

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
CRIME & DISORDER COMMITTEE
Committee Room 2 - Town Hall
21 May 2013 (7.30 - 8.25 pm)**

Present:

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

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Frederick Osborne

33 MINUTES OF THE MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on 17 April, 2013 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

34 BURGLARY

Further to minute 27, 'Report from Police on Burglary', the Borough Commander advised the Committee that since the last meeting he had met with his colleagues in the North East cluster to discuss the issue of cross-borough burglaries. He re-affirmed that of those arrested in the borough 54% were from Havering.

The Master class on burglary had been held and he had taken the opportunity to acquaint himself with his local cohort. As a result of this, in co-operation with Barking and Dagenham a local burglar who operated in both boroughs had been identified and arrested.

The report was noted.

35 WORK PLAN 2013/14

The Committee noted that there were 5 meetings of the Committee scheduled over the next 12 months. The Committee had considered what areas of work they would like to review over the period and agreed the following provisional programme. They accepted that it might be necessary to amend the plan if any issues require their attention.

The Committee **agreed** the following Plan for 2013/14.

Meeting 1 (16 July, 2013)	Meeting 2 (17 October, 2013)	Meeting 3 (21 November, 2013)	Meeting 4 (4 February, 2013)	Meeting 5 (10 April, 2014)
Report from CCG re Mental Health issues in prisoners and ex-offenders	Update report on MOPAC funded projects	Burglary	Update report on MOPAC funded projects	Annual report
Review of National Policy changes on Anti-Social Behaviour	Reducing Reoffending – presentation from London Probation Trust	Review of locality groups model	Review of Youth Offending Services	Work with Public Health
Draft Alcohol and Drugs Strategy	Review of draft Anti-Social Behaviour and Hate Crime policy	Review of progress on the Troubled Families Project	Safer Neighbourhood Boards	Review of services for the victims of Domestic Violence
Transforming Rehabilitation – Government response to the consultation				

At the next meeting the Committee would give consideration to areas of work which it might wish to consider for review by a Topic Group.

During discussion on the work plan the Borough Commander was asked about the on-going national debate about the naming/non-naming of suspects. The Borough Commander advised the Committee of the position within the Metropolitan Police Service.

36 ANNUAL REPORT 2012/13

A draft of the Committee's Annual Report had been circulated for approval. The report covered the activities of the Committee during the period May 2012 to May 2013.

The Committee indicated their **approval** for the report, but asked that it be brought further up to date to include the response of the Lead Members to the recommendations of the Domestic Violence Topic Group, the outcome

of the applications for funding from MOPAC and a paragraph relating to the seminar attended by the Chairman and Vice-Chairman earlier this year.

37 HAVERING COMMUNITY SAFETY PLAN -REPORT ON MOPAC FUNDING 2013/14

Officers advised the Committee of the outcome of the applications for funding submitted to MOPAC under the auspices of the Crime Prevention Fund.

In 2012/13 MOPAC allocated a number of funding streams inherited from the Home Office. These were:

- Drug Intervention Programme (DIP) - £12.8 million (part of which was provided directly to the Metropolitan Police to undertake compulsory drug testing);
- Community Safety Fund - £5.3 million;
- Youth Prevention - £2.2 million; and
- CAGGK (communities against guns, gangs and knives) - £1 million.

After March 2013 these funding streams ceased to exist, and in their stead the Home Office allocated un-ring fenced 'Community Safety Fund' monies to each Police and Crime Commissioner. MOPAC had decided to combine this with other funding streams (the Police Property Act Fund and Partnership Fund), into the London Crime Prevention Fund.

The key principles for the new fund were:

- A first step to drawing together disparate national and regional funding programmes to produce one single pot that Local Authorities could access through a relatively light touch 'challenge fund' mechanism.
- MOPAC was committed to funding activity that was able to demonstrate impact and was, therefore, encouraging outcome-based commissioning to generate a strong evidence base.
- Funding decisions for each Local Authority would be determined by both the potential impact (i.e. likelihood of making a difference on the ground) of their proposals and local demand (levels of crime).
- Boroughs were in the best position to commission and deliver local interventions that would achieve the right outcomes, therefore, individual commissioning decisions would be taken at as local a level as possible. The assumption was that boroughs could deliver better outcomes given sufficient freedom, flexibility and resource.
- MOPAC must deliver value for money and would, therefore, ensure any funding was used to complement existing spend. MOPAC was looking to pay for outcomes. Local Authorities should look to develop Payment by Results (PbR) arrangements for any services that were commissioned. The precise nature of the PbR arrangement was for Local Authorities to determine.
- Providing boroughs the time and assurance to deliver meaningful results through opportunity for longer term funding (up to four years). This

longer term funding commitment could offer a useful foundation for tackling complex and ingrained crime and offending problems.

- Expectation of partnership (and ideally matched) funding from boroughs to ensure greater impact.
- MOPAC was committed to improving the evidence base for what works in London. Local Authorities would, therefore, be required to show that they were engaging with Project Oracle for any youth programmes.
- The funding process should be simple and as non-bureaucratic as possible. But the funding should ensure there was clear accountability in terms of spend and outcomes.

Local authorities had been able to bid for monies under the categories of drugs and alcohol, gangs, violence against women and girls, reducing re-offending and local priority. The Havering Community Safety Partnership (HCSP) had submitted fifteen proposals under the following priority areas.

- Alcohol and Drugs
 - Proposal 1 – Street Triage
 - Proposal 2 – Project Weekend
 - Proposal 3- Substance Abuse Education
 - Proposal 4 – Drugs and Alcohol Service Provision
 - Proposal 5 – Caught Out Kept Out
 - Proposal 6 – Substance Misuse and Young People
- Gangs
 - Proposal 7 – Havering Gangs Prevention
 - Proposal 8 – Youth Crime Prevention
- VAWG
 - Proposal 9 – Domestic Abuse Perpetrators
 - Proposal 10- Improving Support for Domestic Abuse
 - Proposal 11- Domestic Abuse, Children and Young People
- Reducing Re-offending
 - Proposal 12- Working with Male Offenders
 - Proposal 13- Working with Female Offenders
 - Proposal 14 – Rent Deposit Scheme
- Other - Addressing Serious Acquisitive Crime
 - Proposal 15 – Localities Based Approach to Crime Prevention

MOPAC had advised the HCSP in April that the following bids had been successful:

1. Street Triage - £30,000
2. Substance Misuse and Young People - £40,000
3. Domestic Abuse Perpetrators - £20,000
4. Improving Support for Domestic Abuse - £35,000
5. Rent Deposit Scheme - £32,400
6. Drugs and Alcohol Service Provision - £56,000

The amount of funding awarded was £213,400. Funding for these bids would be subject to conditions, such as outcomes being more specific and measurable (for example). Officers were still in discussion with MOPAC around these.

In addition to the funding received by the HCSP Barking and Dagenham had received £120,000 for work with gangs and as we work together on Youth Offending issues the Council would benefit from this funding.

The problem for the HCSP was that in previous years it had a small amount of funds available to tackle emerging trends, this was no longer available. The partnership needed to be smarter and they would be looking for sponsorship from local businesses to run specific projects.

The Committee **noted** the report and asked for further information on the matched funding which was being made available.

Chairman