



**CHARNWOOD COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP  
25TH FEBRUARY 2010**

**PRESENT:** Councillor D. Snartt (Chair) – Charnwood Borough Council  
Mr A. Bailiss - Loughborough Chamber of Trade and Commerce  
Mr P. Collin - Loughborough Chamber of Trade and Commerce  
Ms D. Cunningham – Drugs and Alcohol Action Team  
Mr B. Greaves – Police Authority  
Mr P. Green – JP Representative  
Mr M. Grewcock – Leicestershire Fire and Rescue Service  
Mr N. Lambert – Voluntary Action Charnwood  
Mr C. Moore – Charnwood Neighbourhood Housing  
Chief Inspector N. Newell - Leicestershire Police  
Ms A. Pearce – Probation Service  
Mr K. Pearson - Leicestershire Fire and Rescue Service  
Mr S. Phipps – Charnwood Borough Council  
Councillor C. Radford – County Fire Authority

**OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE:**

Charnwood Borough Council: Ms W. Brown  
Ms A. Fadesco  
Ms N. Gibson  
Mr T. Kiernan

Leicestershire County Council: Mr J. Fox

Leicestershire Police: Inspector T. McCabe  
Inspector D. Southall  
Sergeant C. Wharton  
Mr C. Woodward

**APOLOGIES:** N. Chapman, R. Holland, J. Orson, I. Rickard, L. Rowbotham and W. Spinks

**I. MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 17th December 2009 were agreed.

**2. MATTERS ARISING**

**Minute 3 – Performance Update and Delivery Group Reports – DAAT Performance Data**

Reference was made to the lower than expected ‘needle finds’, which I. Rickard had said she would check. She was not at the meeting and C. Moore agreed to submit information to the next meeting of the Partnership.

**AGREED** that the Charnwood Neighbourhood Housing representative submit information in respect of number of 'needle finds', compared to the figures submitted in the DAAT performance data to the next meeting of the Partnership.

#### Minute 6 – NHS Leicestershire County and Rutland

Reference was made to the performance data in respect of Loughborough Hospital and Walk-in Centre being available for the next meeting of the Partnership, if available. Officers agreed to contact L. Rowbotham to request that information.

**AGREED** that officers contact Liz Rowbotham at the PCT to ascertain if the performance data for the Loughborough Hospital and Walk-in Centre was available. When it became available, the information should be circulated to members of the Partnership.

### 3. PERFORMANCE UPDATE AND DELIVERY GROUP REPORTS

A presentation detailing performance figures was given by N. Newell. The slides contained within the presentation were circulated with the agenda as a separate document (copy filed with the agenda) and can be accessed at:

<http://www.charnwoodtogether.com/files/agenda-item-04-performance-figures.ppt>

In his absence. W. Spinks submitted the following comments in respect of the item:

*'Looking at the performance statistics there appears to be a marked difference between the Charnwood LPU and the Loughborough LPU with Charnwood showing a larger increase in areas like burglary and increases in robbery and cycle theft where, in both cases, Loughborough is falling. Is there a reason for this?'*

During discussion of the figures, further comments on specific areas were made by Chief Inspector Newell, Inspector McCabe, Inspector Southall, T. Kiernan, K. Pearson, B. Greaves and S. Phipps as follows:

#### Domestic Burglary

Domestic burglary continued to be an issue. During recent months the increase figure in the Charnwood LPU was showing a reduction and there had been a slight increase in the Loughborough LPU.

Work continued with the University to address issues in the student triangle, where a significant number of burglaries were from insecure properties. It was of concern that the figures would increase during the spring and summer with less inclement weather.

Offender management continued in the area. Until November 2009 Loughborough LPU had been on target for reductions, with a 56% increase in arrests. Criminals were coming to the area from as far away as Nottingham, with no tools, but just seizing opportunities with unlocked doors.

As part of Operation Chinook, nominals from Leicester City had been arrested in the Charnwood LPU.

### Robbery

The recent trend was down, although the CSP was moving in the wrong direction within its Family Group. In the Charnwood LPU there was no pattern to the robberies or an individual identified, therefore it was difficult to pin point.

### Cycle Theft

The Chair referred to the successes in respect of cycle thefts in the Loughborough LPU, with the support of and funding from the CSP.

In the Charnwood LPU there had been an increase of 20 offences compared to the previous year. Schools were tagging cycles and an application had been made for a laptop tracking device. Officers were taking reasonable measures to address the increase.

### Hate Crime

There had been an increase in the number of disability hate crime reports.

It was perceived that there was a better awareness of officer reporting and a greater confidence to report, which had resulted in increased reporting rather than an increase in the number of incidents.

HREC had appointed two Hate Incident Officers, that would increase activity and the number of reported incidents was expected to rise.

### Anti-social Behaviour

The figures recorded by Leicestershire Police were different to those recorded by the Borough Council on its Sentinel system. There was a reduction in figures on Police data, while Sentinel showed a significant increase compared to figures for the previous year. Officers considered the rise in figures was due to a greater number of reports being made and greater use of the Sentinel system.

The Chair referred to the moves being made to have one recording system for all partners to use. He was pleased that there were increased numbers of reporting which identified hotspots and showed that more people were confident to report incidents.

### Fire and Rescue Services

The style of presenting data was being changed and future presentations would include details of the previous year's figures, to use as comparisons with current figures.

Reference was made to the following:

- The Home Fire Safety Check initiative - officers visited vulnerable people and fitted smoke alarms in their homes, although not all houses without smoke alarms were vulnerable people. Officers were striving for all domestic properties to have smoke alarms fitted.
- There appeared to be a link between ASB and secondary fires, with a rise in incidents between July and September – the period of the school holidays.
- Work was being undertaken to address the number of non domestic fires.

#### CRAVE Survey Data

The data showed headline indicators in respect of residents perception of the Police. There had been a slight downturn across the Force area, but members should be cautious of the figures. Officers were considering different ways to communicate with residents to increase confidence.

Reference was made to the British Crime Survey, which showed a lower satisfaction rate than the CRAVE survey, although the trend direction was the same for both surveys.

Ward by Ward statistics showed a 75% confidence rating in the Hastings Ward, a success to be celebrated.

B. Greaves noted that in no area of crime was the situation deteriorating.

Reports from Delivery Groups were submitted as follows:

(i) Acquisitive Crime

There was nothing further to add following consideration of the matter as part of the Performance data presentation.

(ii) Violent Crime

T. McCabe made reference to the follow matters:

- There was a marked reduction in figures.
- The new Sergeant was aware of the problems in the area.
- A representative of Pub Watch attended the previous meeting of the Delivery Group and officers hoped they would continue to attend on a regular basis.
- Operation Philby had been organised on Friday and Saturday nights, with a zero tolerance approach.
- Revolution has had its licence extended until 4.00am, should all local clubs extend their hours it would cause planning issues for the Police.

C. Woodward reported the problems the Students' Union was experiencing in respect of taxis using the bus lay-byes. The Ministry of Transport had been approached to allow additional signage on lamps posts.

(iii) Anti-social Behaviour

W. Brown made reference to the following matters:

- ASB interventions had been successful.
- A number of District Councils had requested information from Charnwood in respect of ASB process and officers had received positive feedback.
- Sentinel reporting had doubled during the last year and was being used by Beat Officers.
- On Monday, 1st March 2010, with the support of the National Autism Society, officers would begin autism training for front line staff.
- CLG would be holding an ASB event at Loughborough Town Hall on Wednesday, 3rd March 2010. The event would include presentations and cases. Although the arrangements were short notice, members of the public and local residents would be invited to attend.

In response to a question, W. Brown stated that treatment providers had been involved with the individuals at the Crack houses, prior to them being closed down.

**AGREED**

1. that the information be noted;
2. that W. Brown submit a report in respect of ASB/Autism training to the April meeting of the Partnership.

4. ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR – COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP MINIMUM STANDARDS

On the 13th October 2009, the Home Secretary announced that by March 2010 he expected to see all local areas delivering a minimum set of anti-social behaviour standards. The Partnership was requested to consider the submitted report and adopt the proposed Standards.

In his absence, W. Spinks submitted the following comments in respect of the item:

*'On the ASB minimum standards, I think recommendation 1 is open to misunderstanding. It asks for an (at least) 10% reduction. I'm not sure if this is a 10% reduction from 15.6% to 5.6% or a 10% reduction of 15.6% from 15.6% to ca. 14%.*

*On ASB recommendation 3, I'm not sure if victims complain to their "elected members" on the CSP as the text says or the wider CSP as the recommendation implies.'*

Issues were raised and comments made as follows:

- (i) Although a national problem, it was relevant to the document that there was no definition for 'anti-social behaviour' or 'community'. There was a need for a consistency in respect of what could be defined as ASB.
- (ii) From a Police perspective, consideration should be given to ASB being perception based, aligned to the victims. There were three types of ASB: offenders – deliberately undertaking acts of ASB, victim perceived – where by a victim sees ASB while the perpetrators consider they are having fun and location based ASB. That concept was still under development.
- (iii) In respect of **Standard 4**, reference was made to repeat victimisation and harassment. That may or may not be the case, depending on the complainant, it could overlap with vulnerability.
- (iv) In respect of **Standard 4**, the Police would agree in principle with the Standard, however further discussion would be required in respect of the detail in associated text.
- (v) In respect of **Standard 5**, it was suggested that additional wording be included to make reference to not being tied to response times in all cases, in some instances it was more convenient to make an appointment to meet with a complainant.
- (vi) In respect of **Standards 5 and 6**, reference was made to the Sentinel recording system. It should be noted at the current time not all police incidents were recorded on that system.
- (vii) In respect of **Standard 7**, consideration should be given to the wording in respect of public perception.
- (viii) In respect of **Standard 7**, it may not be appropriate to include references to 'prevent' within the Standards, however, a reference could be made to prevention work taking place elsewhere.
- (ix) In respect of **Standard 7**, it was welcomed that a significant minority of perpetrators offended due to health disabilities.

In response to issues raised, comments made and questions, officers stated:

- (a) There were legislative guidelines to define anti-social behaviour, those were descriptors which were used locally. There were fifteen and officers had tried to clarify them in the 'Safe and Secure' booklet, although there were such grey areas as graffiti.
- (b) In terms of a definition for 'community', performance management techniques used geographical areas or neighbourhoods. There were other

types of communities, for example interest based communities, which officers were aware of.

- (c) In respect of **Standard 1**, the 10% reduction was 10% reduction of 15.6% to 14%.
- (d) In respect of the proposed 10% reduction referred to in **Standard 1**, the target was considered to be realistic and achievable, although would stretch officers to reach.
- (e) In respect of the target referred to in (d) above, the County target was expected to be roughly 14%. It was considered that such a reduction would show change while remaining achievable.
- (f) In respect of **Standard 2**, it was the view of the Borough Council that any partner wishing to provide information in different languages would do so at its own cost.
- (g) In respect of **Standard 3**, it was not the intention of the complaints procedure to replace those of individual Partner agencies complaints procedures.
- (h) The Standards were required by the Home Office by 31st March 2010. However, in respect of **Standard 4**, how those standards were achieved would be discussed with partner agencies further after that date.
- (i) In respect of **Standard 5**, consideration should be given to response times being based around need.
- (j) In respect of the NHS supporting the Standards, officers were confident that they were engaged through the Multi-agency tactical responses.
- (k) In respect of (viii) above, prevent became more dominant in Standards 7, 8 and 9. It was suggested that reference to prevention work be included in the introduction to the Standards.

Officers were sceptical of including 'prevent' within the Standards. Prevention work was undertaken in other ways and should be highlighted in a separate document.

### Standards 7 to 10

Following discussion of each proposed Standard, it was questioned whether Standards 7, 8, 9 and 10 should be included in the document, they were relevant to the Community Safety Partnership, but possibly not the Standards.

W. Brown stated that the additional Standards informed the local community of the work already being undertaken in the area of ASB locally and not being undertaken in other areas. She proposed they should remain in the Standards.

The Chair proposed that the matter be considered further at the meeting of the ASB Steering Group to be held on 11th March 2010, and members of the

Partnership could submit further comments to W. Brown for consideration at that meeting. A final version could then be circulated to all members of the Partnership for final comments.

The following issues were raised and comments made by members of the Partnership:

- (i) There was an issue of principle whether those final four Standards should be included in the final document.
- (ii) Charnwood was ahead of most CDRPs in respect of its ASB work, therefore that detail should be included.
- (iii) Reference was made to including work undertaken by the County Council. J. Fox stated that the Standards within the document were on the same basis the Community Safety Standards Board was seeking. The first six standards tied in directly.
- (iv) Charnwood already met the first six Standards. The further four provided an opportunity to show the public that Charnwood was going further.
- (v) It was good practice to share the work being undertaken at Charnwood.
- (vi) Leicestershire County Council produced information in respect of the work of local District Councils. The Home Office had requested information in respect of the work in Charnwood. Officers bought in to the work of LCC but the work at Charnwood had gone beyond that. By publishing the details of that work, members of the public had the opportunity to advise the Council if they considered that work was not being undertaken in any specific ASB report.
- (vii) The Partnership needed to commit in principle to the document at the meeting in order that the Standards could be submitted to the Home Office by the deadline.
- (viii) T. McCabe spoke in support of including the ten Standards. He had worked with Pathfinder and a White Paper. Charnwood was striving to work beyond the minimum Standards.
- (ix) Using all ten Standards showed what people in Charnwood could expect.

S. Phipps stated that it was a complicated process to match the County and local view. The Charnwood Standards had to be submitted to the Home Office by 31st March 2010 and discussions with the County could continue after that date. The principle of ten or six Standards had to be agreed at the meeting and the ASB Steering Group could then consider the detail further, with members of the Partnership submitting further comments to that Group. The Partnership could then agree to the Chair and Vice-chair signing off the final document. The Standards could be considered further at a later date by the Partnership if required.

S. Phipps stated that his preference was to include the ten Standards, as that detailed the work being undertaken in Charnwood.

In conclusion the Chair stated that he was proud of the work undertaken in Charnwood in respect of ASB and reducing ASB. Charnwood was leading the way in some of its work. He was confident the Standards could go forward with the proposed amendments.

## **AGREED**

1. that the draft report, together with the comments of the Partnership be submitted to the ASB Steering Group at its meeting to be held on 11th March 2010;
2. that members of the Partnership submit any further comments to W. Brown, prior to the meeting of the ASB Steering Group on 11th March 2010;
3. that the Partnership delegate authority to the Chair and Vice-chair to sign off the document to ensure it is finalised and submitted to the Home Office, by 31st March 2010.

## **5. DOMESTIC BURLGARY - STUDENTS**

On Monday, 22nd February 2010 an event had been held with Home Office representatives to further consider issues relating to domestic burglary from student accommodation, both on and off campus. A verbal feedback report of the event was given by T. Kiernan.

In his absence, Will Spinks submitted the following comments in respect of the item:

*'The university and the students union will be well represented at the 22<sup>nd</sup> Feb workshop on student burglaries with representatives from Security, Facilities Management and the student union itself. I look forward to hearing the outcomes of the day.*

*Whilst I understand that there remains a significant issue of students not locking windows / doors etc. I wouldn't want us to feel that the victims of crime are the cause of the problem or "bringing it on themselves". This has a flavour to me of some of the out-of-date views. Whilst accepting that students could and should do more to protect themselves, I have also heard reports of the mode of burglary changing to more forceful and persistent attacks (bricks through windows, entering properties whilst occupied etc). This I find to be worrying.*

*As above, I note that the much bigger increase in burglaries is in Charnwood, both in percentage terms and in actual numbers, rather than Loughborough.'*

T. Kiernan reported that a number of members of the Partnership had attended the session, together with representatives from the University security and accommodation sections, the Students' Union, Police including CID and Landlords. A number of ideas had been agreed to take forward, which should result in improvements. Officers expected to see the benefits from the session in September 2010.

T. McCabe made reference to the comments of W. Spinks and stated that although there had been recent pushes in respect of student security, it had not been the intention of either the Police or the Partnership's publicity to apportion blame to the students.

The Chair requested a detailed report in respect of the session be submitted to the next meeting of the Partnership.

### **AGREED**

1. that the information be noted;
2. that a report in respect of the Domestic Burglary event be submitted to the next meeting of the Partnership.

## 6. FUNDING

A report detailing end of year figures for 2009/10 and details of available funding for 2010/11 was submitted.

S. Phipps stated that the spend had been matched against priorities and had been submitted to Leicestershire County Council. Officers had agreed to attend a meeting week beginning 1st March 2010.

C. Woodward referred to an email sent to the Chair, confirming the BCU funding for 2010/11, which also included additional funding based around sustainability to go beyond 2011.

**AGREED** that the information be noted.

## 7. COMMUNICATIONS AND ENGAGEMENT STRATEGY AND PERFORMANCE PLAN

The draft Communications and Engagement Strategy was submitted for the consideration of the Partnership, together with the draft Performance Plan 2010/11, items 8 and 9 on the agenda.

In his absence, Will Spinks submitted the following comments in respect of the draft Performance Plan:

*'Lastly, the university has launched a new community relations website which is why, I think, the change is noted on P 68 of the documentation. The overall link is:*

<http://www.lboro.ac.uk/service/publicity/community/>

*And the link specifically re student behaviour is:*

<http://www.lboro.ac.uk/service/publicity/community/issues/student-behaviour.html> '

S. Phipps stated that the Communications and Engagement Strategy was a delivery plan developed through the Performance Group to address reassurance issues. The Performance Plan addressed resourcing, performance and delivery.

N. Newell made reference to Force targets for the next year, provisionally there was a reduction target of 9% for acquisitive crime. In response, S. Phipps stated that variations would be submitted to the Performance Group, in order that the figures were aligned.

In respect of the Communications and Engagement Strategy there were two hard to reach groups that should be included: Eastern European and Southern European communities.

### **AGREED**

1. that the information be noted;
2. that any variations be submitted to the Performance Group;
3. that in respect of the Communications and Engagement Strategy Eastern European and Southern European Communities be included as hard to reach groups.

### 8. TOTAL PLACE

D. Cunningham gave a presentation in respect of Total Place, specifically providing an overview of Drugs and Alcohol, (copy filed with the agenda) and can be accessed at:

<http://www.charnwoodtogether.com/files/total-place-presentation.ppt>

D. Cunningham stated that the way officers wished to deliver locally had been hampered by national government. The Total Place pilot was an opportunity to address that situation. The document had been submitted to White Hall and feedback was expected towards the end of March 2010.

The Chair requested that the Partnership be updated in respect of the process. He stated that he had been disappointed that 24 hour licensing had not been considered, in his view that was a real issue, in particular in respect of policing with limited resources.

With reference to changes in the Licensing Laws, B. Greaves stated that the changes had added a disproportionate amount of pressure on to the services of the Police and the Primary Care Trust.

There had been difficulties getting the Primary Care Trust to participate as a Partner agency, however, they were now working with other Partners.

In response to a question, D. Cunningham stated that due to a jobs freeze, the Alcohol Strategy post had been left vacant in October 2009. Officers were currently

looking to get a commitment from partners to fund the post, together with Leicestershire County Council.

**AGREED**

1. that the information be noted;
2. that D. Cunningham feed back the Chair's comments in respect of 24 hour Licensing.

9. PREVENT STRATEGY

S. Phipps proposed that the item be deferred to the next meeting of the Partnership.

**AGREED** that the Prevent Strategy be considered at the next meeting of the Partnership.

10. CATS-EYES COVERT ASSET TRACKER SYSTEM

An update report in respect of the CATS Eyes Tracker System was submitted for the consideration of the Partnership.

T. Kiernan stated that there had been technical problems which the Police were in the process of resolving. The suppliers appeared to be in financial difficulties and Legal Services had suggested that the Borough Solicitor be instructed to recover the funds. In the meantime officers were in discussions with another supplier to provide the system.

**AGREED** that the information be noted.

11. LEICESTERSHIRE CONSTABULARY NORTH AREA BEAT STRUCTURE

A report in respect of the North Area Beat Structure was submitted for the consideration of the Partnership.

N. Newell stated that the structure would change, but had been delayed until the end of the summer 2010. The key issues were as follows:

- There would be no reduction in the number of PCs or PCSOs in each area, with additional sergeants dedicated to Neighbourhood policing.
- The beats would be aligned as closely as possible with local Wards, with larger clusters and beat teams.

B. Greaves stated that the new beats would improve effectiveness and communication with local communities.

**AGREED** that the information be noted.

12. COUNTY COUNCIL LEVEL ACTIVITY

A report in respect of County Council level activity was submitted for the consideration of the Partnership, including information in the following areas:

- (i) Community Safety
- (ii) Hate Incidents
- (iii) Domestic Abuse

J. Fox stated that in respect of the training hub, six members of the Partnership had not logged on to the site and requested that those members contact him. It was important they did so as it was part of the Hall Marks.

In response to a question, J. Fox stated that £20,000 funding would go to Loughborough Women’s Aid.

**AGREED** that the information be noted.

13. FORWARD PROGRAMME

This item had been included on the agenda to provide details of matters programmed for future meetings of the Partnership.

**AGREED** that the forward programme for the Partnership, taking account of decisions taken elsewhere on the agenda, be as follows:

ITEM	DETAIL	DATE	ACTION BY
Offender Management	A report in respect of Offender Management.	Deferred to 15 April 2010	T. McCabe
Operation Consequence	A report detailing the impact of Operation Consequence on the Community Safety Partnership.	15 April 2010	N. Newell
Operation Teak	A report detailing Operation Teak.	15 April 2010	N. Newell / C. Woodward
91 Russell Street, the Marios Tinenti Centre (MTC)	A report in respect of the MTC be submitted to a future meeting of the Partnership.	15 April 2010	T. Kiernan
Pub Watch	A briefing will be given by a representative of Pub Watch (Debbie Smith)  Invite a Street Pastor	15 April 2010	A. Fadesco
Human Rights and Equalities - Hate	An update report on the HREC Hate projects	15 April 2010	HREC representative

Domestic Burglary - General	A verbal report in respect of an event with home Office representatives to further consider issues relating to domestic burglary.	15 April 2010	S. Phipps
Domestic Burglary - Students	A written report following the session held on 22nd February 2010.	15 April 2010	T. Kiernan
Needle Finds	Charnwood Neighbourhood Housing representative submit information in respect of number of 'needle finds', compared to the figures submitted in the DAAT performance data to the next meeting of the Partnership.	15 April 2010	I. Rickard / C. Moore
ASB/Autism Training	A report in respect of the training in March 2010.	15 April 2010	W. Brown
Prevent Strategy	A verbal report, deferred from February meeting.	15 April 2010	S. Phipps
Total Place	An update report in respect of the process.	TBA	D. Cunningham
Strategic Assessment	A further report in respect of the Strategic Assessment 2010/1.	TBA	A. Fadesco / T. Kiernan

#### 14. OTHER BUSINESS

(i) Leicestershire Fire and Rescue Service – Outcomes of the Integrated Risk Management Plan

K. Pearson provided a verbal update in respect of the Leicestershire Fire and Rescue Service – Outcomes of the Integrated Risk Management Plan.

He stated that the proposals submitted to the Fire Authority in January 2010 had been approved. There would be new stations in Castle Donington and Birstall and the station in Melton Mowbrary would be brought up to daily crewing levels. The impact on Charnwood was that the Syston station would close and Loughborough retained personnel would be phased out during the changes. The timescale for the changes were still to be confirmed and the Partnership would be advised when the details were available.

**AGREED** that the information be noted.

(ii) Police Authority Inspection

B. Greaves stated that the initial feedback from the Inspection had been positive. However, he felt that the outcome of the Pilkington Inquest had had an impact on the final classification. The following areas were identified within the report, strengthen strategic approach, integrate – not work in silos and improve performance management. B. Greaves noted that the comments were valid, welcome and were being addressed.

The Inspection had commended the work with the Charnwood Community Safety Partnership, while being critical of the work with Leicester City CSP.

**AGREED** that the information be noted.

15. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

Dates for future meetings of the Partnership have been agreed as follows:

Thursday, 15th April 2010

Proposed dates for the 2010/11 Council Year are as follows:

17th June 2010  
19th August 2010  
21st October 2010  
16th December 2010  
17th February 2011  
21st April 2011

All meetings will commence at 1.30pm and be held in Committee Room 3 at the Council Offices, Southfields, Loughborough.

**AGREED**

1. that the dates for the current Council Year be noted;
2. that the dates for meetings of the Partnership for the Council Year 2010/11 be as follows:

17th June 2010  
19th August 2010  
21st October 2010  
16th December 2010  
17th February 2011  
21st April 2011