

# Norfolk Countywide Community Safety Partnership Scrutiny Sub-Panel

Minutes of the meeting held at County Hall, Norwich on Friday 24 February 2023 at 10 am

**Present:**

Cllr Mark Kiddle – Morris (Chair)	Norfolk County Council
Cllr Penny Carpenter (Vice-Chair)	Norfolk County Council
Cllr Wendy Fredericks	North Norfolk District Council
Cllr Alexandra Kemp	King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council
Cllr David King	Broadland District Council
Cllr Emma Corlett	Norfolk County Council
Cllr James Easter	South Norfolk District Council

**Also in Attendance:**

Mark Stokes	Chief Executive, OPCCN and Chair of the NCCSP Partnership
Amanda Murr	Head of Community Safety, OPCCN
Nicola Allum	Community Safety Officer, OPCCN
Liam Bannon	Community Safety Officer, OPCCN
Insp Matthew Wakefield	Acting Inspector, Community Safety, Norfolk Constabulary
Jo Martin	Democratic Support and Scrutiny Manager, Norfolk County Council (NCC)
Nicola Ledain	Committee Officer

**1. Apologies for Absence**

- 1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Alison Webb and substitute Cllr Robert Hambridge, Cllr Graham Carpenter and substitute Cllr Ian Mackie, and Cllr Sarah Butikofer, substituted by Cllr Wendy Fredericks.

**2. Minutes**

- 2.1. The minutes of the meeting held on 24 February 2022, 28 September 2022 and 8 December 2022 were all agreed as an accurate record and signed by the Chair.

**3. Declaration of Interests**

- 3.1 Cllr Penny Carpenter expressed an 'other' interest as she was a member of the Safeguarding Adults Board as referred to page 22 of the agenda pack.
- 3.2 With reference to item 5, Cllr Emma Corlett expressed an 'other' interest as she was Chair of Trustees at Leeway Domestic Violence and Abuse Charity.
- 3.3 Cllr Wendy Fredericks expressed an 'other' interest as she was Chair of the Domestic

#### **4. Urgent Business**

4.1 There were no items of urgent business.

#### **5. Partnership Priority – Serious Violence**

5.1 The Scrutiny Sub Panel received a report from the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services, setting out an overview of the Domestic Homicide Review process which was requested by the Scrutiny Sub Panel at its 24 February 2022 meeting.

5.2 Before the discussion of this item took place, the Chair reminded those present and watching the live stream that abuse could and did happen to anyone and was indiscriminate of age, gender, race, profession, or social background. It was important to act quickly and anyone with concerns about a child, family or individual could contact NIDAS (Norfolk Integrated Domestic Abuse Service) for free confidential advice. Details could be found online or by calling 0300 561 0555. If anyone was in immediate danger, they should call 999.

5.3 During the discussion that ensued the following key points were made:

- The full Thematic Review was not currently in the public domain, but this could be reviewed, and a copy would be provided to the Scrutiny Sub Panel.
- The work of the Domestic Violence Change Champion Coordinators who were active before the pandemic were now part of the new Norfolk Integrated Domestic Abuse Service (NIDAS) and continued to be active across the county. The Partnership were also working with key stakeholders regarding their agency training so that gaps in education and awareness across the county could be identified.
- With reference to page 18, paragraph d, the Head of Community Safety clarified that when information was being gathered, all information regarding any children involved was gathered. Safeguarding and safety mechanism were put in place for those children by the relevant agencies such as Children's Services and they were very much part of the review. Specific Domestic Homicide Review (DHR) support was now in place and this information was requested to be brought to a future meeting. A written response about what was being done for the child would also be sent to the Scrutiny Sub Panel.
- A timescale of six months to conduct a DHR was acknowledged as being a tight timescale to adhere too by the Partnership. The number of agencies involved in the Partnership who managed the process of the review made it unworkable. There could also be associated panels which were running alongside the review, and those outcomes were needed to feed into the review such as criminal investigations. There could also be joint reviews, such as mental health reviews happening alongside the DHR. It was also important to give the families time to consider a report, and the volume of information, and it was unreasonable to give them a timescale to digest that. The timeframe was a guide, and each domestic homicide was review was different. The timeframe had been alerted to the Home Office as unworkable.
- Each recommendation from the 2019 sample reviews were anonymous and it was unknown which Community Safety Partnership (CSP) those recommendations were associated with. The CSP's were responsible for monitoring the actions, but the agencies were responsible for actioning them. Within Norfolk, actions and

recommendations were moved forward. In relation to recommendation in the reviews conducted in the anonymous, it wasn't possible to be able to tell what had happened due to the anonymous nature.

- Composite action plans were devised from the recommendations from the reviews for the Partnership to respond too. SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, timely) variables were used on the action plan. All members on the Partnership had a commitment to ensure those actions were put in place. Such examples were given to the Scrutiny Sub Panel.
  - Training:
    - learning events covered specific issues such as dementia,
    - Agreed a standard set of training across the partnership.
  - Raising awareness for the public:
    - hear campaign (help, educate, awareness, respond) which was managed through OPCCN.
    - Targeted communications for certain groups in the community
  - Amending process:
    - All staff in emergency departments would now check patients records and if presented with assault injuries.
    - Operation Encompass which raises awareness in schools.
  - Policy:
    - Named GP for safeguarding adults in Integrated Care Board constructed a template domestic abuse policy and shared with all primary care colleagues.
- The Scrutiny Sub Panel supported the endorsement of rolling out the training for hairdressers and those in the beauty industry. It was critical that impact of that training was measured and to do this the action plan recommendations were SMART and had measurable accountability The Home Office Quality Assurance Panel were ensuring that all CSP's were looking at how it was measurable and had made a difference. There were opportunities to review and disseminate guidance and it would be possible to go back to partners soon to find out how they had used that information.
- There had not been one area or agency that had been identified in the reviews that needed greater focus on professional curiosity.
- With regards to benchmarking, Officers were working with national colleagues but there had been a rise in the DHR's. It was a challenge to compare against another local authority, but the Eastern Region had identified that they had received more DHR's than had been anticipated. There was work being carried out to see if the Covid pandemic had an impact, with less people being visible to friends and families and agencies, and the move of information to predominantly online. The outcome of that review was unknown currently. However, Norfolk was thought to be similar to local and national colleagues.
- A suggestion was made that information regarding NIDAS could be put in places regularly accessible to those of an older generation, such as on local pharmacy prescription labels. Information regarding services such as NIDAS and Childline could also be put on school letter footers.
- The Scrutiny Sub Panel requested a copy of the composite action plans that had been referred to earlier in the discussion.
- The Partnership explained that it engaged with the District Council representatives by way of the quarterly meetings of the NCCSP Board. Those representatives were often leads on various Panels and Boards at their respective Authority and were aware of the detail in the reports provided at the Scrutiny Sub Panel meetings. It was then their responsibility to circulate that to all their elected members and key officers. There was some concern that the information was not being disseminated to all members, but the Chair of the NSSCP assured the Scrutiny Sub Panel that work was being carried out to ensure that this would

happen going forwards.

- The Scrutiny Sub Panel was reassured that any persons attending, dealing with, or witnessing any details regarding domestic homicides were supported and all services across the board were supporting their staff in a trauma informed way.
- Reassurance was given to the Scrutiny Sub Panel regarding the support for those children whose homes had been burgled and heard that this was predominantly carried out by the Safer Neighbourhood Teams.
- The Serious Violence Duty commenced on 31<sup>st</sup> January 2023 and as a Partnership had been working over the last 12-18 months in preparation of that Duty. The Scrutiny Sub Panel heard that there was a serious violence Partnership Group which was made up of all the responsible authorities which was meeting to progress the response to that Duty.

#### 5.4 The Scrutiny Sub Panel:

- 1) **NOTED** the information provided.
- 2) Made the following **RECOMMENDATIONS** to the Partnership:
  - a) that the Partnership should provide a full report on its thematic review of Norfolk DHRs to a future meeting, together with further information on Domestic Violence Change Champions to explain how they are working in practice in Norfolk.
  - b) that the Partnership should provide further information on how children are supported (written response attached at **Appendix A**).
  - c) that the Partnership should provide an overview of its response to the new Serious Violence Duty, which commenced on 31 January 2023, to a future meeting.
- 3) **AGREED** to delegate to the Chair and Vice-Chair the task of reporting the outcome of its discussion to the Scrutiny Committee, through a written report to the next scheduled meeting (22 March 2023).

## 6 Partnership Priority - Prevent

6.1 The Scrutiny Sub Panel received a report from the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services which introduced further progress updates on the Prevent priority, which were requested by the Scrutiny Sub Panel at its 24 February 2022 meeting.

6.2 During discussion the following key points were made:

- NCCSP, together with Suffolk Community Countywide Safety Partnership had been successful in obtaining funding for a Preventing Radicalisation Project, which was currently being run by Shout Out UK. They were currently running two projects; a raising awareness conference for professionals and a parents and carers information course about how to stay safe online.
- The Sub Panel were pleased to hear that work was being done regarding venue hire, IT policy and guidance in relation to venues being used by radicalised influencers. However, there was still anonymous far right literature being put through doors in some areas of Norwich and Members wondered if there was a gap in legislation around the requirement to have an imprint on the literature. This would be brought back to a future meeting.
- The Sub Panel requested information regarding the impact of projects raising awareness of radicalisation, such as thoughts of the courses and what they were

then doing with the information that they had been taught. Shout Out UK who were delivering the current projects had built an evaluation into it and the NCCSP team would also be looking at the outcomes of those projects to feed into other projects.

- With reference to page 38, point 9.5, the Hate Crime Review analysed the Constabulary's data to understand what was happening with regards to young people and hate crime. It revealed that a large proportion of perpetrators were school age which led to the recommendation as outlined in the report. It was being managed by the Community Relations and Strategic Group. It was an ongoing piece of work, and it was requested that the outcomes were brought to a future meeting.
- Being parent of teenage children meant it could be difficult to explain what hate crime was. Communication was about reaching people whatever medium they used. Social media was obviously applicable for the younger generation and the communications officer was looking at the best way of reaching all demographics and reviewing those channels for feasibility across all the priorities.
- Independent Review of Prevent MKM asked about any implications arising from the Independent Review of Prevent, published on 8 February 2023. AM confirmed that the Partnership was currently reviewing this. Please could you add a bullet point to cover this.
- Members acknowledged the role that elected members themselves had in supporting the Partnership by highlighting problems in their own areas and highlighting the availability of awareness raising projects through their various community roles. The Chair of the Partnership explained that by working with lead officers across all the authorities and ensuring they engaged more effectively with their members, including those involved with the Sub Panel, would support elected members with awareness about the issues in their wards and know what resources they needed.

6.3 Members discussed the importance of cascading information provided by the Partnership to all elected members and strengthening the connection between lead partnership officers and key councillors at all local authorities. The Chair emphasised that he made a regular report to Norfolk County Council's Scrutiny Committee to raise the profile of the Partnership's work and the challenge brought by the Scrutiny Sub Panel and encouraged district councillors to do the same at their local authorities.

6.4 The Scrutiny Sub Panel:

- 1) **NOTED** the information provided
- 2) **RECOMMENDED** to the Partnership;
  - a. That it should provide clarification on whether there is a gap in legislation around the requirement to include a legal imprint on any leaflet campaign material.
  - b. That it should provide evidence of the impact of projects seeking to raise awareness of radicalisation and extremism to a future meeting.
  - c. That it should report the outcomes of its Hate Crime Review to a future meeting.
- 3) **AGREED** to delegate to the Chair and Vice-Chair the task of reporting the outcome of its discussion to the Scrutiny Committee, through a written report to the next scheduled meeting (22 March 2023).

## **7. Partnership Priority – Neighbourhood Crime**

7.1 The Scrutiny Sub Panel received a report from the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services that updated the Sub Panel on the development of a communication strategy for the Community Trigger process, which was requested by the Scrutiny Sub Panel at its 9 June 2022 meeting.

7.2 During discussion, the following key points were made.

- A comment was made that through the Community Trigger process, an accused perpetrator could be victimised in the neighbourhood. There could be underlying unmet need issues which were the reason for that behaviour such as being criminally exploited, a lack of access to mental health services, a lack of access to child and adolescent services, parents being separated from children and not being helped with the trauma of that situation. The Community Trigger process should not be used to enable people to access a health and social care service. The Head of Community Safety explained that all those who were part of the Partnership understood the duties they were responsible for both as individual organisations and collectively. Through this process, the Partnership would assess if it met the trigger. Although those concerns were valid the Head of Community Safety explained that they would be fed into the Partnership and explored further. There was accountability that the members of the Partnership carried out in their organisation what they were supposed to be doing. An update would be brought to a future meeting.
- There were several actions that could be taken with regards to vehicle noise and nuisance. Local Authorities would take the lead on any noise disturbance but if a driving offence had been committed, Norfolk Constabulary would become involved, either through the local beat managers who had access to traffic teams and the community teams who would also be able to reinforce messages. Encouragement was given to always report any issues. The Trigger Process was more concerned with persistent offences rather than a one-off occurrences.
- There had been success in Great Yarmouth with the installation of a special camera funded by a grant from the Department of Transport. The camera took pictures of number plates and other features and recorded incidents. Thanks were given to Constable Dan Smith in Great Yarmouth for seeing this through.
- The Community Trigger Process was on every District Council website as well as most housing providers, but it was hoped that this would extend to all housing providers in due course.
- The Community Trigger Process would be available to initiate in writing eventually, not just online.
- Once the policy was in place and the staff were informed, then training sessions would be held for elected members. It was also important to make the public aware about what Community Trigger was, the threshold of the trigger, how to access the process and the single point of contacts in the District and Police. The Sub Panel heard that the training would be available to anyone such as parish councillors or practitioners. The Sub Panel urged that this was completed as soon as possible, and the Head of Community Safety reassured them that it would hopefully be completed by Easter 2023.

- 1) **NOTED** the information provided.
- 2) **RECOMMENDED** that the Partnership should consider how constituent partners can ensure that individuals are able to access support for unmet needs, to avoid circumstances where a Community Trigger might be requested, and report back to the Sub Panel at a future meeting.
- 3) **AGREED** to delegate to the Chair and Vice-Chair the task of reporting the outcome of its discussion to the Scrutiny Committee, through a written report to the next scheduled meeting (22 March 2023).

## 8. Resourcing the Community Safety Partnership

- 8.1 The Sub Panel received a verbal update from the Chair of the NCCSP Partnership on progress with the Partnership's internal resource review.
- 8.2 The Sub Panel noted that while there was a core Community Safety Team within the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Norfolk, the success of this area of work was reliant on the engagement of those partner organisations and agencies that constituted the Partnership.
- 8.3 Members were advised that the Government was due to start a national review of Community Safety Partnerships (how they worked, roles and responsibilities), which could influence how they functioned in future. This review was possibly going to start in early March. It could also influence how both Partnerships and Police and Crime Commissioners have greater regard for each other.
- 8.4 The Sub Panel also heard how the Partnership were regarded as carrying out best practice, and they were assisting the Home Office with the review by devising a case study of how Norfolk's Partnership worked and how it could be developed.
- 8.5 The Scrutiny Sub Panel;
  - 1) **NOTED** the information provided,
  - 2) **AGREED** that an update on the national review of Community Safety Partnerships should be provided to the next meeting, and
  - 3) **AGREED** that the Chair would include a summary in his report to the Scrutiny Committee.

## 9 Forward Work Programme

- 9.1 The Scrutiny Sub Panel received a report from the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services that set out a proposed Forward Work Programme for the Scrutiny Sub Panel that could be used to shape future meeting agendas and items for consideration.
- 9.2 The Scrutiny Sub Panel **AGREED** the forward work programme and the items identified for consideration at future meetings as set out in Appendix A to the report subject to the following points.
  - Following the schedule elections in May, the membership of the Panel could change. The Chair proposed that the focus of the next meeting on 8 June 2023 should be on an overview of the Partnership, how it functioned currently and effects change, together with an update on the Government's national review. It was also agreed that the introduction should include an overview of what happened following a domestic homicide to help inform new members.

- The work programme for the September 2023 meeting would be considered at the June meeting.
- Following the number of updates requested by members of the Sub Panel previously in the meeting, the Scrutiny Support Manger was asked to liaise with the Partnership to consider the best timings for those updates to be brought to future meetings.

9.3 The Scrutiny Sub Panel considered the forward work programme set out at Appendix A of the report and **AGREED** the following changes:

- Given that the membership of the Scrutiny Sub Panel could change after local elections in May, the focus of the next meeting on 8 June 2023 should be on an overview of the Partnership, how it functioned currently and effects change, together with an update on the Government's national review. That introduction should also include an overview of what happened following a domestic homicide to help inform new members.
- The work programme for the September 2023 meeting would be considered at the June meeting. The Scrutiny Support Officer was asked to liaise with the Partnership to consider timings for the updates that had been requested during the meeting, to support discussion of the Sub Panel's work programme.

The meeting finished at 12.10 pm

### Chair



If you need this document in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact Customer Services on 0344 800 8020 or Text Relay on 18001 0344 800 8020 (textphone) and we will do our best to help.



**Norfolk Countywide Community Safety Partnership Scrutiny Sub Panel  
Friday 24 February 2023**

**1) Written response in relation to question asked at paragraph 5.4.b**

When the Scrutiny Sub Panel met on 24 February 2023, it requested further information (a written response) about how children are supported within the Domestic Homicide Review process.

Please see below the Partnership's response, provided by the Community Safety Team (OPCCN). This will be appended to the unconfirmed minutes when they are published.

When the police refer children to Children's Advice and Duty Service (CADS) following a domestic homicide, CADS will look at the needs relating to each case and establish the most appropriate social care intervention.

Children and their families open to social care can be offered support via the Intensive and Specialist Support Services. This service offers bespoke support based on needs. If they need provision around parenting, stabilisation or scaffolding work to support the children or families adjust or for example to get them ready to access specialist support around grief or mental health issue, the service can be flexible to meet the family need and compliment the support provided by the family and professional network. The intervention would usually be delivered by child and family therapeutic workers who are therapeutically informed practitioners that can support the system around the child with relational, parenting or trauma related issues. The provision is dependent on the family need and the case holders assessment of the family strengths. This work fits under the banner of holistic support provided to families to meet their individualised need rather than a specific programme to support post domestic homicide.

The Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Norfolk has commissioned a service to support children affected by domestic homicide within Norfolk provided by Advocacy After Fatal Domestic Abuse (AAFDA), which Children's Services can refer children to directly. The service aims to help support victims or witnesses by providing emotional and practical, expert and specialist peer support to families following suicide/homicide bereavement after domestic abuse. AAFDA offers those children, where appropriate, safe and agreed by all parties a voice in the Domestic Homicide Review process. Families work with a dedicated specialist case worker who provides bespoke support. The service aims to support families to be better able to cope with the emotional and practical challenges, improve their wellbeing, families report feeling reduced isolation and children have improved emotional health.

Children's Services provides staff with mandatory Domestic Abuse Awareness e-learning package that gives an overview of the different types of domestic abuse, defines domestic abuse, explains the signs and indicators of abuse and details actions staff can take to support victims, including what to do if they are concerned a colleague is experiencing domestic abuse.

Children's Services DASH training covers the intimate partner homicide timeline (IPHT), which addresses Domestic Homicide directly. It is a tool that practitioners can use to help predict the escalation of behaviour and the level of risk.