



**MINUTES OF THE
LOCAL STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP
Safer Maidstone Partnership Meeting
25 November 2010 11.00 – 12.30, ROOM 6D, MAIDSTONE HOUSE**

Present:	Martin Adams David Hewetson Zena Cooke John Littlemore Lisa Smith John A Wilson (Cllr) Tracey Kadir Sarah Robson	Chair, Borough Commander, KFRS LSP Lead Officer, Community Safety Coordinator, MBS Director, Regeneration & Communities, MBC Chief Housing Officer, MBC Community Safety Manager, Golding Homes Cabinet Member for Community Services, MBC Asst. Chief Officer, Courts & Mid Kent Probation Services Community Partnerships Manager, MBC
Apologies:	Nick Silvester Robbie Graham Paul Shallcross Juliet Knott Jackie Bradley Annette Hinton Andy Hudson	Partnership Manager South Division, KFRS Inspector, Kent Police Preventative Services Manager, Kent Children's Services Golding Homes Sergeant, Kent Police Maidstone Mediation Governor, Maidstone Prison

	MINUTES	ACTION	DEADLINE
1.	Minutes of the Last Meeting on the 2nd September 2010 Page 5 - TK requested clarification on the item AH raised with regard to sex offenders, stating partners do not address the issue. The reference was acknowledged as incorrect. AH had acknowledged partners do address sex offenders' needs, but raised concern regarding continued service provision for sex offenders. MA proposed to amend the minutes. Partners agreed the change.	SR	By next meeting
2.	Actions/Matters Arising Item on membership of the partnership is Item 3 on the agenda. Page 4 - NS to circulate KFRS quarterly reports - in the absence of NS, MA agreed to follow up with NS.	MA	By next meeting

	MINUTES	ACTION	DEADLINE
	<p>Page 5 – No information was received from partners with regard to inappropriate images/messages on Facebook. ZC will follow up with partners to ascertain whether they have seen an increase in this area.</p> <p>Page 6 –SMP sub-groups is an item on the agenda.</p> <p>Page 6 –November’s Domestic Abuse Stakeholder event update is item on the agenda.</p> <p>Page 7 – MA asked whether any partners had attended the flood defence event at Teapot Lane September. No partners present had attended.</p>	ZC	By next meeting
3.	<p>Proposed Membership of the SMP</p> <p>MA circulated copies of the proposed membership of the SMP delivery group for comment.</p> <p>LS will check and confirm the most appropriate representative from Golding Homes.</p> <p>ZC queried whether it was appropriate to have two members from Kent County Council (KCC) Children’s Services. The group agreed that Paul Shallcross should be the lead KCC member, with the opportunity for other KCC representatives to attend as non-members.</p> <p>SR proposed two additional candidates who had expressed their interest in membership of the group; Lesleigh Bounds from KDAAT (who attends all other partnership meetings in the county) and Paul Alcock, Manager of The Mall shopping centre. The group agreed for invitations to be extended to both as they met the agreed criteria for membership.</p> <p>Members present approved the final membership. MA will present the proposals to the LSP Board on 15 December for their formal approval.</p>	<p>LS</p> <p>SR</p> <p>MA</p>	<p>By Dec 2010</p> <p>By Dec 2010</p> <p>15 Dec 2010</p>
4.	<p>Update from LSP Board</p> <p>MA confirmed his membership and attendance at the LSP Board, which meets every quarter (the next meeting is scheduled for 15 December) and is attended by all delivery group chairs across the Maidstone LSP. MA will provide the Board with a Chair’s update based on today’s meeting and will disseminate information from the Board to the next delivery group meeting in February 2011.</p> <p>ZC reported the proposals for the SMP to be part of the Maidstone</p>	MA	Feb 2011

	MINUTES	ACTION	DEADLINE
	LSP had been well received by the Board. The proposals advised the Board that the SMP would have fewer priorities based on the strategic assessment being co-ordinated by JL and DH . MA advised that tackling domestic abuse is a Board priority. DH confirmed that domestic abuse has been proposed as a priority issue within the Strategic Assessment refresh.		
5.	<p>Review of the SMP sub-groups</p> <p>JL presented a paper on the SMP's existing sub-groups. All groups had originally been set up to tackle a strategic priority, however many still existed beyond the timeframe of their original remit. JL had assessed the sub-groups for their purpose and relevance against the SMP's current priorities. The circulated paper proposed a series of recommendations for each sub-group.</p> <p>MA asked if partners had any views or comments.</p> <p>TK suggested the sub-groups should naturally come from those priorities identified from the strategic assessment.</p> <p>ZC suggested that all sub-groups/individuals should be reassured that this exercise is about formalising the SMP's structure and responsibility for its priorities. The exercise aims to strengthen and modify the sub-groups, rather than putting at risk the good work already done.</p> <p>MA suggested the delivery group should communicate this to the existing sub-groups. MA offered to meet with the sub-groups once the assessment was complete to explain what the SMP is trying to achieve. MA is keen for the SMP to have a role in supporting the process of helping to evolve and support the sub-groups. JL will ensure MA is invited to attend these meetings, once organised, with the relevant sub-groups.</p> <p>The report was agreed on the basis that the final set of sub-groups would be based on the SMP's agreed priorities arising from the Strategic Assessment Process. JL to produce a further report for the next SMP meeting.</p>	<p>JL</p> <p>JL</p>	<p>By next meeting</p> <p>By next meeting</p>
6.	<p>Strategic Assessment update</p> <p>JL updated the group on the strategic assessment, a key piece of work setting the SMP's future priorities. Following the recommendation of the September delivery group meeting, a task and finish group has been established with key partners to review existing priorities and ascertain whether data is available to support these as priority issues. Initial discussions had proposed reducing the 9 priorities to 4; anti-social behaviour, domestic</p>		

	MINUTES	ACTION	DEADLINE
	<p>abuse, road safety and drug and substance misuse.</p> <p>The 4 priorities had been chosen as they had broader links with other types of crime, e.g. drug and substance misuse is often linked with burglary crimes.</p> <p>The task and finish group had met prior to the SMP meeting to discuss future actions. JL and DH will take the lead, collating and analysing the crime data statistics and will report back at the next task and finish group meeting in December. The task and finish group will meet on a monthly basis until the assessment's completion in March 2011.</p> <p>JL will circulate the draft strategic assessment by the next delivery group meeting. JL advised that the task and finish group is a temporary working group, which will cease to exist once the strategic assessment is complete.</p> <p>ZC asked if the data is correct in terms of the four proposed priorities. JL advised that this could not be confirmed until the data has been analysed.</p> <p>JAW asked if data had been collated yet. DH confirmed that some data had been received, although it should be noted that probation data is likely to change. DH confirmed that the strategic assessment tackles crime as an inclusive perspective rather than just through the police.</p> <p>JAW asked for clarification on how the assessment's priorities had been established. ZC confirmed that the strategic assessment is updated on an annual basis. Priorities are set against data gathered in the borough, which ensures the assessment's priorities are set based on the borough's identified and evidenced needs.</p> <p>JL confirmed that the task and finish group meeting notes can be circulated to the delivery group. Members agreed this would be helpful. MA requested the task and finish meetings be extended to two hours as an hour had not been sufficient time for consideration of the data..</p>	<p>JL</p> <p>JL/SR</p>	<p>By next meeting</p> <p>By next meeting</p>
<p>7.</p> <p>7.1</p>	<p>Performance Management</p> <p>Performance exceptions report</p> <p>DH advised the group that he had spoken with RG regarding the performance exceptions report circulated to the delivery group. Unfortunately, RG and JB were unable to attend today's meeting. As Kent Police representatives, they are in the best position to</p>	<p>RG/JB</p>	<p>At next meeting</p>

	MINUTES	ACTION	DEADLINE
	<p>disseminate the information to the group. MA confirmed he would request RG/JB provide an update at the next meeting.</p> <p>DH was able to confirm that burglary (dwellings) had seen substantial increases, but these are still low against overall county figures.</p> <p>Sex offences have increased with the distribution of indecent images through the web/mobile technology contributing to the increase. Theft, drug offences and fraud have all seen increases. Domestic abuse has decreased, although figures for repeat victims are not available. TK mentioned she had seen data regarding repeats. ZC requested DH liaise with RG to obtain this information.</p> <p>With regard to abandoned vehicles, MA suggested the target for the fluctuations in the figures depends on scrap metal value going up and down.</p> <p>ZC questioned whether a condensed problem profile or an analysis of the key areas outlined could be made available to complement the performance exceptions report. DH confirmed he had made a request to RG to explain any changes in data. The group agreed it would be useful to consider these at the next meeting.</p>	<p>DH</p> <p>DH</p>	<p>By end Dec 2010</p> <p>By end Dec 2010</p>
7.2	<p>Sustainable Community Strategy</p> <p>SR is undertaking a refresh exercise of the Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS) on behalf of the LSP. This involves working with each delivery group to set priorities, actions, targets and performance measures. The SMP delivery group's current terms of reference include the following objectives:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue the decrease in overall rates of crime • Take a preventative approach to tackle and reduce anti-social behaviour • Promote Maidstone as a safe place to live • Reduce violent crime and reduce serious crime in the wards where the trend is higher than the borough average • Reduce alcohol related crime in the town centre • Reduce drug offences • Improve road safety <p>MA suggested that it is sensible to align the SCS, terms of reference and strategic assessment priorities. SR proposed that the SCS should reflect the priorities currently being set through the strategic assessment to ensure consistency across the partnership. This was supported by the group.</p> <p>JL confirmed that the strategic assessment task and finish group</p>		

	MINUTES	ACTION	DEADLINE
	<p>will incorporate discussions on the SCS refresh, including performance data availability and action setting.</p> <p>SR raised the need for community engagement to be integrated as a priority across all delivery groups. ZC will request Roger Adley from the Borough Council's Communications team to review the LSP's planned Communication and Engagement Strategy, with a view to incorporating the requirements of the SMP.</p> <p>ZC proposed the LSP Away Day held annually in February is a good time to present the SCS refresh to LSP partners, including the SMP's priorities.</p>	ZC	By end Dec 2010
8.	Any other business		
8.1	<p>SMP Funding requests</p> <p>JL advised the group of a funding request for Porchlight services for street homelessness. Maidstone Borough Council's Housing Service, Canterbury Housing Service and Porchlight have previously been successful in a bid to support two outreach workers. However, the funding is time limited, only 1 year. JL advised SMP partners that the request was for £5,000 from the SMP's current under-spend.</p> <p>ZC asked how much uncommitted funding the SMP currently has. DH confirmed this was approximately £18,000.</p> <p>DH also advised the group of requested funding for the Community Safety Unit's "<i>Stay Safe this Christmas</i>" campaign- i.e. chains for purses, SmartWater etc. The unit are requesting £5,000 funding to support crime prevention issues.</p> <p>ZC confirmed that the SMP has not had a protocol for approving funding requests, but in the absence of such a protocol felt both requests should be brought to this meeting for discussion.</p> <p>MA proposed that the SMP should support both initiatives. All partners present agreed. MA suggested the remainder of unallocated funding (£8,000) for this year could be transferred into next year's budget if this was possible, given the anticipated funding reductions. DH will clarify with KCC, as it is their funding and will inform partners of the decision.</p> <p>SR suggested the LSP's criteria for awarding and monitoring its performance reward grants could be updated for administering SMP funding. MA asked the group for views and all agreed this would be useful. The group agreed to fund both requests and JL and the CSU would be asked to complete a form retrospectively for funding.</p>	<p>DH</p> <p>SR/JL/DH</p>	<p>By 31 Dec 2010</p> <p>By 31 Dec 2010</p>

	MINUTES	ACTION	DEADLINE
8.2	<p>The group agreed that a protocol for managing SMP funding was needed. JL to provide a report with proposals for consideration at the next SMP meeting.</p> <p>DV Stakeholder event update</p> <p>SR updated the group on the Domestic Abuse stakeholder event held on 12 November at Lenham Community Centre. The event was commissioned by the LSP SMP delivery group and delivered in partnership with the Maidstone Domestic Violence Forum. Over 90 people attended the event, including Helen Grant MP. The day included presentations from practitioners and agencies and a workshop session explored prevention, intervention, education and enforcement, identifying the priorities for Maidstone, best practice and gaps/barriers in the service. Initial feedback has identified a number of recurring themes including the need for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A co-ordinated agency approach for tackling DA in the borough • Better early intervention • Provision of a one stop shop • Better information and training for practitioners and victims <p>SR noted that the SMP's strategic assessment has proposed domestic abuse as a priority, suggesting a working group with a lead agency is the next step forward.</p> <p>ZC asked whether the delivery group would consider supporting a virtual social networking approach as part of the very positive response to the DV event. TK advised that Swale Borough Council had created a similar network. SR to research the options and update the group at the next meeting.</p> <p>MA thanked SR and the Community Partnership support officers for their efforts to ensure the day's success.</p>	JL	By next meeting
8.3	<p>National accredited training for health trainers</p> <p>ZC circulated information regarding the NHS' free training programme for potential Health Trainers. The sessions tackle life style choices, e.g. drug and alcohol misuse, weight management and smoking cessation. ZC agreed to forward the information and asked partners to confirm if they wished to participate.</p>	SR	By next meeting
8.4	<p>JAW observed that there were very few partners attending today's meeting. ZC confirmed that three were not here due to meeting clashes – one on holiday. It was noted that the previous SMP Strategy group meeting dates were potentially still in people's diaries and had caused some confusion. MA asked SR to</p>	ZC/ALL	By Dec 2010
		SR	By Dec

	MINUTES	ACTION	DEADLINE
	confirm to partners all 2011 meeting dates and times, to avoid future diary clashes.		2010
9.	<p>Dates of Future Meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Safer Maidstone Partnership Delivery Group <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 24 February 2011 • 16 June 2011 • 6 September 2011 ➤ LSP Board (for info for reporting purposes) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15 December 2010 • 23 March 2011 		