

CRIME & DISORDER OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY PANEL

THURSDAY, 19 MAY 2016

PRESENT: Councillors David Hilton (Chairman), John Bowden, Hari Sharma and Simon Werner.

Also in attendance: Councillor Malcolm Beer, Councillor Stuart Carroll, Chief Inspector Grahame (Thames Valley Police), Parish Councillor Spike Humphrey (Sunninghill & Ascot Parish Council) and Parish Councillor Margaret Lenton (Wraysbury Parish Council).

Officers: Tanya Leftwich, Hilary Hall, Craig Miller, Simon Fletcher, Chris Nash and Kate Whittaker (Domestic Abuse Coordinator for Bracknell, Windsor and Maidenhead).

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor John Story, Councillor Hashim Bhatti, Councillor Lisa Targowska, Superintendent Rai (Thames Valley Police) and Parish Councillor Pat McDonald (White Waltham Parish Council).

The Chairman informed everyone present that the meeting was being recorded and would be made available on the RBWM website.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Parish Councillor Margaret Lenton declared an interest in Item 5 (Domestic Abuse) as she was the Chairman of Trustees of a charity called True Honor.

MINUTES

The Part I minutes of the meeting held on the 22 March 2016 were agreed as a correct record.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The Chairman explained that Item 6 (Road Safety Improvements at School – Parking Policy & Practice) had been withdrawn. It was agreed that an update would be brought to the Panel after the event.

The Chairman informed everyone present that Item 7 (DAAT Review Outcome and Recommendations) would be heard first, followed by Item 5 (Domestic Abuse – Pathway to Resolution) and then Item 8 onwards as per the agenda.

It was noted that Item 4 (Thames valley Police Priorities) had been moved into Part II by the Chairman as requested by the Thames Valley Police.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That the order of business as detailed in the agenda be varied.

DAAT REVIEW OUTCOME AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Head of Commissioning, Adults, Children and Health, Hilary Hall, informed the Panel that the report presented the outcome of the comprehensive review of drug and alcohol services commissioned by Cabinet on the 29 October 2015 and had been undertaken by a multi-

stakeholder Task and Finish Group, under the leadership of the Deputy Lead Member for Public Health (Councillor Stuart Carroll).

Members noted that the report recommended that Cabinet accept the recommendations of the Task and Finish Group to specify a best practice model for RBWM, and approve a procurement exercise to secure drug and alcohol services for adults, effective from 1 April 2017.

The Head of Commissioning, Adults, Children and Health explained that the recommendations of the Drug and Alcohol Task and Finish Group in relation to the commissioning of drug and alcohol services in the Royal Borough were to:

- Retain the current commissioning staff of one manager and two commissioning officers to ensure tight contract management, effective coordination across all services and specialist advice and guidance.
- Carry out a systematic review of the services provided by other agencies in the Royal Borough for drug and alcohol substance misusers in order to provide assurance around quality and breadth of provision.

The recommendations of the Drug and Alcohol TFG in relation to adults were to:

- At a minimum, commission the essential core service model.
- Commission the essential enabling services required to ensure maximum impact of the core service model or at least a significant proportion of these services according to priority to allow for effective implementation, see table 5 in appendix 1.
- Work with partners to ensure that the services which enhance the core service model and its enabling services, see table 6 in appendix 1, are provided within the Royal Borough. The costs of these additional services could be split across local partners and be implemented in an integrated fashion based on the JHWS and JSNA. Undertake a feasibility study to assess opportunities in this area with a detailed budget proposal to follow to assess cost-effectiveness and financial viability.
- Deploy a flexible negotiated tender methodology in order to secure maximum efficiencies from the procurement process.

The recommendations of the Drug and Alcohol TFG in relation to young people were to:

- Move the current young people's substance misuse workers into children's early help services to enable integration with the wider children's service delivery. This is viewed as the only credible and viable option.

The Deputy Lead Member for Public Health, Councillor Stuart Carroll, added that the Task and Finish Group had in terms of the method broken it down against some clear terms of reference,, did a benchmarking report (in Appendix) and undertook a comprehensive stakeholder consultation exercise. It was noted that bespoke meetings also took place to ensure broad views were included.

In the ensuing discussion the following points were noted:

- Members were referred to table 4 in the report (page 37) which listed the detailed core service requirements and estimated annual costs.
- That the Council was not proposing to take anything out of the service but was looking to commission services more efficiently.
- That signposting would be looked at more closely.
- That the review had started to hone in on clearer definitions of success which the Council could use to measure the effectiveness of delivery.
- That the key message was that this was a really important service that needs to be protected.
- Councillor Malcolm Beer informed the Panel that he had been in contact with Councillor Lynne Jones who whole heartedly agreed with the content of the report. It

was noted that Councillor Jones was however concerned that if at all possible the 'whole package' should be done in order to save money in the long-term. The Chairman stated that he believed not everything could be done but that the Council were proposing to do what it could to deliver the service to meet the needs of the cohort of people with drug and alcohol needs in the Royal Borough.

- The Chairman referred everyone present to paragraph 9.7 in the report (page 39).
- Parish Councillor Margaret Lenton agreed that it was a well written paper and stated that she was pleased to hear that the paper was flexible as she was concerned that a number of people going into prison were coming out as drug abusers. The Deputy Lead Member for Public Health, Councillor Stuart Carroll stated that the current service did already look at that issue quite clearly already.
- The Head of Commissioning, Adults, Children and Health explained that prevention for the Young People cohort could be delivered in a much more integrated way across all agencies by using the whole children's workforce to get a better value for the resource. Councillor Werner stated that he would hate this to be dropped in a cost-cutting exercise.
- Councillor Bowden raised the issue of patient confidentiality when it came to doctors identifying individuals when referring them to the Council. The Chairman stated that he believed the majority of referrals were self-referrals and that only 50% of the drug user's cohort would use the service. It was noted that whilst a GP could refer someone to use the service they did not have to.
- Councillor Simon Werner and Malcolm Beer both questioned what would be happening with the Reform Road Centre. Councillor Carroll confirmed that the costs of accommodation were included in the core service model costs.
- The Chairman stated that 'success' with abusers was when they ceased to take the drug.

The Crime & Disorder Overview & Scrutiny Panel unanimously agreed to recommend to Cabinet the following:

- i. Notes the outcome of the Drug and Alcohol Services review undertaken by the Task and Finish Group and agrees the recommendations, see box 1.**
- ii. Approves a tender exercise to secure drug and alcohol services for adults, effective from 1 April 2017.**
- iii. Notes that Cabinet will receive a report back on the outcome of the tender in January 2017.**

Councillor Stuart Carroll, echoed by Councillor Coppinger (Lead Member for Adult Services), thanked everyone involved in the Task & Finish Group including officers who had worked to the tight timescales involved.

The Panel commented that they would like DAAT services as included in the paper to be provided and the tender process commence.

The Panel requested that the referral pathways be checked and that signposting (as part of the feasibility study) be included.

The Panel congratulated Councillor Carroll and the Head of Commissioning, Adults, Children and Health on the report.

DOMESTIC ABUSE - PATHWAY TO RESOLUTION

The Chairman introduced Domestic Abuse Coordinator for Bracknell, Windsor and Maidenhead, Kate Whittaker, to the Panel and invited her to give her presentation on Domestic Abuse: Pathway to Resolution.

The Domestic Abuse Coordinator informed the Panel that she was going to talk to them about the shape of Domestic Abuse and the services provided in the Royal Borough.

Members were given a brief presentation on Domestic Abuse which covered the following areas:

- National context.
- National data.
- Local context.
- Local data.
- RBWM in context.
- Domestic Abuse: Pathway to Resolution.
- What we do well.
- DA Pathway – future areas for development.
- Current challenges.
- Future outlook.

In the ensuing discussion the following points were noted:

- It was requested that a Domestic Abuse decision tree / pathway document be added to the minutes.
- Councillor Simon Werner stated his surprise at the demographic spread of male victims of Domestic Abuse.
- The Domestic Abuse Coordinator stated that in response to the question ‘What number one improvement would she make if she had additional funding?’ she would like to find a way to get victims to understand the process in place and also to encourage an increase in reporting Domestic Violence, particularly by male victims.
- That victims of 7+ repeat offences by the same person could be down to having children involved, people being aware of their rights, cultural issues or it simply being a very vulnerable time.
- That repeat offences were discussed in detail at the Domestic Abuse Forum where they were monitored.
- That the Thames Valley police figures relating to Domestic Violence were slightly different to the Councils.
- Chief Inspector Grahame (Thames Valley Police) stated that she would like to start up a perpetrator programme and recommended everyone present to watch a DVD called “Behind Closed Doors” which involved a case in Windsor and Maidenhead. It was noted that Chief Inspector Grahame would provide a link to the footage so it could be included in the minutes.
- Chief Inspector Grahame informed the Panel that the subject of forced marriages had been introduced into the plan this year and that they had provision to provide interpreters when needed over the phone.
- Councillor Hari Sharma stated that he felt the local community element (community mobilisation) was missing and that it needed to be publicised in order to be able to seek support.

The Strategic Director of Operations, Simon Fletcher, stated that he found the presentation really interesting and requested the following information be provided:

- ❖ The numbers of which victims were at what stage now.
- ❖ To quantify squeeze / issues.
- ❖ How success was to be measured.

Councillor John Bowden added that he felt it would also be useful to have the outcomes of crimes as a number of offences rather than as a percentage figure in addition to information about what would qualify as a non-crime offence / incident.

The Chairman thanked the Domestic Abuse Coordinator and the Team Leader - Environmental Protection, Chris Nash for attending meeting and addressing the Panel.

COMMUNITY PROTECTION & ENFORCEMENT NEW STRUCTURE

The Head of Community Protection & Enforcement projected the Community Protection & Enforcement Services new structure chart on the big screen. It was agreed that a copy of the chart would be circulated to Members with the minutes by the Clerk.

The Head of Community Protection & Enforcement explained that some common areas had been brought together which meant the Council could utilise some other resources available to it. Members were informed that the Head of Community Protection & Enforcement currently had the following people / teams in his area:

- Enforcement principal (Steve Johnson)
 - Control Room Services
 - Emergency Planning
 - Trading Standards / Licensing
 - Environmental Health (Residential Services & Commercial Services)

- Waste Strategy Manager (Naomi Markham)
 - Waste & Recycling
 - Waste Management
 - Waste & Recycling Collection
 - Waste & recycling Processing & Disposal
 - Waste Marketing

- Community Protection Principal (Chris Nash)
 - Community Protection
 - Environmental Protection
 - Anti-Social Behaviour
 - Community Safety
 - Community Wardens
 - Liaison with Thames Valley Police

 - Parking Enforcement
 - Parking
 - Abandoned Vehicles
 - Machine & hardware Repair & Maintenance

 - Technical / Customer Support

In the ensuing discussion the following points were noted:

- Councillor Simon Werner stated that he was very happy to see Community Wardens back in the Head of Community Protection & Enforcements area.
- It was stated that the Council was looking at where Parking should sit now and that as a Borough the Council was looking at reviewing the parking strategy and enforcement strategy to ensure they were aligned.
- Councillor Hari Sharma questioned whether double yellow lines could be enforced if a driver had a disabled badge. The Head of Community Protection & Enforcement explained that it could only be enforced if the car was obstructing traffic. It was noted that double yellow lines could be stopped on for unloading purposes but not for waiting purposes.
- The Head of Community Protection & Enforcement explained that red lines could not be used in the Royal Borough, like in London, as he did not believe they applied outside London.
- The Head of Community Protection & Enforcement explained that the Council was currently looking at lots of opportunities to increase the number of community wardens (internally and externally).
- That a report would be going to June Cabinet titled 'Delivering services differently in Operations and Customer Services' would come to the Panel first.

The Chairman thanked the Head of Community Protection & Enforcement for the update.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

The Chairman referred everyone present to pages 11-14 of the agenda and explained that the report set out amendments to the Constitution agreed by Council on the 15 December 2015.

The Chairman requested that a copy of the report be sent to all Parish Councils as it explained that co-optees could sit on a Panel for a maximum of four years and the position would then need to be re-appointed. It was noted that non-attendance to two or more Panel meetings would mean that the Panel could decide whether the co-optee should be replaced.

RESOLVED Unanimously: That the Panel noted the amendments to the Constitution as detailed in the Appendix to the report.

COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP PLAN

The Head of Community Protection & Enforcement, Craig Miller, informed the Panel that the Community Safety Partnership was looking at how the Community Safety Partnership Plan was shaping up. Members were informed that the plan used to be a very definitive plan and that the Community Safety Partnership had been looking at how they could shape the plan so it reflected how partners reported and to get it aligned with everyone's direction of travel. It was noted that the plan was a 'work in progress' which would be circulated to the Panel in due course.

Members were informed that the Community Safety Partnership established its priorities in a number of ways - Police data was used to identify crime trends, while the borough also conducted an annual survey which highlighted public concerns around community safety; national and regional emerging issues such as child sexual exploitation were taken into account along with issues identified by local neighbourhood action group surveys and police Have Your Say Meetings. It was noted that account was taken of related issues and plans including those of the Adults and Children's Safeguarding Boards. The Head of Community Protection & Enforcement explained that the priorities often fell across two or more themes and were delivered within the theme framework. Members were informed that the 2015/16 Strategic Assessment identified 5 main priority areas:

- Violent Crime
- Sexual Assault
- Safeguarding (Crime related)
- Burglary
- Business As Usual (including all types of Anti-social Behaviour, speeding, parking issues etc)

Members were informed that the priorities established in the Annual Strategic Assessment were agreed at the December 2015 Community Safety Partnership Meeting. The priorities were categorised under the themes below:

- Theme 1 – Prevention (Supporting our communities)
- Theme 2 – Protection (Supporting victims of crime & anti-social behaviour)
- Theme 3 – Inclusion (Assisting troubled families and rehabilitating offenders)
- Theme 4 – Maintaining Public Confidence (Resident reassurance & confidence initiatives)

It was noted that each theme was overseen by a theme lead from the partnership that provided progress reports on delivery to each CSP meeting.

The Head of Community Protection & Enforcement explained that the identified priorities had been reviewed and analysed more closely and broken down into more specific sub-priorities:

1. Violent Crime: Why is this a priority for the Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead?
 - Violent crime is violent offences where the offender has used, or threatened to use force, whether or not there is an injury.
 - The Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead has a buoyant Night Time Economy (NTE). As such, assaults and violent crime within or arising from the night time economy remains an area of focus. Incidents increase or decrease?
2. Sexual Assault: Why is this a priority for the Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead?
 - Sexual assault is a crime of power and control. Sexual assault refers to sexual contact or behaviour that occurs without explicit consent of the victim.
3. Safeguarding (Crime related) : Why is this a priority for the Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead?
 - The partnership recognises the importance of implementing measures to protect the health, well-being and human rights of individuals, which allow people — especially children, young people and vulnerable adults — to live free from abuse, harm and neglect.
4. Burglary: Why is this a priority for the Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead?
 - Burglary and in particular burglary dwelling can have a significant impact on victims, families and the wider community. Crime is low within the Royal Borough however the CSP recognises the importance of sustained effort to maintain these levels.
5. Business as Usual: Why is this a priority for the Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead?
 - ASB deals with incidents where individuals and groups have an impact on other groups or individuals or their surroundings including natural, built and social environments. It is a priority for the CSP because it is about protecting various individuals and/or groups quality of life and protecting environments to enable people to enjoy private and public spaces.

The Head of Community Protection & Enforcement requested the Panels thoughts on the format and style of the new Community Safety Partnership Plan.

In the ensuing discussion the following points were noted:

- The Chairman stated that the improved Community Safety Partnership Plan operated at a strategic level. It was noted that the Chairman hoped to see crime information that related to the Nighttime Economy captured in the plan so that the Nighttime Economy could be better managed in conjunction with the Nighttime Economy premises. The Head of Community Protection & Enforcement explained that he was in the process of going through a problem solving programme with the Thames Valley Police at present which he would report the finding back to the Panel.
- The Chairman informed the Panel that he believed the new Acting Inspector at the Thames Valley Police had a fresh view of the world and that he believed he would make significant change.
- The Chairman stated that he believed it was how the Thames valley police managed the egress from Windsor Town Centre which was the more difficult problem to solve.
- Councillor Beer informed the Panel that Reading Council ran a late night bus service to transport Nighttime Economy revellers back to where they lived. The Chairman stated that this was a charity service which helped get revellers get into a 'better state'.
- The Chairman informed everyone present that he believed the work the Council did with 'Street Angels' was very positive and a valuable volunteering resource. It was

noted that the Council was looking to expand 'Street Angels' to pub locations. It was suggested that the 'Street Angels' could be provided with radios to help them.

CRIME & DISORDER OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY FORWARD PLAN (ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETING)

The Panel agreed the following forward plan / items for future meetings:

- 19 July 2016 = Integrated Offender Management (IOM) Update – Objective – to ensure IOM is operating effectively.
- 14 November 2016 = Cyber Crime – How do stakeholders & CSP protect residents/victims.
- A future meeting = Night Time Economy – Update on Options for Enhancing the Management of the NTE.

DATE OF FUTURE MEETINGS

The Chairman informed Members that the dates of the next meetings were as follows:

- Tuesday 19 July 2016.
- Thursday 15 September 2016.
- Monday 14 November 2016.
- Monday 30 January 2017.
- Thursday 20 April 2017.

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 items 14 & 15 on the grounds that it involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraphs 1-7 of part I of Schedule 12A of the Act.

The meeting, which began at 6.15 pm, finished at 8.40 pm

CHAIRMAN.....

DATE.....