

## COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP EXECUTIVE GROUP - 10 NOVEMBER 2016

### Present:

Sarah Gee (in the Chair)	Head of Housing & Neighbourhoods, RBC
Chris Bagshaw	Royal Berkshire Fire & Rescue Service
Nicola Bell	Manager, Rahab Project
Anthony Brain	Community Safety Manager, RBC
Emma Burroughs	Thames Valley Police
Geoff Davis	Head of Operations, Thames Valley CRC
Romy Freiburghaus	Problem Solving Advisor for Thames Valley Police
Louise Griffiths	National Management Trainee, RBC
Liz Harrison	Chair, Berkshire Magistrates
Tina Heaford	Area Team Leader, Youth, RBC
Jo Middlemass	Anti-Social Behaviour Team Manager, RBC
David Newton	Royal Berkshire Fire & Rescue Service
Kathryn Warner	Communities Manager, PACT
Graham Wilkin	Head of Adult Social Care, RBC
Lisa Wilkins	Troubled Families Project Manager, RBC
Michael Popham	Committee Services, RBC

### Apologies:

Gabrielle Alford	Berkshire West CCGs
Ann-Marie Dodds	Head of Governance & Business Support, DCEEHS, RBC
Cllr Jan Gavin	Lead Councillor for Children's Services and Families, RBC
Stan Gilmour	Reading Police, TVP
Clare Muir	Policy, RBC
Cllr Tony Page	Deputy Leader and Police & Crime Panel representative, RBC
Bindy Shah	Early Help, RBC
Cllr Liz Terry (Chair)	Lead Councillor for Neighbourhoods, RBC
Nicola Webb	Asst. Chief Officer, National Probation Service

### 1. MINUTES AND MATTER ARISING

The Minutes of the meeting held on 22 September 2016 were agreed as a correct record. The following matter of arising was discussed:

#### Integrated Offender Management

Further to Minute 3, the CSP noted that the meeting of the four Delivery Group chairs had been arranged to discuss a co-ordinated approach to deliver the new harm/risk based Integrated Offended Management programmes and determine the respective responsibilities of the Groups in respect of this initiative.

### 2. DRUGS COUNTY LINES (LONDON DRUG GANGS) - NEED TO KNOW SESSIONS IN READING

Emma Burroughs and Romy Freiburghaus, Thames Valley Police, explained the threat from drug dealers who had adapted their operations from selling on the street to the 'County Lines' model in Reading. This model of drug-related criminality often

## COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP EXECUTIVE GROUP - 10 NOVEMBER 2016

targeted affluent areas with good transport links to major cities. These urban gangs were attracted by the combination of the potential customer base and low resistance from local dealers in the face of greater capability and intent. The gangs usually began by taking over premises in the target town, sometimes by coercion, by using property belonging to vulnerable people who were susceptible to exploitation. Once they had established a foothold, the gangs expanded their workforce, recruiting local runners to deliver drugs and money. The groups often used children, because they were less likely to be suspected of this type of crime and could be more easily manipulated. This particular criminal approach posed a significant risk to vulnerable adults and children many of whom would be known to local social services and voluntary organisations.

As a result of this new threat, the Police would be providing "Drugs County Lines - Need to Know" awareness training sessions to give an overview of the tactics these organised crime groups used to target young and vulnerable people living in Reading. It was hoped that the sessions would assist partner agencies to spot early signs of exploitation and therefore enable earlier intervention and support to those affected. A series of workshop sessions would be organised with the first one provisionally booked to take place on Wednesday 4<sup>th</sup> January 2017 at 10am. It was recommended that each session should not consist of more than 25 attendees to encourage participation from those present. At the end of the initial sessions, there would be a six-month review to keep practitioners up to date with progress. The initial awareness sessions would only be the beginning of a long-term process to tackle this new phenomenon.

### AGREED:

- (1) That the proposal to hold "Drugs County Lines - Need to Know" awareness training sessions, starting in January 2017, be supported;
- (2) That the "Drugs County Lines" paper be recirculated to members of the CSP to enable them to comment on the proposed partners or practitioners to be invited to attend the "Need to Know Sessions" and to provide any comments on the list and suggestions for other invitees to Emma Burroughs or Romy Freiburghaus;
- (3) That the Partnership note that the sessions to be held over a period of approximately six months would only be the initial phase and practitioners would be updated regularly on the issues that would be raised at these sessions.

### 3. RBFRS - CONSULTATION ON CHANGES UPDATE

This item was deferred to the next meeting.

### 4. DELIVERY GROUP ACTION PLANS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

The four Delivery Groups presented their action plans and performance measures as follows:

- a) Domestic Abuse Strategy Group

## COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP EXECUTIVE GROUP - 10 NOVEMBER 2016

Sarah Gee reported on the Group's six priorities, details of which were circulated at the meeting.

The Group had reviewed the Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conference (MARAC) - a multi agency victim-focused meeting where information was shared on the highest risk cases of domestic abuse. The MARAC had experienced a growth in referrals, which had put additional pressure on the process. In some circumstances, where there had been poor attendance from certain agencies at the MARAC this had been escalated and it was critical for the success of the process to have full attendance. A need for further guidance and training about repeat referrals to the MARAC had been identified by the Group as these were currently below the expected level. The MARAC coordinator was now working in the Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH), which would help the coordination of the process with other safeguarding activity. The Domestic Abuse Forum had received very positive feedback and forum sessions were very well attended. There were now over 240 people on the Domestic Abuse network list. The number of referrals to outreach work had levelled out but remained high, meaning that Berkshire Women's Aid was projected to receive 600 new referrals by the end of the year compared with 464 in the previous year. The re-procurement of Domestic Abuse services was currently being progressed and there would be further information to a future meeting of the Partnership in due course.

### **b) Violent Crime Delivery Group**

Emma Burroughs, Thames Valley Police, gave the Group an update on the schedule of priorities and related tasks identified by the Violent Crime Delivery Group.

The work of the Group was focussing on violent crime associated with late night activity in the town centre. Work was being carried out with the security industry through door supervisors and Pubwatch. The Group was also working with the Street Pastors who routinely patrolled the town between 10pm to 4am on Fridays and Saturdays to help people who were on the streets during that period and could be in need of assistance. Reading was also using the Safe Town Radio scheme whereby the police could communicate securely through two-way radios whilst having the coverage of a mobile phone network.

### **c) Modern Day Slavery and Adult Exploitation Delivery Group**

Nicola Bell updated the Partners on the Objectives and Actions identified by the Modern Day Slavery and Adult Exploitation Delivery Group. She explained that the strategic assessment of the situation in Reading would need to be reviewed to make sure that it was up to date. The Group was keen to develop training and awareness packages about modern day slavery and adult exploitation to be used across agencies, faith, community and voluntary sector groups. It was also important to make the public aware of the issues being tackled by the group. A case management group had been established to review cases of vulnerable adults and referred to them by other agencies. The point was made that it was also possible to refer a business rather than an individual for assessment where there were concerns. The Home Office had seen the action plan created by the Group and were interested in using it as a model of best practice nationally.

### **d) Vulnerable Communities Delivery Group**

## COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP EXECUTIVE GROUP - 10 NOVEMBER 2016

Anthony Brain updated the Partners on the priorities and tasks identified by the Vulnerable Communities Delivery Group.

It was noted that there had been a reduction in racially and religiously motivated attacks despite the increase following the referendum decision to leave the EU. However, Reading had a poor success rate in prosecuting Hate Crimes through the Criminal Justice System. The reasons for this would be investigated. There were also plans being progressed to hold an event to raise awareness amongst the business sector of the threat of terrorism and how to recognise signs. The main potential threat was now considered to be a lone person using multiple weapons.

**AGREED:** That the Delivery Group Action Plans be received and that the Plans be adapted, as previously agreed, into a standard format and be produced in time to be circulated with the agenda for future meetings of the Partnership.

### 5. CRIME PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Anthony Brain reported on the latest crime figures. This included the British Crime Survey Comparator Crimes. The survey measured crime by asking members of the public about their experiences of crime over the last 12 months in order to collect information on all types of crimes experienced by people, including those crimes that may not have been reported to the police. It was important to have information from people who had not experienced any crime in the last 12 months, so that this could be reflected as part of an accurate picture of crime in the country. In 2015/2016 around 50,000 households across England and Wales had been invited to participate in the survey. In Reading, comparator crime statistics had shown an upward trend, which had mainly been attributed to theft of bicycles and theft from vehicles. Reading was just above the average of its comparator authorities. In relation to violent crime against the person, Reading had performed well with only Oxford doing better in reducing this type of crime within the comparator group.

**AGREED:** That the crime figures and the performance of Reading against its comparator authorities in relation to the crime statistics be noted.

### 6. UPDATE FROM THE OFFICE OF POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER - INCLUDING UPDATE ON FUTURE FUNDING

Anthony Brain reported that the Office of Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC) was consulting on budget proposals to top slice 10% of the budget across the Thames Valley and continue to allocate the remaining budget on the basis of the current funding formula. The proposal would be applied to the CSP, which would equate to a funding reduction of approximately £50k. If the funding formula were to be changed the impact could be greater. The Partners would need to consider how the saving could be made for the 2017/18 financial year.

**AGREED:** That the Partners be asked to consider the implications of the OPCC's budget proposals and agree how to save the likely reduction of £50k from the CSP budget in 2017/18.

## 7. FUTURE ITEMS

The Partnership discussed items for future meetings. The Partners discussed the possibility of having a standing item on the agenda about communication and publicity of the agenda items being considered as a way of making better use of the local media to publicise issues of public interest.

**AGREED:** That the following potential items be agreed for future meetings:

- RBFRS - Consultation on Changes Update;
- Court System - Update on Changes (including a review of cases);
- Troubled Families (including an initiative about 'Women at risk of offending');
- Standing item on communicating and publicising issues under discussion by the CSP and engagement with the local media.

## 8. DATES OF FUTURE MEETING

Future meeting dates were confirmed as:

Thursday 2 February 2017, 9.30am

Thursday 27 April 2017, 9.30am

(The meeting commenced at 9.30 am and closed at 10.51 am)