

# Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel

7th September 2010

<b>MINUTES</b>	<b>Present:</b>
	Councillor Bill Hartnett (Chair) and Councillors Simon Chalk and Anita Clayton
	<b>Also Present:</b>
	M Collins (Standards Committee), ADI V Reay and Insp I Joseph (West Mercia Police)
	<b>Officers:</b>
	B Houghton
	<b>Committee Services Officers:</b>
	J Bayley, D Sunman

## 12. APOLOGIES AND NAMED SUBSTITUTES

Apologies were received from on behalf of Councillor Wanda King and co-opted member, Councillor Sheila Blagg.

ADI V Reay attended as a substitute for Councillor Sheila Blagg (West Mercia Police Authority).

Apologies for absence were also received from S Hanley (Redditch Borough Council), K Hazeldine (Redditch Anti-Harassment Partnership) and A Burnett (West Mercia Police).

## 13. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND OF PARTY WHIP

Councillor A Clayton declared a personal interest because her husband was a member of the West Mercia Police Authority Board.

There were no other declarations of interest nor of any party whip.

## 14. MINUTES

**RESOLVED that**

.....  
Chair

# Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel

7th September 2010

---

**the minutes of the meeting of the Panel held on 15th July 2010 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.**

## **15. ACTIONS LIST**

Members noted the content of the Panel's Action List from the meeting on 15th July 2010.

Officers reported that all actions would be completed by 8th September 2010.

**RESOLVED that**

**the report be noted.**

## **16. SEXUAL ASSAULT REFERRAL CENTRE (SARC)**

The Chair welcomed ADI Vikki Reay, from the West Mercia Police Authority and lead officer for the Rape Steering Group. She had been invited to deliver a presentation on Sexual Assault Referral Centres (SARC).

Members were informed that the aim of a SARC was to promote recovery and health following a rape or sexual assault on victims, whether or not the victim wished to report it to the Police and that these services would be best provided by a range of public, independent and third sector providers co-located in one place.

West Mercia Police had been working to establish a SARC in Worcestershire since 2003. The Department of Health's National Operating Framework for 2010/11 confirmed that Primary Care Trusts (PCT) had a crucial role in working with local partners to ensure that a properly resourced SARC would be in place in every area by 2011. Only four areas, including West Mercia, had not established or begun work to establish a SARC in their area.

A SARC Board had been established and their first meeting would be held on 1st October 2010 when it was expected that the Vision agreement would be confirmed. The Board would be jointly chaired by an Assistant Chief Constable from West Mercia Police and the Director of Public Health, Shropshire PCT with additional Chief Executive representation from other PCTs in the area.

Ms Reay reported that the resourcing of SARCs varied greatly nationally and identifying sustainable funding had been challenging and would continue to be so. Many agencies were awaiting

# Crime and Disorder

## Scrutiny Panel

7th September 2010

---

information from Central Government's October Spending Review to enable prioritisation of their limited resources.

Other key challenges for SARC delivery, nationally and locally, had been identified as:

- (a) (National Operational Framework amendments 2010 including removal of PCTs and Strategic Health Authorities in 2013 and the introduction of GP Commissioning Services;
- (b) cost neutral interim solutions; and
- (c) sustainable funding arrangements.

The Chair thanked Ms Reay for an informative presentation.

**RESOLVED that**

**the report be noted.**

### **17. QUESTIONS FOR WORCESTERSHIRE PCT**

The Panel was asked to propose questions for the consideration of representatives from Worcestershire PCT on the subject of Sexual Assault Referral Centres (SARC).

Members agreed the following questions:

- 1) What is your provision at the moment for victims of sexual violence?
- 2) What funding could you provide to support a Sexual Assault Referral Centre (SARC) in the West Mercia area?
- 3) Please could you briefly outline what changes are due to be made to the NHS and in particular local PCTs?
- 4) How are these changes to NHS and PCT provision of services likely to impact locally on potential support for a SARC?

**RESOLVED that**

**the questions as noted above be sent to officers of Worcestershire PCT prior to their attendance at the following meeting of the Panel.**

# Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel

7th September 2010

---

## 18. POLICING WHITE PAPER - POLICING IN THE 21ST CENTURY: RECONNECTING POLICE AND THE PEOPLE

Members considered the White Paper, "Policing in the 21st Century: Reconnecting Police and the People" and were asked whether they wished to have the Panel's comments included in the White Paper consultation process. Members also considered written feedback on the questions posed in the White Paper from the Panel's co-opted Member, Councillor Sheila Blagg. This had been provided at the request of the Chair of the Panel because she had been unable to attend the Panel meeting.

The White Paper included chapters on the following with the addition of a foreword by the Home Secretary:

- 1) The Challenge;
- 2) Increasing Democratic Accountability;
- 3) Removing Bureaucratic Accountability;
- 4) A National Framework for Efficient Local Policing; and
- 5) Tackling Crime Together.

Chapters 2 to 5 included a number of questions for comment.

Following the advice of Officers Members agreed that it would not be appropriate for the Panel to comment on the Questions contained Chapter 3 as these were concerned with internal Police processes rather than with the wider implications for local Community Safety Partnerships.

Members discussed and considered their response to each of the questions.

### **RESOLVED that**

- 1) **the Panel's comments on "Policing in the 21st Century" be forwarded to the Home Office for consideration; and**
- 2) **the report be noted.**

## 19. REFERRALS

The Panel considered an invitation from the Home Office to comment on its desire to reduce prescriptive regulations for Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs).

Members were informed that the proposed changes were a move by the Coalition Government towards localism, developing accountability to the public and removing unnecessary bureaucracy,

# **Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel**

**7th September 2010**

---

as set out in Chapter 5 of the consultation on "Policing in the 21st Century" (Minute 18 above refers) and runs in parallel to that consultation process.

Officers clarified how each the proposed changes to the regulations would impact on Community Safety Partnerships.

**RESOLVED that**

- 1) **the Panel's comments, as attached to these minutes, be forwarded to the Home Office; and**
- 2) **the report be noted.**

**20. WORK PROGRAMME**

Members considered the Panel's Work Programme.

**RESOLVED that**

**the contents of the Panel's Work Programme be noted.**

**SARC Presentation (Minute 16 above refers)**

**Community Safety Partnerships Consultation (Minute 19 above refers)**

The Meeting commenced at 7.00 pm  
and closed at 10.00 pm



# Sexual Assault Referral Centre; SARC

Redditch Crime and Disorder  
Scrutiny Panel

7.9.10

ADI Vikki Reay

Rape Steering Group Lead



## Drivers for SARC

- 'Without Consent' 2006
- 'Together we can end violence against women and girls', a strategy November 2009
- Stern Review December 2009
- 'Rape the Victim Experience Review' Sara Payne MBE November 2009
- 'Mainstreaming the commissioning of local services to address violence against women and girls' December 2009
- National Operating Framework; 4.16; Dept of Health December 2009
- ACPO Rape Support Programme West Mercia 13<sup>th</sup>, 14<sup>th</sup> October 2009
- NST Dept of Health 'Rape' April 2010



SERVING - PROTECTING - MAKING THE DIFFERENCE



## **SARC**

**A SARC aims to promote recovery and health following a rape or sexual assault on victims, whether or not the victims wish to report to the police.**

**SARC services are likely to be delivered by a range of public, independent and third sector providers, ideally all in one location.**



## **10 Minimum elements for SARC**

- 1. 24 hour access to crisis support, first aid, safeguarding, specialist clinic and forensic care**
- 2. Appropriately trained Crisis Workers**
- 3. Choice of Gender of Physician, wherever possible**
- 4. Access to Forensic Physicians and others who are appropriately trained**



5. Dedicated forensically approved premises
6. Medical consultation includes risk assessment of harm. Immediate access to emergency contraception, post exposure prophylaxis, and other acute mental or sexual health services
7. Access to support, advocacy and follow-up provided through an Independent Sexual Violence Advisor



**8. Well Co-ordinated Interagency arrangements**

**9. The SARC has a core team to provide 24/7 service to meet NHS standards of clinical governance and WTD**

**10. A minimum dataset and appropriate data collection procedures in each SARC.**



## **National Operating Framework 2010-11 DoH**

**4.16; ‘PCTs will continue to work as a member of the crime and disorder reduction partnership to identify and share information effectively in order to support local action on reducing violent crime – especially serious youth violence, including knife crime, and violence against women and children…… PCTs have a crucial role in working with local partners to ensure that a properly resourced sexual assault referral centre can be in place in every area by 2011. The National Support Team on Response to Sexual Violence and additional central funding will be available to help with this process.’**

**Not amended in June 2010**

# Statistical Information Reports of Rape

## West Mercia

2008-09 262                      2009-10 250

## Worcestershire

2008-09 105 (40%)              2009-10 113 (45.2%)

## North Worcestershire

2008-09 48 (18.3%)              2009-10 63 (25.2%)

## Redditch

2008-09 34 (13%)                2009-10 37 (14.8%)

## **NST Response to Sexual Violence West Mercia report 27<sup>th</sup> April 2010**

**One off meeting between ACC and PCT chief executives to agree a shared vision for West Mercia SARC**

**Terms of reference and membership of SARC joint Commissioning Group should be revisited to create a SARC Strategic Board.**

**NST recommend that the Strategic Board develop and agree a costed action plan to ensure delivery of high quality service for victims of sexual violence in West Mercia, with clearly defined timelines.**

**The duty of care to victims of sexual violence should be addressed as a matter of urgency..**

**The Strategic Board may wish to consider an interim approach to ensure the needs of victims are met adequately.**

**NST recommend Strategic Board reviews current procurement arrangements for FMEs**

**Consistent appropriate fast track arrangements are developed and implemented to ensure access to STI management, emergency hormonal contraception and Post Exposure Prophylaxis for victims.**

**Commissioners should ensure access to the new 5-day emergency hormonal contraception.**



## Good Practice

**Needs and Gaps analysis document used to support the development of a strategy on sexual violence and abuse in women and girls in Shropshire and Telford and Wrekin is the highest standard we have seen to date.**

**The ‘West Mercia Sexual Assault Referral Centre; A business case’ is a well structured, evidence based and informative document that should be helpful to commissioners in West Mercia and elsewhere in the country.**

**Where are we now**

- **ISVA provision Worcestershire; WRSASC**
- **SARC Board being established; 1<sup>st</sup> meeting due in October 2010**
- **Joint Chair ACC Simon Chesterman, and Professor Rod Thomson, Director of Public Health Shropshire PCT.**

- **Additional Chief executive representation at PCT level; Dr Richard Harling, Worcestershire; Rev Pam Bickley Telford and Wrekin; Dr Ali Akeem Herefordshire.**
- **Vision agreement to be confirmed in October 2010.**
- **Worcestershire PCT Needs Gap analysis in process. Shropshire analysis underway. Herefordshire needs gap analysis completed.**

## **Key Challenges nationally and locally for SARC delivery**

- **Government Spending Review September 2010**
- **National Operational Framework amendments 2010; including removing PCTs in 2013, removing Strategic Health Authority 2013; introducing GP Commissioning services**
- **Cost neutral interim solutions**
- **Sustainable funding arrangements**

Thank you

Any Questions?

ADI Vikki Reay

[vikki.reay@westmerciam.pnn.police.uk](mailto:vikki.reay@westmerciam.pnn.police.uk)

01905 747013





## Community Safety Partnerships Consultation

### The Government has committed to freeing up and improving Community Safety Partnerships.

In July 2010 the Government outlined its proposals for police reform in the consultation document, 'Policing in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: Reconnecting police and the people'.

Chapter 5, 'Tackling crime together', sets out the Government's commitment to improving the partnership between the police and the public and to helping partners work together to solve local issues.

The Government identifies that Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) have been effective in preventing crime but that they need to have more freedom and flexibility. While the core statutory duty for key partners to work together will be retained, unnecessary prescription and bureaucracy should be removed so that partners can develop the structures best suited for their own circumstances and priorities.

### To do this we intend to reduce the regulations which prescribe the way Community Safety Partnerships operate

Details of regulations we propose to repeal / retain are set out on pages 2 to 5.

We would like your views on the proposals for repealing / retaining certain regulations, including:

- Any risks associated with repealing regulations as proposed
- Any other regulations you think could / should be repealed without having a detrimental impact on local partnership working

We will be consulting separately in Wales as some of these regulations are separate or apply differently in Wales.

Please send your responses to [paula.milner@gowm.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:paula.milner@gowm.gsi.gov.uk) by **close, 8<sup>th</sup> September 2010**.

**Regulations to be repealed / retained**

<p><b>1. Purpose of regulations: Prescribes list of bodies CSPs must cooperate with and invite to participate</b></p>	<p>Summary</p> <p>These regulations prescribe descriptions of persons or bodies with whom the responsible authorities are required to cooperate in the formulation and implementation of strategies for the reduction of crime and disorder within local government areas. The list includes parish councils, governing bodies of schools, social landlords and voluntary organisations.</p>
<p>Statutory Instruments</p>	<p><a href="#">2452/1998</a>, <a href="#">2513/1998</a> &amp; <a href="#">483/1999</a> (<a href="#">hyperlinks to Statutory Instruments on www.opsi.gov.uk</a> )</p>
<p>Recommendation</p>	<p><b>Repeal all</b>                  These regulations are unnecessarily prescriptive and partners are best placed to decide which persons or bodies they should involve in the formulation and implementation of strategies.</p>
<p><b>Q. Do you agree with the recommendation above?</b></p> <p>The Redditch Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel, Redditch Borough Council's designated Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Committee, is concerned about this proposal to repeal the prescribed list of bodies that responsible authorities must co-operate with and invite to participate in the formulation and implementation of strategies for the reduction of crime and disorder. The Panel therefore does not agree with this recommendation.</p>	
<p><b>Q. What, if any, are the risks associated with repealing these regulations?</b></p> <p>The Panel believes that there are risks involved in repealing these regulations. There are a large number of organisations that are currently classified as 'co-operating bodies'. A number of these bodies recognise the value of working with local Community Safety Partnerships. Unfortunately, however, sometimes some of these bodies are less co-operative. Under these circumstances the regulations provide a useful lever to encourage the co-operating bodies to work with the Partnership to the benefit of community safety in the local community. In particular, we are concerned that registered landlords might be less inclined to work with Community Safety Partnerships if the regulations were to be repealed. This could have serious implications with regards to the ability of Community Safety Partnerships to tackle anti-social behaviour in local areas.</p>	



<p><b>2. Purpose of regulations: Requires CSPs to complete strategic assessments, produce partnership plans, consult the community, share information and have in place arrangements for appointing a chair</b></p>	
<p>Statutory Instruments <a href="#">1830/2007</a> &amp; <a href="#">647/2010</a> (England)</p>	
<p>Recommendation</p>	<p><b>Repeal</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requirement for the strategy group to have arrangements in place for the functions of the chair (Regulation 3: subsection 4)</li> <li>• Requirement for the strategy group to meet from time to time (Regulation 3: subsection 5)</li> <li>• Requirement for strategy group to consider whether the group have the right skills and knowledge (Regulation 3: subsection 7)</li> <li>• Requirement for the county strategy group to have arrangements in place for the functions of the chair (Regulation 8: subsection 3)</li> <li>• Requirement for the county strategy group to meet from time to time (Regulation 8: subsection)</li> <li>• Requirement for strategy group to hold public meetings, that the meetings should be attended by certain people and that the public should be informed about the meetings (Regulation 12: subsection 4)</li> <li>• Requirement for the strategy group to consider the extent to which local people might assist them in preparing the partnership plan (Regulation 13)</li> </ul> <p>We consider that these regulations are overly prescriptive.</p> <p><b>Retain</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requirement for strategic assessments</li> <li>• Requirement for partnership plans</li> <li>• Requirement for CSPs to consult the community</li> </ul> <p>We consider that regulations that set out a need for CSPs to formulate and implement strategies and that support the role of CSPs in engaging with the community are still helpful to ensure a level of consistency of approach.</p>
<p><b>Q. Do you agree with the recommendations above?</b></p> <p>The Redditch Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel believe that the requirements which may be repealed represent the minimum operating standards for local Community Safety Partnerships. Under these circumstances repealing these requirements would appear to be questionable as they should be shaping the standard governance frameworks for Community Safety Partnerships in the country. The Panel believes that retaining these requirements would be useful as they provide public reassurance of quality control and good governance for local Community Safety Partnerships.</p>	

<p><b>Q. What, if any, are the risks associated with repealing these regulations? (please specify which regulation the risk is associated with)</b></p> <p>Community Safety Partnerships should already be complying with these requirements as a minimum standard governance arrangement. The Panel has every confidence that the Redditch Community Safety Partnership, for example, complies with these requirements. However, the Panel recognises that there is a risk that if these requirements were to be repealed the operation of some partnerships could be negatively effected.</p>
<p><b>3. Purpose of regulations: Requires named authorities to share depersonalised information each quarter</b></p> <p>Statutory Instruments <a href="#">1831/2007</a>, <a href="#">1406/2008</a> &amp; <a href="#">656/2010</a></p> <p>Recommendation <b>Retain</b></p> <p>We consider that these regulations are necessary to ensure information is shared between partners. <b>Please note that we will be carrying out a separate, more detailed piece of work on information sharing to determine whether current powers and guidance are sufficient and appropriate.</b></p> <p><b>Q. Do you agree with the recommendation above? Please provide any further thoughts on these regulations that will help us in developing the more detailed piece of work on information sharing.</b></p> <p>The Redditch Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel agrees with this recommendation.</p>
<p><b>4. Purpose of regulations: Prescribes how the Crime and Disorder Overview and Scrutiny committee should operate</b></p> <p>Statutory Instruments <a href="#">942/2009</a> &amp; <a href="#">616/2010</a></p> <p>Recommendation <b>Repeal</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regulation for how the committee may co-opt additional members to serve on the committee (Regulation 3)</li> <li>• Requirement to meet annually (Regulation 4)</li> <li>• Requirement that any responses to the committee's reports/recommendations should be in writing and submitted within 28 days (Regulation 7)</li> </ul> <p>We consider that these regulations are overly prescriptive and that committees should be free to decide how they should operate.</p> <p><b>Retain</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requirement to share information</li> <li>• Regulation to allow committee to require an officer of a responsible authority to attend a committee</li> </ul>

	<p>meeting We consider these regulations are still helpful to ensure effective scrutiny and a level of consistency of approach.</p>
<p><b>Q. Do you agree with the recommendation above?</b></p> <p>The Redditch Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel largely agrees with the recommendations outlined above, though suggests that a few points of clarification should be provided in any final guidance or legislation that will be issued.</p> <p>The regulations with regards to co-opted membership currently exclude co-option from the local authority's Executive Committee. This corresponds with original requirements set out in the Local Government Act 2000 which separated the Executive and Overview and Scrutiny functions in local government. The Panel are questioning whether repealing the regulations on co-opted membership would provide Executive Committee members with an option to act as co-opted members of a designated crime and disorder scrutiny committee. The Panel would be concerned about this development as they agree that there should be a clear separation between the executive and Overview and Scrutiny. They are therefore suggesting that the Home Office should provide clarification about this matter when making any final decision on the subject.</p> <p>The Redditch Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel established local arrangements for the frequency of meetings. The Panel agreed that in order to develop expertise in scrutinising the work of Community Safety Partnerships meetings would need to take place more frequently than once per annum. The Panel therefore has a requirement to meet a minimum of four times per year, though it is likely that the Panel will act flexibly and meet more regularly as and when required. The Panel concur that this flexibility is important and suitable for determination at the local level.</p> <p>The requirement for responses to the Committee's recommendations and reports to be submitted within 28 days has always been interpreted flexibly by the Panel. The guidance issued by the Home Office originally stipulated that relevant partners "should submit a response within a period of 28 days from the date the report or recommendations are submitted (or if this is not possible as soon as reasonably possible thereafter)". (Home Office Guidance, May 2009). The Panel is aware of the competing priorities and duties impacting on both the Community Safety Partnership and local partner organisations. It therefore believes that the flexibility over the submission of responses to recommendations is reasonable, though there should remain a requirement for the Partnership and / or relevant partners to respond at some point to outline what action, if any, will be taken in response to the report and / or recommendations. This will ensure that the process remains as transparent as possible.</p>	

**Q. What, if any, are the risks associated with repealing these regulations?**

The Panel believe that there is a risk in some areas that by repealing the requirement to meet annually some local authorities will convene no meetings during the year to review the work of the local Community Safety Partnership.

**Q. Are there any other regulations that you think hinder the effective working of CSPs and should be repealed?**

The Panel has no further comments to add though would be prepared to contribute comments as part of any further consultation work that may occur in future.