

RECORD OF MEETING

Meeting: Safer York Partnership Board meeting
Date and Time: Tuesday 1st September 2020
Location: via Teams
Chair: Sharon Houlden

**Attendees:**

Name	Role
Alison Semmence ASe	Chief Exec CVS
Amber White AW	Community Safety Hub
Andrew Blades AB	North Yorkshire Fire & Rescue
Angela Stabeler ASt	Department of Work & Pensions
Jane Mowat JM	Community Safety Hub / Safer York Partnership
Leigh Bell LBe	City of York Council Public Health
Paul Morrison PM	Community Safety Hub
Rachel Harvey RH	Make It York
Sandra Chatters SC	Probation CRC
Sara Orton SO	City of York Council Youth Justice Service
Sharon Houlden SH	Corporate Director of HHASC & Chair
Superintendent Lindsey Butterfield LB	North Yorkshire Police York & Selby Commander
Tanya Lyon TL	Community Safety Hub

Apologies:

Name	Role
Amanda Hatton	Director Children, Education & Communities CYC
Andrew Lawson CA	Executive Director York BID
Cllr Darryl Smalley DS	City of York Council
Cllr Denise Craghill DC	City of York Council
Dave Ellis DE	Acting Area Commander NYP
Louise Johnson /Simon Godley	National Probation Service
Melanie Liley ML	York Teaching Hospital Foundation Trust
Michelle Carrington	Vale of York CCG
Neil Ferris	Director of Economy and Place CYC
Nicole Hutchinson NH	Representing Police & Crime Commissioner
Odette Robson	NYCC Head of Safer Communities
Sharon Stoltz	City of York Council Director Public Health
Vacant post (to be Nicholas Harne)	City of York Council, Housing Operations Manager

Items and Decisions:

No	Discussion	Action
1	<p>The Chair welcomed attendees. Introductions were made including two new members. The Partnership had last met in March and could not have foreseen events that lay ahead. SH advised that she did not intend to go through the minutes of the previous meeting or matters arising as this would seem rather hollow in light of the pandemic that had followed.</p>	
2	<p>Future of Safer York Partnership i) Terms of Reference ii) Frequency of Meetings</p> <p>SH thought it fortunate that the group had had the away day and chance to plan the future of the Partnership at the beginning of the year. Views were sought from around the virtual table on the revised TOR circulated on the day of the meeting and the frequency of future meetings. SH noted that there were more partnership members not on the call than in attendance and with the work taking place mainly within organisations the current format did not attract huge attendance. The focus should be the quality of the interventions.</p> <p>LB had looked at the revised TOR and nothing stood out as needing changing. She felt it was fair to say that the Partnership had struggled to attract key people to the quarterly meetings and it was sensible to review this. Work happened outside of the meeting at operational and tactical levels and meeting six monthly seemed sensible.</p> <p>In response to a question JM outlined changes made to the TOR including making sure that wording was consistent with the York and North Yorkshire Community Safety Hubs around the OPFCC, overview of funding was included, frequency of meetings was changed and making clear links with the York and North Yorkshire Safeguarding Children’s Boards. Links with other meetings (such as the Modern Slavery Partnership) would be reflected within the strategy rather than attempting to fully map all those linked.</p> <p>LBe agreed in general with the revised TOR and changes to frequency of meetings describing the meetings as providing strategic direction and a place for reporting work undertaken. LBe suggested that these meetings tended to get less attention than those focusing on actions but that they were worth taking place.</p> <p>SO was happy with the TOR changes and meeting twice per year was okay. TL also agreed with the changes noting that partnership working continued throughout the year at the various groups. ASt also agreed. AB described taking over from Stuart Simpson and that it was expected that this would be a long term change. He had no objections to the TOR or bi-annual frequency. Tactical and operational activities were key between meetings and although he recognised some names AB thought it would be useful for him to make connections between meetings.</p> <p>SC supported the revised TOR but noted that meeting six monthly was fine as long as each organisation completed its actions. Given the large amount of support SH asked if there were any professionals present that objected to meeting six monthly and the revised TOR which there were not. The changes were agreed.</p>	

	<p>SH highlighted the next issue to be sorted which was the election of a new Chair as she was leaving in October. SH described JM, LB and SS being aware of how much work was needed chasing things in the background. JM advised that normally people would be invited to put themselves forward and if there was more than one volunteer, for the Partnership to vote. LB had offered to become Chair but suggested given that key partners were missing she be Interim Chair while an offer was shared with wider membership. JM thought this made sense and was fine constitutionally. JM suggested a tight timescale to prevent drift. SH agreed therefore LB would step in after the meeting as Interim Chair with an offer out to full membership before the end of the week.</p>	
<p>3</p>	<p>Delivery during Lockdown</p> <p>JM described the SYP meeting in March and the world changing 2 or 3 weeks later. Work was delivered outside of the meetings towards achieving the strategic priorities of the Partnership.</p> <p>City Centre Crime and Anti-social Behaviour</p> <p>During lockdown local businesses had been closed with the city centre very quiet. While a good number of these had now reopened a return had not been seen of the normal level of drinking culture (thought partly to be due to reduced capacity, having to book tables and partly due to habits changing). Shops had paved the way for the hospitality industry, managing queries and developing working practices. Local businesses had been supported and continued to be monitored with links into YBAC among others. The large groups that came in via train had not been seen (they had to book and pay for tickets with seat reservations which along with reduced capacity had deterred them). Op Erase continued with multi-agency discussions and managed processes.</p> <p>Counter Terrorism: Protect, Prepare, Prevent</p> <p>Little had happened in the first month or two but the significant increase in pavement café licenses was generating a significant piece of work to keep people safe. The challenge was to keep people safely distanced while increasing capacity. Links with the NECTU had been used with JM and a security adviser walking around some of the proposed locations in July. The police Designing Out Crime Officer was also being sighted on every application. Individual advice was being provided to all applicants as well as an overview being presented to the CTTG. Fossgate was piloting a business model with additional security and support which would be developed over the following months.</p> <p>Domestic Abuse</p> <p>There were concerns in March/April about a significant increase in people seeking support but the reverse had been seen with low figures. A small tactical meeting had been held weekly with police, JM and her North Yorkshire counterpart and OPFCC with the focus on practical measures to manage capacity and not allow COVID to impact on delivery. This meeting had just been dropped to fortnightly. Some Ministry of Justice funding had been secured for IDAs to help with the Helpline and Webchat functions. There had been recent reports of a national massive increase in calls to the helpline but this was used by a lot of professionals so it was unclear if this would come through as a local increase. Some themed videos had been shared via Facebook. Increases in referrals were being closely monitored and Foundation were described as operating at capacity. All were adapting to keep up.</p>	

	<p>High Risk Anti-social Behaviour The Community Safety Hub had worked closely with police to contact individuals breaching COVID regulations or causing ASB. The NEOs had gradually returned their service to near normal, taking the opportunity to use new technologies to widen the options for gathering evidence while keeping staff and the public safe. The closure of Courts had and continued to hold back enforcement action but the opportunity had been taken to think innovatively and use various multi-agency problem solving techniques which would continue into recovery. The link with CVS and the Social Prescribers had been made in the Spring and plans were developing to embed this within the Hub.</p> <p>Serious Organised Crime: County Lines, Modern Slavery, Exploitation Work was delivered through City and County meetings which had continued during lockdown (both strategic and the Disruption Panel). A lot of work was done on modern slavery at the beginning of lockdown but there had not been a massive uptake – intel suggested that the businesses that might be involved (nail bars, car washes) did not have staff that lived in York as accommodation was too expensive. Intel meetings continued fortnightly sharing information on County Lines with the focus remaining on evidence gathering and building cases to take to court.</p> <p>SH thanked JM for the comprehensive update and wondered if it was comprehensive as other partners that had taken the lead for individual priorities had gathered information and fed it back to JM? With meeting bi-annually it was even more important for members to feed back what they were doing against the priorities agreed by the SYP via whoever was lead for that priority to enable them to give a rounded picture at the following meeting.</p> <p>ASe enquired if hate crimes had increased but with the exception of one slight issue at a York University (JM described working with them to resolve the issue) they had not. Meetings had continued, a hate crime task and finish group had created an action plan & a further meeting in the next month or so would continue what had been a good piece of work. More work was being done with the voluntary sector empowering groups to be the voice for their communities and encourage better working. These were likely to be the people that knew their communities best. JM was very pleased with the work done so far describing it as the best in 18 years.</p>	
4	<p>Partner challenges and pressures caused by COVID-19</p> <p>CVS ASe described supporting GP phone lines (3000 patients) where they were lonely, isolated, suffering with dementia or having trouble getting their medication. A report was due out soon. ASe described the difficulties that all charities were suffering from as they tried to support people through the pandemic with a survey in April advising that 40% thought they would close by the end of October and 2/3 by the end of the year. Fundraising events could not go ahead and sources of income such as renting out rooms in offices were also unavailable. While business had been provided with support little had been available to charities (just those services specifically related to COVID support).</p> <p>Public Health LBe suggested she could fill up the rest of the meeting with Public Health activities related to COVID. Since January work had been done with care homes and adult social care colleagues with the breadth of the job widening. Seven themes had</p>	

been identified including how vulnerable people could be assisted during COVID and minimising the impact on already disadvantaged groups. Asylum seekers had been supported with 19 placed. A central inbox was created for COVID enquiries. Focus was now changing to how the vulnerable and isolated could be supported over the coming 18 months.

Probation CRC

SC described the exceptional delivery model that had been running since March (with contact being made mostly over the phone usually on a weekly basis). Some doorstep visits had been made or calling from the car outside someone's property. As they moved into phase 2 of the model it was widened who they could see and West Offices was available to see some of their service users. Group interventions had been suspended but work was underway to recommence this shortly. Meanwhile remote delivery of interventions has been in place throughout the pandemic.

Fire Service

AB advised of reduced demand during COVID with lifestyle changes noted along with reduced use of the road network which had had a huge impact of the number of road traffic collisions. As people returned to the roads this had not increased to expected levels which was positive. Amenity sites had been closed leading to increased garden fires (sometimes spreading to fences, sheds or occasionally buildings). Prevention work had been limited as they remained unable to put crews into community settings. Negotiations were underway to allow this but without impacting on operational staff (such as a whole station having to be quarantined). All staff now had access to Teams and in the medium term it was expected this would be how they would engage with partners as well as using it to deliver training. AB had recently moved into the role and was looking at the risk profile for York and what support was needed.

Department of Work & Pensions

ASt advised of a massive increase in registrations with all hands on deck – 5000 in York (3000 more than March). Young people were suffering with a quarter of the figures being 18-24 year olds (200% increase). Offices remained shut with contact over the phone or via journal messages (similar to email). From 4/7/20 vulnerable customers could have appointments. Southern House in Leeds was opening to the public as a trial. Lots of redundancies had been seen in hospitality and retraining had been offered to upskill people. Extended opening hours were planned from the end of November (opening Saturdays and some evenings until 8pm). The youth hub for 18-24 year olds was looking for premises and working with CYC (offering multi-agency support to get young people into work or apprenticeships). Kickstart had launched to 16-24 year olds on universal credit – offering them six months with an employer on minimum wage for 25 hours per week with the hope for a job at the end). New employers were sought.

Neighbourhood Enforcement

TL described focussing on risk assessments, PPE and safe systems of work to enable staff to get back up and running. Staff had enjoyed coming up with new and innovative ways to gather evidence and these were likely to stay and improve the service.

	<p>Anti-Social Behaviour Officers PM described the biggest issue being the continued closure of courts. They had been expected to reopen on 24th August but this had been postponed the preceding Friday to the end of September. A lot of work had been done to be in a position to move forward with enforcement on cases only for this not to be possible. Expectations were having to be managed with enforcement options very limited.</p> <p>Make It York RH described working closely with businesses and signposting them to available grants. Times remained challenging. They were delivering the recovery strategy for the city centre with CYC.</p> <p>SH noted that members could contact each other outside of the formal meetings as part of relationship building. As just 'a flavour' of the activities taking place within the member organisations it was an impressive list of work. SO noted that a lot of the work done did not get celebrated.</p>	
5	<p>Any other business: JM thanked SH for her support to herself and as Chair of SYP pressing forward with agreeing the Priorities and hosting the workshop. The SYP was grateful and wished SH every success for the future.</p>	
6	<p>The next meeting was due to be Monday 30th November 9.45-11.15, but this was likely to be cancelled if no objections were raised to meeting twice yearly. It would be rearranged for March 2021.</p>	

Actions Agreed:

No.	Action / Update	Owner	Date Issued
1	Email to full membership regarding election of new Chair and Vice Chair	SH/AW	Sep 2020 Completed
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			