

JOINT COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting held at Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council

TUESDAY, 17 JANUARY 2017

Present from Blaby District Council:-

Cllr. Geoff Welsh (Vice-Chairman)

Cllr. Marian Broomhead	Cllr. Stuart Coar	Cllr. Les Phillimore
Cllr. Cheryl Cashmore	Cllr. Graham Huss	Cllr. Deanne Woods
Cllr. Adrian Clifford	Cllr. David Jennings	

Present from Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council:-

Cllr. MR Lay (Chairman)

Cllr. R Camamile	Cllr. KWP Lynch	Cllr. P Wallace
Cllr. MB Cartwright	Cllr. BE Sutton	Cllr. HG Williams

Officers present (Blaby):-

Mrs Sarah Pennelli	- Director of People & Finance
Mrs Rebecca Holcroft	- Housing Options Manager
Mrs Linda McBean	- Senior Scrutiny Officer
Mr James Edmondston	- Democratic & Scrutiny Services Officer

Officers present (Hinckley & Bosworth):-

Mrs Rachel Burgess
Mrs Rebecca Owen
Mrs Sharon Stacey

Also in attendance as observers:-

Cllr. Lee Breckon	- Joint Chair of the Blaby & Hinckley and Bosworth Community Safety Partnership
Inspector Dan Eveleigh	- Leicestershire Police

Apologies:-

Cllr. Shabbir Aslam, Cllr. Mark Jackson, Cllr. Sam Maxwell, Cllr. Antony Moseley & Cllr. Louise Richardson from Blaby District Council
Cllr. Bill, Cllr. Bray, Cllr. Crooks & Cllr. Richards from Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council, with the substitution of Cllr. Cartwright for Cllr. Bill.

1. MINUTES

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the first meeting of the Joint Community Safety Partnership Overview & Scrutiny Committee, and all attendees introduced themselves.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No interests were declared at this stage.

BLABY AND HINCKLEY & BOSWORTH COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP UPDATE

Members were presented with a report which provided the background to the merger of the community safety partnerships, the structure of the partnership and information on performance, priorities, the action plan, challenges and successes. Attention was drawn to the strategic priorities and the importance of protecting vulnerable people, including a greater focus on more harmful crime (ie leading to injury).

Concern was expressed that there was uncertainty about the level of funding available for the next financial year from the Police & Crime Commissioner and it was suggested that a letter should be sent to the Commissioner from the partnership about the importance of early notice of funding. Members were reminded that the PCC was in the same situation as local authorities who, at this point in the year, were still finalising budgets for 2017/18. It was also noted that indication had been received that there would be a slight increase in funding, but this was specifically to deliver an extra element of work.

In response to a member's question, the committee was informed that a 'hate incident' referred to an incident that was perceived, by the victim or someone else, to be based on someone's prejudice against them. It was noted that there were very few hate crimes, but that reporting of hate crimes and incidents was increasing, which may be due to raised awareness of what constitutes a hate incident.

A member referred to cybercrime and child sexual exploitation and noted that these were not included in the table. In response it was explained that a breakdown of these figures was not currently available at partnership level, however a new team at force level was currently undertaking a great deal of work on this, including data collection, so it was hoped that figures would soon be available.

It was felt that it would be helpful to be able to see a breakdown of crime numbers by authority which, officers explained, was provided at Executive

Board level and could, therefore, be provided to members. It was agreed that this would show whether there were particularly different issues between the two authority areas and where they could learn from each other. It was also requested that year on year increases be shown as a percentage, that historical data (for example, the last five years) be shown, and that the national trend and other (for example, county) comparators be included.

There was some discussion about links with Leicestershire County Council's due to their role in safeguarding, and officers explained that the County Council was an active member of the Community Safety Partnership and of locality meetings where specific matters were discussed in more detail and they had also been crucial in dealing with child sexual exploitation matters.

Concern was expressed that the focus on protecting vulnerable people and on harmful crime was at the detriment of tackling car crime and burglary. In response, Inspector Eveleigh explained that it wasn't the case that these crimes were not taken as seriously and that where these occurred resources were moved to be able to prevent a further spate of similar crime, but that as much as possible was done to prevent these crimes and therefore on a day to day basis, focus was required on crimes resulting in injury.

A member suggested it would be useful to know the number of convictions in relation to the crime statistics. In response, Inspector Eveleigh emphasised the importance of the work of the partnership in reducing opportunities for crime, but that some information on 'outcomes' may be available.

During discussion, members also raised the following points:

- The need to undertake work to reduce scams, for example lottery scams aimed at elderly people, of which the post office were aware and should be encouraged to help prevent them
- The possibility of working with retailers to offer incentives for home security measures
- The possibility of the report incorporating information on how the partnership's successes had impacted on the crime figures
- The need to review the Terms of Reference of this committee following the first year of operation.

Members were reminded that the role of this overview & scrutiny committee was to scrutinise the effectiveness of the partnership, and that the role of the Executive Board was to look at the data and the detail. It was suggested that reports to the Executive Board be shared with members of this committee so they had the detailed information and that, whilst this committee would meet annually, a six-month update would be taken to each authority's Scrutiny Commission which would allow the opportunity to look at more detailed information.

In response to a question, Councillor Breckon, one of the chairs of the Joint Community Safety Partnership, agreed that more information should be shared outside of the partnership as a great deal was available and was

scrutinised by the Executive Board. He commended the new Police & Crime Commissioner for his communication with the partnership and his commitment to ease the funding process and also referred to the hard work of the skilled officers involved in the partnership.

RESOLVED –

- I. The report be noted;
- II. The Scrutiny Commission of each authority be provided with a six-month progress report;
- III. The next meeting of the Joint Overview & Scrutiny Committee be held in January 2018;
- IV. Future reports to this meeting include:
 - a. Figures on cybercrime and child sexual exploitation when available at partnership level;
 - b. Separation of figures for Blaby and Hinckley & Bosworth;
 - c. Year on year percentage increases;
 - d. Historical figures for the previous five years to show trends;
 - e. National trends and other comparators;
 - f. The impact of work on the figures;
 - g. Detection and conviction rates.
- V. A letter be sent from the two chairs of the joint committee to the Police & Crime Commissioner endorsing the work of the Community Safety Partnership and emphasising the importance of certainty in relation to funding;
- VI. The terms of reference of the overview & scrutiny committee be recirculated for information

THE MEETING CONCLUDED AT 8:10 P.M.

