

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
STRONG AND SUPPORTIVE COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
HELD IN THE
BOURGES & VIERSEN ROOMS, TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH**

21 JULY 2010

Present:	Councillors Todd (Chairman), S Day, Collins, Simons, JR Fox	
Also Present:	DCI Gary Goose	Safer Peterborough Strategy Manager
Officers in Attendance:	Paul Phillipson	Executive Director – Operations
	Adrian Chapman	Head of Neighbourhoods
	Christine Graham	Safer Peterborough Partnership Manager
	Paulina Ford	Performance Scrutiny and Research Officer
	David O'Connor-Long	Solicitor

1. Apologies

Apologies had been received from Councillors Fletcher, and Goldspink. Apologies were also received from Ansar Ali, co-opted member representing the Cambridgeshire Police Authority.

2. Declarations

There were no declarations of interest.

3. Minutes of the meeting held on 16 June 2010

The minutes of the Strong and Supportive Communities Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 16 June 2010 were approved as an accurate record, subject to:

Review of the Work Programme – paragraph 7 on page 4 – to read January 2011 and not January 2010.

4. Call In of any Cabinet, Cabinet Member or Key Officer Decisions

There were no requests for Call-in to consider.

CRIME AND DISORDER SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

5. The Development of Integrated Offender Management (IOM)

The report informed the Committee of the progress, development and impact of the Integrated Offender Management programme over the past year. DCI Goose reported to Members that the programme was continuing to develop and had so far been successful. This success could be evidenced by the reduction of offences over the past year especially burglary which had reported 240 fewer offences this year and which meant 240 fewer victims. IOM was an important tool for reducing offences and the Programme was about investing now to save in the future. The programme included targeting young people at an early stage to help them change their attitude about offending. DCI Goose commended the IOM programme to the Committee and asked for their support for the continuation of the programme.

Observations and questions were raised around the following areas:

- With regards to anti-social behaviour, was it true that these offences did not always lead to court? Members were informed that this was the case and if it could be sorted out without legal recourse it would be better in the long term.
- Members felt that the IOM programme was excellent. In the current climate there was often more focus on financial benefit but the savings from this programme were often not cashable. DCI Goose agreed with this and advised Members that IOM was about fewer victims and making the city safer. Now that there were fewer burglaries they could concentrate on some of the other issues like vehicle crime and people who regularly got into fights on a Saturday night.
- Statistics showed that one in four people in the UK would suffer mental health problems at some point. Nine out of ten prisoners suffered mental health issues but what was being done to work with Health to address this? Members were informed that work was already being done with Health and good pathways were being established for known mental health diagnosed illnesses. However there was still a need to establish ways of dealing with people who sometimes suffered slight mental health problems.
- What was the Social Impact Bond? Members were informed that it was a way of rethinking finance for social outcomes. It was a contract between a public sector body and Social Impact Bond investors, in which the former committed to pay for an improved social outcome and investor funds were used to pay for a range of interventions to improve the social outcome. This was a new initiative and the first issue had been used to fund social organisations who were working to reduce the re-offending rates of short sentence male prisoners leaving Peterborough Prison.
- What was the Key's Project and the Dawn Project? Members were advised that the Key's Project was about capturing the next level of offenders that were classed as just below the prolific and priority offenders. The Dawn Project was funded by the Ministry of Justice and was available to women throughout Cambridgeshire. The project offered women information, support and an opportunity to change aspects of their lives they were not happy with. It dealt with women who had very complex cases.
- How could this Committee help you? The officer requested that the Committee take a message back to Cabinet that the IOM project was not a soft option but was key to reducing crime in the City and that it should continue to be supported long term. The vision for IOM was to start working with the children of offenders so that they did not become offenders. This needed long term planning and investment.

The Committee whole heartedly supported the continued development of the Integrated Offender Management Programme and recognised the valuable impact the IOM Programme had already made on the reduction of serious acquisitive crime and burglary in the City.

RECOMMENDATION

That following consideration by the Committee of the Integrated Offender Management (IOM) Programme it is recommended that Councillor Lee and Councillor Fitzgerald as the Council's representatives on the Cambridgeshire Police Authority:

- i. support the views of this Committee in relation to IOM, and
- ii. on the Committee's behalf champion the programme for continued resourcing to sustain its ongoing future development.

6. Citizens Power Programme

The report informed the Committee of the new Citizen Power Programme in Peterborough. The Head of Neighbourhoods advised the Committee that the Council had entered into a unique collaborative agreement with the Royal Society for the Arts (RSA) and the Arts Council (East) to develop and deliver the Citizen Power Programme for an initial period of

two years. The programme focused on developing new ways of supporting local people and their communities in tackling the most challenging issues to make a positive difference. It was aimed at bringing local people together to shape the city's future by getting them more involved in public life and encouraging active citizenship. The idea was to renew civic activism with people becoming more engaged, resourceful, self-reliant, resilient and creative. The programme currently had seven distinctive projects:

- Sustainable Citizenship
- Building Recovery Capital
- Peterborough Curriculum
- Civic Commons
- Arts and Social Change
- Making Social Media Social
- Civic Health Audit

Observations and questions were raised around the following areas:

- Members felt that historically the Council did not engage and listen to the citizens of Peterborough and to enable the programme to work this would have to change. The Officer agreed with that view but this was a unique programme to Peterborough and was not being done anywhere else in the Country.
- Who would take the lead for the programme and what was the difference between this programme and neighbourhood councils? Members were advised that Graeme Clark would be the project manager for the programme. The Head of Neighbourhoods role would be to embed the programme and make it part of the core business. Neighbourhood Councils would be part of the programme and would be used as a delivery vehicle.
- Who would be funding the programme? Members were advised that the Council had provided funding of £125K each year for two years and the RSA and Arts Council had each matched this. The programme had the potential to deliver something powerful and was expected to produce long term radical change. It was a new way of delivering public services without affecting the public purse. A major part of the programme was using different ways to engage people for example through the arts.
- The social media strand involving building websites was an excellent idea and could the existing Council website be used as a portal for these? Members were advised that they would link to existing technology.
- The Paston local delivery team was currently completing a mapping exercise, would this be replicated across the city? Members were advised that this would be done in some other communities but not all, but similar mechanisms would be used to engage people.
- Was there an opportunity for social networking to be taken forward through the Council's website? The Officer responded that IBM was already doing work in the city and he was working with them concerning social networking and that there would be a direct association with the Council website.
- The Committee agreed that the programme was very positive and they committed to supporting it in any way they could. The Committee suggested that each member should champion one of the strands of the programme and work with officers to help take it forward. The Committee requested that at each of the remaining meetings during the year the Head of Neighbourhoods give a more detailed presentation of the work being done on each of the strands of the programme. The Member Champion for each strand could co-present this with him. The Scrutiny Officer would contact members to assign strands to each member.

ACTION AGREED

- i. That each member of the Committee chooses one of the seven strands of the Citizens Power Programme and works with the lead officer to Champion the work being done within that strand.
 - Sustainable Citizenship
 - Building Recovery Capital
 - Peterborough Curriculum
 - Civic Commons
 - Arts and Social Change
 - Making Social Media Social
 - Civic Health Audit
- ii. The Scrutiny Officer to co-ordinate with Committee Members and the Head of Neighbourhoods to facilitate this going forward.
- iii. That the Head of Neighbourhoods reports back to the committee in detail on the work of each of the seven strands of the Citizens Power programme at future meetings.

7. Scrutiny Big Debate – Issues Paper

The report provided the Committee with information regarding the outcomes of the Scrutiny Big Debate held on 16 February at the Key Theatre.

The Scrutiny Big Debate involved an investigation by the four Scrutiny Committees in to how the economic downturn had affected the City in terms of its aspirations for growth, levels of crime, requirements to support vulnerable people and its credentials for environmental sustainability with particular reference to transport. It was a pioneering piece of work that had been designed and delivered in consultation with the Centre for Public Scrutiny.

The scope of the review for the Strong and Supportive Communities Scrutiny Committee had been to look at how the economic downturn had affected the amount and type of crime in Peterborough. The event involved a group of students from the Key Youth Theatre who put on a short performance that told the story of a family living in Peterborough who had been affected by the economic downturn. After the performance the audience were able to question a panel of representatives from partner organisations on the effects of the economic downturn and crime in Peterborough. The Committee were now asked to delegate to the Group Representatives consideration of which items should be added to the Committee's work programme.

ACTION AGREED

- (i) To note the outcomes from the Scrutiny Big Debate.
- (ii) To delegate to the Group Representatives consideration of which items should be added to the Committee's work programme.
- (iii) To receive an update on the progress of the outcomes at a future meeting.

8. Forward Plan of Key Decisions

The Committee received the latest version of the Council's Forward Plan, containing key decisions that the Leader of the Council anticipated the Cabinet or individual Cabinet Members would make during the course of the following four months. Members were invited to comment on the Plan and, where appropriate, identify any relevant areas for inclusion in the Committee's work programme.

Members noted that two items on the forward plan were incorrectly allocated to the Committee and requested that the Scrutiny Officer get this amended. The two items were in relation to:

- Legal Services for the medium Term Financial Strategy
- And Extension of the banking Services Contract with Barclays Bank

ACTION AGREED

The Committee noted the Forward Plan and agreed that there were no items to bring to the Committee.

9. Work Programme

Members considered the Committee's Work Programme for 2010/11 and discussed possible items for inclusion.

The Chair raised an item on behalf of Councillor Goldspink which concerned a recent incident involving the death of a resident in Peterborough and the question of why people were reluctant to get involved and help people in trouble. Councillor Goldspink had requested that an item be added to the work programme to look into this further. The Head of Neighbourhoods advised the Committee that this type of issue would come under the Civic Health Audit strand of the Citizens Power programme and that it would be a good example to use in a pilot to understanding peoples behaviour and beliefs. He advised Members that it would be included under this strand of work and he would report back to the Committee at a future meeting.

The Executive Director of Operations advised that the report on The Approach to Restorative Justice in Schools in Peterborough from Dr Hilary Cremin which was due to come to the Committee in September would be delayed. He was unable to give a new date for the report at the meeting but advised that it would be sometime during this municipal year.

ACTION AGREED

To confirm the work programme for 2010/11 and the Scrutiny Officer to make any amendments as discussed during the meeting.

The meeting began at 7.00 and ended at 8.40pm

CHAIRMAN

This page is intentionally left blank