Director of Adults, Culture and Health
Contact officer, job title and phone number	Sue Longden, Interim Head of Public Health. 01628 683532
Member reporting	Cllr David Coppinger, Lead Member for Adult Services and Health (including Sustainability)
For Consideration By	Cabinet
Date to be Considered	29 October 2015
Implementation Date if Not Called In	Immediately
Affected Wards	All
Keywords/Index	Drug, Alcohol. Recovery, Prescribing, Prevention

Report Summary

1. RBWM's public health vision, which aligns with the Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy, is an integrated approach that emphasises prevention, early intervention and targeted support to provide maximum benefit to residents, whilst ensuring a cost-effective use of resources. This report requests 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 is innovative, cost-effective and tackles local health inequalities.
2. It is proposed that costs and outcomes for RBWM's services are benchmarked against drug and alcohol services in other Local Authorities and that RBWM officers work in collaboration with partners and key stakeholders to review national and international best practice and opportunities for local innovation.
3. Benchmarking and review of best practice evidence will be used to provide options for local implementation. These options will be modelled for population health impact. An integral part of the review will be assessment and analysis of

- risk and the development of rigorous risk mitigation plans.
4. A comprehensive consultation strategy will be developed and implemented to ensure that all key stakeholders and service users are effectively engaged in service transformation.
 5. A thorough impact assessment of the recommended option, including health and crime and disorder implications, will be conducted.
 6. If the report is approved, a task and finish group will be established under the leadership of the Deputy Lead Member for Public Health. This will provide the governance framework for the review, which would commence immediately. The timetable for the review is outlined in the report.

If recommendations are adopted, how will residents benefit?	
Benefits to residents and reasons why they will benefit	Dates by which residents can expect to notice a difference
Conducting a review will ensure that key stakeholders and service users are engaged in the process to improve the drug and alcohol service in the Royal Borough.	1 October 2016

1. Details of Recommendations

RECOMMENDATION: That Cabinet:

- i. **Approve the timetable and methodology for the proposed review of RBWM drug and alcohol services funded by Public Health funding.**
- ii. **Note that Cabinet will receive a report on the outcome and recommendations from the review to inform future procurement in March 2016**

2. Reason for Recommendation(s) and Options Considered

Policy context

- 2.1. In April 2013, the Health and Social Care Act placed local government at the heart of public health. The National Drugs Strategy 2010-2015 empowers local government to develop its own way of improving public health that meets the needs of local communities, with local commissioners maintaining appropriate levels of investment in drug and alcohol services to ensure these adequately meet local needs.
- 2.2. The National Drugs Strategy does not prescribe how much local authorities should spend or the type of services they should commission; leaving the local authority discretion to commission those services it considers are necessary to meet the needs of its local population. The strategy mandates Public Health England (PHE) to supporting local commissioners and practitioners in implementing evidence-based prevention activity.

- 2.3. A joint review conducted by PHE and the Association of Directors of Public Health, published in October 2014, reported that a large number of local authorities were planning realignments of resources between alcohol and drug services, with alcohol assessed as the greater need. Over half of local authorities were recommissioning drug and alcohol services (or planned to). Improved delivery and performance by providers was a clear aim in all recommissioning. Many areas were integrating drug and alcohol services with wider services such as housing, younger people services, criminal justice, and local health delivery. ⁱ

Assessment of need

- 2.4. RBWM, in partnership with local residents and NHS colleagues, has developed the Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy (JHWS). This is a plan to improve the health and wellbeing outcomes for residents and those who come into the Borough. The strategy has three key themes:
- Supporting a healthy population.
 - Prevention and early intervention.
 - Enabling residents to maximise their capabilities and life chances.
- 2.5. The JHWS highlights a need for local drug and alcohol prevention services to be targeted at younger people and to increase focus on improving the number of residents successfully completing their treatment.
- 2.6. The Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) assesses the current and future health healthcare and wellbeing needs of the local population in Windsor, Maidenhead and Ascot. The JSNA states that around three people in every 1,000 people living in the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead are in drug treatment. Out of 279 clients currently in drug treatment, the most prevalent drug in use is heroin followed by cannabis and then cocaine.
- 2.7. There is a growing awareness of the impact of alcohol on health and wellbeing. While most people who drink can do so without causing harm to themselves or others, the problems related to alcohol misuse range from physical and mental health issues to social issues (complex families, homelessness, and domestic abuse), and can result in unemployment and loss of workplace productivity. Nationally, levels of alcohol-related health problems are increasing year on year, and particularly affect deprived communities thereby contributing to health inequalities. Around 11 in every 100,000 people under 75 across RBWM die as a result of liver disease. Around 20 people of working age in every 100,000 are claiming Incapacity Benefit or Severe Disablement Allowance, with the main reason to not work

being alcoholism. Overall, the numbers of adults accessing treatment is rising (141 in 2011/12) to 215 in 2012/13).

Current provision

- 2.8. The current drug and alcohol provision in RBWM commenced in April 2012. It comprises a number of services that support people to recover from drug and alcohol addiction by offering a range of interventions from detox and residential rehab to supported living and ongoing support.
- 2.9. In 2014/15 there were a total of 515 adults in treatment, with 300 of those being new referrals. 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%). One hundred and eleven service users (22%) successfully completed their treatment. Completion is assessed as the number of service users not re-presenting themselves within six months of leaving their treatment.
- 2.10. Although RBWM's completion rate compares favourably with national outcomes, there is scope for improvement in supporting individuals to successfully complete their drug treatment and re-integrate back into their local communities for example, by maintaining their own homes and acquiring education, training and employment.
- 2.11. The RBWM contractual arrangements for the recovery and prescribing services have been secured subject to review until October 2016.

Securing optimal outcomes for local residents

- 2.12. The possible future commissioning arrangements for drug and alcohol services have recently been discussed at a number of strategic groups, including the Local Safeguarding Children's Board and the Adults and Health Overview and Scrutiny Panel. Additional feedback was received from other key stakeholders, including Windsor and Maidenhead Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG), Berkshire Healthcare and PHE. The discussion and feedback highlighted the need for a thorough review prior to any recommissioning. Therefore, in order to ensure that RBWM provides community drug and alcohol services which both maximise successful outcomes, as well as provide value for money to residents, it is proposed that a comprehensive strategic review of substance misuse services is carried out. The review will assess local levels of need, draw upon areas of best practice both nationally and internationally and consult with all relevant stakeholders as well as service users.

- 2.13. On completion of the review and satisfactory risk mitigation planning, a tender for the Community Drug and Alcohol Recovery and the Community Substitute Prescribing services will be carried out, with a new contract/s commencing on 1 October 2016.
- 2.14. In order to carry out a full comprehensive review, which reflects the complexity of the service and the need to secure value for money for residents, a Substance Misuse Services Task and Finish Group (TFG) will be established under the leadership of the Deputy Lead Member for Public Health. Taking a collaborative and integrated approach, the TFG will draw on a broader pool of expertise and include representation from elected members, local health partners, criminal justice partners and RBWM officers. Expertise from other partners, including PHE will be brought in as necessary.
- 2.15. The TFG will deliver a proposal of how RBWM should procure substance misuse services in the future with explicit detail of outcomes, benefits to service users and residents, value for money and affordability.
- 2.16. The scope of the TFG is to include the following:
- **Benchmarking.** This will include the provision of local data demonstrating the current level of need and outcomes for the service, to compare against comparable local authorities. This will support RBWM's strategy of outcomes-based planning and data driven decision making. Key sources of benchmarking data will include PHE data from the National Drug Treatment Monitoring System, the JSNA data and Berkshire and national comparators. In addition to data analysis, members of the TFG will undertake local site visits to obtain a full picture of the current service.
 - **Best Practice.** With the support of the PHE Drug and Alcohol Teams, the TFG will explore best practice in terms of national innovation and service configuration, as well as drawing upon reviews of international best practice where appropriate. Models considered will also be reviewed in the context of central Government policy/strategy, local plans such as the Police and Crime Commissioner Plan and the JSNA, NICE guidance, the CQC and key legislation such as the Care Act. Members of the TFG will proactively contact providers with a proven track record of successful outcomes and visit to discuss in detail if necessary. The TFG will also seek market feedback from local and national providers on sustainable models and potential costings, including transitional arrangements during service redesign.
 - **Risk Mitigation.** When viable options for the future direction of the services have been outlined, risk mitigation plans for each option will be examined. This will specifically focus on any transitional arrangements associated with potential changes to the service model.

- **Consultation.** A consultation strategy and framework will be formulated, which will ensure that all key partners are able to input into any DAAT and service reconfiguration. Service users and their families will also be consulted with alongside provider organisations.
- **Impact Assessment.** Health Impact and Crime and Disorder Impact Assessments of the proposed new service will be completed.

Action Plan for Review

TASK	TIMESCALE
Cabinet approval of the recommendations of this paper	October 2015
Establish Substance Misuse Services Task and Finish group. Agree Scope of review, Terms of Reference and Key Accountabilities.	October 2015
Benchmarking, fundamental review of current service and critical appraisal of evidence of best practice in order to develop options for consultation	November - December 2015
Consultation with Stakeholders and Service Users	January - February 2016
Collation of consultation feedback	February - February 2016
Development of recommended option based on review findings, consultation feedback, impact assessment and risk mitigation planning	February - March 2016
Cabinet approval to go to tender	March 2016
Tender process – Invitation to tender / evaluation and recommendation for award	April - June 2016
Tender process – Transition to new contract including potential TUPE considerations	June – September 2016
New contract/s commence	October 2016

Options

Option	Comments
Approve the action plan for the proposed review of drug and alcohol services. Recommended	This will enable a full review of the function to ensure the best outcome based and Value for Money model for the future
Do not approve the action plan for the proposed review of drug and alcohol services.	This will not the best outcome based and Value for Money model for the future.

3. Key Implications

Defined Outcomes	Unmet	Met	Exceeded	Significantly Exceeded	Date they should be delivered by
Consultation with stakeholders and service users underway by:	After 4 January 2016	4 January 2016	28 December 2015	21 December 2015	4 January 2016

4. Financial Details

a) Financial impact on the budget

The current DAAT budget is £1.1m, funded by a £1.047m contribution from the Public Health grant and £63k from the Police & Crime Commissioner. There is no current budget impact to be reported prior to the review.

Impact on the Revenue Budget	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
	Revenue £000	Revenue £000	Revenue £000
Addition			
Reduction			
Net reduction			

Impact on the Capital Budget	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
	Capital £000	Capital £000	Capital £000
Addition			
Reduction			
Net reduction			

b) Financial information

5. Legal/Procurement Implications

Legal and Procurement advice will be sought once the task and finish group has made recommendations and will be incorporated into the March 2016 Cabinet paper seeking approval to tender.

6. Value for Money

The redesign and tender process will follow OJEU and will be fully evaluated by Procurement for value for money.

7. Sustainability Impact Appraisal

N/A

8. Risk Management

Risks	Uncontrolled Risk	Controls	Controlled Risk
Health and Criminal Justice Stakeholders do not feel engaged	Medium	Stakeholders will be involved in Task and Finish Groups	Low

9. Links to Strategic Objectives

The objectives of the DAAT and the services it commissions are in line with the following Royal Borough Strategic Objectives:

Residents First

- Support children and young people.
- Encourage healthy people and lifestyles.
- Work for safer and stronger communities.

Value for Money

- Deliver economic services.
- Invest in the future.

Delivering Together

- Deliver effective services.
- Strengthen partnerships.

The Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy (JHWS) themes are:

- Supporting a healthy population
- Prevention and Early Intervention
- Enable Residents to Maximise their Capabilities and Life Chances.

10. Equalities, Human Rights and Community Cohesion

An Equality Impact assessment and Health impact assessment will be completed once the review has been undertaken.

11. Staffing/Workforce and Accommodation Implications

Local Authority Staff and External Provider Staff will be openly communicated with and involved in the review of the service.

12. Property and Assets

The Property implications will be reviewed through the TFG

13. Any Other Implications

14. Appendices

15. Consultation (Mandatory)

Name of consultee	Post held and Department	Date sent	Date received	See comments in paragraph:
Internal				
Cllr Burbage	Leader of the Council	09/10/15	12/10/15	
Cllr Coppinger	Lead Member for Adult Services	05/10/15	08/10/15	
Cllr Carroll	Deputy Lead Member for Public Health	05/10/15	08/10/15	
Alison Alexander	Managing Director and Strategic Director of Children's Services			
Christabel Shawcross	Strategic Director of Adults, Culture and Health			
Lise Llewellyn	Director of Public Health			
Alan Abrahamson	Finance Partner			
Michael Llewelyn	Cabinet Policy Office			
	Legal			

Report History

Decision type:	Urgency item?
Key decision	Yes

Full name of report author	Job title	Full contact no:
Sue Longden	Interim Head of Public Health	01628 683532

ⁱ Review of Drug and Alcohol Commissioning A joint review conducted by Public Health England and the Association of Directors of Public Health

REPORT TO CRIME & DISORDER OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY PANEL

Title: **CRITERIA FOR ESTABLISHING PUBLIC SPACE PROTECTION ORDERS (PSPOs) RELATED TO ALCOHOL-RELATED ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR**

Date: 27th October 2015

Officer Reporting: **Brian Martin, Community Safety Manager**

Contact Officer(s): **Brian Martin Tel:01628 796337**

Wards Affected: All

1. SUMMARY

- 1.1 The paper identifies a methodology for assessing whether an area can be considered for and alcohol-related Public Space Protection Order. It proposes that the Crime and Disorder Overview and Scrutiny Panel approves this methodology.

2. RECOMMENDATION:

That the Crime and Disorder Overview and Scrutiny Panel agrees:

- 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) **agrees 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.**

3. SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Background

- 3.1 The 30 July 2015 Cabinet Meeting received a paper regarding replacement of the borough's two Designated Public Place Orders with one Public Space Protection Order. It agreed to this proposal and recommended it should be adopted to the 24th September Council Meeting.
- 3.2 The above Cabinet paper also covered the procedures that should be put in place for consideration as to whether areas should be made PSPOs. This too was put forward to Council for approval.
- 3.3 Additionally, 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.
- 3.4 A methodology and assessment criteria for establishing whether locations are viable PSPO areas have been identified and these are detailed in section below.

- 3.5 Discussions with Thames Valley Police HQ Performance Management Team have established that geographically based data can be provided on alcohol related ASB and a specific data format has been agreed. A year's worth of ASB data has been provided and it has been agreed that such data can be requested on an ad hoc basis as long as the TVP HQ team are given sufficient notice. This is good news for the borough and thanks go to the Performance Team for their assistance.
- 3.6 It is proposed that any consideration about such PSPOs that goes to either full council or the PSPO Panel should receive data as specified above.
- 3.7 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 is given urgent consideration, thereby allowing the flexibility to 'fast-track' a particular location.
- 3.8 If one or more of the above criteria are fulfilled the borough's Community Safety Team will 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.
- 3.9 The Anti-Social Behaviour Crime and Policing Act (2014) requires that new PSPOs are reviewed after one year's operation and thereafter every 3 years. It is suggested that any review uses the dataset described in 3.5 above. However, a significant reduction of incidents in a PSPO location would not immediately suggest the PSPO should be de-commissioned i.e. the reduction may reflect that the PSPO has been successful. It is therefore recommended that the PSPO Panel or full council reviews this information in conjunction with advice provided by Thames Valley Police and other relevant agencies.

4. OPTIONS AVAILABLE AND RISK ASSESSMENT

- 4.1 Option1 – It is proposed that the methodology outlined in 3.5 and 3.7 is adopted. No other options are proposed at this stage.
- 4.2 **Risk assessment** - There are no significant risks associated with this paper.

5. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

- 5.1 There has been no direct consultation associated with this paper, but as alluded to above consultation would be necessary when a PSPO is being proposed.

6. COMMENTS FROM OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL

- 6.1 Not applicable.

7. IMPLICATIONS

The following implications have been addressed where indicated below.

Financial	Legal	Human Rights Act	Planning	Sustainable Development	Diversity & Equality
n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	Yes

This page is intentionally left blank