

Contact for this Agenda: Steve Wood
Tel: 020 8313 4316
E-mail: stephen.wood@bromley.gov.uk
London Borough of Bromley
27 June 2017

To: Members of the



STRATEGIC GROUP

Chris Hafford, (Borough Police Commander) (Chairman)
Nigel Davies, (LBB Executive Director, Environmental Services) (Vice-Chairman)
Councillor Kate Lymer ((Portfolio Holder for Public Protection and Safety))
Jane Bailey, (LBB Director of Education)
Anne Ball, (Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime)
Sara Bowrey, (LBB Director of Housing Needs)
Deirdre Bryant, (Probation Service)
Barbara Godfrey, (Oxleas NHS Foundation Trust)
Terry Gooding, (Bromley Fire Commander)
Laurie Grasty, (LBB--Emergency Planning and Corporate Resilience Manager)
Dan Jones, (LBB Director of Environment)
Trevor Lawry, (Police Deputy Borough Commander)
Betty McDonald, (Head of Service-YOS)
Amanda Mumford, (LBB Community Safety Officer)
Philip Powell, (London Ambulance Service)
Victoria Roberts, (Interim DV & VAWG Commissioner)
Lucien Spencer, (London Community Rehabilitation Company)
Rob Vale, (LBB Trading Standards and Community Safety Manager)

A meeting of the Safer Bromley Partnership Strategic Group will be held at Committee Room 2 - Bromley Civic Centre on THURSDAY 6 JULY 2017 at 10.00 am

A G E N D A

- 1 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**
- 2 **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 9TH MARCH 2017 (Pages 3 - 16)**
- 3 **QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS OR MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, questions to the Safer Bromley

Partnership Strategic Group should be received 4 working days before the meeting. Questions should therefore be received by 5.00pm on 30th June 2017.

4 MATTERS ARISING (Pages 17 - 20)

5 CHAIRMAN'S UPDATE

An update will be provided by the Borough Police Commander.

6 RESILIENCE UPDATE

7 PRESENTATION FROM RESTORE LONDON (Pages 21 - 24)

A presentation will be given by Anika Cosgrove from Restore London.

8 SAFER NEIGHBOURHOOD BOARD UPDATE

9 MOPAC UPDATE

10 UPDATE ON THE PREVENT STRATEGY

11 UPDATE FROM THE LONDON AMBULANCE SERVICE

12 REPORTS FROM SUB-GROUPS

a DOMESTIC ABUSE SUB GROUP UPDATE

b OFFENDER MANAGEMENT SUB GROUP UPDATE

c YOUTH OFFENDING SERVICE AND GANGS SUB GROUP UPDATE

d ASB AND ENVIROCRIME SUB GROUP UPDATE

13 COMMUNICATIONS UPDATE

14 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

15 DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday 14th September 2017.

.....

Agenda Item 2

SAFER BROMLEY PARTNERSHIP STRATEGIC GROUP

Minutes of the meeting held at 10.00 am on 9 March 2017

Present:

Nigel Davies ((LBB Executive Director, Environmental Services)) (Chairman)

Anne Ball, (Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime)

Terry Belcher, (Safer Neighbourhood Board)

Terry Gooding, (Bromley Fire Service)

Laurie Grasty, Emergency Planning and Corporate Resilience Manager

Dan Jones, (Director for Environment)

Betty McDonald, (Head of Service-YOS)

Amanda Mumford, (Community Safety Officer)

Philip Powell, (London Ambulance Service)

Rob Vale, (LBB Trading Standards and Community Safety Manager)

Deirdre Bryant (Probation Service)

Cassie Newman (London CRC)

Acting DCI Charles Clare (Bromley Police)

Also Present:

Stephen Wood (Democratic Services Officer)

128	APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE	Action
	Apologies were received from the following: Chris Hafford, (Borough Police Commander) Trevor Lawry, (Deputy Borough Police Commander) Janet Bailey, (LBB Interim Director for Children's Social Care), and Councillor Tim Stevens.	
129	MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING	Action
	The minutes of the previous meeting held on 8 th December 2016 were agreed as a correct record.	
130	MATTERS ARISING	Action
	CSD 17041 It was noted that most of the matters arising, would be covered in the agenda during the meeting. The exception to this were the updates relating to the Domestic Abuse Sub Group, as there was no one present at the meeting to provide this update.	

	RESOLVED that the Matters Arising report be noted.	
131	QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS AND MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC	Action
	No questions were received.	
132	CHAIRMAN'S UPDATE	Action
	<p>The Chairman's update was provided by acting Detective Chief Inspector Charles Clare on behalf of the police.</p> <p>The Group heard that Cressida Dick had been appointed as the new MET Police Commissioner--she was the first woman to take charge of the service. Previously she was a senior officer in the MET police and had previously worked on Operation Trident and in Counter Terrorism. Her appointment had been well received.</p> <p>Confirmation had still not been received concerning the structure of the proposed new BCU (Borough Command Unit) sites. Some pilot sites had been set up and were working; some teething problems had been experienced. It was anticipated that the composition of the BCUs would be clarified in June, and rolled out between September and December. It was still possible that the new commissioner could decide to halt the BCU process, or decide that the amalgamation of forces could be limited to two instead of three.</p> <p>Mr. Clare informed the Group that a Development Team had been set up to aid in driving up standards and to enable lower ranked officers to take on more responsibility. Bromley police were ten officers over strength in total, but were under strength in detectives by 14. There was a young CID in Bromley, and recruitment into the CID was a problem.</p> <p>Mr Vale informed the Group that trading standards officers were able to support CID officers in fraud matters relating to rogue traders and often took the lead on these enquiries locally. Furthermore, arrangements were being made to provide a presentation to CID officers by trading standards in order that they could readily refer appropriate cases on for investigation. Mr Vale was preparing to draft an MOU in order that the current partnership working could be formalised.</p> <p>Bromley was one of only four forces that was continuing to experience an overall yearly decrease in crime. It was planned that two District Ward Officers would be patrolling in each ward by the end of the year.</p>	

	<p>On March 20th, a new Acting Chief Inspector (Clair Haynes) would be appointed, and would have responsibility for Local Policing. She would in effect be the replacement for Chief Inspector David Tait.</p> <p>Mr. Vale (Head of Trading Standards and Community Safety) enquired how low level resources would be pooled in the BCU model. Mr. Clare responded that the answer to this was not known at this time. Mr. Vale explained that a good working relationship currently existed between Trading Standards and the local police, and this was something that he hoped would not be lost under a BCU restructure.</p> <p>The Chairman (Executive Director for Environmental and Community Services) referenced a recent meeting that had taken place between himself, Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime), the Council Leader, Chief Executive and the Portfolio Holder. Various issues were discussed at the meeting including MOPAC (Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime) funding, priorities, and possible BCU amalgamations. It was the case that Croydon and Sutton were still being considered as possible partners, but the Chairman hoped that an alignment could be made instead with a south east borough such as Bexley, Lewisham or Greenwich.</p> <p>RESOLVED that the Police update be noted.</p>	
133	<p>SAFER NEIGHBOURHOOD BOARD UPDATE</p> <p>Councillors Tim Stevens and Councillor Kate Lymer were not present to provide the Safer Neighbourhood Board (SNB) update.</p> <p>The Chairman mentioned that a Forum was going to take place on 16th March to discuss the dissolution of MOPAC 7 targets at City Hall.</p> <p>The previous Police and Crime Plan's ambition for neighbourhood policing had rigid, city-wide targets for reducing local crime. While this may have helped to reduce certain crimes across the city and provided a simple way for the Mayor to scrutinise police performance, it put pressure on Neighbourhood Teams to focus on 'MOPAC 7' crimes, even if the crimes of highest concern to the community they policed were different.</p> <p>This measure focused attention on resources only at what is known as 'volume crime' – offences such as burglary and robbery – excluding other serious crimes that harm communities, such as domestic abuse and child sexual exploitation.</p> <p><i>The Portfolio Holder for Public Protection was unable to attend the meeting, but provided a post meeting update as follows:</i></p> <p><i>The last public meeting of the Safer Neighbourhood Board was held on 23rd February 2017 at Bromley College Campus. It was well</i></p>	Action

	<p><i>attended with nearly 60 people present. In addition to the regular updates from the Police, attendees heard from the new Fire Borough Commander Terry Gooding, and received presentations from the CEO of 'Growing Against Violence' - which was an anti-gang education programme working in the schools in the north of the Borough that the SNB funded. A presentation was also received from the Bromley Police Counter-Terrorism Desk.</i></p> <p><i>There was a Board Members only meeting on 27th February where a formal welcome was extended to new Board members. These were representatives from Keston Mosque, Churches Together, Somali Association in Penge, and the Muslim Community who had links to Darul Uloom School.</i></p> <p><i>The Bromley Youth Manifesto Event which the SNB provided funds for was scheduled for 16th March, and the SEN Schools Safety Conference that the SNB also funded was scheduled for 14th March.</i></p> <p><i>The next public meeting would be a joint meeting with Bromley Neighbourhood Watch's AGM in Orpington on Tuesday 13th June.</i></p> <p><i>The Annual General Meeting of the SNB will be held on 22nd May 2017.</i></p>	
<p>134</p>	<p>MOPAC UPDATE</p> <p>The MOPAC update was provided by Anne Ball (MOPAC Programme Officer).</p> <p>The current London Crime Prevention Fund (LCPF) budget arrangements would end in March 2017.</p> <p>The Group heard that the current bids from 32 boroughs for MOPAC funding were currently being assessed. As part of the assessment process they were considering clarity of what was being delivered and:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarity of the spend • Overall outcomes and how they would support the annual review process • How it aligned with the PCP • To what extent it met the minimum standards and the transition arrangements, including future commissioning decisions. <p>It had been decided that the LCPF budget should continue for another 4 years from 2017 to 2021. There would be a commitment to direct borough funding for two 2 year periods, which would enable boroughs to exercise flexibility in the way that they apportioned spend.</p>	<p>Action</p>

	<p>The LCPF budget would be apportioned between direct borough funding (70%) and funding for co-commissioned services (30%) starting in year 2 of the fund, from 2018/19 to 2020/21. Boroughs would be core partners in the development and use of the new co-commissioning funding pot which accounts for 30% of the LCPF budget from 2018/19 onwards.</p> <p>The funding would be allocated in line with the new Policing and Crime Plan. A letter had been sent to the Chief Executive on 23rd February 2017, outlining the initial period of two year funding; this had not been formally ratified, but had been agreed in principle. The grant funding should be in place by 31st March 2017.</p> <p>On the 28th February, Sophie Linden the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime, met with the Council Leader, Chief Executive, Portfolio Holder for Public Protection and the Executive Director for Environmental and Community Services to discuss the PCP and its implications for policing in Bromley.</p> <p>RESOLVED that the MOPAC update be noted.</p>	
135	COMMUNITY REHABILITATION COMPANY PRESENTATION	Action
	<p>A presentation was received from Cassie Newman, Head of Strategic Partnerships at London CRC (Community Rehabilitation Company).</p> <p>An outline of the aims of London CRC was given, the primary aims being to reduce re-offending and to protect the public. London was the largest of the new 21 Community Rehabilitation Companies across England and Wales, employing nearly 1,200 staff across London. London CRC had a caseload of between 25,000 to 29,000 offenders at any one time.</p> <p>In 2016, the contract for London CRC was awarded to MTCnovo.</p> <p>The contract for the London Community Rehabilitation Company was awarded to MTCnovo. MTCnovo was a joint venture involving:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MTC (Management Training Corporation) – A private company. • Novo – a consortium with a number of public, private and third sector shareholders including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RISE – a probation staff community interest company • A Band of Brothers – a Charity • The Manchester College (TMC) – a public sector education provider • Thames Valley Partnership – a charity • Amey – a private company. 	

An 800 point action plan had been developed to change the way London CRC worked, and to make it more productive. This was a four year action plan that had commenced in 2016. A new IT system was already up and running, and a restructure was in progress.

Ms Newman referenced IOM (Integrated Offender Management) and explained that it was a cross-agency response to the crime and reoffending threats faced by local communities. Persistent and problematic offenders were identified and managed jointly by partner agencies working together. The big problem was re-offending, and a vigorous cross-agency response was required to break the cycle. The premise was that by changing the behaviour of a small number of people, this would have a big impact on reducing crime and re-offending. She felt that IOM should be modified to reflect the needs of the local community.

Ms Newman explained the core principles of IOM and outlined the 'carrot/stick' approach. The benefits of participating in the IOM programme would be explained to offenders, and they would be expected to face up to their responsibilities or face the consequences. She felt that it was also important that best use was made of voluntary organisations. The long term aim was to achieve a desistance from crime.

Previously, IOM was structured according to cohorts:

- Young Males
- Adult Males
- Mature Males
- Women

The new system of case management would be based on geographical areas rather than cohorts.

The current number of CRC IOM cases was 83, and these were primarily cases dealing with a high volume of repeat offenders; two police officers were managing the caseload. The 83 cases were the number that met the criteria, not necessarily how many had been accepted into the scheme via the panels.

The Chairman asked Dan Jones (Director for Environment) if he would like to comment on IOM and give the IOM sub-group update at this point. The Director explained that he had been tasked to re-invigorate IOM in Bromley and that in the course of this work he had been in dialogue with Haringey and Bexley Councils. It was the case that LBB now had a MOPAC funded IOM co-ordinator, and that attendance at IOM panel meetings was good. The panel met on a case by case basis as required. It had been decided that the Strategic

	<p>Board for IOM would act as a virtual board and Mr Jones, as the Chairman, would direct issues identified by the IOM co-ordinator to the relevant senior manager/director within the partner organisation/s to seek resolutions. This would negate the need to hold unnecessary meetings.</p> <p>The Chairman enquired if there was a representative of the Youth Offending Service on the IOM Panel. Betty McDonald responded that currently this was not the case. The Chairman felt that there was a need for the YOS and the IOM panel to be joined up. Ms Newman highlighted that in some boroughs there was a separate IOM panel for young people. A link was needed to enable a smooth transition between YOS and IOM.</p> <p>The Chairman enquired if Ms Newman would remain Bromley's CRC contact going forward. Ms Newman explained that due to the current restructure, this was unlikely to be the case. LBB's contact going forward would be a new area manager who would be appointed shortly.</p> <p>The Chairman thanked Ms Newman for attending and presenting to the Group.</p> <p>RESOLVED that the CRC update be noted.</p>	
136	<p>PRESENTATION FROM LONDON AMBULANCE SERVICE</p> <p>The LAS (London Ambulance Service) presentation was given by the LAS Stakeholder Engagement Manager, Philip Powell.</p> <p>LAS continued to lead the delivery of care to the sickest and most seriously injured, whilst developing the delivery of care for urgent patients e.g. falls, mental health, and long term conditions. The first 8 urgent APPs (Advanced Paramedic Practitioners) had now commenced employment.</p> <p>There had been a huge rise in call volumes, and category 'A' calls (the most urgent) had increased by 11%. The LAS were facing new challenges around mental health, dementia and obesity. The Group heard that annually, up to 15,000 calls were dealt with by paramedics over the phone, and that the LAS was struggling to meet demand.</p> <p>As well as the emergency response ambulances, the LAS provided the following services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two emergency Operations Centres • Patient Transport Service • Operating out of 70 sites • Motorcycle Response Unit • 111 Services 	Action

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cycle Response Unit • 2 HART Teams <p>HART (hazardous area response team) was a specialist team of Service staff who had been trained to provide life-saving medical care in hostile environments such as industrial accidents and natural disasters. Mr Powell informed that the Leadership Team had been strengthened, and front line recruitment had been increased.</p> <p>It was the case that the PRUH (Princess Royal University Hospital) had been struggling with a lack of beds, and this had delayed the LAS in transferring patients into the hospital. It was estimated that 1750 operational hours per month were lost because of queuing at the hospital.</p> <p>The Chairman enquired what sites the LAS were operating out from locally. Mr Powell responded that the sites were Bromley Common, Lee, Forest Hill and St Mary Cray.</p> <p>Terry Gooding (LFB Borough Commander) noted the operational mismatch in call volumes between the two services. A trial was taking place around 'Red 1' Calls. This was where the LFB was able to respond first to a member of the public that was having a heart attack and would benefit from defibrillator treatment before LAS paramedics arrived. Trials to date had been regarded as successful, but in some cases LFB crews found the situations difficult as the medical intervention that they could use was limited.</p> <p>RESOLVED that the LAS update be noted.</p>	
137	<p>RESILIENCE OVERVIEW</p> <p>The resilience overview update was provided by Laurie Grasty (LBB Emergency Planning and Corporate Resilience Manager).</p> <p>It was noted that the Civil Contingencies Act required the establishment of a Borough Risk Forum. The Borough Risk Forum should report back to the Safer Bromley Partnership, and the minutes be reported back to the SBP. The objective of the Council's resilience measures was to provide support to the emergency services in the wake of a disaster. LBB CEO along with all other London CEO's are on call 365 days a year to coordinate the Local Authority Response should there be a pan London major incident. LBB will be on call for London in April for 2 weeks</p> <p>A Pan London training exercise took place in February testing the Borough's capability to deal with extreme weather On the 20th March, another London wide training exercise was being planned which would focus on a 'mass fatality'. It was expected that eight representatives from LBB would attend. Ms Grasty highlighted the</p>	<p>Action</p>

	<p>importance of engaging the help of the faith and voluntary sectors. It was planned that a joint faith group forum be set up.</p> <p>Terry Gooding (Bromley Fire Commander) informed the Group that a training exercise was going to be undertaken on 22nd June 2017, based on the events that occurred at the Shoreham Air Crash in August 2015. This was going to be a large scale exercise with a multi-agency response. The Police and LAS would be attending, as would the LBB. A working group would be set up to finalise the details.</p> <p>The Chairman stated that LBB had to consider how to respond if the terrorist threat changed from severe to critical, and the possible effect on business continuity.</p> <p>RESOLVED that the minutes of the Bromley Risk Forum be reported back to the Safer Bromley Partnership.</p>	LG
138	REPORTS FROM SUB-GROUPS	Action
	Updates are noted in the sub-group sections.	
139	<p>DOMESTIC ABUSE SUB GROUP UPDATE</p> <p>The Group noted the Domestic Violence and VAWG report written by Victoria Roberts.</p> <p>The report provided updates on the following key areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q3 Performance and Data pertaining to the Bromley Domestic Violence Advocacy Project • VAWG Service Transformation Fund • Update on the DV/VAWG Training and Development Programme <p>Similarly, the Group noted the domestic abuse sub-group report submitted by Trevor Lawry, the Deputy Borough Police Commander.</p> <p>It was noted that the detection rates for domestic abuse had risen steadily, and that the Safer Bromley Van service would be decommissioned at the end of March 2017. A new round of commissioning for all services was currently in progress, and an extension until June was being sought for the old services to allow a seamless transition to take place.</p> <p>The report briefed that the domestic abuse sub group had met on 21st February 2017 and had agreed a formal plan. Reference was also made to the problems caused by the fact that one of the DA &VAWG Commissioners had been on long term sick. This had impacted on the</p>	Action

	<p>capacity of the remaining Commissioner, especially as the commissioning bids were now nearing submission; it had also meant that the DA &VAWG Forum had been disrupted.</p> <p>RESOLVED that the Domestic Abuse Sub Group report, and the DA &VAWG reports be noted.</p>	
	<p>139a OFFENDER MANAGEMENT SUB GROUP UPDATE</p>	<p>Action</p>
	<p>This update had been given by the Director of Environment as part of the CRC presentation.</p>	
	<p>139b PREVENT UPDATE</p> <p>The Prevent update was presented by Rob Vale, Head of Trading Standards and Community Safety.</p> <p>The Group heard that an Action Plan had been developed and staff briefings had been delivered across the workforce; briefings had also been delivered to ley leaders across the authority, including Members.</p> <p>LBB chaired a Prevent Case Management Board that met monthly to review an active caseload. Work was also being undertaken to support schools to implement their own Prevent response.</p> <p>The Group were informed that a Prevent Strategy and Channel Referral protocol had been produced, and that this had been reviewed by the Policy and Procedure sub group of the BSAB (Bromley Safeguarding Adults' Board).</p> <p>It was noted that a RAG status of the Action Plan would be provided at the next meeting.</p> <p>RESOLVED that an update on the RAG status of the Action Plan be provided at the next meeting.</p>	<p>Action</p> <p>RV</p>
	<p>139c YOUTH OFFENDING SERVICE AND GANGS SUB GROUP UPDATE</p>	<p>Action</p>
	<p>The Youth Offending and Gangs Service Update was provided by Betty McDonald (Head of Youth Support and Youth Offending Services). Ms McDonald updated the Group as follows:</p> <p>The remit of the YJB was to continue monitoring the operations of the youth justice system, and to provide advice to the Secretary of State on a range of matters relating to the most effective operation of the youth justice system, including the setting of national standards. YJB would continue to gather and publish information, identifying, and promoting good practice across the sector. The YJB would continue to make grants to Youth Offending Services and to commission research.</p>	

The Group heard that Charlie Taylor was the new Chair of the YJB, taking over from Lord McNally in mid-March 2017.

Ms McDonald briefed the Group concerning the Charlie Taylor Review of Youth Justice.

The Ministry of Justice had commissioned a review of the youth justice system and appointed Charlie Taylor to lead the review. This began in September 2015 and an interim report was published in February 2016. The final review was published in November 2017 with a number of recommendations for the Government to take forward.

The Review recounted the changes that had taken place in the Youth Justice System over the last decade, including how the Police and Youth Offending Services had sought to deal informally with minor offending by children. This led to one of the most successful outcomes of the change, in that there had been a dramatic decrease in the numbers of first time entrants to the Youth Justice System. However, whilst the numbers had fallen, the young people who entered and remained in the system were the most difficult to rehabilitate, often with complex issues.

The Review focused on the importance of the wider youth offending partnership of health, education, social care and other services providing a multi-agency and integrated response to a child's offending. The report identified a need for greater devolvement, freedoms and responsibility for the Youth Justice System to local authorities, who also held the statutory responsibility for education and protecting children.

The Review highlighted that the Youth Justice System and the wider partnerships that operated through it, needed to shift thinking to seeing a young person as a child first, and offender second. There needed to be a greater focus on improving life prospects through welfare, health (particularly mental health) and education rather than simply imposing punishment.

The Review made little reference to disproportionality of Black, Asian and ethnic minority (BAME) young people in the system, support for victims and addressing the risks of future offending, and the impact of children going missing, child sexual exploitation and sexually harmful behaviour on offending patterns.

The Government response to the review had been generally supportive of the recommendations made by Charlie Taylor, particularly the focus on education and health. However there were a number of areas where the Government acknowledged Taylor's concerns, but indicated that there may not be such radical change as

	<p>proposed. They included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Government would continue to ring-fence grants for the provision of Youth Justice Services within local authority funding to ensure sufficient funding for these services. • The Government agreed that the governance of the Youth Justice System needed to be reformed and would work with the YJB to review the governance and accountability framework for the whole system, with a focus on ensuring clearly defined outcomes and performance measures. • The Government understood the concerns raised about the appropriateness of the Crown Court hearing some youth cases. However, they felt that moving more cases out of the Crown Court into the Youth Court raised significant questions over, for example, access to trial by jury. • The Government were not keen to support the establishment of children's panels taking on sentencing functions, as this radical new approach raised a number of legal and practical issues. However the Government supported the principles underpinning the recommendations. <p>It was noted that Lord McNally was stepping down from the role of YJB Chair, and that Charlie Taylor had been appointed.</p> <p>HM Inspectorate of Prisons had inspected LBB YOS (Youth Offending Services) in January 2017. A report on the outcome of the inspection was due to be received on 23rd April 2017.</p> <p>Concerning the matter of gangs, the Group were informed that the Deputy Borough Police Commander was leading on this and other issues such as vulnerable adolescents, and child sexual abuse, and would be reporting to the Bromley Children's Safeguarding Board.</p>	
140	<p>ASB AND ENVIROCRIME SUB GROUP UPDATE</p> <p>The ASB (Antisocial Behaviour) and Envirocrime Sub Group Update was received from Terry Gooding (Borough Fire Commander).</p> <p>It was noted that the sub group membership had been defined, and a meeting schedule set in place. Mr Gooding felt that Operation Crystal had been very effective, and that it was ending on 16th March 2017. Operation Crystal had been focused on defined geographical areas. A new project was being developed, which was 'Community Impact Days'. These would be intelligence led and not restricted to pre-determined geographical areas. Funding for this had not been secured yet, but had been agreed in principle.</p> <p>RESOLVED that the ASB update be noted.</p>	<p>Action</p>

141	COMMUNICATIONS UPDATE	Action
	Andrew Rogers (LBB Communications Officer) was not present to provide the communications update.	
142	ANY OTHER BUSINESS	Action
	Mr Belcher encouraged the Group to persevere with efforts to reduce fly tipping.	
143	DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING	Action
	The next meeting of the Safer Bromley Partnership Strategic Group is scheduled for 8 th June 2017.	

The Meeting ended at 11.50 am

Chairman

This page is left intentionally blank

Report No.
CSD 17104

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: Safer Bromley Partnership Strategic Group

Date: 6th July 2017

Decision Type: Non Urgent Non Executive Non Key

Title: **MATTERS ARISING**

Contact Officer: Steve Wood, Democratic Services Officer
Tel: 020 8313 4316 E-mail: stephen.wood@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Mark Bowen, Director of Corporate Services

Ward: N/A

1. Reason for report

1.1 **Appendix A** updates Members on matters arising from previous meetings.

2. RECOMMENDATION

2.1 The Group is asked to review progress on matters arising from previous meetings.

Non-Applicable Sections:	Policy/Financial/Legal/Personnel
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	Minutes of the last meeting, and the previous Matters Arising Report.

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy
 2. BBB Priority: Excellent Council/Safer Bromley
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: No Cost
 2. Ongoing costs: Not Applicable
 3. Budget head/performance centre: Democratic Services
 4. Total current budget for this head: £343,810
 5. Source of funding: 2017/18 revenue budget
-

Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 8 posts (7.27fte)
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: Completion of "Matters Arising" reports for PP&S PDS meetings and partnership groups can take up to a few hours per meeting.
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: The Safer Bromley Partnership ("the Partnership") has been constituted to comply with the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 (as amended by section 97 and section 98 of the Police Reform Act 2002 and section 1 of the Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005). The Responsible Authorities identified by the Act have a statutory duty to work with other local agencies and organisations to develop and implement strategies to tackle crime and disorder including anti-social and other behaviour adversely affecting the local environment as well as the misuse of drugs in their area.
 2. Call-in: Not Applicable
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): This report is intended primarily for Members of the Safer Bromley Partnership Strategic Group.
-

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Not Applicable
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: N/A

<u>Minute Number/Title</u>	<u>Matters Arising</u>	<u>Update</u>
Minute 137 9th March 2017 Resilience Overview	It was resolved that the minutes of the next meeting of the Bromley Risk Forum be reported back to the Partnership.	The Bromley Risk Forum is due to meet in July and so the minutes are not yet available.
Minute 139b 9th March 2017 Prevent Update	It was resolved that an update on the rag status relating to the Prevent Action Plan would be provided at the next meeting.	Mr Vale will provide an update at the meeting on 6 th July.

This page is left intentionally blank

Executive Summary January 2017

Introduction

The Mayor's Office for Policing And Crime (MOPAC) has commissioned Restore:London (R:L) - a non-profit consortium (*Catch22, Restorative Solutions, Khulisa and IARS International Institute*), led by social business Catch22, to develop a London-wide Restorative Justice (RJ) service.

R:L seeks to increase the knowledge, access and take up of restorative interventions across London by increasing co-ordination, consistency and 'victim centricity' of existing RJ provision. The R:L vision is that of an accessible, collaborative, relational and victim-led pan London service; where all eligible victims can expect consistent high-quality restorative justice approaches and interventions.

A positive and restorative experience can positively impact the health and wellbeing of victims (ie. capacity to 'cope and recover'); as well as reducing the fear of crime and re-victimisation. A sustainable R:L service provision can ease the burden on public services from the long-term effects of crime on victims.

Service Overview

As part of delivering our vision, and ensuring we adhere to a restorative style of leadership underpinned by a set of **values**, namely:

- working **collaboratively and inclusively** with our network partners and stakeholders;
- **listening** (directly and indirectly) to the **voice of the victim**,
- providing them with **informed (voluntary and inclusive) choice**.

We value justice that focuses on **repairing harm done with and for those directly impacted by the crime**. We believe a Pan-London service needs **sustainable consistency in quality of provision**. To ensure this, we are committed to **sustaining a reflective, continuously learning network** – meeting national occupational standards; informed by international research and best practice.

R:L will operate a centralised referral and case allocation hub, working with a broad range of statutory and voluntary sector organisations. We aim to help facilitate and maintain a pan **London RJ Network**. This is a platform for service providers to build relationships, share knowledge and maximise the potential of the range of services being delivered across London.

Service Model

The R:L Service is available in all 32 London boroughs, and is offered to all those victimised in London (offence taking place within London), or living in London (where the offence may have taken place outside of London) at any stage of the Criminal Justice System.

We will utilise a **hub and spoke service model**. The hub handles referrals, and provides service delivery and support through five geographical spokes. Each will cover 5-6 London boroughs, and be aligned with the five MPS Witness and Case Management departments across London.

Service provision will be informed by service user feedback and in response to needs that have been identified through a network of professionals working with victims. This model seeks to serve and integrate with wider provision / partners pan London, and national and borough based services as appropriate; maximising the value and capacity for RJ services more broadly. R:L recognise that

strong positive relationships with existing RJ providers in London will be central to the success of this project.

It will be supported by a Communications and Marketing Strategy, primarily focused on raising awareness with victims and the wider public, and crucially in engaging partners and stakeholders in order to drive referrals.

In our quest to facilitate consistent and co-ordinated quality provision pan-London, we seek to engage with statutory and voluntary sector providers. This **Partner Network (Network)** will include victims' services, RJ services, Metropolitan Police, Youth Offending Teams, Victim Support, probation services, prisons and faith and community groups. This is an incredible opportunity to improve and harness the wealth of knowledge and experience that exists across London, with the net result of improving the lives of those who have been victims of crime in our capital.

The Network will also be the focus for a R:L Training & Development Hub, helping partners maintain commonly agreed standards, practice and quality assurance based on the National Occupational Standards for RJ and the RJC's Best Practice Guidance. Scope exists for provision of training and development (new practitioners, development for experienced practitioners, awareness training for stakeholders, access to accreditation and case supervision).

Governance and Scrutiny:

The London Restorative Justice Service Steering Group provides strategic and operational direction to develop a co-ordinated, cohesive approach to developing and delivering the Service. This includes compliance with the Code of Practice for Victims of Crime¹, and adhering to the Restorative Justice Council standards.

The **User Scrutiny Panel** is a group of individuals who have been victims of crime. The panel will continually evaluate and feedback on our progress. Taking a victim-centric approach, this group will share evidence and insights to enable continuous improvement. Our aim is to gain a 360-degree perspective from service users and partners across the network, in line with our vision and values.

The **Innovation Lab** ensures that R:L remains informed by the latest national and international research. We believe it's crucial to share new and best practice in RJ across the partner network, in order to offer and deliver a high-quality service to victims of crime in London.

R:L will work with MOPAC's internal Evidence and Insight team to collect and analyse performance and outcomes data, so as to monitor and evaluate our service. The User Scrutiny Panel will contribute to monitoring and evaluation by scrutinising data on a regular basis, to ensure that we deliver a service that truly listens to the voice of the victim - responding to, and meeting the needs of victims as identified by them.

1 <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-code-of-practice-for-victims-of-crime>

Restorative Justice – Quick Guide

Restorative Justice is a process that can bring victims and offenders into facilitated contact. Restorative Justice is:

- Victim-led and provides victims with the opportunity to explain the full effects of the crime and have their questions answered
- Allows offenders to take responsibility and understand the real impact of their behaviour.
- A restorative experience can positively impact the health and wellbeing of victims (i.e. capacity to ‘cope and recover’); as well as reducing the fear of crime and re-victimisation.

Requirements of Restorative Justice

- There must be a direct victim
- The offender has to admit some responsibility
- Participation requires voluntary consent

Victims and offenders can be brought into facilitated contact by a variety of means such as

- Face-to-face facilitated meeting
- Shuttle mediation
- Letter

When can Restorative Justice be used?

- It can be used at **any stage** of criminal proceedings e.g. NFA, Conditional Caution, Charge, Post Sentence etc

What happens if I have a suitable case?

- This is a free service therefore, once a suitable case is identified, you can email the R:L inbox with the details. Then you will be contacted by a Restorative Justice Practitioner who will assess the case circumstances and will, if appropriate, contact the victim/offender while keeping you updated throughout the process

What is the difference between a Community Resolution and Restorative Justice?

- A Community Resolution is an out of court disposal outcome.
- Restorative Justice is **not** a disposal; it is a practice that brings an offender and victim and / or community into facilitated contact to discuss the impact of the offending and to forge a positive way forward.
- Restorative Justice can be applied to complement any stage of criminal proceedings from out of court disposal right through to post sentence.
- Community Resolutions can however, impose restorative elements for example: a letter of apology, victim conferencing or repairing damage.

Contacts: R:L Inbox: Info@restorelondon.org.uk, Tel: 03001023031

This page is left intentionally blank