



# Haverling

LONDON BOROUGH

## CRIME & DISORDER COMMITTEE AGENDA

7.30 pm

Wednesday  
17 April 2013

Town Hall, Main Road,  
Romford

Members 9: Quorum 3

### COUNCILLORS:

Osman Dervish (Chairman)  
John Wood (Vice-Chair)  
Becky Bennett  
Denis Breading  
David Durant

Roger Evans  
Georgina Galpin  
Frederick Osborne  
Linda Van den Hende

For information about the meeting please contact:  
James Goodwin 01708 432432  
[james.goodwin@haverling.gov.uk](mailto:james.goodwin@haverling.gov.uk)

## **What is Overview & Scrutiny?**

Each local authority is required by law to establish an overview and scrutiny function to support and scrutinise the Council's executive arrangements. Each overview and scrutiny committee has its own remit as set out in the terms of reference but they each meet to consider issues of local importance.

They have a number of key roles:

1. Providing a critical friend challenge to policy and decision makers;
2. Driving improvement in public services;
3. Holding key local partners to account; and
4. Enabling the voice and concerns of the public.

The Crime and Disorder Committee considers issues by receiving information from, and questioning, Cabinet Members, officers and external partners, particularly the Responsible Authorities, i.e. Metropolitan Police, Metropolitan Police Authority, Fire and Rescue Authorities, and Primary Care Trusts, to develop an understanding of proposals, policy and practices. They can then develop recommendations that they believe will improve performance, or as a response to public consultations.

Committees will often establish Topic Groups to examine specific areas in much greater detail. These groups typically consist of between 3-6 Members and the review period can last for anything from a few weeks to a year or more to allow the Members to comprehensively examine an issue through interviewing expert witnesses, conducting research and site visits. Once the topic group has finished its work it will send a report to the Committee that created it and it will often suggest recommendations to the executive.

## **Terms of Reference**

The areas scrutinised by the Committee are in exercise of the functions conferred by the Police and Justice Act 2006, Section 19-22 and Schedules 8 & 9.

## **AGENDA ITEMS**

### **1 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman will announce details of the arrangements in case of fire or other events that might require the meeting room or building's evacuation.

### **2 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND ANNOUNCEMENT OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS**

(if any) – receive.

### **3 DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY INTEREST**

Members are invited to disclose any pecuniary interest in any of the items on the agenda at this point of the meeting.

*Members may still disclose any pecuniary interest in an item at any time prior to the consideration of the matter.*

### **4 MINUTES OF THE MEETING** (Pages 1 - 6)

To approve as correct the minutes of the meetings held on 5 February 2013 and authorise the Chairman to sign them.

### **5 REPORT FROM POLICE ON BURGLARY**

To receive an oral report from the Borough Commander.

### **6 CHRISTMAS CRIME UPDATE**

To receive an oral report from the Borough Commander.

### **7 METROPOLITAN POLICE ESTATES STRATEGY**

To receive an oral report from the Borough Commander.

### **8 LIFE PROJECT**

To receive an oral report from the Borough Commander.

### **9 UPDATE ON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE TOPIC GROUP** (Pages 7 - 14)

To approve the attached report for submission to the Cabinet.

### **10 URGENT BUSINESS**

To consider any other item in respect of which the Chairman is of the opinion, by reason of special circumstances which shall be specific in the minutes that the item should be considered at the meeting as a matter of urgency.

**Ian Burns**  
**Acting Assistant Chief Executive**



**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE  
CRIME & DISORDER COMMITTEE  
Town Hall, Main Road, Romford  
5 February 2013 (7.30 - 9.00 pm)**

**Present:**

Councillors Osman Dervish (Chairman), John Wood (Vice-Chair), Becky Bennett, Denis Breading, David Durant, Roger Evans, Georgina Galpin and Linda Van den Hende

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Frederick Osborne.

**18 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

The minutes of the meeting held on 7 November 2012 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**19 MATTERS ARISING**

In response to a question officers advised the Committee that the issue of prisoners with mental health problems had been referred to the Health OSC and Health and Wellbeing Board. When matters had progressed a report would be brought back to the Committee.

With the Domestic Violence Topic Group matters had stalled over the Christmas and New Year period with both Croydon Family Centre and the London Borough of Hackney being slow to respond to requests for visits and meetings. Officers would be pursuing matters in the next two weeks.

**20 YOUTH OFFENDING SERVICE UPDATE**

The recently appointed Youth Offending Service Manager, Dan Hales attended the meeting to provide an update on progress with responding to the adverse HMI report last year. In October the Council had merged its Youth Offending Service with the London Barking & Dagenham. A number of changes had been introduced to ensure the service provided to Youth Offenders in Havering was improved. A key issue currently was premises. The lease for Portman House was expiring and a decision need to be made as to where to locate the service. Current thinking was that it would be co-located in barking with the Barking and Dagenham team. However, satellite officers would be maintained in the borough e.g. at Youth Zone and My Place. Each satellite office would be manned by at least three members of staff.

The first meeting of the Integrated Management Board had been held last week. The board were looking for a consistency of approach across both boroughs and a lot of positives had emerged.

Prior to the changes the structure had been very linear with little option to refer problems up to management. The new structure ensured adequate reporting lines were in place so support was easily available. The Committee were informed that Havering staff were embracing the changes and taking the opportunities offered for extensive training. Under the old regime Havering staff tended to work in clearly defined areas under the new arrangements they were being given the opportunity to provide a generic service thereby expanding their experience.

Although the two services were being integrated it was still two distinct services with a joint management system. Therefore when support was provided, i.e. by the Probation Service it was expected each borough would receive support.

The Committee noted the report and looked forward to receiving a further update in six months' time.

**21 DRAFT MOPAC POLICE AND CRIME PLAN 2013-17**

Officers had circulated a copy of the draft MOPAC Police and Crime Plan 2013/17 to all members for consideration. Natasha Plummer from MOPAC attended the meeting to provide a brief overview of the plan. A more detailed presentation would be delivered by the Deputy Mayor, Stephen Greenhalgh, and a senior Police Officer on 4 March, 2013.

The objectives and goals set out in the plan were to reduce key crimes by 20%, improve public confidence in the police by 20% and cut costs by 20%, all by 2016. 7 priority high impact, high volume neighbourhood crimes were identified, these were:

- Violence with injury;
- Robbery;
- Burglary;
- Theft from person;
- Theft from vehicles;
- Theft of motor vehicles; and
- Vandalism/criminal damage.

The Plan identified 4 key areas which the Mayor was looking to change. These were:

1. Policing – as set out above;
2. Criminal Justice – the Plan set targets for London Criminal Justice agencies to:
  - a. Reduce court delays by 20%;
  - b. Increase compliance with community sentences by 20%;

- c. Reduce reoffending by young people leaving custody in London by 20%.
3. Policing resources – the new Policing Model proposed aimed to put more police constables on the street, in to the Safer Neighbourhood Teams by reducing the number of senior police officers and sergeants.
4. Police estate – a comprehensive review had been undertaken of police buildings to save running costs of £140m each year. Although police stations will be closed every London borough will host at least one front counter open 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

Previously when being informed of proposals for the new Policing Model it had been suggested that some boroughs would be sharing a Borough Commander. Natasha Plummer advised the Committee that this was no longer the case, all boroughs would have their own Borough Commander.

Under the proposed arrangements each Safer Neighbourhood team would have one named PC and one named PCSO who could not be moved. The other safer neighbourhood resources which would increase to 107 by 2015 would be flexed on a task driven basis. Across the borough Havering would benefit from 48 additional officers.

All the proposals would be implemented by 2015.

The Committee asked officers to draft a response to the consultation based on the comments made.

## **22 REVISED MOPAC FUNDING ARRANGEMENTS**

Natasha Plummer advised the Committee the final details of the arrangements for the allocation of the London Crime Prevention Fund (formerly Community Safety Fund) was being sent electronically to all boroughs this evening by London Councils. Boroughs have not been allocated any specific allocation but boroughs would need to bid for the funds. This year boroughs would be able to bid for multi-year funding. All bids would need to address the Mayor's priorities.

Concern was expressed that last year the process was slow and funding was not necessarily received in a timely manner. Natasha accepted that last year the process was slow, but this had been caused by the change over from MPA to MOPAC, this year successful bids would be paid quarterly on receipt of invoices, this should speed up the process.

Officers advised the Committee that the Havering Community Safety Partnership had agreed the Strategic Assessment and agreed the form of the bids which would be submitted by the Council. Natasha confirmed that funding for the Community Engagement Fund was separate from the Crime Prevention Fund.

The Committee noted the situation.

## 23 DRAFT POLICE ESTATES STRATEGY

Details of the draft Police Estates Strategy had been circulated to the Committee for comment. Natasha Plummer from MOPAC talked the Committee through the proposals.

In financial and space terms, to achieve MOPAC's strategic objective the Metropolitan Police Service will need to:

- Enhance the opportunities for members of the public to meet with the police providing suitable access facilities in buildings that are already within the estate or local civic facilities, whilst also raising the profile of public facing properties through consistent standards of signage and corporate 'look and feel'.
- Reduce the running costs of the MOPAC estate to £140m each year by 2015/16 – a 30% reduction on 2012 costs.
- Reduce the amount of space occupied by 300,000 sq m by 2015/16.
- Provide up to 950 modern cells, reducing the cost of the custody estate, and providing suitable facilities to support the reduction in the time it takes for a detainee being taken into custody to be processed.
- To reduce the amount of residential accommodation owned by MOPAC to no more than 200 units whilst working with Residential Providers to provide affordable accommodation to officers and staff close to where they work.

What does this mean for Havering? The proposals include the closure of Rainham Police Office, Havering PASC, 84-86 Straight Road and Hornchurch Police Station. This would leave the borough with one Police Station, Romford Police Station which would provide an operational front counter 24/7. What would be the effect on the borough? The Acting Borough Commander, Tony Bennett, did not believe there would be any difference. The emergency response teams would still response to 999 calls from the Patrol Base in Jack Brown House in Harold Hill. The Borough Commander would determine the requirements for bases out of which the Safer Neighbour Teams would parade. He would also work with local partners to ensure suitable facilities were available for members of the public to meet the police.

Te Committee noted the report and agreed that the borough would submit one response to the two consultation papers.

## 24 TRANSFORMING REHABILITATION

Lucy Satchell-Day (LSD) briefed the Committee on the government's proposals to transform the Rehabilitation Services. The Coalition government had committed themselves to introducing a 'rehabilitation revolution' that would pay independent providers to reduce reoffending. In December 2010 they had produced the Green paper 'Breaking the Cycle' in which they stated their intention to extend the principles of payment by



results to all providers of services for offenders by 2015 and improve the rehabilitation of offenders. This was followed by a further consultation 'Punishment and Reform: Effective Probation Services' which proposed changes to the way probation services were commissioned and delivered. The latest document 'Transforming Rehabilitation' was a response to that earlier consultation.

Why do the Government believe change is necessary?

- 57.6% of prisoners sentenced to under 12 months re-offend;
- 35.9% of prisoners sentenced to 12 months or more (excluding imprisonment for Public Protection and life sentences) reoffend; and
- 34.1% of those starting a court order reoffend.

The evidence suggested that even those who do not reoffend in the first year will often go on to commit further offences. For adult offenders released from custody in 2000, 45.8% reoffended in the first year, and this rose to 66.1% within three years and 72.5% within five years. LSD reminded the Committee that the Probation Service were not involved with those offenders who were sentenced to under 12 months once pre-trial assessments were undertaken.

The consultation paper was looking to promote greater flexibility in delivery. The government wishes to incentivise providers to innovate and to make best use of approaches and services that have demonstrated they can work to reduce reoffending. Providers will be freed to do what works to rehabilitate offenders, and incentivised to deliver real results with part of the contract payment dependent on reducing reoffending.

Nearly 58% of offenders sentenced to less than a year in custody reoffend within a year of release, yet the system currently provided few opportunities to make them address their reoffending. The rehabilitation services will be extended to make those who go in for short sentences but reoffend time and again part of the approach. There will be a statutory basis to require them to engage.

There is a need for more efficient services. The proposal is to introduce a widespread programme of competition, and invite providers from the private and voluntary sectors to bid to deliver the majority of the current probation services. Contracts would be awarded to those providers who can demonstrate that they could deliver efficient, high-quality services and improve value for money. The Probation Service will not be able to bid for these contracts. It was estimated that 70% of the current Probation Trust workload would be put out to contract i.e. services for low to medium risk offenders. The Probation Trust would continue to write risk assessments for courts and be responsible for managing high risk offenders.

A positive side to the proposal was that offenders who were sentenced to less than 12 months would be supervised on release. This should have a positive impact on communities. The downside is that this represents a

large cohort of offenders who will need to be supervised for the first time whilst the overall costs of the system need to be cut.

The paper does not provide sufficient detail on how the payment by results would work and who would be responsible for managing the contracts.

The paper recognises the need for one provider to have overall responsibility for getting to grips with an offender's life management skills, co-ordinating a package of support to deliver better results. This includes the need to tackle the problem of substance abuse, housing, training and employment.

The Committee noted the report.

25 **CHIEF SUPERINTENDENT MIKE SMITH**

The Committee were advised that Chief Superintendent Mike Smith was leaving the borough. The Committee agreed that a letter of thanks be sent to Mike regarding his dedicated service to the borough.

---

**Chairman**

# CRIME AND DISORDER COMMITTEE

17 April 2013

# REPORT

**Subject Heading:**

**DOMESTIC VIOLENCE TOPIC GROUP**

**Report Author and contact details:**

Contact: James Goodwin  
Designation: Committee Officer  
Telephone: 01708 432432  
E-mail address:

**Policy context:**

James.Goodwin@havering.gov.uk  
To review how effectively services were co-ordinated to meet the needs of children and vulnerable adults who were living with domestic violence.

**SUMMARY**

To receive the report of the Domestic Violence Topic Group

## RECOMMENDATIONS

That members::

1. . Note the report of the Domestic Violence Topic Group (attached);
2. Decide whether to refer the recommendations of the Topic Group to Cabinet.

## REPORT DETAIL

At its meeting on 8 May 2012, the Crime and Disorder Committee established a Topic Group to review how effectively services were co-ordinated to meet the needs of children and vulnerable adults who were living with domestic violence.

Attached is a copy of the Topic Group's report. The report includes details of the research that it undertook in reaching the conclusions set out.

### **Background Papers:**

Notes of the Domestic Violence Working Party.



## REPORT OF THE CRIME AND DISORDER COMMITTEE DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

### 1.0 BACKGROUND

1.1 At its meeting on 8 May 2012, the Crime & Disorder Committee agreed to establish a topic group to

- review the level of services delivered locally in respect of the effects of Domestic Violence on Young People and Children both as victims, witnesses and/or perpetrators;
- look at what steps the Community Safety Partnership were taking to tackle the problem in the future;
- identify good practice in other boroughs;
- make recommendations to the administration on areas which could be improved, if appropriate; and
- look at the scope of Domestic Violence locally against male victims.

1.2 All members of the Committee indicated a desire to serve on the Topic Group.

1.3 The topic group met on four occasions including two visits. One for the group to look at the work of the Women's Aid Refuge and second to look at the work of the Partnership Triage in Hackney.

### 2.0 SCOPE OF THE REVIEW

2.1 The Topic Group were looking to see how effectively services were co-ordinated to meet the needs of children and vulnerable adults who were living with Domestic Violence.

2.2 The Topic Group were looking to see what specific interventions were available.

2.3 The Topic Group were looking to evaluate the impact of current policies and procedures including reporting and detection of Domestic Violence.

2.4 The Topic Group were looking to explore the provisions of Domestic Violence Services for male victims of Domestic Violence.

### **3.0 FINDINGS**

#### Havering Women's Aid

- 3.1 Three members of the Topic Group attended the Annual General Meeting of Havering Women's Aid on the 24 September 2012. Women's Aid provided two refuge's in Romford and Hornchurch.
- 3.2 The members noted that in previous years Women's Aid had receive grant funding of £24,000, from Social Services, which was used to replace sheets, mattresses , bedding, etc. The Romford Refuge was housed in Council premises for which Women's Aid paid a commercial rent. The Hornchurch Refuge was in accommodation provided by a Housing Association who provided office space free of charge.
- 3.3 At the end of the Annual General Meeting officers talk to one of the residents of the Hostel. She explained that she had been resident there for nearly 6 months because the accommodation being offered by Housing was in a different part of the borough to the school her son was attending. She did not wish to move her son from the school where he was settled as this would be a second move for him in a short time.

#### Troubled Families

- 3.4 Work had begun in May 2011 to identify and work with high need, high contact families, across all agencies. Approximately 350 individuals had been identified at risk from Domestic Violence.
- 3.5 With regard to Domestic Violence the team had adopted the following approach:
- 2 lead professionals approach in DV families;
  - Team around the family;
  - Specialist DV support and capacity in front line teams;
  - Introduced SMART Plans and CAF – tenancy officers have unusual (positive) relationships;
  - Young male Adolescent Perpetrators are put in Anger Management courses. But there are not enough places.

#### Housing Services

- 3.6 In 2010/11 the loss of a home due to violent relationship breakdown accounted for 20% of homelessness acceptance in Havering. This was higher than the national average. In 2011/12 the figure was 17%. Generally the figures for London Boroughs were higher than areas outside the Metropolis.
- 3.6 In terms of numbers 226 households were accepted as homeless by the council in 2011/12. Of these 38 households were accepted as homeless because of violent relationship breakdown.

- 3.7 Housing Services deal with victims differently depending on whether they are owner/occupied, private rented or other type of property not rented from a Local Authority or a Social Landlord, or rent from a Local Authority or Social Landlord.
- 3.8 Where a person is feeling Domestic Violence and does not reside in Social Housing they were dealt with by the Homelessness and Housing Advice Service. They can be approached in person or referred by an external agency i.e the MARAC Panel or Family Mosaic.
- 3.9 Where a risk of violence is identified the first action of the Team is to secure a place of safety, this will usually be a refuge placement. These would nearly always be out-of-borough. Once a refuge place has been secured a choice exists between continuing with the homelessness application with the Council and making a homelessness application to another authority.
- 3.10 The Council can only secure accommodation within the borough therefore an approach to another authority was often in the best interests of an applicant in cases where there was a risk of further violence if resident in the borough. However once an application has been made to the council a referral to another authority can only be made if the applicant has a local connection with that authority. There was no mechanism for referring to another authority on the grounds that they would suffer violence within the host borough. It was therefore important that a fully informed choice was made as to which authority a homelessness approach was made to.
- 3.11 In order to be eligible for assistance a person must not be subject to immigration control. If a person is subject to immigration control and fleeing domestic violence the local authority cannot assist them directly with accommodation. In such cases an applicant may be able to approach the UK Border Agency for assistance.
- 3.12 Homelessness law defines who is in priority need. The local authority cannot depart from these categories or add their own. The vast majority of cases accepted as homeless by the Council are in priority need because a member of the household is pregnant or because they have dependent children residing with them. A person can also be in priority need because they were vulnerable as a result of ceasing to occupy accommodation because of violence, or threats of violence that were likely to be carried.
- 3.13 The vast majority of those fleeing domestic violence would be in priority need because they were pregnant or because they have dependent children residing with them.
- 3.14 If the local authority was satisfied that an applicant was eligible, homeless and in priority need they will then look to see if the applicant has a local connection with them. A local connection could be established by residence in the borough, immediate family residing in the borough or by employment in the borough.

- 3.15 If an applicant does not have a local connection they may be referred to another borough with which they do have a local connection. However, a person cannot be referred to another authority if they would be at risk of domestic violence in that area.
- 3.16 If the authority were satisfied that an applicant was eligible, homeless and has a local connection they would be offered on-going accommodation. This would ordinarily be a private sector property leased by the Council.
- 3.17 Secure tenancies were valuable things and were in short supply. Where the person fleeing violence is a secure tenant of the authority, the authority will always attempt to ensure that they were not disadvantaged by losing their tenancy. This would normally be done by arranging a management transfer to another property as long as that is a safe option for the tenant.
- 3.18 Requests for management transfers were considered by a team of senior officers within the estates services. Once approved the tenants would be registered for such a move by the Council's Housing Needs Team and would be placed in the Council's Housing Register in Band 'A'.
- 3.19 They remain in Band 'A' for 12 weeks after which, if no successful bid has been made a direct offer of the next available, correctly sized property, would be made.
- 3.20 Under the New Allocations Scheme which was due to come into effect in April 2013 the household would not need to participate in the Choice based Lettings Scheme and instead the case would be deemed an emergency requiring assisted, direct offer of accommodation.

#### School Admissions

- 3.21 When a woman and child(ren) were placed in a Women's Refuge in Havering they needed to apply for a place at a school using the Local Authority's In-Year Common Application Form. Staff at the Refuges were familiar with the forms and were able to assist mothers with their completion.
- 3.22 If a place was available at the requested school this was granted. However, more often than not if a primary school place was required it could well be that no place was available within a reasonable travelling distance. In those circumstances the request would be considered by the Fair Access Panel who would take into account exceptional social circumstances. Given the shortage of places at reception age and in the primary sector generally this was likely to happen more often than not.
- 3.23 Once a family was re-housed a fresh application for a school place nearer to the new home might well be necessary. The same process would need to be followed with additional disruption for the child(ren).



- 3.24 Currently just two schools in the borough do not have a criteria of exceptional medical or social grounds. This could change, especially in the secondary sector as all but one of the schools in the borough have gone down the academy route and could set their own admissions criteria.
- 3.25 From 2013/14 there was no requirement for the Local Authority to co-ordinate in-year admissions. It was likely that a significant number of own admission authority schools, i.e foundation, voluntary aided and academies would wish to deal with their own in-year admissions from September 2013.
- 3.26 Whilst the local authority would be required to provide information to parents about the places still available in all schools within the borough the new system was likely to result in delays in placing children in schools.

#### Family Mosaic

- 3.27 Family Mosaic work closely with the Council. They were a Housing Association who provided care and support. They provide a floating support system to provide support where it was needed.
- 3.28 A key area of support was the provision of money for a rent guarantee scheme to help victims of domestic violence find suitable accommodation. This money was reclaimed from victims once all the benefit issues had been resolved.
- 3.29 Family Mosaic did not have a specific pot of money to help victims of Domestic Violence. Money came from a general fund.
- 3.30 They help find out-of-borough accommodation and have a good relationship with Housing Benefits. They worked closely with the Police, and both Adult and Children's services. The £40,000 they have available for the rent deposit scheme helped up to 100 families a year. They received around 20 referrals a week.

#### Partnership Triage Scheme.

- 3.31 The Chairman and officers visited Hackney on the 6<sup>th</sup> March to look at how their Partnership Triage Scheme worked and see if there were any lessons Havering could learn from this model. The model had been introduced 2 years ago because there had been a lack of coordinated response to Merlin reports.
- 3.32 During the past year, Partnership Triage's role had been broadened to take more than police referrals. Referrals were now accepted from schools, Health Visitors, School Nurses, Children's Centres and Parenting Service. Partnership Triage dealt with more than just Domestic Violence, it also worked with missing children and Children Missing Education. Triage was very focussed on Children, adult domestic violence did not come through Triage.
- 3.33 In a typical month approximately 4% of case referrals to Partnership Triage were Domestic Violence cases and a further 4% Domestic Dispute.

- 3.34 What Hackney had found was that young people did not understand the language which was used. As a result very few 16/18 year olds were reporting domestic violence. Partnership Triage was working with Young Hackney to deal with this problem.
- 3.35 Partnership Triage had developed a strong relationship with Health, a representative from Health worked in Triage. They also had a good working relationship with Homerton Hospital (maternity unit) and school nurses. Housing was still a problem.
- 3.36 Approximately 30% of cases referred related to male/parents as victims of domestic violence.

#### **4.0 RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 4.1 To recommend the lead member with responsibility for Housing and Public Protection to review how the Homelessness Team deal with the Victims of Domestic Violence;**
- 4.2 To recommend the Lead Members for Housing and Public Protection and Children and Learning to explore ways of improving the communication between Housing and Public Services to ensure the victims of Domestic Violence were not disadvantaged by decisions taken in isolation. i.e. Housing to check with Pupil Services whether a suitable school place was available within a reasonable distance before making an offer of accommodation.**
- 4.3 To recommend the Mead member for Children and Learning to explore with officers the best way to communicate with young people to ensure the measure about domestic violence was understood.**

#### **5.0 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

During the course of its review, the topic group met and held discussions with the following people:

Vicki Nicholson – Havering Women's Aid  
Sarah Thomas – Troubled Families  
Neil Keylock – Manager, Additional Education Needs Service  
Alexander Szantal – Housing Options Manager  
Jonathan Geall – Housing and Public Protection  
James and Kelly – Family Mosaic  
Jeanne and Katherine – Hackney Partnership Triage