

Note of decisions taken and actions required

Title:	Safer and Stronger Communities Board
Date and time:	Monday 9 July 2012, 11.00am
Venue:	Smith Square rooms 1 & 2 (Ground Floor), Local Government House

Attendance

Position	Councillor	Council
Deputy Chair	Cllr Robert Gordon CBE DL Cllr Duwayne Brooks (Deputy Chair)	Hertfordshire CC Lewisham LB
Members	Cllr Brian Coleman Cllr Nilgun Canver Cllr Lisa Brett Cllr Paul Bettison Cllr Tom Fox Cllr Brian Coleman Cllr Jim Harker OBE	Barnet LB / LFEPA Haringey LB Bath & NE Somerset Council Bracknell Forest Scarborough BC Barnet LB / LFEPA Northamptonshire CC
Substitutes	Cllr Ian Gillies Jack Hopkins Cllr Crada Onuegbu Cllr Henri Murison Cllr Clarence Barrett	City of York Lambeth LB Lewisham LB Newcastle City Havering LB
Apologies	Cllr Mehboob Khan (Chairman) Cllr Ann Lucas Cllr Joanna Spicer	Kirklees MBC Coventry City Suffolk CC

Officers: Helen Murray, Mark Norris, Ian Leete, Stephen Service (all LGA)

Item	Decisions and actions	Action by
-------------	------------------------------	------------------

Cllr Robert Gordon welcomed Members to the meeting. He gave apologies for Cllr Khan and said he would be deputising as Chair in his absence. Cllr Gordon registered his thanks to the outgoing Conservative Vice Chair Cllr Les Lawrence for his service to the Board.

Cllr Brian Coleman conveyed the Board's congratulations to Cllrs Gordon and Harker for their honours in the Queen's Birthday list.

1. The Troubled Families Programme

Joe Tuke and Ian Brady from DCLG gave a short presentation on the Troubled Families programme (**Appendix A**). They invited questions from the Board.

Members commented that programmes targeting troubled families had been running for several years and said that the biggest barrier to success was information sharing. They asked how the Government proposed to deal with this problem.

Mr Tuke agreed that this was a long held issue, however he believed a new arrangement whereby local authorities can send lists of troubled families to the Department for Work and Pensions to check if they are already known to them was a breakthrough. 150,000 names have already been passed to DWP and are currently being processed. Mr Tuke said information sharing required a partnership approach.

Cllr Henri Murison (Newcastle) cited the negative response of media in the North East to what was seen as the conflagration of troubled families with deprived communities in the Government's campaign. While he recognised there was some overlap between the 2 groups, a statement from the Government clarifying circles of legitimacy and emphasising that there are alternative ways of dealing with poverty to those found in troubled families would be welcome.

Members drew attention to the focus on families already having problems as oppose to doing the work earlier in the process to identify and prevent vulnerable families reaching these trigger points. Mr Tuke agreed, saying that it was important that the programme was about stopping the flow of troubled families and

learning how to deal with them more effectively. He expressed hope that LAs would use the programme as a catalyst for realigning services, highlighting the strong economic case for investing in pre-emptive approaches.

On evaluating the the programme, Mr Tuke said that the Prime Minister had asked for regular stock takes to be carried out to ensure its effectiveness.

On the funding proposed to go to LAs for working with troubled families, Mr Tuke confirmed that this consisted of £3200 up front per family, with a results payment in year one of £800. He confirmed that there would be no clawback of funds if results were not achieved but evidence of work not being done could affect the likelihood of success for authorities applying for funding beyond the first year.

Members questioned whether greater flexibility could be built into the payment to allow for local discretion, to include families in need but not necessarily fulfilling the Government's definition of troubled.

Mr Tuke responded that funding was non-negotiable for the first 3 years, emphasising that other families would be dealt with in other programmes but the terms of this programme were clear. He argued that provision had been made so that funding for local discretion could deal with the most significant cases.

Members argued that factors such as the number of people in a family and the level of the problem meant that different families required different levels of intervention and funding.

Mr Tuke replied that the wins of the programme were less about money received and more about enabling an integrated approach and helping authorities avoid ongoing intergenerational problems.

Members pointed out that the money would only be available until 2015 with no guarantees beyond this, so any system in place must be sustainable for the long term. They emphasised the importance of money being made available as early as possible.

The Chairman concluded with a plea that the Government trust local government to get on with the job in hand and did not impose layer upon layer of reporting requirements on authorities. He thanked Mr

Tuke and Mr Brady for attending and voiced the Board's support for the programme.

2. Police and Crime Commissioners update

Helen Murray, LGA Head of Programme introduced this item. On local authority preparations for PCCs she said that this represented a success story despite a challenging timetable. While 2 or 3 councils were still at risk of not meeting the Government's deadline, some cases could be attributed to diary problems between the Home Office and Councils in scheduling visits. Rather than intervening in the first instance, the LGA is trying to persuade the Home Office to send warning letters to authorities who have not fulfilled its requirements by the due date, setting out what needs to happen.

On the LGA's bid to represent PCCs, Mark Norris, LGA Senior Advisor said that the LGA and APA had met to discuss the prospect of a joint offer and put together some options. A further meeting is scheduled for the end of July with the intention of getting something agreed before August.

Some Members cautioned against the wording of the LGA's relationship as "working together" with PCCs, arguing that this sounded like a direct endorsement.

Members queried the statement in Paragraph 13 of the report that LGA corporate subscription is "not viable" from an APCC perspective. Helen said this was in reference to uncertainty over the ongoing financial situation of the APA beyond March.

Members drew attention to the code of conduct for PCC candidates, arguing that this seemed overly harsh. Councillors cited the case of Falklands war veteran Simon Weston OBE who was forced to retire as a candidate due to a juvenile joyriding conviction. Members highlighted that while the Standards code had been relaxed for LA members, it would be applied retrospectively to PCCs and include matters outside of public office. The Board agreed for the LGA to pursue this matter with Government.

Members raised the issue of Deputy PCCs and how these would be integrated within the LGA given that they would not be elected.

Item 7

Helen responded that no conclusions had yet been drawn but that this was under consideration.

On funding for the PCC elections, Members highlighted the lack of a central fund and questioned if this could disadvantage some candidates. Helen responded that Nick Herbert MP had already been made aware of this issue and had stated that it was not open to negotiation.

Some Members felt that funding for commissioning should follow a 3 year plan rather than year on year negotiations and that it should include a targeted element for domestic violence issues. Mark responded that it had been left up to PCCs how long to keep funding for and that local authorities could therefore expect to see a mixed picture on how it was organised across the country.

On Chief Executives of PCC Offices, Helen confirmed that these are currently represented via a subset of SOLACE but stage 2 of LGA plans would be to develop an offer for this group.

On Police and Crime Panels, Members advocated an independent review of the way they worked roughly every 2 years.

Members emphasised that PCCs need to be seen to operate in partnership with LAs and that staffing structures between the two should be made more publically transparent in the run up to the elections in November.

Action

Officers to develop LGA response calling for the relaxation of current standards for the appointment of PCCs. **Helen Murray /Mark Norris**

3. Safer and Stronger Communities Board update

On the **metal theft Bill**, Members asked for the LGA to provide a briefing and agreed to lobby MPs in advance of the Bill being published on 13 July to stress its importance to communities.

On the Government's **Anti Social Behaviour** white paper proposals, while Members agreed that changes to the model of dealing with anti social behaviour were necessary, some warned

against a wholesale rebranding, arguing that communities clearly understand some elements of the current system and these aspects should be retained.

The Chairman said that the potential for a surge in malicious complaints as a result of changes had been drawn to the Government's attention.

Regarding the link up between council and police structures, Helen said that call handling testing was currently being undertaken to examine this issue.

Action

Officers to send Metal theft briefing to Members to aid their communication with MPs in advance of the publication of the Bill on 13 July.

LGA Officers

Decision

Members noted the report.

4. Update on Regulatory Services issues

On the **Late Night Drinking consultation**, Ian Leete, LGA Advisor reported that Cllrs Khan and Canver had written to Lord Levy at the Home Office and received responses. Ian noted that one area the Home Office had not responded on were budgets.

On "**Chugging**", while some Members argued that face to face fundraising can provide valuable opportunities for the public to give, the Board recognised that this activity can also be anti-social. Members agreed that if a licensing system was put in place, Councils must have the powers to stipulate that no activity take place in given areas.

Helen Murray said that at a recent roundtable on this issue, delegates had agreed that a balance needs to be struck.

On the Live Music Bill, Members questioned the detail of proposals for events with less than 200 attendees. Helen said that specific conditions such as a "no alcohol" rule applied for such events to fall

under this category.

5. End of Year Report

Helen Murray presented this item. She recognised the importance of communicating to Member Authorities work done and agreed to present a paper at the next meeting of the Board to outline how this would be done.

The Chairman asked Officers to note that the date of the final Board in the 2012/13 cycle was incorrectly listed as Monday **12** July 2013. The correct date is Monday **8** July 2013.

Action

Officers to present paper on communicating the Board's work to LGA membership at September meeting.

LGA Officers

6. Notes of the last meeting

The notes of the last meeting were agreed as a correct record.

Date of next meeting: Tuesday 11 September 2012, Local Government House

Appendix A



www.communities.gov.uk
community, opportunity, prosperity

Troubled Families

Joe Tuke,
Director, Troubled Families Team
Communities and Local Government

LGA Safer & Stronger Communities Board
3rd July 2012



Context

Troubled families ...

- have complex family structures – nearly 1 in 5 FIP families have more than five children
- have inter-generational problems that have proved intractable - $\frac{3}{4}$ are out of work
- have a comprehensive range of needs/problems – a quarter of mums have a long-standing illness, in 1/3 of FIP families there is DV, 1/2 FIP families include children who are truanting, excluded or behaving badly at school.



Impact

Troubled families ...

- attract multitude of uncoordinated services –up to 20 different agencies involved with one family
- have high impact on community – an estimated 1 in 5 young offenders come from troubled families
- drain public finances – estimates £75k to £250k per family p.a. mostly reactive costs



Government investment

- £420m over next 3 years (just 1.5% of current total spend) as incentive to local areas to turn around lives of their troubled families
- Primarily via payment by results model - 40% of cost
- *Not* an education programme, *not* an employment programme, *not* a crime programme a **family programme** turning around **each of 120k troubled families**.



Confirming/Identifying Families

Youth Crime

Proven offence in last 12 months

Anti-social behaviour

Enforcement action in last 12 months

School Attendance

More than 15% unauthorised absences, permanent or 3+ fixed term exclusions last 3 terms

Unemployment

Adult on working age benefits

Local Discretion

(2 of 3 above and cause for concern/high cost e.g. edge of care, police callouts, substance misuse, other health)



What is 'turning lives around'?

Simple ...for Payment by Results scheme, for front line workers, for families, for public

- Adults into work
- Children at school
- Cutting crime/ASB
- Cutting costs, saving money

Broader evaluations to measure success - process/impact/economic



Troubled Families Team

- Incentivise and support local delivery
 - importance of TF Co-ordinators
- Align OGD policy and delivery chains with PM commitment
- Galvanise public/other sector support