

M I L T O N   K E Y N E S

**Community Safety**

P A R T N E R S H I P

TACKLING CRIME AND SAFETY TOGETHER

Minutes of the meeting of the COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP held on MONDAY 15 JANUARY 2007 at 10.00 AM

- Present:**
- Superintendent S Blake(Chair) – Thames Valley Police
  - Clrr I Henderson - Milton Keynes Council
  - Clrr A Dransfield - Milton Keynes Council
  - C Westwood-Smith - Milton Keynes Drug Action Team
  - L Nicholas - Government Office South East
  - P Jones - Bucks Fire and Rescue Service
  - P McShane - Bucks Fire and Rescue Service
  - Clrr S Coventry - Milton Keynes Council
  - R Vitiello - Thames Valley Police
  - A Gray - Thames Valley Police
  - Clrr S Crooks - Thames Valley Police Authority
  - D Butt - Thames Valley National Probation Service
  - P Nichols - Milton Keynes Chamber of Commerce
  - J Alder - Director of Safety Centre (Hazard Alley)
  - C O'Farrell - Milton Keynes SASS
  - D Willis - Midsummer Housing Association
  - H O'Neill - MKREC
  - N Atwal - MKREC
  - Clrr I Fraser - Milton Keynes Council
  - L Emmanuel - Milton Keynes Community Safety Partnership
  - P Nicholls - Milton Keynes Chamber of Commerce
  - K Williams - Victim Support
  - J Croston - Milton Keynes Lighthouse
  - Chief Inspector A Standen- Thames Valley Police
- Officers:**
- L Westlake - Milton Keynes Youth Offending Team
  - M Toze - Committee Manager
  - S Marsh - Corporate Communications Manager
  - R Solly - Community Safety Manager
  - B Sandom - Corporate Director Environment
  - R Townend - Parish Projects Officer
- Apologies:**
- J Best - Milton Keynes Council
  - A Farr - Milton Keynes Council
  - R Flowers - Milton Keynes Primary Care Trust
  - C Godfrey - Milton Keynes Council

**1.0 MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 13 November 2006 were received.

**2.0 PRIORITY CRIMES PLAN**

The Partnership received a report from Chief Inspector A Standen on the Priority Crimes Plan. The Partnership noted that the Plan would be put before the Partnership Performance Group on 30 January, and it was expected that at that stage either the Plan would be brought immediately into effect or the date for doing so would be finalised.

RESOLVED –

That the progress of the Priority Crimes Plan be noted.

### **3.0**

#### **PERFORMANCE UPDATE**

The Partnership noted that the Community Safety Partnership Action Plan was expected to provide a comprehensive plan for dealing with the rise in BCS crime. It was currently being converted into Excel to create a searchable database that could be used by all partners. It was hoped that the Action Plan would allow for better co-ordination between agencies, but this was something that needed to be monitored. Delivery dates would be included within the plan and the focus would be on the outcomes. Each agency would have to provide action plans for meeting targets.

The Partnership noted that the Plan was a large document, and it would be more practical to present it to the Partnership in sections, rather than as one item. However, it was important that the Partnership should monitor progress and delivery of the plan.

Some members of the Partnership expressed concern that some of the partner bodies were unaware of their role in the overall structure.

RESOLVED –

That an update on the Action Plan be brought to the next Partnership meeting.

### **4.0**

#### **TACKLING ANTISOCIAL BEHAVIOUR DELIVERY GROUP**

The Partnership received a report from the Chair of the Antisocial Behaviour Delivery Group. The Partnership noted that the Antisocial Behaviour Delivery Group was currently having working to its own three-year plan, and also attempting to tackle some of the BCS issues. There was a need to work closely with the Priority Crimes group, as the two groups tackled many of the same issues.

There had been achievements in developing training sessions and in close work with JATAC. In addition, the Fear of Crime survey had shown a 3% decrease in fear of antisocial behaviour, and there had been a 40% decrease in deliberate fire setting. An integrated data system would take time to develop, so in the interim a manual system had been introduced. However, the delivery group suffered from staffing shortages in the Community Safety Team, and a lack of capacity for data analysis.

Members of the Partnership noted that in some cases antisocial behaviour was not reported because of a perceived lack of response. There needed to be better communication in order to reassure the public that antisocial behaviour would be addressed. The Chair of the Antisocial Behaviour Delivery Group noted that action was taken to address specific antisocial behaviour “hotspots”.

Members of the Partnership suggested that the Council should be more proactive in dealing with reports of vandalism to Council property, such as bus shelters.

It was suggested that more advance planning should be done in the development of new estates to consider issues such as speed limits and parking. Tackling visible issues such as parking on verges would improve the appearance of estates and reassure the public that the Council was proactive in dealing with these matters. The Partnership noted that the Development Control Committee often could only comment on plans for the development of new estates and so had limited influence to amend them.

Some members of the Partnership noted that often there was no alternative to parking on verges, especially where roads were very narrow. Taking action against those who parked on verges could alienate citizens who were generally law-abiding. However, it was noted that public consultation had shown that parking issues were a serious concern.

The Partnership noted that there were currently proposals to allow community groups to apply for Antisocial Behaviour Orders, and the Council ought to consider in advance how to respond to such requests. Members of the Partnership noted that many members of the public wanted more Antisocial Behaviour Orders to be applied, and there needed to be better communication around the alternative methods that could be used.

Members of the Partnership noted that they would like more feedback on the Joint Agency and Tasking and Co-ordinating Group’s actions. However, it was noted that JATAC’s minutes were confidential.

Some members of the partnership expressed concern that antisocial behaviour problems were displaced from one area to another. More action needed to be taken to prevent individuals from becoming involved in antisocial behaviour in the first place.

RESOLVED –

- 1) That the report of the antisocial behaviour delivery group be noted.
- 2) That the Partnership receive regular reports on the actions of JATAC, starting in the next two weeks.

## **5.0 SAFER NEIGHBOURHOODS DELIVERY GROUP**

The Partnership received a report from the Chair of the Safer Neighbourhoods Delivery Group. The Partnership noted that the Final Roll-Out Plan had been completed, and five areas were now identified as "live". It had been recognised that the initial target of a reduction of BCS crime by 17.5% was an unrealistic target. The Action Plan was still being developed, but was almost complete.

RESOLVED –

That the report be noted.

## **6.0 CITY COUNSELLING CENTRE**

The Partnership received a report from the Assistant Counselling co-ordinator of the Milton Keynes Rape and Sexual Assault Support Service (MK-SASS) on the work of MK-SASS. The Service operated from within the offices of the City Counselling Centre.

MK-SASS provided services to men and women over the age of 17 who had experienced a recent or a historic assault. The service ran on very few resource hours but the City Counselling Centre provided a telephone answering service.

The Partnership noted that the waiting list was currently low, at around 5 clients. It was unclear what proportion of sexual assault victims were male, especially since such assaults were often under-reported, but MK-SASS aimed to increase the number of male victims using its services. MK-SASS would welcome offers of help with advertising its services from partner agencies.

Some members of the Partnership expressed concern that there were a large number of voluntary agencies within Milton Keynes, and there needed to be a greater effort to co-ordinate groups, and ensure efficiency. The Assistant Counselling Co-ordinator of MK-SASS noted that consultation had been carried out to ensure that MK-SASS did not duplicate the work of other voluntary bodies. It had recently merged with the Metamorphosis group to prevent duplication. In addition, it shared administration staff and resources with other services. The Partnership noted that the Council's community development group monitored voluntary groups to ensure efficiency.

The Partnership noted that MK-SASS did monitor the ethnic origin of clients, although it did not have the resources to target specific groups.

RESOLVED –

That the report be noted.

## **7.0 DRUG INTERVENTION PROGRAMME**

The Partnership received a report on the Drug Intervention Programme. This was a government scheme, targeting those with drug addiction problems who committed crimes. 75% of crack cocaine

and heroin users claimed to have committed crimes to fund their habits. It was estimated that every £1 spent on drug intervention would in the long-term lead to savings of £9.50 for other services such as health and criminal justice.

It was an end-to-end service, from when people first came into contact with the justice system through to providing support services such as housing or training. Statistics from other areas showed that as drug treatment levels rose, acquisitive crime levels decreased. The Drug Intervention Programme worked closed with the Priority and Prolific Offenders scheme, but the two schemes would remain separate.

The Partnership noted that some statistics on the Programme were still unavailable. It was difficult to make direct comparisons between Programmes in different cities as the service focused on individual offender needs.

Some members of the Partnership expressed concern that the statistics provided did not prove cause and effect. L Nicholas noted that local partnerships had to decide what was effective on a local level. In some cases targeting a fairly small number of perpetrators could be very effective. The Local Area Agreement proposed a Performance Indicator on the reduction of re-offending rates for people on the scheme, which would be a measure of effectiveness.

The Partnership noted that although the Drug Intervention Programme was intended to save money overall, there would not necessarily be immediate savings. Sustained treatment was also important.

Members of the Partnership noted that crime had risen sharply within Milton Keynes. It was asked why the Drug Intervention Programme had not led to a fall in crime, as it had elsewhere. The Partnership noted that without better data analysis resources, it was difficult to monitor the impact of the Drug Intervention Programme. It was also probable that there were drug-users committing crimes who had never been arrested and so were not on the programme.

RESOLVED –

- 1) That more detailed statistics on the outcomes of the Drug Intervention Programme be brought back to the next meeting.
- 2) That details of why the Drug Intervention Programme did not have an Information Officer should be brought back to the next Partnership meeting.

## **8.0 TAXI MARSHALL SCHEME.**

The Partnership received a report from the Partnership Inspector on the pilot taxi-marshalling scheme. The Partnership noted that the pilot had proved very successful, with 93% of hackney carriage drivers now stating that they felt safe when collecting passengers from the Xscape building, and all drivers noticing an improvement in the ease of collecting passengers. There were fewer arguments over taxis and fewer obstructions to the hackney carriage stand. As a result, more

drivers were working Thursday-Saturday evenings, and they were working later into the night. Businesses had also noticed a positive impact.

The provision of funding until the end of March would allow time to source permanent funding, hopefully from the businesses benefiting from the scheme, and would also allow for greater statistical analysis of the benefits of the scheme. The Partnership noted that it was important that there were specific statistics on the reduction of violence, as this was the key purpose of the taxi marshals.

Members of the Partnership noted that they had observed a reduction in criminal damage caused by revellers walking home late at night from the city centre.

The Partnership noted that there were still wider issues to address around late-night transportation. Late night buses were not available and many areas of the city centre did not have taxi stands, meaning that customers congregated at the Xscape building. The taxi marshalling scheme only applied to hackney carriages, and not to private hire vehicles.

It was noted that the provision of a third marshal would improve the effectiveness of the scheme.

RESOLVED –

- 1) That the Milton Keynes Community Safety Partnership agrees to fund the taxi marshal scheme, with the addition of a third marshal, after the end of the original 12 week pilot until March 31 2007.
- 2) That additional funding sources for the Taxi Marshalling Scheme be sought.

## **9.0 UPDATED LOCAL AREA AGREEMENT**

The Partnership received a report from the Partnership Manager on the Updated Local Area Agreement (LAA). The LAA would be going forward to the Government Office of the South East shortly, and would be agreed in March. The Partnership expressed its thanks to all those who had been involved in its preparation

RESOLVED –

That the Updated Local Area Agreement be noted.

## **10.0 LINK WORKER SCHEME**

This item was deferred to a future meeting.

## **11.0 ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

The Partnership noted that the Police and Crime Standards Directorate had agreed to conduct a Partnership Support Programme with the Milton Keynes Partnership. Draft terms of reference had been circulated to Partnership members. However, the Milton Keynes Community Safety Partnership would still maintain its independence.

The Partnership noted that Robin Vitellio would be leaving the Partnership, and Andy Gray would be taking his place. The Partnership expressed its thanks to Robin Vitellio.

The Partnership noted that there had been a spate of serious arson attacks on an estate within the city recently. However co-ordinated efforts by partners had led to a rapid response to the problem.

The Partnership noted that the Fear of Crime Survey had just been agreed, and hard copies were available. The survey showed a 3% fall in fear of antisocial behaviour. However, there was still a large gap between perception and experience of crime.

The Partnership noted that a Campbell Park Parish Spotlight meeting would take place looking at the accession of Eastern European states. This would be held on 3 February at Christ the Cornerstone.

The Partnership noted that the Milton Keynes Chamber of Commerce would be holding a breakfast meeting looking at business crime. This would be held on 17 April. In addition a business crime survey would now be carried out annually, with the results being distributed widely to businesses.

The Partnership noted that the Safe at Home project would be launched shortly.

The Partnership noted that a BBC documentary being aired in the spring would look at CCTV within Milton Keynes.

The Partnership noted that the Drugs Action Team would be holding an open evening on 1 March and would be issuing invitations shortly.

RESOLVED –

That the Terms of Reference for the Partnership Support Programme be agreed.

## **12.0**

### **DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

- Monday 12 March 2007
- Monday 14 May 2007
- Monday 16 July 2007
- Monday 17 September 2007
- Monday 12 November 2007

THE CHAIR CLOSED THE MEETING AT 12:15 PM