

# MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP HELD ON Thursday, 17th March, 2016, 13.00

**PRESENT:** Councillor Bernice Vanier (Co-Chair); Victor Olisa (Co-Chair), Andrew Billany, Andrew Blight, Craig Carter, Craig Dixon, Zina Etheridge, Gill Gibson, Tony Hartney, Stephen McDonnell, Geoffrey Ocen, Steve Porter, Jill Shattock, Beverley Tarka, and Councillor Ann Waters

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Joe Benmore, Victoria Hill, Marc Kidson, Claire Kowalska, Gareth Llywelyn-Roberts, Joe McBride, Angelia Miller Moore, Jennifer Sergeant, Will Shanks.

## 177. FILMING AT MEETINGS

### RESOLVED

- That the Chair's announcement regarding the filming of the meeting for live or subsequent broadcast to noted.

## 178. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Caroline Birkett, Jeanelle de Gruchy, Eubert Malcolm and Joanne McCartney. Apologies for lateness were received from Cllr Waters.

The Chair extended a welcome to Geoffrey Ocen, Chief Executive of the Bridge Renewal Trust, a new member of the Board following the Trust's successful bid to replace HAVCO as the statutory partner for the voluntary sector. Welcome was also extended to Steven Porter from the Barnet Enfield Haringey Mental Health Trust.

The Chair identified that it was the last Community Safety Partnership (CSP) meeting of the municipal year and extended her thanks to partners for their hard work over the period. It was recognised that it would continue to be a challenging time for the CSP going forward in light of uncertainties linked to the outcome of the London Mayoral elections in May as well as entering into the final year of the current Community Safety Strategy.

## 179. MINUTES

### RESOLVED

- That the minutes of the meeting held on 8 October be confirmed as an accurate record.

It was identified that the requested report on school exclusions would come to a future Board meeting for consideration [**action: Jon Abbey**].

## 180. AMENDED DRAFT INFORMATION SHARING PROTOCOL

The Board received a report setting out proposals for a new draft Crime and Disorder Information Sharing Protocol (ISP) to keep pace with good practice and legislative requirements arising since approval of the current version in 2009. The ISP was an important tool in facilitating effective partnership working and it was emphasised that the CSP had a statutory duty to ensure one was in place.

Feedback had been sought from partners in reviewing the current protocol and which had identified a number of key issues to be addressed under a new ISP. These included a general lack of awareness and confidence in applying the protocol at an operational level such as uncertainty around named contacts and the existence of dedicated liaison officers. On this basis, it was considered that the process was not working as effectively between partners as it should. Further clarification was also required on legislative requirements and governance arrangements in this area and to extend the protocol to include new Board partners such as probation and new voluntary sector representative.

Officers reiterated that statutory partners were responsible for the implementation of the protocol and for assigning named points of contact within their organisations to facilitate application at an operational level. The overriding principle was to ensure the safe and secure sharing of information in a clear manner.

The following issues were raised in discussion of the report:

- The importance was emphasised of ensuring read across with the Vulnerable Children Information Sharing Protocol and Agreement (**action: Gill Gibson to double check**).
- Clarification was sought on how additional agencies could be added to the ISP going forward such as voluntary sector groups. It was advised in response that new signatories could be added to the protocol on request, with support provided by the Community Safety team as required.
- Concern was raised over the security of information sharing via email, particularly within the voluntary sector. In response, it was advised that the Council used the Egress Switch system, an open for all, encrypted email system, for the secure transmission of sensitive personal information.
- Further work was required in training officers on the application of the protocol at an operational level including on the use of secure email systems and communicating the key elements of the protocol to frontline officers. (**action: Anne Woods to progress**).
- The importance was stressed of the new protocol reflecting learning points on the barriers to information sharing encountered in the past by partners and maintaining a primary focus on practical application of the protocol at frontline level as opposed to on a theoretical basis. The Chair agreed the value of undertaking further work to look at past case studies, lessons learnt, the experiences of partners and information sharing agreements at an operation level. As such, it was agreed to defer the item to the next Board meeting to allow further discussions to take place to inform the new ISP.

**RESOLVED**

- To defer the item to the next meeting.

## **181. CSP PROPOSED REVIEW / REFRESH**

The Board received a presentation on progress of the refresh underway of the Community Safety Partnership with a view to trialling a new way of working to support the development of the new Community Safety Strategy. An overview was provided of feedback provided by partners as part of the process as to how the strategic role of the Board could be enhanced going forward. The Chair extended thanks to partners for participating in the process and providing valuable feedback. It was emphasised that the review was an ongoing, iterative process.

Proposals were outlined for the CSP to concentrate on three key priorities going forward of reoffending, prevention and public confidence, with a view to focussing on areas where the partnership could add value. It was suggested that each of the priorities be supported by a partner agency to lead and drive forward discussions.

The Board held a brief round table discussion on key proposals arising from the review and provided the following feedback in response to key questions posed:

Q1 Are you supportive of a more focussed/strategic approach to CSP meetings:

- General support was expressed for a more focussed and strategic approach to CSP meetings.
- Concerns were raised over the potential for the CSP, in adopting a more focussed approach, to lose oversight of other important partnership areas such as information sharing etc.
- It was suggested that the duties imposed on the Board under the Care Act should be incorporated within the revised Terms of Reference including reference to the disproportionate impact of crime on key vulnerable groups in society. Officers commented that potentially this could serve as a core strand across the three proposed priorities or under the prevention priority.
- The importance was agreed of maintaining a focus on areas where the Board could add value, avoiding duplicating work and where possible joining up agendas e.g. across youth justice.
- An exercise was proposed to map existing community safety related services provided across the voluntary sector to help reduce future duplication.

Q2 Do you agree with the three priority areas identified?

- Concerns were raised that the three priorities covered a very sizeable agenda and that the Board would need to agree clear definitions to achieve a balance between imposing too narrow or broad a focus. Particular concern was raised over the prevention priority within this context, as on a partnership level it was considered that the term was too broad and all encompassing. A clear definition was also required of early intervention within this context.
- It was commented that the priorities should encompass a focus on wellbeing and safety as well as crime in the broader sense, in order to allow the participation of other agencies and organisations in a partnership approach.
- The importance was emphasised of defining clear outcomes for priorities with reference to baseline data, maintaining an overriding focus on where value could be added and establishing clear links to correlating work being undertaken elsewhere.

- Concerns were raised over whether reoffending was the right choice as a key priority. It was commented that the reoffending priority was 'bigger than crime' and that the definition should be broader in also taking into account safety.
- Clarification was required on where the 'challenge' element would come from around the prevention priority.
- Further discussions would be required at a partnership level regarding the allocation of resources for these priorities set against individual organisational objectives and budgetary pressures.
- The development of an effective communications strategy would be fundamental to efforts under a public confidence priority.
- It was suggested that consideration be given to how the CSP could add value to the Integrated Offender Management workstream.

Q3 Do you agree with the idea of having designated priority leads to improve accountability within the CSP?

- Initial proposals for priority leads were reoffending-Police/Probation; prevention-Bridge Renewal Trust and public confidence-Homes for Haringey.

In light of the concerns raised by the Board regarding the three priorities put forward and requests for further development work to be undertaken, it was agreed that a revised report would come back to a future CSP meeting for further discussion [**action: Will Shanks**].

It was advised that revision was required of the paragraph within the draft Terms of Reference related to the Clinical Commissioning Group [**action: Jill Shattock**].

#### **RESOLVED**

- To note the current progress of the review and that further discussions would be held at a future CSP meeting following the undertaking of additional development work.

## **182. GANGS STRATEGY - NEXT STEPS**

The CSP received a presentation on the development of a 10 year Gangs and Serious Youth Violence Strategy. An overview was given of the current gang problem within the borough and proposals to address this under the new strategy through a focus on 5 key priorities of prevention and early help; exploitation; effective intervention; community empowerment and enforcement. The strategy would be underpinned by successive action plans supporting implementation.

The Board held a brief round table discussion on key proposals for the new strategy and provided the following feedback in response to key questions posed:

Q1 Are the 5 priorities right?

- It was commented that partner agencies already undertook a significant amount of prioritised work under the five proposed headings and that it would be challenging to provide additional prioritisation in relation to gangs.
- Concerns were raised over the risk of duplicating actions with work already underway and that a focus was required on actions that were not being picked up elsewhere.

- It was suggested that families with younger children and the 18-24 age range group be a future focus under the strategy owing to their vulnerability by virtue of their circumstances.

Q2 What do we know about exploitation? What is the role of partners?

- It was identified that a clear assignment of partner responsibilities would need to be made in this area, supported by appropriate governance arrangements, particularly as it was noted that the Local Safeguarding Children Board would take the primary lead.
- A future focus was proposed on vulnerable adults information sharing arrangements and whether these needed review and improvement.

Q3 Can partners commit to prioritising gangs and serious youth violence for the next ten years?

- Partners questioned the feasibility of committing to a strategy that extended over such a long timeframe and whether the objectives of the strategy should more appropriately be considered more as an aspiration, particularly as partners already had responsibilities in relation to the reduction of crime.
- Clear outcomes would need to be defined within underpinning action plans and be easily monitorable including capturing the overarching priority of reducing the impact of gangs on the local community.
- Research should be undertaken to look at the approaches taken by other local authorities in dealing with gangs to see if learning points could be made.

#### **RESOLVED**

- To note the update

### **183. CORPORATE PLAN P3 EXTERNAL BOARD**

The Board received a report on proposals for a new corporate governance structure to support the delivery of Corporate Plan priorities. It was proposed that the CSP Board provide external governance for priority 3-safe and clean Haringey, as much of the work of the CSP fell within this priority and required partnership working. Issues would be referred or escalated by the Priority 3 Strategic Board to the CSP to ensure the co-ordinated delivery of joint outcomes and priorities.

#### **RESOLVED**

- To agree that the Community Safety Partnership Board provides external governance for Priority 3 of the Corporate Plan.

### **184. DELIVERY PLANS 2016 - 2017**

The Board considered a report on annual delivery plans against five of the strategic outcomes of confidence in policing; gangs; integrated offender management; acquisitive crime and ASB and violence against women and girls. This was set within the context of development of a new Community Safety Strategy and re-negotiation of the Mayoral funding bid.

The Borough Commander gave a health warning on the strategic assessment summary provided within the report in that it covered a specific time period and data

timescales centred on medium to long term trends and covered different points of comparison. A revamp was planned going forward of the background documents in order to better capture positive performance stories.

It was advised that the final PREVENT plan would be submitted to a future meeting.

The Board was advised that they could feed any comments in via the Chair.

**RESOLVED**

- To endorse the recommended actions and timescales on the drafts plans with reference to the strategic assessment summary, where relevant.

**185. CHANGE IN MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP**

The Board considered a report on a proposed change to the membership of the Community Safety Board to reflect the appointment of the Bridge Renewal and Trust Moracle Foundation as the Council's voluntary sector partner in replacement of HAVCO.

**RESOLVED**

- To appoint the Bridge Renewal and Trust Moracle Foundation to the Community Safety Partnership in replacement of HAVCO as the statutory partner for the voluntary sector, with immediate effect.

**186. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

It was requested that the Board hold a discussion on youth justice at a future meeting in light of considerable changes made in this area following government review [action: **Gill Gibson and Jennifer Sergeant**].

**187. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

Post meeting note: the 2016/17 municipal year meeting dates for the CSP have been agreed as follows:

- 21 June 2016, 13.00
- 20 October, 13.00
- 19 January 2017, 13.00
- 30 March, 13.00

[**post meeting note:** the CSP dates for the remainder of the municipal year have been revised in agreement with the two new co-chairs. The new dates and times are as follows:

- 18 January '17, 2pm, Civic Centre
- 29 March, 2pm, Civic Centre]

CHAIR:

Signed by Chair .....

Date .....