A meeting of the above Committee will be held on

**Wednesday 6 July 2011**

at 7.00pm at the Civic Centre, Dartford
CRIME AND DISORDER (OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY) COMMITTEE
AGENDA
Wednesday 6 July 2011

1. **Apologies For Absence**
   To receive any apologies of absence.

2. **Declarations of Interest**
   To receive any declarations of interest Members may wish to make including the term(s) of the Grant of Dispensation(s) by the Standards Committee.

3. **Confirmation of the Minutes of the meeting held on 26 January 2011**

4. **Urgent Items (IF ANY)**
   The Chairman will announce his decision as to whether there are any urgent items and their position on the agenda.

5. **To consider references from other Committees (IF ANY)**
   There are no references from other Committees at present.

6. **Councillor Call for Action (CCfA) (IF ANY)**

7. **Forward Plan**
   To consider any issues arising from the Forward Plan for the period 1 July 2011 to 30 October 2011.

8. **Introduction from the Strategic Director**

9. **Annual Report for the 2010/2011 Municipal Year**
   To approve the *draft* Annual Report for 2010/11.
10. **Community Safety Plan**

   To consider the Community Safety Strategy and Action Plan 2011-12.

11. **Performance**

   To note the attached report approved by the Dartford & Gravesham Community Safety Partnership on 6 June 2011.

12. **Draw - Down (IF ANY)**

   No items have been Drawn down for consideration.

13. **Work Programme for 2011-2012 Municipal Year**

   To agree a Work Programme for the 2011 / 2012 Municipal Year.

14. **Date of next meeting**
DARTFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL

CRIME AND DISORDER (OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY) COMMITTEE

MINUTES of the meeting of the Crime and Disorder (Overview and Scrutiny) Committee held on Wednesday 26 January 2011.

PRESENT: Councillor A Bardoe (Chairman)
Councillor M J Davis (Vice-Chairman)
Councillor M J Bryant
Councillor A R Lloyd
Councillor G T Prout
Councillor P J Scanlan
Councillor I D Armitt JP (Substitute for Councillor D E Hunnisett)

ABSENT: Councillor D E Hunnisett

Dartford Borough Council Officers:-

Sheri Green − Strategic Director
Matt Roberts − CSO/CSU
Colin Newmarch − SEO/CSU
Paul Woodfield − CCTV Manager

CABINET MEMBERS: Councillor Mrs Ann Allen, portfolio holder for Anti-Social Behaviour and Community Safety, at the invitation of the Committee

ALSO PRESENT TO RESPOND TO ISSUES RAISED BY THE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE:

Temp./Ch Supt. Ali − Acting Area Commander, Kent Police
Ch. Insp. Philip Painter − Kent Police
Insp. Peter Dale − Kent Police / CSU

15. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor D E Hunnisett.

The Chairman welcomed Temporary Chief Superintendent Ali Roden, Acting Area Commander to the meeting and her Kent Police colleagues Chief Inspector Philip Painter and Inspector Peter Dale.

16. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST
Councillor I D Armit JP (substituting for Counsellor D E Hunnisett), declared a personal interest in most of the agenda items, given his role as a sitting Magistrate on the North Kent Bench.

17. CONFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 23 JUNE 2010

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 23 June 2010 be confirmed as accurate.

18. URGENT ITEMS

There were no items for urgent consideration.

19. TO CONSIDER REFERENCES FROM OTHER COMMITTEES (IF ANY)

There were no references from other Committees.

20. COUNCILLOR CALL FOR ACTION (CCFA)

There were no Councillor Calls for Action (CCfA) for consideration.

21. CHAIRMAN’S UPDATE

At the suggestion of the Chairman, Members agreed to take Item 12 – “Update on the Policing of the Town Centre”, immediately after Items 8 and 9 to allow Kent Police colleagues attending to resume their operational duties as soon as possible.

22. FORWARD PLAN

Members noted the contents of the Forward Plan for the period 1 January 2011 to 30 April 2011.

23. CROSS - BORDER POLICING WITH ESSEX AND METROPOLITAN FORCES (DRAW-DOWN)

The Acting Area Commander was invited to update Members on current arrangements for cross-border policing between the Kent, Metropolitan and Essex forces.

Ch. Supt. Roden advised Members that cross-border cooperation with the Metropolitan and Essex police forces had been ongoing for some 2 years.

Regular overview meetings were held with Metropolitan colleagues from Bexley, whilst collaboration with Essex colleagues was more comprehensive and being taken forward under the terms of a joint protocol signed in 2007. Cross – border operations with Essex police were led jointly by a Kent
Assistant Chief Constable and a Chief Superintendent from the Essex force. It was the first such national initiative to be undertaken in England and Wales and was serving North Kent well.

The Acting Area Commander explained that collaboration with the Essex force concentrated on the major areas of Serious Crime, Forensics and Intelligence, with a Superintendent in charge of each operational area. Essex police colleagues were in the process of co-locating to North Fleet police station in Kent, to further enhance the joint working relationship. Examples of joint operations with Essex police included: cooperation with Thurrock police over Bluewater operations; combating HGV thefts plus a major push to combat “car creeper” crime – whereby criminals, primarily from Essex, make reconnaissance trips to North Kent to identify high quality vehicles before returning to burglar the car owner’s homes for the keys and driving off the targeted vehicles undamaged on car transporters.

Members relayed the following personal and anecdotal evidence of perceived cross-border crime issues in their Wards:

- Bexley Park residents in the Joydens Wood Ward were frequently referred to the Metropolitan Police in error, when making 999 calls to Kent Police’s Force Control Centre (FCC);
- Joydens Wood residents in general had expressed concern over the apparent division of responsibility for the investigation of burglaries between Kent Police (houses) and the Met force (garden sheds);
- Joydens Wood residents also reported high levels of Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB) and other low-level crime from teenagers entering the Ward via the 96 bus route – so called “oyster card” crime. The perception was that the teenagers were able to return to the Metropolitan area, again by 96 bus, before Kent police could respond;
- Councillor Mrs Allen (Joydens Wood Ward and KCC), Cabinet portfolio holder for ASB and Community Safety said that some KCC Highway funds might be made available for minor projects to combat low-level crime;
- Heath Ward residents continued to complain of regular incidents of car theft and associated vehicle crime, and illegal behaviour using vehicles on Dartford Heath. The Friends of Dartford Heath and the Heath Ward PACT were working together to monitor the illegal activity and feed back information to Kent Police.
- It was argued that CCTV cameras situated on Dartford Heath and at the A2 junction with the M25 would act as a visual deterrent to criminals, including those entering Dartford from the Metropolitan area;

Police and CSU officers made the following points in response to Members concerns:

- Kent Police would advise the FCC that Bexley Park lay within the Joydens Wood Ward in Kent and was not the responsibility of the Met;
- Kent Police systems differentiate between addresses in Kent and the Met area. Examples of where there has been a problem brought to the
attention of Members could be most usefully fed into the review process via Inspector Dale in the CSU;

- Kent police were aware of the ready access and egress the 96 bus route provided to teenagers and others intent on visiting Dartford for criminal purposes. The topic featured in the strategic discussions held with Met colleagues. ASB in Bexley Park had been successfully tackled in the past by the temporary deployment of ‘Stryker’ mobile CCTV cameras;

- Additional permanent CCTV cameras in Dartford would require capital funding which was not feasible in the current economic climate. However, the Council’s 3 ‘Stryker’ mobile cameras were deployed to “crime hotspots” on the basis of identified need. Consistently reporting crime was essential to help identify need and consider the re-deployment of existing resources;

- The installation of a cycle path across the Heath by KCC appeared to have helped to deter some of the more public displays of anti-social behaviour in the area;

- Kent Police’s Tactical Team regularly pursued known criminal elements into the Metropolitan area, either to make arrests under agreed cross-border protocols, or to warn identified criminals that they were under surveillance and not to return to Kent. Met officers pursued Kent criminals under the same arrangements;

- The Bexley / North Kent border and the A2 junction with the M25 at Dartford Heath in particular were the focus for joint operations targeting petty criminals. Joint operations at the Dartford Crossing and Tunnel between the Kent and Essex forces, HMRC and the UK Border Agency had also proved particularly effective;

- Staffs from Dartford’s Community Safety Unit (CSU) have been meeting with equivalent staff at Bexley and Greenwich Councils, together with Kent and Metropolitan police colleagues. Strategic discussions are held on a Quarterly basis and operational information exchanged on a regular basis in the interim.

RESOLVED:

1) That the Police’s Force Control Centre (FCC) be advised that Bexley Park is in Kent and callers reporting crimes from that area should be dealt with by Kent police rather than the Met;

2) That CSU officers advise Councillor Allen, Cabinet portfolio holder for ASB and Community Welfare, of any minor projects that would benefit from limited KCC Highways funding;

3) That the Acting Area Commander provides the Committee with details of projected savings as a result of joint working with Essex police;

4) That details of Operation Eclipse be advised to Heath Ward Members.

24. PACT / NEIGHBOURHOOD PANELS INCLUDING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT (WORK PLAN ITEM)

Chief Inspector Painter updated Members on the new arrangements governing PACT meetings following the change of Government in May 2010.
He explained that under the previous Administration, PACT meetings had been held monthly and were designated as the primary vehicle for the public to engage with the police. PACT meetings had also been used in the past to support the National Indicator (N.I.), and gauge public confidence in police performance. This was no longer the case.

The new Coalition Government favoured a greater police presence on the streets, engaging with the public on a daily basis. PACT meetings had been reduced to a quarterly function, with police forces also encouraged to identify more effective and better attended forums to engage with the public. The recent collaboration between the Heath PACT and the Friends of Dartford Heath was a good example. As part of the gradual change towards greater interaction with the public, Kent Police had surveyed 8,500 residents using a BlackBerry questionnaire.

Members agreed that in their experience PACT meetings had been poorly attended, despite good police reports and presentations. Lack of adequate publicity was seen as a contributory factor, but in general terms, the PACT process had not produced positive results.

Members welcomed the new emphasise on increased engagement with the public through an enhanced police presence on the streets via the Neighbourhood Policing Team network. A higher police profile in the Wards would help raise public confidence and a positive perception of effective police performance. Improved publicity for the quarterly PACT meetings, plus regular electronic updates to Members on crime statistics for inclusion in Ward Newsletters, would also help.

The Acting Area Commander assured Members that the new Chief Constable for Kent fully supported the Coalition Government’s initiative towards Neighbourhood Policing, based on an enhanced police presence inter-acting with the public on a daily basis. She added that the new operational measures were due to be considered by the Kent Police Authority on 9 February 2011.

The Chairman advised Members that he had encountered a divergence of opinion over the Coalition Government’s new proposals for community policing at a police conference in December 2010. He suspected that any benefits from the proposed new measures would need 2-3 years to take effect.

In further final discussion, it was confirmed for Members that Kent Police were aware of the 3 Wards in the Borough experiencing the highest levels of ASB and that Neighbourhood Policing resources were being deployed as effectively as possible to combat these crime “hotspots”. However, it was also necessary to ensure that all Wards retained a consistent police presence, to better build community relationships.

RESOLVED:
1) That use of the CSU website to advertise future quarterly PACT meetings be investigated;
2) That the present arrangements for the delivery of PACT flyers be reviewed;
3) That the CSU website be updated to include results of Operation Horizon;
4) That Members be advised of the 6 week rota for Horizon with a reminder 1 week in advance of the Operation visiting their Ward.

25. POLICING OF THE TOWN CENTRE: UPDATE FROM KENT POLICE (EXEMPT CATEGORY SO 46 (1)(B) ANNEX 1 PARAGRAPH 7)

The Acting Area Commander updated Members on the new strategies and resources being deployed to police the Town Centre and exit routes during the operating hours of the Night Time Economy (Item B in the Exempt Agenda) and responded to Members questions.

In subsequent related discussion, the Strategic Director advised Members that funding for the Grabbacab scheme was secured for the next 6 months and that further funding for Grabbacab was being pursued with Kent Police and KCC Health officials. She further commented that long-term sustainable funding was not currently available but had hopes that the Government might introduce legislation allowing Council’s to levy on late night establishments to fund community safety initiatives.

The Acting Area Commander added that Kent Police were considering using a mobile police station vehicle, deployed in the Town Centre, as a ‘Safe Place’ facility for distressed members of the public or those perceived to be at risk;

RESOLVED:

1. That CSU staff pursue with the Street Pastor Organisation the possibility of setting up a ‘Safe Place Scheme’ with the aid of funding from town centre church’s and possibly the local PCT;
2. That CSU staff consider the re-deployment of a ‘Stryker’ mobile CCTV camera along Dartford Road in West Hill;
3. That effective policing of the exit routes from the Town Centre where the majority of the Dartford population resided was crucial in terms of community wellbeing and public perception of efficient police performance.

26. CCTV : ANNUAL UPDATE (WORK PLAN ITEM)

The following points were confirmed for Members by the Strategic Director and CSU officers present:
Existing CCTV cameras were replaced at a rate of 4 to 5 per year on the basis of a rolling programme that was 50% towards completion;

DBC owned a total of 54 permanently installed CCTV cameras of which 44 were strategically placed in the Town Centre. The rolling replacement programme also contained an element for camera repairs;

The siting of CCTV cameras in Dartford was based on need and crime analysis carried out in the past. Some crime patterns had changed on the margins of those areas with CCTV installations, but they remained the areas of highest crime concentrations and therefore continued need;

The Council’s new mobile ‘Stryker’ CCTV cameras had been funded by the Dartford and Gravesham CSP (CDRP as was), in the absence of any further capital funding from central government for additional CCTV installations. In the current economic climate further capital funding was unlikely.

It was confirmed that deployment of the mobile ‘Stryker’ CCTV cameras to fresh crime “hotspots” was made on the basis of reported crime and ASB. It was therefore essential that residents consistently reported crime in their area to enable CSU staff to make informed decisions and re-deploy resources accordingly.

RESOLVED:

1. That the Committee note the contents of the report and Appendices.

27. DARTFORD AND GRAVESHAM COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP STRATEGIC ASSESSMENT (SA): PART I EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Community Safety Officer informed Members that the Dartford and Gravesham Community Safety Partnership (CSP) had signed –off the Strategic Assessment (SA) document without amendment at their meeting on 17 January 2011.

He confirmed that subject to public consultation, the priorities identified in the SA document would now be used to develop the new Community Safety Plan.

Members welcomed the headline figures in the SA which recorded an overall reduction in crime for Dartford of - 6.4% for the period October 2009 to September 2010 compared to the corresponding period in 2008/09.

Detailed discussion of the Executive Summary and In-Depth Analysis sections of the SA document were conducted by the Committee in subsequent closed session.

RESOLVED:
1. That the Committee note the contents of the Strategic Assessment as adopted by the Dartford and Gravesham CSP meeting of 17 January 2011;
2. That the Committee endorse the priorities identified by the Strategic Assessment (SA) subject to public consultation;
3. That the Committee endorse the proposal to develop a new Community Safety Plan to address the priorities identified in the SA and to submit the draft Plan to the next meeting of the CSP.

28. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC
RESOLVED:
That under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended), the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that involves the likely disclosure of exempt information.

29. DARTFORD AND GRAVESHAM COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP STRATEGIC ASSESSMENT (SA) PART II (EXEMPT CATEGORY SO 46(1)(B) ANNEX 1 PARAGRAPH 7)

Following confirmation that no members or the Press or Public were present, the Committee went into closed session to consider Item A of the Exempt Agenda - Strategic Assessment (SA) 2010 Part II: In-depth Analysis.

Members, assisted by officers and representatives from Kent Police undertook a detailed discussion of the In-depth Analysis material, concentrating in particular on the areas of Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB), Bluewater (Shoplifting), Domestic Violence, Violent Crime and Youth Re-offending / Referral Orders.

Following discussion Members requested that Officers and Kent Police provide the Committee, where possible with any further analysis of and background to the specific areas discussed.

At the conclusion of proceedings, the Chairman thanked Kent Police representatives, the Strategic Director and CSU officers for attending and congratulated the CSP and partner agencies for achieving a significant overall reduction in crime in the Borough for the period under review.

The meeting closed at 9.40 pm

Councillor A Bardoe
CHAIRMAN
<table>
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CRIME AND DISORDER (OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY) COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT 2010/11

1. Summary

To consider a report of the work carried out by the Crime and Disorder (Overview and Scrutiny) Committee during the last Municipal Year.

2. RECOMMENDATION

That, subject to any amendments made by the Committee, the Committee’s Annual Report for 2010/11 is submitted to the next meeting of the General Assembly of the Council.

3. Background and Discussion

3.1. In accordance with the Committee’s Protocol, the draft Crime and Disorder (O&S) Committee Annual Report 2010/11 is attached for consideration at Appendix A.

4. Relationship to the Corporate Plan

The work of the Committee supports the aim of creating Safer Communities and a safer Borough in which to live, work and socialise.

5. Financial, legal, staffing and other administrative implications and risk assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Implications</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal Implications</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing Implications</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Implications</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Assessment</td>
<td>No uncertainties and/or constraints</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Details of Exempt Information Category

Not applicable.

7. Appendices

Appendix A: Crime and Disorder (O&S) Committee Annual Report 2010/11
Appendix B: Crime and Disorder (O&S) Protocol (May 2011)
Appendix C: Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with Dartford & Graveshame Community Safety Partnership (CSP) (June 2010)
CRIME AND DISORDER (OVERVIEW and SCRUTINY)
COMMITTEE
06 July 2011
Appendix D: Terms of Reference (ToRs) (My 2011)

BACKGROUND PAPERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documents consulted</th>
<th>Date / File Ref</th>
<th>Report Author</th>
<th>Section and Directorate</th>
<th>Exempt Information Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crime and Disorder (O&amp;S) Protocol (May 2011), MoU with D&amp;G CSP, Annual Report 2009/10, Committee Agendas and Minutes for 23 June 2010 and 26 January 2011.</td>
<td></td>
<td>David Hook Committee Coordinator</td>
<td>Member Services/Executive Director</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Member Services (01322 343276)
APPENDIX A

DARTFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL

CRIME AND DISORDER (OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINITY) COMMITTEE

Draft Annual Report 2010/11
CRIME AND DISORDER (OVERVIEW and SCRUTINY)  
COMMITTEE  
06 July 2011

In accordance with its Protocol, the Crime and Disorder (Overview & Scrutiny) Committee is to report annually to the Council on the Committee’s work.

The Crime and Disorder (O&S) Committee performs the overview and scrutiny functions relating to crime and disorder and community safety on behalf of the Council, in accordance with the guidelines contained in the Committee’s Protocol (Appendix B).

The Committee met twice during the Annual Report period.

In accordance with established practice, the Committee reviewed the published Forward Plan at each meeting and confirmed the Minutes of the previous meeting.

WORK PROGRAMME REVIEW

The Committee’s Terms of Reference (Appendix D), re-confirmed at the Annual meeting of the Council on 25 May 2011, provide that the Committee is required to approve an annual Crime and Disorder (O&S) Work Programme.

At its meeting on 23 June 2010, the Committee reviewed, in general terms, the Work Programme for the 2010/11 Municipal Year.

The Strategic Director advised that, as had been the case for 2009/10, the Committee’s Work Programme for 2010/11 would be dictated to an extent by the legislative requirement and timetable for agreement of the annual Strategic Assessment (SA) and the Community Safety Plan (CSP). Members were due to consider the 2010 -11 Refresh document to the existing CSP later in the agenda.

In addition to considering the performance of the Community Safety Partnership (formerly the CDRP), as captured in the annual Strategic Assessment and Community Safety Plan Refresh documents, the following topics would be carried forward from the 2009/10 Work Programme:

- Community involvement;
- PACT;
- Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB);
- CCTV (Update).

Members were reminded that the overview elements of the Committee’s Work Programme had to be agreed with the Community Safety Partnership in advance, but that ad-hoc scrutiny of performance areas (Draw-downs) were not subject to prior CSP approval.
Annual Report 2009/10

The Committee approved the Annual Report for 2009/10 and expressed their gratitude to the Committee Coordinator for compiling the report and for his assistance during the Committee’s inaugural year of operation.

Regular Attendees

Members agreed that Councillor Ann Allen as Cabinet Member for Community Wellbeing and the joint CSU Managers (Council and Kent Police), should have an open invitation to attend meetings of the Committee.

Community Safety Partnership (formerly CDRP)

Members were advised that on 7 June 2010, the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership (CDRP) had been renamed as the Community Safety Partnership (CSP), in line with new legislation and to make it easier for the public to understand what the CSP was trying to achieve.

WORK PROGRAMME ITEMS

DARTFORD and GRAVESHAM COMMUNITY SAFETY PLAN REFRESH DOCUMENT - 2010/11

On 23 June 2010 the Committee considered the 2010 -11 Refresh document to the Dartford and Gravesham Community Safety Plan (CSP) for 2008 – 2011.

The Strategic Director advised Members that the draft annual Strategic Assessment (SA) document considered by the Committee in December 2009 had subsequently been approved by the CDRP (now the CSP) at its meeting in January 2010. The priorities and themes identified in the final 2009 SA had been used to inform the 2010/11 Community Safety Plan Refresh document. She confirmed the following points for Members in subsequent discussion:

- Dartford was represented on the CSP by the Leader of the Council, who alternated as Chairman with the Leader of Gravesham Council on an annual basis. Councillor Kite was Chairman of the CSP for 2010/11. In addition Councillor Hunnisett represented Dartford on the CSP Support Group where he alternated as Chairman with the Gravesham lead Member on an annual basis. Councillor Hunnisett was Vice-Chairman of the Support Group for 2011/11. Dartford was represented on these bodies at senior officer level by the Managing Director and the Strategic Director;
• Dartford utilised the Community Payback scheme run by Kent Probation, whereby people sentenced by the Courts undertook unpaid community work including: litter picking, painting, graffiti removal and allotment work. Future payback works could be requested by local Members and through public consultation;
• Offenders released back into the Dartford community were monitored using a multi-agency holistic approach, utilising the IOMU and PPO frameworks, designed to dissuade offenders from further criminal activity and prosecuting them if they did re-offend.

PERFORMANCE

Also on 23 June 2010, the Committee discussed the Community Safety Partnership’s Performance Progress Report (PPR).

The Strategic Director advised Members that the PPR detailed CSP performance in relation to recorded crime levels, in addition to recording changes in public perception concerning crime and anti-social behaviour. The report also summarised key actions and works being undertaken to address CSP priorities identified in the 2010/11 Refresh document.

Members expressed concern that Dartford’s recorded crime rate was the highest in Kent. Members acknowledged that total crime in Dartford had fallen by 28% in the previous 5 years, but also noted that a 47% reduction had been achieved in Gravesham during the same period. Members asked what measures were proposed by the CSP to redress the apparent imbalance in performance between the Boroughs.

Members were assured by the Strategic Director that Dartford’s crime figures had been discussed by the CSP on 7 June. Discussion had focussed on Dartford’s proximity to the Essex and Metropolitan borders and the issue of cross-border crime. The siting of a major retail complex within the Borough’s precincts was an additional linked factor with implications for acquisitive crime. The Partnership also supported the Kent Police policy on early intervention to police Dartford’s town centre and the night time economy. All these factors served to drive up crime and statistics for Dartford, in comparison to more rural and prosperous Kent communities.

North Kent Police representatives confirmed their intention to continue with their early intervention policy for policing Dartford town centre and the night time economy. The policy was proving successful and would, in the long-term, impact positively on crime figures for the Borough. Police representatives endorsed the Strategic Director’s concerns over acquisitive and cross-border crime in the Borough. However, despite these factors Members were advised that crime statistics for Dartford continued to improve in comparison to its Kent peers in the Five Year Comparison tables.
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Members were assured that police and other partner agency resources within the Community Safety Partnership were targeted appropriately between Dartford and Gravesham.

ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR (ASB): TOOLS, POWERS and PROCESSES

Finally on 23 June 2010, Members received a presentation from the Senior Enforcement Officer (SEO), detailing government legislation aimed at tackling anti-social behaviour (ASB).

Members were advised of the Home Office definition of ASB, of the powers open to the Council to address ASB, together with details of the processes used by the Community Safety Unit (CSU) for dealing with reported incidents of ASB in the community. Members also received copies of the ASB Charter leaflet and the “Information pack for Councillors” on ASB, adopted by authorities across Kent.

The Committee welcomed the presentation and guidance material and noted the importance of getting good news stories about successfully combating Anti Social Behaviour into the local press; both to improve public confidence and to deter criminals. Members were advised that the CSP website was updated every Thursday, and that Neighbourhood Watch magazines also included updates and good news stories.

DARTFORD and GRAVESHAM COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP (CSP) STRATEGIC ASSESSMENT (SA) 2010 PARTS I AND II

On 26 January 2011 the Committee considered, for overview purposes, the Strategic Assessment (SA) document for 2010. Members were advised that the CSP had agreed the document without amendment on 17 January 2011.

Members welcomed the headline figures in the SA recording an overall reduction in crime for Dartford of minus 6.4% for the period October 2009 to September 2010 over the corresponding period for 2008/09.

Detailed discussion of the Executive Summary and the In-Depth Analysis sections of the SA was subsequently undertaken by the Committee in closed session, under Section 100A (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended). Member discussion focussed on measures to combat Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB), Shoplifting, Domestic Violence, Violent Crime and Youth Re-offending, including the use of Referral Orders.

PACT / NEIGHBOURHOOD PANELS and COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Also on 26 January 2011, the Committee received an update from Kent Police on the new arrangements for PACT meetings proposed by the new Coalition Government.
Members were reminded that previously PACT meetings had been held monthly and were often poorly attended. Future meetings would be quarterly as the new Coalition Government favoured a greater police presence on the streets engaging the public on a daily basis. During this on-street engagement Kent Police had surveyed 8,500 residents by BlackBerry questionnaire for views. Police forces were also being encouraged to identify more effective and better attended forums to engage the public.

Members welcomed the new proposals which should help to raise public confidence and give a positive perception of effective police performance. Improved publicity for the quarterly PACT meetings would help, also regular electronic updates to Members on crime statistics for inclusion in their Ward Newsletters.

The Acting Area Commander informed Members that the new operational measures were due to be considered by the Kent Police Authority on 9 February 2011 and were fully supported by Kent’s Chief Constable.

CCTV: ANNUAL UPDATE REPORT

In addition on 26 January, Members considered an update report on the Council’s CCTV operation.

The Strategic Director and attending CSU officers clarified the following points for Members in relation to the report:

- CCTV cameras were replaced at a rate of 4 - 5 per annum, in a rolling programme which included an element for repairs. The programme was some 50% towards completion;
- The Council owned 54 permanently installed CCTV cameras with 44 strategically placed in the Town Centre;
- The siting of CCTV cameras in Dartford was based on need and analysis of previous crime patterns. The areas presently subject to CCTV surveillance continued to retain the highest levels of concentrated crime;
- The Council’s new mobile ‘Stryker’ CCTV cameras had been funded by the Dartford and Gravesham CSP (CDRP) as was;
- Deployment of the mobile ‘Stryker’ CCTV cameras to new crime “hotspots”, was made on the basis of reported crime and incidents of ASB: resident support and cooperation was essential to enable CSU staff to make informed decisions and effectively re-deploy resources.

The Committee welcomed the update and noted the further points of clarification.
Policing of the Night Time Economy: Impact on the Town Centre

At its meeting on 23 June 2010 the Committee were briefed by North Kent Police officers on the measures being undertaken to police Dartford’s night time economy and the town centre.

Members expressed general satisfaction with the policing arrangements in the town centre at night but expressed concern with the policing arrangements for the main exit routes from the town, which suffered a high degree of vandalism after 1 a.m. and noted the disparity in the concentrations of police resources between town centre and the adjacent residential areas where most acts of vandalism occurred.

Members were advised that the police operation in the town centre, including the supervision of Dartford’s night time economy, had been developed over a three year period and addressed the specific areas of:

- Violent Crime
- Anti Social Behaviour (ASB)
- Criminal Damage and
- Increasing Public Confidence and Safety.

North Kent Police had adopted a high profile interventionist approach to make the town centre safer, with offenders removed at an early stage. The interventionist policy had led to an increase in police reported crime but produced marked reductions in instances of serious assault, criminal damage and ASB and produced a rise in public confidence and safety.

Members were further advised that police manning levels and patrol strategies outside the town centre had been adjusted during the preceding 12 month period to place increased emphasis on patrolling the main exit routes from the town centre and Grabbacab patrons. Patrol strategies reacted to short-term problems, whilst maintaining progress towards long-term goals and remained subject to review based on officer feedback and weekly intelligence gathering. However, a critical mass of officers and resources would always be required in the town centre to deal with flash-points.

Cross – Border Policing with Essex and Metropolitan Forces

On 26 January 2011 the Committee received a presentation from the Acting Area Commander on cross-border policing arrangements with the Essex and Metropolitan forces.
Members were advised that cross-border cooperation with the Metropolitan and Essex police forces had been ongoing for some 2 years with regular meetings held with Metropolitan colleagues.

Collaboration with Essex concentrated on the major areas of Serious Crime, Forensics and Intelligence gathering. Some Essex colleagues were in the process of co-locating to North Fleet police station to further enhance joint working.

Members subsequently relayed a number of examples of cross-border crime suffered by residents in their Wards. Police and CSU officers in attendance undertook to respond to Member’s concerns and advise them of any outcomes outside of the meeting.

POLICING OF THE TOWN CENTRE: UPDATE FROM KENT POLICE

Also on 26 January, Members received an update from the Acting Area Commander on the new strategies and resources being deployed to police the town centre and exit routes during the Night Time Economy.

Given the confidential nature of the information, discussion took place in the absence of the press and public under the Exempt Agenda, in accordance with Standing Order 46 (1)(B) Annex 1 Paragraph 7.

Members were advised by the Strategic Director that funding for the Grabbacab scheme had been secured for the next 6 months and that further funding for Grabbacab was being pursued with Kent Police and NHS West Kent. Further long-term sustainable funding for Grabbacab might arise in the future, if the new Government decided to introduce mooted legislation allowing Council’s to impose a levy on late night establishments to help fund community safety initiatives.

CHANGES TO THE COMMITTEE’S TERMS OF REFERENCE

On 7 June 2010 the Dartford and Gravesham Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership (CDRP) resolved to change its name to the Dartford and Gravesham Community Safety Partnership (CSP). Also on 7 June, the General Assembly of the Council adopted a new Petitions Scheme. Under the new Scheme it is possible for members of the public to petition the Council for an officer “to be held to account”. Where such petitions (which must contain at least 1,500 valid signatures) relate to crime and disorder issues, they will be referred to the Crime and Disorder (Overview and Scrutiny) Committee for consideration. The Committee’s Protocol was amended to reflect these changes.
In addition, the Committee’s Protocol was amended to reflect the inclusion of Kent Probation as a “responsible body” on the CDRP (now CSP), from 1 April 2010, under the provisions of the Policing and Crime Act 2009.

THANKS

The Committee wishes to express it’s thanks to Officers and Kent Police representatives for attending its meetings, for providing informative reports and presentations, and for giving such full and detailed responses to Member’s questions during the municipal year under review.
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# Crime and Disorder (Overview and Scrutiny) Committee Protocol

‘Crime and disorder’ is defined as including forms of crime and disorder that involve anti-social behaviour or other behaviour adversely affecting the local environment or the misuse of drugs, alcohol and other substances.

## Introduction

This Protocol recognises the division of executive and non-executive roles and responsibilities, the overview and scrutiny role performed by non-executive Councillors and the part played by all Councillors in representing local communities.

## Terms of Reference

To review and scrutinise, and make reports or recommendations, regarding the functioning of the responsible authorities which comprise the Dartford and Gravesham Community Safety Partnership (the CSP):

- Dartford Borough Council [a responsible authority]
- Gravesham Borough Council [a responsible authority]
- Kent Police [a responsible authority]
- Kent Police Authority [a responsible authority]
- Kent County Council [a responsible authority]
- Kent Fire and Rescue Service [a responsible authority]
- Kent Probation [a responsible body]
- West Kent NHS Primary Care Trust [a responsible authority]

To receive petitions/ePetitions to ‘hold officers to account’ on matters related to crime and disorder and community safety.

## Guidelines

(a) Terms of Reference agreed by the General Assembly of the Council (the GAC);
(b) Standing Orders and Financial Regulations;
(c) Codes of Conduct;
(d) Secretary of State/Home Office guidance issued from time to time.

## Committee accountability

To the Council as the ultimate decision making body from which all of the other elements in the decision-making process derive their authority.

## Elected Member accountability

Individual elected Members have a collective responsibility for the Council’s functions. This collective responsibility extends to a duty to ensure that the Council complies with the law and does not act unlawfully.

## Compliance principles

The Committee will:
- Comply with the Council’s crime and disorder aims as stated from time to time in the Council’s Strategic and Policy Framework;
- Recognise the legitimate right of the Cabinet to provide political and operational leadership to the Council and will not attempt to usurp the power vested in the Cabinet by the GAC;
• Recognise that Officers continue to owe a duty to all Members of the Council;
• Guarantee the right of Officers to express their advice on matters within their areas of responsibility, particularly (but not exclusively) on technical professional issues. Officers must not be pressurised to change their advice to suit political aspirations. Questions to Officers must be within Officers’ remit and will as far as possible be confined to questions of fact and explanation relating to policies and decisions within Officers’ remit;
• Will not criticise or adversely comment on any individual Officer by name;
• Not attempt to thwart the Cabinet by engaging in vexatious or unnecessarily repetitive overview and scrutiny activities.

### Frequency of meetings
No less than once in every twelve month period, the Committee will meet to review or scrutinise decisions made, or other action taken by the CSP and the responsible authorities (acting collectively or individually), in connection with their crime and disorder functions, as the Committee considers appropriate.

### Membership
Committee membership cannot include any member of the Council’s Cabinet.

### The Overview and Scrutiny Process
In accordance with its Terms of Reference, the Committee can only discharge overview and scrutiny functions relating to crime and disorder/community safety.

#### 1. What may be scrutinised

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>decisions and/or actions of the CSP and the responsible authorities (either collectively or individually);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>the CSP’s annual strategic assessment to inform the Community Safety Plan;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>the CSP’s partnership plan;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Councillor Calls for Action (CCfAs);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>crime and disorder/community safety related local improvement targets;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>subject to section U. of this Protocol, any other local crime and disorder matter related to the Council’s/Cabinet’s crime and disorder/community safety functions;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>items related to crime and disorder/community safety referred to in the Members’ Information Bulletin.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB: Overview and scrutiny of the CSP’s crime and disorder functions will not focus on day to day operational performance, which is the proper concerns of managers of the responsible authorities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Petitions/ePetitions - to ‘hold officers to account’ in accordance with the Petitions Scheme Guidelines.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. What may be reviewed

2.1 The matters referred to in sections 1.1 – 1.3 and 1.6 – 1.7 of this Protocol.

A. Draw downs

Draw downs for the purposes of scrutinising/reviewing decisions/actions of the CSP, responsible authorities, Cabinet etc and/or the scrutiny/review of the effects/outcomes of a decision post implementation

A.1 For each meeting of the Committee:

through the Chairman of the Committee, up to three items in total for the Political Group on the Council forming the administration on the Council;

through the Chairman of the Committee, up to three items in total for the Political Group on the Council forming the largest party in opposition on the Council;

one item only for any other Political Groups on the Council, dealt with on a ‘first come first served basis’.

In cases of genuine urgency, the Chairman may authorise more than the allocated number of draw downs per Political Group on the Council, referred to this section A.1

A.2 Each Committee meeting may draw down for overview and scrutiny purposes, no more than seven items in total. These seven items may comprise a combination of items relating respectively, to a Call-in, CCfA, the overview and scrutiny of decision(s)/actions of the CSP and the responsible authorities (either collectively or individually), Cabinet/Officers, local improvement targets etc. Whatever combination is applied, the Committee is restricted to the overview and scrutiny of seven items in total, per Committee meeting.

A.3 (a) A draw down(s) must be on written notice to Member Services by no later than noon on the 16th day before a Committee meeting i.e. 16 clear days’ (sixteen weekdays i.e. 16 periods of 24 hours running from midnight to midnight excluding bank and public holidays and the day on which the meeting is held).

(b) The need (if any) for participants (CSP representatives, Members, Officers, and other external participants) to appear before the Committee will be notified to Member Services by no later than noon on the 16th day before a Committee meeting i.e. 16 clear days’ (sixteen weekdays i.e. 16 periods of 24 hours running from midnight to midnight excluding bank and public holidays and the day on which the meeting is held).

A.4 Where the Committee wish to review/scrutinise an item for the purposes of examining the effect and outcomes of the CSP and/or the responsible authority, Cabinet etc decision post implementation, drawing down the item may need to be delayed to a future date.

NB: The focus of the review/scrutiny in such circumstances will be concerned with the effects and outcomes of the decision whether or not reference was made to effects or outcomes (potential or perceived) in any background document before the Committee.
A.5

When more than one Political Group on the Council notifies a draw down of the same item, the Political Group which first gave notice in accordance with section A.1 of this Protocol, will lead at the meeting, on the discussion of the item and the Chairman will exercise his/her discretion about the right of the Political Groups to sum up.

B. Requests for information

B.1

Any Committee member may make requests for information, on written notice to Member Services by no later than noon on the 16th day before the Committee meeting i.e. 16 clear days’ (sixteen weekdays i.e. 16 periods of 24 hours running from midnight to midnight excluding bank and public holidays and the day on which the meeting is held) and the following will apply. The request for information will:

- detail the item(s) to be drawn down, supported by reasons for the draw down(s);
- the nature of the information requested e.g. a full report from the CSP, background information, research, data, statistics, etc;
- if applicable, identify the need for participants (CSP representatives, Members, Officers and/or other external participants) to appear before the Committee (refer to the general principles on participation detailed in section D of this Protocol);
- provide an indication if at all possible, of the questions and the likely topics to be raised on the item(s);
- provide an indication if at all possible, of whether the request for information is for the purposes of informing the debate or for the purposes of putting questions to participants.

B.2

On receipt of a request for information, Member Services will notify the Strategic Director and links officers of the CSP and responsible authorities. Where the request for information relates to a Cabinet decision/action, the Strategic Director and the Cabinet Chairman will be notified accordingly.

B.3

Where information requested is readily available and routinely collected, it will be provided within 14 days of receipt of the request, save that if some or all the information cannot reasonably be provided within the 14 day period, the information will be provided as soon as reasonably possible and in any event, no later than 7 clear days’ (seven weekdays i.e. 7 periods of 24 hours running from midnight to midnight excluding bank and public holidays and the day on which the meeting is held).

B.4

Information will be depersonalised, unless the identification of an individual is necessary or appropriate in order to enable the Committee to properly exercise its powers or disclosure is permitted by or under the Data Protection Act 1998.
B.5 Information will not include matters reasonably likely to prejudice legal proceedings or current or future operations of the CSP and the responsible authorities, whether acting collectively or individually.

B.6 Information will not include matters reasonably likely to constitute a breach of confidence actionable by any person.

B.7 Schedule 12A, Parts 1-3 of the Local Government Act 1972 as regards the categories of exempt information, and Standing Order 46(2) as regards confidential information, will apply to the proceedings of the Committee.

B.8 The overview and scrutiny of an item may need to be deferred pending the receipt of information, particularly where requests for additional information are made or where the information requested is voluminous and/or where there are costs implications associated with providing the information. In these circumstances, Member Services will advise the Committee Chairman accordingly.

B.9 To facilitate the overview and scrutiny process, the CSP and responsible authorities are under a duty to pro-actively provide information to the Committee on request (reg.5 of the Crime and Disorder (Overview and Scrutiny) Regulations 2009 and reg.10 of the Local Authorities (Overview and Scrutiny Committees) (England) (Regulations 2009).

C. Call-in of Cabinet decisions

C.1 This Call-in procedure will be operated in such a way as not to have a concomitant negative effect on the efficiency of Cabinet decision-making.

C.2 (a) Call-in will be by three Members of the Committee (involving representation of at least two political groups), in writing, to Member Services by no later than noon on the day before the Cabinet meeting. Member Services will notify the Cabinet Chairman of the Call-in.

(b) Once a member of the Committee has signed a Call-in, he/she may not do so again until a period of six months has expired.

C.3 A special meeting of the Committee may be called in accordance with the rules detailed in Standing Order 27 (Special Meetings of the Cabinet, Committees and Boards) and will be held before the next meeting of the Cabinet (Cabinet meetings are scheduled on a four weekly basis), with a view to reporting to the next Cabinet meeting. Where it is not possible for the Committee to report to the next Cabinet meeting, the Committee Chairman will consult with the Cabinet Chairman and agree a date for referring the Call-in back to the Cabinet for consideration/reconsideration.

Referring the Call-in back to the Cabinet will not be delayed by more than 4 weeks from the date of the notice of Call-in.
C.4 Once a Call-in has been effected, the Cabinet may at its discretion, either:

(a) defer consideration of the proposed decision and/or action (the Deferred Decision) to its next scheduled meeting or where it is not possible for the Committee to report to the next scheduled meeting of the Cabinet, defer consideration until receipt of the Committee's report; or

(b) take the decision and/or action which decision/action will stand as suspended (the Suspended Decision) until the next scheduled meeting of the Cabinet or where the Call-in is referred to the GAC by the Committee, until referred back to the Cabinet by the GAC for reconsideration.

C.5 Following consideration of the Call-in, the Committee will, on a report (setting out the Committee's concerns, recommendations, conclusions, suggestions and/or comments), either refer the Deferred Decision/Suspended Decision back to the Cabinet for consideration/reconsideration, or request a debate on the Call-in at the next ordinary meeting of the GAC, or if necessary, at an extraordinary meeting of the GAC, but subject to the rules detailed in Standing Order 1.(3) on the convening of extraordinary meetings.

C.6 On receipt of the Committee's report:

(a) the Cabinet will consider/reconsider the Deferred Decision/ Suspended Decision and the contents of the Committee's report before coming to a final decision. Providing the Deferred Decision/Suspended Decision is not contrary to the budget or policy framework, the Cabinet may or may not amend the Deferred Decision/Suspended Decision before reaching a final decision and implementing it; or

(b) the GAC will consider the Call-in and may object to the Deferred Decision/Suspended Decision in which case the Deferred Decision/Suspended Decision will be referred back to the Cabinet (with the GAC's views) for consideration/reconsideration. Unless the Deferred Decision/Suspended Decision is contrary to the budget or policy framework, the Cabinet may choose whether to amend the Deferred Decision/Suspended Decision or not before reaching a final decision and implementing it.

NB: The GAC has no locus to make a decision in respect of a Cabinet decision unless the Cabinet decision is contrary to or not wholly consistent with the budget or policy framework agreed/adopted by the Council.

C.7 Following the Cabinet's consideration of a Deferred Decision or reconsideration of a Suspended Decision, the decisions(s) will take effect i.e. be implemented immediately. In addition, a Suspended Decision will become effective:
(a) on the date of the GAC meeting where the Call-in has been referred to the GAC and the GAC does not object to the Suspended Decision and/or does not refer the Suspended Decision back to the Cabinet.

(b) on the date of the Committee meeting, where the Committee does not refer the Suspended Decision back to the Cabinet or to the GAC.

C.8
A Call-in (i.e. the decision itself) cannot be the subject of further scrutiny after implementation, pursuant to the draw down mechanism detailed in section A of this Protocol.

NB: This restriction does not preclude a subsequent draw-down of the subject matter of the decision for purposes related for example, to topic scrutiny or reporting on matters of local concern.

C.9
This Call-in procedure will not apply to urgent Cabinet decisions and/or action to be taken by the Cabinet which need to be implemented urgently. The definition of 'urgency' means any matter of immediate urgency (i.e. where any delay likely to be caused by the Call-in would prejudice the Council's or the public's interest), making the prompt exercise of the powers of the Cabinet, in consultation with the Managing Director and the Monitoring Officer/Chief Finance Officer desirable and/or necessary and which cannot await the next meeting of the Cabinet, or the next ordinary meeting of the GAC.

NB: The definition of 'urgency' as detailed above, excludes urgent key decisions under Standing Order 54(8) (Special Urgency) and urgent departure decisions under Standing Order 55(3) (Decisions outside the Budget or Policy Framework).

C.10
Cabinet decisions and/or actions to be taken which are not subject to Call-in will take effect, i.e. be implemented immediately.

C.11
Subject to the draw down rules in section A.2 of this Protocol, the Committee may only Call-in two decisions per three-month period.

C.12
Key decisions of Officers, area committees/joint arrangements (referred to in the Cabinet's Forward Plan) may be subject to individual Call-in in accordance with the procedure detailed in this Protocol.

C.13
Call-in will not apply to urgent departure decisions (refer to Standing Order 55(3)) and urgent key decisions (refer to Standing Order 54(8)).

C.14
The rules detailed in sections B and D of this Protocol will apply to an individual Call-in.

C.15
A CCfA does not provide an additional opportunity for a Cabinet decision to be challenged. A previous Call-in will only be relevant, if the circumstances of the Call-in and the CCfA are clearly different.

C.16
The operation of this Call-in procedure will be monitored annually by the Monitoring Officer and if necessary, a report submitted to the GAC with proposals for review.
D. Participants

D.1 The nature of a Call-in, the item to be drawn down or the nature of the topic under review/scrutiny will generally determine who participates in the proceedings of the Committee.

D.2 Persons required to attend if summoned

Subject to the rules on participation at section D.7 of this Protocol, the giving of 14 clear days notice, (fourteen weekdays i.e. 14 periods of 24 hours running from midnight to midnight excluding bank and public holidays and the day on which the meeting is held) and information being provided as to the nature and scope of the overview and scrutiny, the following persons may be required to attend meetings of the Committee, to give evidence, make representations and/or answer questions:

Council participants

Cabinet members and Council Officers (Section 21(13) Local Government Act 2000);

CSP participants

Representatives of the CSP, responsible authorities and co-ordinating body (reg. 6 of the Crime and Disorder (Overview and Scrutiny) Committee Regulations 2009).

D.3 Members of the community and other organisations/stakeholders etc

Subject to the rules on participation at section D.7 of this Protocol, members of the community and other organisations/stakeholders etc may be invited (but cannot be compelled) to attend the Committee, to make representations, answer questions or give evidence.

Where the Committee seeks to engage with the third sector (voluntary and community groups), it will respect the principles of the Council’s Compact.

D.4 Expert advisors and assessors

The Committee may consider the available options for future direction in the development of crime and disorder policies and may appoint experts, advisors and assessors to assist the Committee in the process.

D.5 Councillors who are not members of the Committee

The rules detailed in Standing Order 36, will apply to the attendance at Committee meetings, of Councillors who are not members of the Committee.

D.6 The overview and scrutiny of an item may need to be deferred pending the availability of a participant to attend, when summoned or invited. In these circumstances, Member Services will advise the Committee Chairman accordingly.
D.7 Participation Rules

(a) The attendance of Cabinet members and Council Officers as participants and any necessary substitutions will be within the discretion of the Cabinet Chairman in relation to Cabinet member participants and the Managing Director, in relation to Officer participants.

The CSP’s representative will be its Chairman or Vice-Chairman.

The nomination/appointment by the responsible authorities of representatives as participants in the overview and scrutiny process, and substitutions, will be at the discretion of their governing bodies or as detailed in their constitutions.

(b) The Managing Director may restrict the attendance of Council Officers to above a certain grade or in accordance with other criteria to ensure that junior Officers are not put under undue pressure. This restriction is consistent with the European Convention on Human Rights.

(c) The Chairman reserves the right (supported by detailed reasoning to the Cabinet Chairman or Managing Director (as appropriate)), to strongly request the attendance of a named Cabinet member(s), Council Officer(s), representatives of the CSP and/or responsible authorities as participants in the proceedings of the Committee, subject to written notice to Member Services by no later than noon on the 16th day before the Committee meeting i.e. 16 clear days’ (sixteen weekdays i.e. 16 periods of 24 hours running from midnight to midnight excluding bank and public holidays and the day on which the meeting is held).

(d) Council Officers who are subject to disciplinary proceedings and/or investigation will not be called as participants.

(e) When questioning participants, due regard will be had to the Compliance Principles referred to in this Protocol and to paras.(f) and (g) below. Participants may leave the meeting on the conclusion of their particular issues.

(f) Participants may decline to answer questions in open session of the Committee on the grounds that the answer might disclose information that would be exempt or confidential under the access to information provisions. In that event, the Committee may resolve to exclude the public and the press in accordance with Standing Orders in order that the question may be answered in private session.

(g) Participants are not obliged to answer any question which they would be entitled to refuse to answer in a court of law for example any question relating to a participant’s past conduct/actions which could not be answered without acknowledging or referring to possible inappropriate conduct/actions/inactions.

(h) To better inform the Committee, participants may be required to provide their evidence in writing and may be questioned by the Committee on that evidence.
(i) The substance (rather than the detail) of oral evidence and participants' responses will be documented by the Committee Co-ordinator and circulated to them for comment, before the next meeting of the Committee.

(j) Participants may be asked to explain:

   (i) what the policies are;
   (ii) the justification and objectives of those policies;
   (iii) the extent to which those objectives may have been met;
   (iv) how administrative factors may have affected both the choice of the policy measures and the manner of their implementation.

(k) Participants may be asked explain and justify;

   • advice they have given prior to decisions being taken;
   • decisions they themselves have taken under delegations from the Cabinet, CSP etc.

NB: As far as possible, Council Officers should avoid being drawn into discussions on the merits of alternative policies where this is politically contentious. Any comment by Council Officers on the Cabinet's policies and actions should always be consistent with the requirement for Officers to be politically neutral.

---

**E. Councillor Calls for Action (CCfA)**

**E.1**

Subject to the 'excluded matters' rule detailed in section E.2 and the restrictions detailed in sections E4, E5, E.7 and E10 of this Protocol, any ward Member may refer to the Committee for scrutiny, any crime and disorder matter.

The flowchart at Annex 1 describes the CCfA procedure.

**E.2**

**Excluded matters**

A CCfA cannot be championed in relation to matters associated with licensing, planning, or a matter where there is already a statutory right of review or appeal (other than the right to complain to the Local Government Ombudsman), or a matter which is vexatious, discriminatory or not reasonable to be included on the agenda for, or to be discussed at, a meeting of the Committee.
A matter does not fall within a description of an ‘excluded matter’ if it consists of an allegation that a function for which the Council is responsible has not been discharged at all or that its discharge has failed or is failing on a systematic basis, notwithstanding the fact that the allegation specifies or refers to an excluded matter.

Referral of a genuine, significant and persistent local community concern by the local ward Member as a CCfA for scrutiny is a measure of last resort, once other approaches for informal resolution have been exhausted. Local ward Members are advised to seek advice from the relevant Director before agreeing to champion a CCfA.

The CCfA may be referred for scrutiny on behalf of a constituent, or on the local ward Member’s own initiative, providing the local ward Member has the support of the local community and the Member does not have a personal and prejudicial interest in the matter.

The Committee may receive a CCfA via the Cabinet in circumstances where the local ward Member has declined to champion the CCfA and the constituent has then referred the issue to the Cabinet (section 19(5) of the Police and Justice Act 2006).

Subject to the draw down rules at section A.2 of this Protocol, the referral of a CCfA to the Committee will be limited to one CCfA per meeting.

The referral of a CCfA to the Committee by a local ward Member will be on written notification to Member Services, by no later than noon on the 16th day before a Committee meeting, i.e. 16 clear days (sixteen weekdays i.e. 16 periods of 24 hours running from midnight to midnight excluding bank and public holidays and the day on which the meeting is held).

The rules relating to provision of information and request for participant attendance, at sections B and D of this Protocol will apply.

The acceptance of a CCfA will be at the discretion of the Committee. In considering whether or not to accept a CCfA, the Committee may have regard to any representations made by the local ward Member as to why it would be appropriate for the Committee to accept the CCfA.

If the Committee decides not to accept the CCfA, Member Services will within 5 days of the meeting, formally notify the ward Member of the Committee’s decision and the reasons for it. The Committee’s decision is final. There is no right of appeal.

The local ward Member may address the Committee (but not vote) on the matter raised.

Following consideration of a CCfA, the Committee may report or recommend accordingly to the CSP and the responsible authorities (either collectively or individually), GAC and/or the Cabinet. The rules detailed in sections H and M of this Protocol, will apply.

The Committee may submit a copy of its report or recommendations to the local ward Member or await the CSP’s and the responsible authorities’ (either collectively or individually), GAC’s or the Cabinet’s response before doing so.
F. Committee member business

Subject to the rules on draw down detailed in section A.2 of this Protocol, any Committee or (sub-committee) member has the legal right [Section 21A(1) Local Government Act 2000] to place any matter relevant to the Committee’s functions on the agenda. This right will be exercised by giving written notice to Member Services by no later than noon on the 16th day before a Committee meeting i.e. 16 clear days (sixteen weekdays i.e. 16 periods of 24 hours running from midnight to midnight excluding bank and public holidays and the day on which the meeting is held).

The rules relating to provision of information and request for participant attendance, at sections B and D of this Protocol, will apply.

G. Local improvement targets/ Community Strategy

G.1

The Council’s Community Strategy (for Promoting or Improving Economic, Social and Environmental Well-being) (CS) is a key long-term planning/place shaping document for improving the quality of life and services in the local area.

Local improvement targets are defined as ‘targets for improvement in the economic, social or environmental well-being of the authority’s area that relates to the authority, one or more partners or one or more other persons acting or having functions exercisable in the authority’s area’.

G.2

There are a variety of activities with which overview and scrutiny can be involved:

- Contributing to the development of crime and disorder policy priorities on which local improvement targets are based;
- Ensuring greater openness and public accountability of public services, through open scrutiny hearings and investigations involving all local partners where appropriate;
- Reviewing how well the achievement of the crime and disorder local improvement targets is going;
- Investigating and proposing new approaches to tackling local problems and needs reflected in the targets.

H. The duty to have regard to reports/recommendations

H.1

The CSP, responsible authorities, GAC and the Cabinet are required by law to have regard to the Committee’s Overview or Scrutiny Report and/or recommendations (reg. 7 of the Crime and Disorder (Overview and Scrutiny) Committee Regulations 2009).

H.2

Where the Committee’s recommendations have not been accepted by the body concerned, clear reasons will be given. Where recommendations have been agreed, but expectations have not been met, the issue may be re-addressed fully by the Committee.
J. Co-option

J.1 The Committee may recommend to the GAC, the appointment/co-option of additional persons to serve on the Committee or its sub-committee, subject to the following:

(i) a person co-opted to serve on the Committee/sub-committee will not be entitled to vote on any particular matter, unless the Committee so determines and subject to the GAC’s permission in advance, on voting rights.

(ii) a co-opted person's membership may be limited to the exercise of the Committee's/sub-committee's powers in relation to a particular matter or type of matter.

(iii) the Committee will only co-opt an employee, officer or member of the responsible authorities comprising the CSP to serve on the Committee/sub-committee, providing this person:

(a) is not the chairman or vice chairman of the CSP or the nominated representative/member or substitute of the responsible authorities; and
(b) is not a Cabinet member (or an executive member of Kent County Council or Gravesham Borough Council).

(iv) the membership of a person co-opted to serve on the Committee/sub-committee, may be withdrawn at any time by the Committee.

(v) Co-optees will comply with the Council’s Member Code of Conduct set out in Part 5 of the Constitution.

(vi) Co-optees will have access to exempt/confidential information considered/to be considered by the Committee. The rules detailed in section Q.4 of this Protocol, will apply.

J.2 Co-optees will count towards establishing a quorum.

K. Work programme

K.1 The Committee will be responsible for setting its own work programme and in doing so, will take into account wishes of Committee members who are not members of the largest political group on the Council.

K.2 Duplication of activities or major additions to the Committee’s work programme will be avoided.

K.3 The CSP and the responsible authorities will be informed in advance, of overview and scrutiny exercises (including their scope).

K.4 The Committee will receive an annual report on its workings and may make recommendations for future work programmes.
L. Appointment of independent experts, advisers/assessors

L.1 Subject to available resources and GAC authority, the Committee may invite independent experts, advisers and assessors to contribute to the overview and scrutiny process undertaken by it, its sub-committees or task groups. Independent experts, advisers and assessors will have no voting rights and will not count for the purposes of establishing a quorum.

L.2 The criteria for selection will be;

(a) candidates must be able to demonstrate to the Chairman an expert knowledge of the subject in question;
(b) candidates will have no contact with the Borough Council, which could be seen as prejudicial to their independence;
(c) candidates will not be employees of the Council, a person/organisation contracted to provide services on behalf of the Council or an employee, officer or member of the CSP, responsible authorities or co-ordinating body.

L.3 Independent experts, advisers and assessors will be expected to abide by the Member Code of Conduct, including the requirement to declare interests and respecting confidentiality.

L.4 Independent experts, advisers and assessors will receive payment in accordance with a standard scale of fees, to be agreed by the Cabinet, plus travel and other reasonable/legitimate expenses.

L.5 Independent experts, advisers and assessors may at the Committee’s discretion, remain in the meeting room when confidential and/or exempt information is being discussed.

L.6 In considering independent experts’, advisers’ and assessors’ recommendations, the Committee will have regard to the advice of the Council’s Statutory Officers (Chief Finance Officer/Section 151 Officer and Monitoring Officer) who are legally bound respectively, to report to the GAC on inter alia:

- the corporate approach of the Council;
- contravention of law and/or Standing Orders, Financial Regulations;
- unlawfulness, maladministration or injustice;
- vires and propriety of expenditure;
- overall integrity of the budget, capital and revenue and the fiduciary duty and responsibility of all Members (Section 112 and 114 Reports).

NB: The GAC retains the ultimate responsibility of censure.
M. Overview or Scrutiny reports and/or recommendations

M.1 All comments, conclusions and recommendations to the CSP, responsible authorities, GAC and/or Cabinet (referred to in this part of the Protocol as the ‘relevant body’ will be accompanied by an Overview or Scrutiny Report prepared by the Committee Co-ordinator, in consultation with the appropriate Officer and the Committee Chairman under the existing rules for the preparation of committee reports.

M.2 The Overview or Scrutiny Report will include:
   (a) an explanation of the matter reviewed or scrutinised;
   (b) a summary of the evidence considered;
   (c) a list of the participants involved in the overview and scrutiny exercise;
   (d) any recommendations on the matter reviewed or scrutinised, including where applicable, an indication of the costs associated with implementing the recommendations;
   (e) a summary of the views of Members dissenting from the majority recommendation(s);
   (f) the mechanism for monitoring progress in implementing the recommendation(s).

M.3 All motions (whether passed, rejected, opposed etc) by the Committee will be detailed in the Overview or Scrutiny Report.

M.4 The Overview or Scrutiny Report and/or recommendations will be published and sent to the link officer of the relevant body.

M.5 The relevant body is under a legal obligation to consider the Overview or Scrutiny Report and/or recommendations and respond to the Committee within two months of the date of the Overview or Scrutiny Report, indicating what (if any) action the body proposes to take.

Relevant bodies may fully accept, partially accept or reject the Overview or Scrutiny Report and/or recommendations. If the relevant body partially accepts or rejects the Overview or Scrutiny Report and/or recommendations, the body must detail its reasons.

M.6 The Committee Chairman, may at the request of the relevant body, attend its meeting and present the Overview or Scrutiny Report and answer questions.

M.7 If in disagreement with the decision of the Committee, any Councillor(s) who expresses a minority view, may through the Committee Chairman, refer a ‘minority view’ report to the relevant body for consideration and provided they do not have a prejudicial interest in the matter under discussion, the Councillor may be requested to attend the body’s meeting and present their views and answer questions.

M.8 If at all possible, Overview or Scrutiny Reports and/or recommendations should be included on the agenda of the next available meeting of the relevant body unless the matter which is the subject of the Overview or Scrutiny Report and/or recommendations is scheduled to be considered by the relevant body within a period of four weeks from the date the Committee issues the Overview or Scrutiny Report and/or recommendations. In such circumstances, the Committee’s Overview or Scrutiny Report/recommendations will be considered by the relevant body in the context of their deliberations on the substantive item on the body’s agenda.
M.9 Only one Overview or Scrutiny Report per meeting of the relevant body may be submitted by the Committee for consideration.

M.10 Following receipt of the relevant body’s response, the Committee may, by motion, move ‘that the matter be referred back to the [named] relevant body’ either ‘for further information’ or ‘for further consideration’ or as the case may be, with an instruction that some specified action be taken or that the Committee considers that no further action is necessary.

M.11 Overview or Scrutiny Reports and/or recommendations to the GAC will be copied to the Cabinet Chairman. The GAC will not consider an Overview or Scrutiny Report and/or recommendations until the Cabinet has had the opportunity to comment.

M.12 Local ward Members and other non-executive Councillors will have the opportunity at GAC meetings, to raise issues either through questions, motions or through policy and other debates.

N. Cabinet Key Decisions

Where the Cabinet has decided not to include a particular decision in the forward plan, but the Committee believes that it should have been included, the Committee may require the Cabinet to make a report on the decision to the GAC in accordance with Standing Order 54(9). The Committee’s consideration of any such matter will be in public, but subject to the rules on confidential and exempt information.

P. Monitoring Officer reports

The Committee may consider whether it would be appropriate, following receipt of a Monitoring Officer report to the Cabinet (and copied to all Members of the Council), to hold a short enquiry into the matter which is the subject of the report prior to the Cabinet’s consideration of it and to recommend accordingly to the Cabinet.

Q. Consideration of items at meetings

Q.1 Without prejudice to the rules detailed in Standing Orders on the consideration of urgent items, items will not be considered at a meeting of the Committee unless included on the agenda for the meeting. The order of business will be as set out in Standing Order 58(10)(a)(i) to and including (iii) and the business as otherwise set out in the agenda in accordance with Standing Order 58(10)(a)(iv) will be in the order of:
• Call – in;
• decisions and/or actions of the CSP and the responsible authorities (either collectively or individually);
• the CSP’s annual strategic assessment;
• the CSP’s partnership plan;
• community safety related local improvement targets (through the Community Strategy goals);
• Draw downs;
• CCfA;
• Petitions/ePetitions to ‘hold officers to account’
• Key Decisions;
• any other local crime and disorder matter related to the Council’s/Cabinet’s crime and disorder/community safety functions;
• Officer decisions pursuant to Standing Order 38 (Delegation of Urgent and Routine Matters);
• Minority member business;
• Scrutiny Committee member business;
• Monitoring progress of agreed actions;
• Members’ Information Bulletin.

Q.2 The order of business may be altered by the Committee in accordance with the rules detailed in Standing Order 58(10)(b).

Q.3 Cabinet decisions and Officer decisions under Standing Order 38 (Delegation of Urgent and Routine Matters) and under the Scheme of Delegations to Officers, cannot be reversed or amended.

Q.4 Voting Committee members have a right of access to exempt or confidential information considered by the Cabinet, but only if it is relevant to an issue(s) before the Committee (Standing Order 51(4)).

Q.5 In exercising its powers, the Committee must respect, support and not compromise the duties and responsibilities of other Committees, Boards and Panels of the Council. If a scrutiny investigation reveals potential disciplinary and probity issues, the Committee will refer the matter to the Managing Director.

Q.6 Litigation proceedings by or against the Council must not be prejudiced by any scrutiny investigation. In the circumstances, it may be necessary to defer further consideration of the matter until the proceedings have been dispensed with.
Q.7 Consultation undertaken by the Committee in accordance with its Terms of Reference will not compromise/prejudice consultations undertaken by any other Committee/Board of the Council.

R. Conduct of meetings
R.1 Meetings will be open to the public and the press unless confidential and/or exempt information is being considered. The Access to Information Procedure Rules detailed in Standing Orders will apply.

R.2 The access to information provisions relating to access to and inspection of agenda and connected reports and minutes as detailed in Standing Orders will apply.

R.3 Minutes will be drawn up and recorded in accordance with the rules detailed in Standing Order 15.

S. Task groups/informal Member working groups
S.1 Task groups (or informal Member working groups) may be appointed at any time by the Committee to examine specific issues in detail. Task groups will be time limited and will tend to work more flexibly and informally.

S.2 The Committee may appoint any of its Members to work informally with other bodies or authorities etc, particularly in relation to external or cross-authority overview and scrutiny matters, where this will contribute to the Committee’s functions.

S.3 Whilst a task group cannot substitute for the Committee or exercise the formal powers associated respectively with overview and scrutiny (which is the preserve of the Committee and its sub-committees), the task group may contribute to or inform the overview or scrutiny process.

S.4 Task groups will be made up of no less than 3 Committee members. The political balance rules need not apply.

S.5 Because of the relative informality of task group meetings, and the evidence gathering nature of much of the discussion, chairing the meetings will involve different skills from those required by traditional committee meetings. The task group Chairman will need to be sure that all task group members are clear about the purpose of the meeting and are given the opportunity to pursue a line of questioning – via a number of supplementary questions if necessary.

S.6 The task group may obtain information through different media, including face-to-face interviews; questionnaires; focus groups; site visits; reports; and written submissions from participants.
S.7 Participants will be offered the opportunity to comment on the accuracy of the record of their attendance.

S.8 Once the evidence is taken, the Committee Co-ordinator will draft a report and recommendations to reflect the preliminary views of the task group. The draft report and recommendations will be agreed by the task group Chairman before it is circulated to the Cabinet Chairman and the Strategic Director for comment.

S.9 The Committee will consider the task group's report and/or recommendations and any comments from the Cabinet Chairman and/or Strategic Director.

S.10 The Committee will refer the task group's report and/or recommendations to the relevant body i.e. CSP, responsible authorities, GAC and/or Cabinet with a note of the debate and any changes arising from the debate.

The rules detailed in sections G, H and M of this Protocol will apply.

S.11 The Committee may refer the issue back to the task group for further consideration.

T. Sub-committees
T.1 The Committee may appoint sub-committees in accordance with the rules detailed in Standing Order 58(1)(4) and may delegate any of its functions to its sub-committees.

T.2 Sub-committees may exercise the formal powers associated respectively with overview and scrutiny.

U. Regulatory bodies
U.1 The Committee will not scrutinise individual decisions made by the Committees, Boards and Panels entrusted to discharge the Council's regulatory functions (the Regulatory Bodies). Scrutiny of decisions of Regulatory Bodies is clearly not an alternative to normal appeals procedures. However, the Committee may make reports and/or recommendations in accordance with section M. of this Protocol.

U.2 Scrutiny of the discharge of a Regulatory Body’s functions will be restricted to one per Committee meeting on notice by the Committee Chairman. The rules detailed in section A. of this Protocol will apply.

U.3 Where the Committee’s recommendations have not been accepted by the body concerned, clear reasons will be given. Where recommendations have been agreed, but expectations have not been met, the issue may be re-addressed fully by the Committee.

V. Declarations of interest
V.1 Elected Councillors and voting co-optees are subject to the Member Code of Conduct.

V.2 Representatives from the responsible authorities and other partner organisations are subject to their respective professional codes of conduct.
V.3 Participants who are not bound by codes of conduct will be subject to the Nolan principles of transparency and accountability.

V.4 All participants (including Council Officers) summoned or invited to attend Committee meetings, will declare any personal interests and the nature of the interests at the beginning of the meeting or as soon as the interests become apparent to them.

V.5 No Committee members may be involved in scrutinising a decision in which they have been directly involved.

Subject to the rule detailed in section V.6 of this Protocol, where the Committee is undertaking its overview function, Members will declare their personal interest at the beginning of the meeting, but need not withdraw from the decision making process.

V.6 With the exception of Cabinet members who are required to attend the Committee to give evidence in accordance with section D of this Protocol, any Member at the meeting (not restricted to members of the Committee) with a prejudicial interest in a matter, may not take part in the discussion or remain in the meeting room or public gallery to observe the vote on the matter.

W. Review of this Protocol This Protocol will be reviewed on an annual basis or more frequently, if experience, circumstances and legislation highlight that amendments are required.
COUNCILLOR CALL FOR ACTION (CCfA) FLOWCHART

CCfA request – local residents have concerns about significant and persistent problems in their area – they approach the local ward Member. Local ward Member may also on their initiative, initiate a CCfA and gather support from their local community.

First level response
In consultation with relevant Director, local ward Member considers whether to agree to champion or reject the CCfA. Log request

Agree to champion

Before agreeing, Director to undertake screening/filter checks (section 6 of Guide)

Refuse to champion and provide constituent/local ward Member with written reasons for refusal

Concern resolved

Second level response
First attempt to resolve the concerns informally in consultation with relevant parties e.g. Cabinet portfolio member, CSP etc (section 11 of Guide) – Log attempt to resolve

Concern not resolved – as last resort, concern referred to Crime and Disorder (Overview and Scrutiny) Committee

Third level response

Fourth level response
Crime and Disorder (Overview and Scrutiny) Committee rejects CCfA (see Committee’s Protocol for procedure)

Crime and Disorder (Overview and Scrutiny) Committee accepts CCfA and considers issue in accordance with Committee’s Protocol

Local ward Member notified with written reasons

Crime and Disorder (Overview and Scrutiny) Committee compiles report and recommendations to Cabinet/GAC, CSP etc (refer to Committee’s Protocol)

Cabinet/GAC, CSP etc consider recommendations and respond within 2 months, setting out reasons for any inaction

Crime and Disorder (Overview and Scrutiny) Committee considers and publishes responses to scrutiny recommendations

Feedback to local ward Member
MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN THE CRIME AND DISORDER (OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY) COMMITTEE AND THE DARTFORD AND GRAVESHAM COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP

Introduction

1. The Council has a legal duty under Section 17(1) of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 to carry out all its various functions with regard to the need to prevent crime and disorder and reduce re-offending in its area.

2. The Police and Justice Act 2006 and the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 grant the Council the power to scrutinise both crime and disorder matters through the Dartford and Gravesham Community Safety Partnership (the CSP) and community safety related improvement targets measured through Local Area Agreements, Comprehensive Assessment and the Place Based Survey. The legislative powers are intended to enable the Council’s overview and scrutiny function to hold the CSP and other partner organisations to account for their performance, including their work with the Council, to meet specific local targets.

3. The Councillor Calls for Action provide a ‘last resort’ mechanism for the Council’s overview and scrutiny function to try to resolve persistent local crime and disorder issues of genuine community concern, where all efforts by a local ward Councillor to find a solution through local action and discussion with the CSP etc, have been unsuccessful.

4. In order for the exercise of overview and scrutiny powers to be effective, it is vital that the CSP and other partners and stakeholders are engaged in the process and share a common understanding of the Council’s overview and scrutiny aims. This Memorandum of Understanding has therefore been developed to embody that understanding and sets out the rights and responsibilities that relate to the parties concerned.

The CSP and main tasks

5.(a) The CSP comprises eight statutory bodies who have a legal duty to work with other local agencies and organisations to develop and implement strategies to tackle crime and disorder, including anti-social and other behaviour adversely affecting the local environment, as well as the misuse of drugs in their area:

- Dartford Borough Council
- Gravesham Borough Council
- Kent Police
- Kent Police Authority
- Kent County Council
- Kent Fire and Rescue Service
- Kent Probation
- West Kent NHS Primary Care Trust

(b) The CSP works with numerous other agencies and voluntary groups.

(c) In order to identify and deliver on the priorities that matter the most to local communities, the CSP is required to carry out a number of main tasks:

- preparing an annual strategic assessment which identifies the crime and community safety priorities in the area, through analysis of information provided by partner agencies an the community;
- producing a partnership plan, detailing the approach for addressing priorities;
Aims of overview and scrutiny

6. To:

(a) involve the responsible authorities, local people and community organisations, in overview and scrutiny activity;
(b) develop a dialogue with the responsible authorities, service providers and other stakeholders external to the Council;
(c) take up issues of concern to local people;
(d) review whether the CSP's goals are being achieved; and
(e) examine what can be done to solve problems and enhance the CSP's performance and achievement.

Designated crime and disorder committee

7. The Council's designated crime and disorder committee under section 19(1) of the Police and Justice Act 2006, is the Crime and Disorder (Overview and Scrutiny) Committee. The Committee is independent of the CSP.

8. There will be at least one ordinary meeting of the Crime and Disorder (Overview and Scrutiny) Committee in each municipal year in accordance with the Council's calendar of meetings. In addition, extraordinary meetings may be called as and when appropriate in accordance with the Council's Procedure rules detailed in its Standing Orders.

9. The Committee's Terms of Reference

The overview and scrutiny of:
(a) decisions and/or actions of the CSP and its partners, but only in so far as they relate to crime and disorder;
(b) the CSP's annual strategic assessment;
(c) the CSP's partnership plan;
(d) community safety related local improvement targets measured through Local Area Agreements, Comprehensive Area Assessment and the Place Based Survey;
(e) any other local crime and disorder matter related to the Council's/Cabinet's crime and disorder/community safety functions; and
(f) the scrutiny of Councillor Calls for Action (on crime and disorder/community safety matters).

Management of the Council's crime and disorder/community safety functions

10. The Council's Strategic Director is responsible for the management of the Council's crime and disorder/community safety functions.

Council representatives on the CSP

11. The Leader of the Council and Managing Director are the Council's nominated representatives on the CSP.

CSP, responsible authorities named link officers and representatives

12. The CSP, individual responsible authorities will assign a named link officer to liaise with the Council’s Member Services [refer to section 31 of this Memorandum of Understanding], to ensure that communication is swift and effective and that requests for information,
responses to reports and/or recommendations and requests for CSP and responsible authorities' representatives to attend meetings, are dealt with, within the timescales referred to in the Committee's Protocol at Appendix A. Contact details of the named link officers will be notified to the Council’s Member Services.

13. If summoned to attend meetings of the Crime and Disorder (Overview and Scrutiny) Committee, the CSP’s representative will be its Chairman or Vice-Chairman.

14. If summoned to attend meetings of the Crime and Disorder (Overview and Scrutiny) Committee, the nomination/appointment by the responsible authorities of representatives and substitutes as participants in the overview and scrutiny process, will be at the discretion of their governing bodies or as detailed in their constitutions.

**Underlying principles of crime and disorder overview and scrutiny**

15. The following underlying principles of overview and scrutiny will assist in securing effective outcomes and adding value:

(a) **Collaboration**

- community safety and freedom from crime and disorder for the people of the Borough of Dartford is dependant upon many factors, including the services provided in partnership by/with the CSP. The CSP will work in partnership with the Crime and Disorder (Overview and Scrutiny) Committee to provide objective and effective scrutiny of crime and disorder in the Borough of Dartford. This shared responsibility should be acknowledged in any crime and disorder overview and scrutiny activity undertaken;
- increasingly, services are provided jointly or as a result of partnerships between the Council and other public sector organisations or other parties. Overview and scrutiny activities should therefore also reflect shared priorities, find shared solutions and be of mutual benefit;
- while overview and scrutiny should be constructive and challenging, it will only be successful if all partners work together considerately, within a climate of mutual respect, trust and good faith with an understanding and commitment to the CSP’s and Council’s crime and disorder aims and objectives.

(b) **Added Value**

- it is vital that overview and scrutiny brings something new to reviews/scrutiny of crime and disorder functions and does not duplicate the many other forms of performance management and inspection that exist for public service providers.
- overview and scrutiny activities should make a distinct and positive impact and only be carried out where objective scrutiny/review by elected Councillors, will help progress to be made.
- overview and scrutiny activities should have a clear purpose. There should be a focus on crime reduction and improving the well-being of those who live and work in the Borough of Dartford.
- the overview and scrutiny process should be proactive in seeking out issues to examine, that will add most value.
- overview and scrutiny should be prepared to examine crime and disorder issues that cross service or agency boundaries and make appropriate recommendations to tackle such issues, whilst being mindful of potential implications for/on the CSP and/or other external organisations.
- overview and scrutiny should aim to develop feasible recommendations which provide value for money by securing benefits that outweigh the cost of implementation.
• overview and scrutiny will be focused on improving services and service provision for the people of the Borough of Dartford and will concentrate on outputs that are intended to help improve community safety and reduce the fear of crime in the Borough.

(c) Clarity

Overview and scrutiny of the CSP’s crime and disorder functions:

• should be a transparent process which encourages open and honest discussion;
• should be well planned and timely;
• should be of particular issues and time-limited;
• should focus on strategic priorities and concerns, with a strategic view of performance usually aligned to key performance targets.

(d) Knowledge

• overview and scrutiny reports must be evidence-based in order to provide credible conclusions and recommendations;
• although the Crime and Disorder (Overview and Scrutiny) Committee will want to be informed, the overview and scrutiny process is not an ‘expert’ review/scrutiny of the CSP’s crime and disorder function;
• the overview and scrutiny process should be impartial, in that it should be driven by the evidence, rather than by a particular standpoint.

(e) Accessibility

• it is a fundamental role of the overview and scrutiny process to ensure that there is full and equal access to the democratic process, through public involvement and engagement;
• the views and ideas of service users (and non-users), service providers and organisations and other agencies with an interest in the subject under review/scrutiny, are all valuable in effective scrutiny – overview and scrutiny should involve all stakeholders and take account of views of service users and the public, with particular efforts to engage groups that are harder to reach;
• constructive engagement and clear lines of communication should enable a two-way flow of information between crime and disorder overview and scrutiny and all those involved, including feedback of results.

Providing information to the Crime and Disorder (Overview and Scrutiny) Committee

16. The CSP, responsible authorities and the Crime and Disorder (Overview and Scrutiny) Committee, will respect the requirements of the Data Protection Act 1998. The provision of information to/for overview and scrutiny will be governed by relevant legislation and established protocols for the sharing of data.

17. To facilitate the overview and scrutiny process and in accordance with reg.5 of the Crime and Disorder (Overview and Scrutiny) Regulations 2009, requested information will be pro-actively provided by the CSP and responsible authorities (acting individually or collectively).

Notice of required attendance at committee meetings

18. Forward planning of the Crime and Disorder (Overview and Scrutiny) Committee’s annual work programme will normally ensure the provision of reasonable notice of requests for information/the submission of written reports and/or required attendance at Committee meetings, of representatives of the responsible authorities.
19. The CSP and responsible authorities will be informed in advance by the Council's Member Services, of overview and scrutiny exercises (including their scope).

20. Dates and times of meetings of the Crime and Disorder (Overview and Scrutiny) Committee, agendas, minutes and reports, will be circulated by the Council's Member Services, to the named link officer of the CSP and the responsible authorities.

21. Subject to 14 clear days’ notice (i.e. 14 periods of 24 hours running from midnight to midnight excluding bank and public holidays and the day on which the meeting is held) and information being provided as to the nature and scope of the overview and scrutiny, representatives of the CSP and the responsible authorities will be required by reg. 6 of the Crime and Disorder (Overview and Scrutiny) Committee Regulations 2009, to attend the Crime and Disorder (Overview and Scrutiny) Committee meetings, to give evidence and/or answer questions, if summoned.

22. Other organisations working with the CSP not under a legal obligation to attend meetings of the Crime and Disorder (Overview and Scrutiny) Committee should be willing to engage constructively with overview and scrutiny and attend meetings when invited.

Access to information

23. Reports which are presented to the Crime and Disorder (Overview and Scrutiny) Committee, will be published on the Council's website www.dartford.gov.uk and circulated to the CSP and the responsible authorities’ named link officers, 5 clear days before the Committee meeting.

Style and conduct of committee meetings

24. Meetings of the Crime and Disorder (Overview and Scrutiny) Committee will be conducted in accordance with the principles and procedures set out in the Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules and Access to information Procedure Rules of the Council's Standing Orders and in accordance with the Committee’s Protocol at Appendix A.

Reports and recommendations of the Crime and Disorder (Overview and Scrutiny) Committee

25. The CSP and responsible authorities will, in accordance with reg. 7 of the Crime and Disorder (Overview and Scrutiny) Committee Regulations 2009, respond and have regard to the Committee’s reports and/or recommendations.

Monitoring recommendations

26. Agreed actions will form the basis against which performance of the CSP and responsible authorities will be measured by the Crime and Disorder (Overview and Scrutiny) Committee.

Local improvement targets

27. The Crime and Disorder (Overview and Scrutiny) Committee may scrutinise performance and delivery of the Kent County Council's KA2 – LAA crime and disorder/community safety local improvement targets.
Councillor Calls for Action

28. The CSP and responsible authorities (either collectively or individually) will co-operate on matters related to Councillor Calls for Action.

Resolving disputes about this Memorandum of Understanding

29. If the CSP and responsible authorities (acting collectively or individually) believe that this Memorandum of Understanding is not being adhered to, the issue should be referred to the Crime and Disorder (Overview and Scrutiny) Committee for consideration and decision. The Committee’s decision will be final.

Review of this Memorandum of Understanding

30. This Memorandum of Understanding will be reviewed jointly, on an annual basis or more frequently, if experience and circumstances highlight that amendments may need to be made.

Complaints against the CSP

31. Complaints against the CSP will be dealt with under the CSP’s complaints procedure. Complaints relating to CSP activities submitted to the CSP against individual responsible authorities will be dealt with by the individual responsible authorities under their respective complaints procedure. The response to the complaint will be copied to the chairman of the CSP.

Availability of support

32. Further advice or information on any aspect of this Memorandum of Understanding or on overview and scrutiny at Dartford Borough Council, is available from Member Services by emailing memberservices@dartford.gov.uk or telephoning the Member Services Manager on 01322 343430.

Received and endorsed by the CSP - 2010
TERMS OF REFERENCE (ToRs):
DELEGATED FUNCTIONS:

General Provisions

‘Crime and disorder’ is defined as including forms of crime and disorder that involve anti-social behaviour or other behaviour adversely affecting the local environment or the misuse of drugs, alcohol and other substances.

1. To review and scrutinise the discharge of the crime and disorder functions of the responsible authorities (local authorities, fire and rescue authorities, police authorities, the police, primary care trusts) which comprise the Dartford and Gravesham Community Safety Partnership (the CSP), as set out in these Terms of Reference.

2. To review and scrutinise the discharge of any other local crime and disorder matter related to the Council’s crime and disorder functions.

3. To make reports or recommendations as appropriate, to the GAC, Cabinet, the CSP or any one or more responsible authority etc.

4. To review responses from and monitor the action (if any), taken by the CSP, an individual responsible authority, Officers, GAC, Cabinet etc.

Overview Functions

5. No less than once in every twelve month period, to review strategies in connection with the discharge by the CSP of its crime and disorder functions and make reports or recommendations in accordance with para. 3 above.

Scrubtny Functions

6. No less than once in every twelve month period, to scrutinise decisions made, or action taken, by the CSP and the Council of its crime and disorder functions and make reports or recommendations in accordance with para. 3 above.

7. To consider any local crime and disorder matter referred to the Committee by a local ward Member under the Councillor Call for Action provisions referred to in the Committee’s Protocol.

8. ePetitions/Petitions
To ‘hold officers to account’ in accordance with the Petitions Scheme Guidelines.

May 2011
COMMUNITY SAFETY STRATEGY AND ACTION PLAN 2011-12

1. Summary

The Community Safety Strategy and Action Plan 2011-2012 is provided for Members’ consideration (Appendix A).

2. RECOMMENDATION

That the Committee considers the Community Safety Strategy and Action Plan 2011-12 (Appendix A) and comments accordingly.

3. Background and Discussion

3.1 The Committee, at its meeting on 26 January 2011, considered the annual Strategic Assessment prepared by and for the Dartford and Gravesham Community Safety Partnership. The priorities identified, together with views expressed by partner agencies, residents and elected Members, were taken forward into the Community Safety Plan written for 2011-12. This document guides the pro-active work of partner agencies and ensures that the focus upon the Community Safety Partnership’s agreed priorities is maintained.

3.2 Members are invited to consider the Community Safety Strategy and Action Plan 2011-12 and comment accordingly. Officers and representatives of Kent Police will be available to respond to Members’ questions.

4. Relationship to the Corporate Plan

Safer Communities – To create a safer Borough in which to live, work and socialise. SC2 – Reduce anti-social behaviour.

5. Financial, legal, staffing and other administrative implications and risk assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Implications</th>
<th>None arising from this report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal Implications</td>
<td>None specifically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing Implications</td>
<td>None arising from this report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Implications</td>
<td>None arising from this report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Assessment</td>
<td>Any reduction or withdrawal of service would have a negative impact on crime and disorder within the Borough.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CRIME AND DISORDER (OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY)
COMMITTEE
6th July 2011

6. Details of Exempt Information Category

Not applicable

7. Appendices

Appendix A: Community Safety Strategy and Action Plan 2011-12

BACKGROUND PAPERS

<table>
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<tr>
<th>Documents consulted</th>
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<th>Section and Directorate</th>
<th>Exempt Information Category</th>
</tr>
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<td>Matt Roberts</td>
<td>(01322) 3433502</td>
<td>EARS</td>
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</tr>
</tbody>
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Dartford and Gravesham
Community Safety Partnership

Community Safety Strategy and Action Plan
2011-12
One Vision

Our Mission Statement

It is the aim of the Dartford and Gravesham Community Safety Partnership to make our Boroughs safer and cleaner places to live, work and socialise.

In 2011-12, we will aim to achieve this by:

- Developing initiatives to reduce violent crime and domestic abuse;
- Effectively tackling all types of anti-social behaviour and environmental crime;
- Improving the safety of young people and addressing youth offending;
- Implementing measures to reduce offences related to theft and the handling of stolen goods;
- Delivering Partnership projects aimed at both preventing substance misuse and tackling drug and alcohol-related crime and disorder;
- Identifying measures to reduce re-offending.

In addition to these headline priorities, we will seek to provide public reassurance and build public confidence to help people to feel safe and improve their perceptions about their local neighbourhoods. We will also strive to ensure that vulnerable people within our communities are given the support and assistance that they need to improve their personal safety.

We will keep local people informed of steps taken by the Partnership to address their concerns and encourage the residents to take an active role in working alongside us to improve community safety.

We will continue to ensure that community cohesion and diversity are fully embraced and that we will work to encourage an appreciation of, and pride in, our multi-cultural environments.
Foreword

One Partnership – One Goal

Reducing crime and anti-social behaviour is not the sole responsibility of any one agency - it is a responsibility shared by all of us. Together, the agencies within the Dartford and Gravesham Community Safety Partnership work with one overriding objective: to make North Kent a safer place to live, work and enjoy.

Our Partnership brings together:

- Dartford Borough Council
- Gravesham Borough Council
- Kent County Council
- Kent Police
- Kent Fire and Rescue Service
- Kent Probation Service
- West Kent NHS/Primary Care Trust
- Kent Police Authority

Dartford and Gravesham have been working together as a joint Partnership for almost five years. During that time we have achieved some very significant reductions in crime in each Borough through a range of multi-agency initiatives and by engaging and listening to local people. The Partnership has gone from strength to strength and this new Strategy and Action Plan for 2011-12 describes how we intend to build on that success by continuing to operate together as one united team.

Working in partnership has many advantages: shared experience, knowledge and expertise, the ability to make fully informed decisions about our priorities and at a time when finances are becoming scarcer, ensuring that our resources are maximised and effectively targeted. Operating as one team means all of the agencies involved can have a role in deciding what goes into our Strategy and how it will be implemented. It also means that each agency can bring to the table the concerns that have been brought to their attention by local residents as those issues they most feel need to be tackled in their area.

We are confident that this new Strategy and Action Plan reflects the priorities that have been identified not just through recorded crime and disorder statistics but also through the regular contact that all of our partners and operational staff at ground level have with local people. We intend to do our very best to improve community safety and drive down crime and anti-social behaviour even further over the next 12 months. We have a strong track record but recognise this is a tough challenge. However, by working together as agencies, businesses and local communities, it is a challenge we feel able to meet.

Cllr Mike Snelling  
Leader, Gravesham Borough Council  
Chairman, Dartford and Gravesham Community Safety Partnership

Cllr Jeremy Kite  
Leader, Dartford Borough Council  
Vice-Chairman, Dartford and Gravesham Community Safety Partnership
Introduction

Improving quality of life

The success of Dartford and Gravesham Community Safety Partnership’s (CSP) Strategy for 2008-11 means that they are now fewer victims of crime than there were four years ago. This new Strategy sets out our plan for reducing crime even further over the next 12 months. Whilst we are proud of our achievements we know that we need to concentrate our efforts to sustain these reductions in the longer term. To help us do this, the Partnership completes a Strategic Assessment each year – a report that is used to inform strategic decision-making by gathering together data held by the partner agencies.

The Assessment considers crime trends, progress made over the previous 12 months and emerging issues that need to be made a priority and given extra focus. We also take account of issues coming to our attention through Community Forums, Residents’ Groups, Public Engagement Meetings and local public consultation surveys.

The priorities identified for 2011-12 are:

- Violent crime including domestic abuse;
- Anti-social behaviour;
- Young people (both improving the safety of young people and addressing youth offending);
- Theft and handling stolen goods;
- Substance misuse;
- Reducing re-offending;

Our experience has also taught us that we need to do more to improve public perceptions so that local people genuinely feel safer – this will be a running theme throughout our work and we will be doing our best to:

- Engage with local communities effectively to be clear about their concerns and use local knowledge;
- Have responsive local partnerships that work closely with residents to address problems quickly and effectively;
- Communicate effectively about the work we are doing and the outcomes we achieve.

Reducing crime and ASB is just one strand of a wider vision for improving quality of life in North Kent. All the partner agencies own corporate plans aim to drive improvements in the environment, health, providing opportunities for young people, safeguarding vulnerable adults, improving our local economy and in creating neighbourhoods where people feel secure and enjoy living. The work of the Community Safety Partnership is central to this work because there are clear links between reducing crime and disorder and achieving these objectives and improving the overall quality of life of our local residents.
Priority 1  Reducing Violent Crime and Repeat Offences of Domestic Abuse

The Facts – Why this is a Priority
Protecting people’s personal safety is always a priority for both agencies and local residents alike and despite good reductions in violent crime, there is still more to be done in addressing repeat victims, offenders and venues. Domestic abuse often involves physical violence and makes up a very significant proportion of offences recorded as violent crime. This issue affects hundreds of victims, their children and families each year and we feel that there is more work to be done in providing them with the support and assistance they need and in dealing with perpetrators effectively to prevent further offending. By tackling violent crime we hope to increase public confidence, provide reassurance and help bridge the gap between public perceptions about personal safety, particularly in the night-time economy, and what is actually happening in both Dartford and Gravesham.

Aims - What do we want to do?
- To reduce incidents of serious violent crime
- To reduce assaults with less serious injury
- To reduce repeat incidents of domestic abuse
- To reduce incidents of violence occurring in the night-time economy
- Address alcohol-related violent crime as part of a wider multi-agency strategy that deals with health and other impacts of alcohol
- To ensure there are services in place to support and protect victims of domestic abuse
- To prevent repeat offending through rehabilitation programmes
- To prevent young people becoming involved in youth-on-youth violence

Implementation - How are we going to do it?

Responding to domestic abuse:
- Supporting work towards ensuring that there is sufficient emergency accommodation for victims of domestic abuse and delivering sanctuary provision;
- Continuing to support current programmes that deal with perpetrators of domestic abuse and/or that provide direct support to victims and their families e.g. Community Domestic Abuse Programme, Freedom Programme;
- Ensuring that victims of domestic abuse are able to report to and receive advice and assistance at as many outlets as possible.

Responding to all violent crime:
- Delivering intelligence led operations around violent crime targeting geographic hot spots and known offenders – establishing links between locations, specific venues, times and nature of injuries and addressing them through practical interventions;
- Tackling late-night violence and disorder and implement long-term preventative measures through Community Safety Units (CSUs);
- Through licensing policy and partnership working between Kent Police and Local Authority Licensing Teams, ensure that licensed premises have adequate plans for preventing violent disorder.

Main Delivery Groups: Violent Crime Sub-Group, North Kent Domestic Abuse Forum.
**Priority 2**  
Reducing Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB) and Associated Environmental Crime

### The Facts – Why this is a Priority

Tackling anti-social behaviour (ASB) and environmental crime such as criminal damage and graffiti, are a priority to both the Partnership and to local people. Residents concerns about ASB have been brought to our attention through local surveys, Neighbourhood Panel Meetings (formerly PACT) and through contact with local Council Members. Despite reductions in criminal damage offences of 15.9% in Dartford and 16.8% in Gravesham in January-December 2010 compared to the previous year, environmental crime, rubbish and litter lying around and rowdy, noisy behaviour still cause many local people concern. We want to continue to work hard to improve on reductions already achieved by working with local communities and partner agencies to make local neighbourhoods places that people feel safe and can enjoy.

### Aims – What do we want to do?

- Reduce overall anti-social behaviour;
- Reduce criminal damage offences;
- Reduce both accidental and deliberate fires;
- Improve perceptions of key types of ASB;
- Improve public confidence in the way in which the Police and the Council deal with ASB.

### Implementation – How are we going to do it?

**Responding to ASB and environmental crime:**

- To continue to address ASB involving young people and adults through the ASB Group by providing tailored interventions to reduce or stop offending behaviour;
- To share intelligence to provide support to victims and use available powers to take prompt and appropriate action against offenders;
- To continue to engage with businesses, retailers and licensed premises to develop initiatives to target the differing nature of ASB affecting day-time and night-time economies;
- To use enforcement measures e.g. Dispersal Orders, Alcohol Control Zones, mobile CCTV cameras and consider how opportunities for ASB can be ‘designed-out’ in locations where it is more prevalent;
- To carry out more joint enforcement operations involving Police, Council and other partner agency staff to tackle fly-tipping, littering and environmental crime;
- To deliver multi-agency initiatives that encourage the active involvement of local people in improving the appearance of their neighbourhoods and that promotes pride in their local communities (using external funding whenever possible);
- To actively engage young people at risk of involvement in ASB through preventative measures including leisure, sport and recreational activities and targeted youth services in key ASB locations;
- To use a range of media to provide regular opportunities for consultation to both inform and listen to local residents.
- To increase awareness and educate the public in the negative effects of graffiti, littering, fly-tipping, including environmental damage, costs and personal consequences.

**Main Delivery Groups:** ASB Group; Community Safety Units.
Priority 3  Improving Safety for Young People and Reducing Youth Offending

The Facts – Why this is a Priority
The safety of children and young people is paramount and first and foremost the emphasis is on reducing the risk of children and young people becoming victims of crime. Both the number of victims of crime in both Dartford and Gravesham (January-December 2010) aged 0-19 years and the number of offenders aged 10-19 years were higher than the County average. However, the repeat offending rate for these is amongst the lowest – this shows that interventions with young people who are offending are effective in changing their behaviour. It is also important to address public perceptions about young people: ‘teenagers hanging around’ is one form of perceived ASB that residents feel is a big problem, even when young people may not be engaging in any ASB, when gathering in groups they can seem intimidating to others.

Aims – What do we want to do?
- To reduce the number of young people who are repeat victims of crime
- To ensure that young people have safe and accessible places for learning and socialising
- To encourage the active participation of young people in positive activities that promote mutual respect, social responsibility and taking pride in the local environment
- To improve public perceptions about young people and reduce the percentage of residents who believe ‘teenagers hanging around’ is a problem
- To reduce the number of young people entering the criminal justice system
- To reduce the number of incidents of youth-on-youth crime

Implementation – How are we going to do it?
Improving safety for young people
- By developing and delivering programmes to address safety issues affecting young people encourage reporting by young victims and provide appropriate support to reduce the risk of repeat victimisation (working alongside Local Children’s Partnerships and Children’s Trusts);
- By continuing to improve and provide safe facilities and opportunities to young people to constructively use their free time and encourage healthy lifestyles;
- By extending the involvement of young people in the design and implementation of local community projects to give them a sense of pride and promote good citizenship;
- By providing targeted initiatives to young people identified most at risk from drug and/or alcohol misuse.
- To support and complement activities to issue road safety advice to young people.

Reducing offending behaviour and the risk of offending
- By ensuring that outreach/youth provision is delivered in key geographical locations and targeted to those most at risk of offending;
- By delivering targeted interventions for young people from new, settling communities;
- By continuing to intervene early, ensuring that final warnings are supported by appropriate interventions;
- By extending the use of restorative justice and reparation by young offenders to victims of crime or to their local communities and assess victim satisfaction;
- By identifying those young people most at risk of becoming prolific offenders (Prevent and Deter) to implement effective and tailored interventions.

Main Delivery Groups: Young People’s Sub-Group, ASB Group, Community Safety Units.
## Priority 4 Reducing Offences of Theft and Handling Stolen Goods

### The Facts – Why this is a Priority
Increases in theft and handling stolen goods offences have been seen not only in North Kent but nationwide and are linked to an upturn and steady increase in the demand for commodity metal, the main driver for criminal activity having been the international price of scrap metal. Lead has been the most commonplace metal to be stolen, primarily due to its high asset price and ease of both accessibility and removal. Considerable efforts by the Police and other partner agencies have had some impact but figures for January-December 2010 indicate that theft and handling stolen goods offences still made up almost 30% of total crime recorded in Dartford and almost a quarter of all crime recorded in Gravesham. The sheer volume of this category of offending requires it to be a priority for 2011-12.

### Aims – What do we want to do?
- To reduce the total number of theft and handling stolen goods offences
- To reduce the number of metal and cable theft offences
- To reduce the number of shoplifting offences
- To reduce the number of robbery offences and theft of personal property e.g. through purse dipping, bag theft etc.

### Implementation – How are we going to do it?
#### Preventative Steps and Reducing Victimisation
- Working with Kent Police in continuing to develop and deliver initiatives working with scrap metal dealers to stamp out illegal activity;
- Targeted awareness-raising activities focussing on properties more likely to be susceptible to metal theft and the provision of advice to reduce risks;
- Working with Planning Departments to ensure that alternative to lead are recommended as part of the planning process;
- Continuing to develop good practice preventative steps with Town Centre retailers and businesses to reduce shoplifting, focussing on deterrence rather than monitoring and detaining offenders once an offence is committed;
- Delivering targeted initiatives focussing on groups most at risk/more vulnerable to personal theft to raise awareness and provide practical solutions to safeguarding personal property.

#### Reducing Offending
- By carrying out detailed analysis to establish patterns of offending behaviour and hot spot locations/venues for metal theft that can be shared with partner agencies to inform a multi-agency strategy to address this offence category;
- By investigating the nature and extent of established local markets that are used to sell on items stolen (including the disposal of goods via Internet facilities);
- By proactive Police operations and partnership multi-agency approaches to identify and prosecute prolific theft offenders.

**Main Delivery Groups:** Community Safety Units; Theft and Handling Stolen Goods Sub-Group.
**Priority 5  Tackling Substance Misuse**

### The Facts – Why this is a Priority
Substance misuse is inextricably tied to crime and disorder with established links with violent and acquisitive crime. The CSP is also keen to minimise the associated risks to health, particularly in relation to young people. Concerted efforts to address drug-related crime have brought more offenders to justice and preventative work has improved access to treatment, advice and assistance. However, public consultation tells us that local residents are concerned about ‘people using or dealing drugs in their neighbourhood’ and with ‘people being drunk and rowdy in public’. Tackling substance misuse will not only help reduce crime and disorder, it will also help people to live healthier lifestyles and improve quality of life generally by reducing the fear and intimidation that can be caused by drug and alcohol related behaviour.

### Aims – What do we want to do?
- Reduce the number of drug and alcohol-related offences, especially in the NTE
- Reduce the number of alcohol-related hospital admissions
- Increase the number of drug users accessing treatment
- Improve public perceptions of drunk and rowdy behaviour as a problem
- Improve public perceptions of people using or dealing drugs as a problem

### Implementation – How are we going to do it?

**Multi-agency preventative work**
- Delivering initiatives that aim to educate and raise awareness about substance misuse targeted at young people and those most at risk;
- Providing support for young people whose parents have substance misuse difficulties;
- Raising awareness of the consequences of irresponsible drinking, including driving whilst under the influence of alcohol and/or drugs;
- Using Licensing controls and other enforcement measures to ensure that licensed premises do not encourage binge-drinking, sell to those underage or allow drug dealing.

**Providing access to treatment and harm minimisation services**
- To increase referrals of those misusing drugs and coming into the criminal justice system into the Drug Intervention Programme (DIP) and appropriate treatment services;
- Promotion of the DIP and treatment services across partner agencies.
- To improve treatment/care and ensure that alcohol treatment services are responsive to and meet the needs of harmful and dependent drinkers, their families and carers;

**Addressing prolific drug and alcohol-related offending behaviour and supporting local neighbourhoods**
- To carry out targeted intelligence-led Police operations focusing on known offenders to disrupt drug markets;
- Multi-agency projects targeted at locations where drug and alcohol-misuse is more prevalent to encourage reporting, improve intelligence to enable action to be taken against offenders and provide reassurance to local residents;
- Use of enforcement measures such as Exclusion Orders, Alcohol Control Zone Orders, in key locations.

**Main Delivery Groups:** Drug and Alcohol Action Group, Young People’s Sub-Group, Community Safety Units.
## Priority 6  Reducing Re-offending

### The Facts – Why this is a Priority
Reducing re-offending is cutting crime by stopping and/or changing the behaviour of known offenders. Whilst repeat offenders are small in number, they cause disproportionate damage to local communities. The challenge is ensuring that services deliver a balance between enforcement and protecting the public and supporting offenders in order that they can steer clear of returning to criminality.

### Aims – What do we want to do?
- To reduce re-offending and ultimately, reduce harm to victims, communities and vulnerable groups;
- Contribute to an overall reduction in the level of crime recorded
- Deliver a co-ordinated and integrated response to the resettlement of offenders
- Reduce the number of prolific offenders who re-offend due to drug or alcohol dependency issues
- Reduce the number of young people (aged 10-19) who are repeat offenders
- Reducing the number of repeat offences of domestic abuse

### Implementation – How are we going to do it?
- Working with the Integrated Offender Management Unit (IOMU), identifying ways of improving multi-agency working arrangements to bolster the management of Prolific and Priority Offenders (PPOs);
- Dealing swiftly and applying rigorous enforcement to offenders who have been sentenced to community orders and those released on licence following a custodial sentence who re-offends or breaches the terms of their supervision;
- Continuing with Prevent and Deter initiatives to stop (particularly young offenders) from entering the pool of prolific offenders;
- Through Police activity to tackle those who are already prolific offenders (catch and Convict);
- By providing pathways out of offending (including tackling issues relating to housing needs, managing finances, education, training and employment, drug and alcohol problems) to reduce or prevent re-offending for those who have been prolific offenders (Rehabilitation and Resettlement);
- By prioritising the protection of the public through Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPA) to manage risks presented by offenders who pose a high risk of harm;
- Tackling reducing youth re-offending through joint initiatives with the Youth Offending Service (YOS);
- Addressing the high level of repeat offending in domestic abuse (through work developed via the Violence Crime Group and North Kent Domestic Abuse Forum).

**Main Delivery Groups:** Integrated Offender Management Unit, all CSP Sub-Groups and North Kent Domestic Abuse Forum, Repeat Offenders Focus Group.
Communicating With and Listening to Local People

The Community Safety Partnership (CSP) recognises that effectively dealing with crime and disorder is not always, in itself, enough to actually make local people genuinely feel safer. The CSP regularly receives information based on the findings of the Kent Crime and Victimisation Survey (KCVS) about how safe people feel and the crime and disorder issues that most concern local residents. In North Kent, there is a disproportionate level of concern about certain types of crime and disorder compared with how much crime and disorder is actually taking place. One of our aims is to improve the way we let people know about the work we are doing and its impact but also to listen to and understand your concerns so that we can work with you to try to alleviate them. We want our two Boroughs to be perceived as areas where people want to live, work, raise their families and spend their leisure time.

KCVS data, information gained from local Neighbourhood Panel Meetings, reports to Council members by their constituents and to Community Safety Units in each Borough, have been used to ensure that the priorities identified in this Strategy are not just shared by partner agencies but also by local people. In addition, throughout the course of 2011-12, regular consultation will take place through surveys and focus group work and through contact with local residents at ground level when we are delivering projects in specific geographical areas, to ensure that we remain aware of the issues that are the priority within local communities.

**ENGAGEMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbourhood Forums and Residents Associations</th>
<th>Neighbourhood Panel Meetings (formerly PACT)</th>
<th>Community Groups and Neighbourhood Watches</th>
<th>Consultation on Community Safety Priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**ACTIVE CITIZENSHIP AND RESIDENT INVOLVEMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbourhood Forums and Residents Associations</th>
<th>Neighbourhood Panel Meetings (formerly PACT)</th>
<th>Community Groups and Neighbourhood Watches</th>
<th>Continuous Community Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**FEEDBACK**

The Partnership is also aware that the level of success that our Community Safety Strategy can achieve is dependent upon the active involvement and support of local residents. We will aim to tackle the community safety issues that local people tell us cause the greatest concern but we will also need your help in order to make sure that the improvements we put in place are sustained in the longer term. We recognise that local people and the part they can play is our greatest resource and we are committed to working alongside and support residents in becoming part of our Partnership team.
The Structure of the Community Safety Partnership

The Partnership has a sound structure to ensure that the work set out in this Strategy can be effectively delivered and performance and progress regularly monitored. As well as a joint Dartford and Gravesham overarching strategic group that brings together statutory agency representatives at the most senior level, the Partnership has a number of operational sub-groups that will deliver work on the ground. These groups will each develop detailed action plans that will clearly identify the projects and initiatives that will be carried out in 2011-12 to underpin the aims and objectives outlined in this Strategy.

Partnership Organisational Structure

Both the Main Strategic Group and the Support Group meet on a quarterly basis. The Chairs of each of the Sub-Groups attend the Support Group meetings and provide progress reports on the projects their Group is implementing. On a day-to-day basis the Community Safety Units in each Borough, jointly staffed by both Kent Police and Council Officers, monitor both the progress being made overall in tackling our key priorities and respond quickly and efficiently to any new issues that may come to light or any change in circumstances that have to be addressed.

This structure means that here are a number of checks and balances in place to keep all involved on track with working towards achieving our goals by the end of the year.
Contacts

Further details of the Partnership and the work of the Community Safety Units can be found on the websites: www.safedartford.gov.uk and www.safegravesham.gov.uk

**Dartford Community Safety Unit**
Dartford Borough Council
Civic Offices
Home Gardens
Dartford
Kent DA1 1DR

Tel. 01322 343 000
www.safedartford.gov.uk

**Gravesham Community Safety Unit**
Gravesham Borough Council
4\textsuperscript{th} floor, Civic Centre
Windmill Street
Gravesend
Kent DA12 1AU

Tel. 01474 337 000
www.safe.gravesham.gov.uk

**North Kent Police**
North Kent Police Station
Thames Way
Gravesend
Kent DA11 8BD

Tel. 01622 690 690
www.kent.police.uk

**Kent Fire and Rescue Service**
The Godlands
Straw Mill Hill
Maidstone
Kent ME15 6XB

Tel. 01622 692 121
www.kent.fire-uk.org

**Kent Police Authority**
1\textsuperscript{st} Floor, Gail House
Lower Stone Street
Maidstone
Kent ME15 6NB

Tel. 01622 677 055
www.kentpa.kent.police.uk

**Kent County Council**
Community Safety Team
Sessions House
County Hall
Maidstone
Kent ME14 1XQ

Tel. 08458 247 247
www.kent.gov.uk

**Kent Probation Service**
25 Knightrider Street
Chaucer House
Maidstone
Kent ME15 6ND

Tel. 01622 350 820
www.kentprobation.org

**West Kent Primary Care Trust**
Wharf House
Medway Wharf Road
Tonbridge
Kent TN9 1RE

Tel. 01732 375 200
www.westkentpct.nhs.uk
COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP: PERFORMANCE PROGRESS REPORT

1. **SUMMARY**
Community Safety Partnership (CSP) performance report detailing reductions in various crime types and perceptions of anti-social behaviour.

2. **RECOMMENDATION**
That the Committee notes the Performance Progress Report approved by the Dartford & Gravesham Community Safety Partnership on the 6th June 2011 (Appendix A).

3. **Background and Discussion**

   3.1 The Performance Report was produced for the Community Safety Partnership main meeting and details performance in relation to levels of crime and disorder as well as changes in public perception in respect of anti-social behaviour comparing figures for the financial years 2009-10 and 2010-11 and is provided for Members’ scrutiny.

   3.3 Members are invited to note the contents of the report. Officers and representatives of Kent Police will be available to respond to Members’ questions.

4. **Relationship to the Corporate Plan**

   Safer Communities – To create a safer Borough in which to live, work and socialise. SC2 – Reduce anti-social behaviour.

5. **Financial, legal, staffing and other administrative implications and risk assessments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Implications</th>
<th>None arising from this report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal Implications</td>
<td>None specifically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing Implications</td>
<td>None arising from this report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Implications</td>
<td>None arising from this report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Assessment</td>
<td>Any reduction or withdrawal of service would have a negative impact on crime and disorder within the Borough.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. **Details of Exempt Information Category**
Not applicable
CRIME AND DISORDER (OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY) COMMITTEE
6th July 2011

7. **Appendices**

Appendix A: CSP Performance Progress Report, June 2011

### BACKGROUND PAPERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documents consulted</th>
<th>Date / File Ref</th>
<th>Report Author</th>
<th>Section and Directorate</th>
<th>Exempt Information Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matt Roberts</td>
<td>(01322) 3433502</td>
<td>EARS</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
By: Kath Donald (CSU, GBC)/Matt Roberts (CSU, DBC)
To: Community Safety Partnership – 6 June 2011
Subject: Performance Progress Report
Classification: Open
Summary: This report details performance in relation to levels of crime and disorder and changes in public perception in respect of anti-social behaviour comparing figures for the two financial years 2009-10 and 2010-11.

Recommendations
Members of the CSP are asked to consider and comment upon the content of the report.


1.1 Figures for the last two financial years indicate a reduction of 3.4% in total crime was recorded in Dartford in 2010-11 compared with the previous year whilst a very small increase (virtually no change) of 0.2% was seen in Gravesham. In numerical terms, Dartford has seen good reductions in fraud and forgery offences and criminal damage that have made a significant contribution to the overall reduction achieved last year. In Gravesham, the increase in theft and handling stolen goods offences was sufficiently high (247 more offences than in 2009-10) to prevent the Borough from recording a further annual reduction in overall crime i.e. had this offence category remained at the same level as the previous year, Gravesham would have recorded a decrease of 3.3%.

1.2 In both Boroughs, theft and handling stolen goods offences make up a very considerable proportion of total crime recorded – 30.6% of all crime in Dartford and 24.4% of all crime in Gravesham. The increase in this crime category was recognised last year and is a key priority within this year’s Community Safety Strategy. A multi-agency Theft and Handling Stolen Goods CSP Sub-Group is also being established this year, led by Kent Police, to develop joint initiatives that may help us to address this form of acquisitive crime. Whilst this type of offence also remains particularly high within the Dartford statistics, it should be noted that this is affected by the presence of Bluewater within the Borough.

1.3 Overall, last year the general trend in Dartford has been one of reduction, with improvements in most crime categories. In addition to the increase in theft and handling stolen goods, Gravesham has also seen increases across all types of property crime. In contrast, crimes against people categories such as violence against the person, sexual offences and robbery, have all recorded decreases and drug offences have fallen by 30.8% compared with an average fall of only 1.6% County-wide. This may be a demonstration of the impact of a number of very successful and intensive Police operations to dismantle local drugs markets that have taken place over the last two years.
### Recorded crime in Dartford and Gravesham
#### April 2009-March 2010 compared with April 2010-March 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime type</th>
<th>Dartford 2009-10</th>
<th>Dartford 2010-11</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Gravesham 2009-10</th>
<th>Gravesham 2010-11</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burglary dwelling</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>-4.8%</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary other</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>-9.4%</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal damage</td>
<td>1386</td>
<td>1257</td>
<td>-9.3%</td>
<td>1620</td>
<td>1501</td>
<td>-7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug offences</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>-8.2%</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>-30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud and forgery</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>-21.0%</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>-3.7%</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>-16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual offences</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>-21.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft and handling stolen goods</td>
<td>2310</td>
<td>2396</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>1490</td>
<td>1737</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from motor vehicle</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft of motor vehicle</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>-19.2%</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence against the person</td>
<td>1405</td>
<td>1397</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
<td>1619</td>
<td>1533</td>
<td>-5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other offences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total crime</strong></td>
<td><strong>8104</strong></td>
<td><strong>7825</strong></td>
<td><strong>-3.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>7086</strong></td>
<td><strong>7098</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.2%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recorded crime in Dartford and Gravesham 2010-11
#### Rates per 1,000 Population compared to the Kent average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime type</th>
<th>Rate per 1,000 population 2010-11 (and County position 1= best 13 = worst)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dartford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary dwelling</td>
<td>8.74 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary other</td>
<td>4.10 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal damage</td>
<td>13.43 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug offences</td>
<td>2.99 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud and forgery</td>
<td>5.94 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>0.84 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual offences</td>
<td>0.88 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft and handling stolen goods</td>
<td>25.60 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from motor vehicle</td>
<td>7.29 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft of motor vehicle</td>
<td>2.93 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence against the person</td>
<td>14.93 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other offences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total crime</strong></td>
<td><strong>83.60 (13)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.4 In terms of County comparisons, the other crime category that remains significantly higher than the Kent average is the level of vehicle crime recorded in Dartford. Despite a considerable reduction in theft of motor vehicle offences of 19.2%, Dartford still has the highest number of vehicle crimes per 1,000 population in the County (both for theft of and theft from motor vehicle offences). Interestingly, although theft and handling offences in Gravesham remain high at a local level, the rate per 1,000 population for this offence is actually lower in Gravesham than the County average.
### Total Recorded Crime in Kent
**April 2009-March 2010 compared with April 2010-March 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Apr 09-Mar 10</th>
<th>Apr 10-Mar 11</th>
<th>% change</th>
<th>Per 1,000 Pop.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashford</td>
<td>6212</td>
<td>6267</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>54.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>8600</td>
<td>8511</td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
<td>57.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dartford</strong></td>
<td><strong>8104</strong></td>
<td><strong>7825</strong></td>
<td><strong>-3.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>83.60</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dover</td>
<td>5993</td>
<td>6090</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>57.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gravesham</strong></td>
<td><strong>7086</strong></td>
<td><strong>7098</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.2%</strong></td>
<td><strong>71.83</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maidstone</td>
<td>9430</td>
<td>9430</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>63.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sevenoaks</td>
<td>5171</td>
<td>4956</td>
<td>-4.2%</td>
<td>43.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepway</td>
<td>6058</td>
<td>5738</td>
<td>-5.3%</td>
<td>57.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swale</td>
<td>9573</td>
<td>9159</td>
<td>-4.3%</td>
<td>69.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thanet</td>
<td>10771</td>
<td>10698</td>
<td>-0.7%</td>
<td>81.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonbridge and Malling</td>
<td>5739</td>
<td>5913</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>50.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunbridge Wells</td>
<td>5780</td>
<td>5496</td>
<td>-4.9%</td>
<td>51.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KCC Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>88517</strong></td>
<td><strong>87181</strong></td>
<td><strong>-1.5%</strong></td>
<td><strong>61.78</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medway</td>
<td>17943</td>
<td>18457</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>72.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kent Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>106460</strong></td>
<td><strong>105638</strong></td>
<td><strong>-0.8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>63.41</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 1.4 Comparison with Our Most Similar Group (MSG)

iQuanta data below for the last available quarter (01 January 2011-31 March 2011) compares the position of Dartford and Gravesham CSP with other CSPs within our MSG. Dartford and Gravesham ranked 7th of the 15 areas, with total crime slightly below the average level. This is a progression of one place from 8th position in the previous quarter and indicates a steady improvement – the CSP ranked 10th in the middle of last year.
2. Public Perceptions and Local Concerns

2.1 Information on public perceptions as measured by the Kent Crime and Victimisation Survey (KCVS) is provided to the CSP via the Central Support Team (KCC). Participants are asked for their views on how big a problem they believe seven different types of anti-social behaviour (ASB) to be in their local area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teenagers hanging around</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People drunk or rowdy in public</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism, graffiti, deliberate damage</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubbish or litter lying around</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noisy neighbours or loud parties</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People using or dealing drugs</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandoned or burnt out cars</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% perceived high level of ASB</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 Whilst improving public perceptions must continue to remain a priority in both Boroughs, the above figures do carry some good news. Although figures generally remain higher in Gravesham than the Kent averages, there have been some marked improvements in public perceptions (particularly on issues such as ‘rubbish or litter lying around’ and ‘vandalism, graffiti and deliberate damage’ that have been our key concerns) during the course of the year. Whilst the perceived high level of ASB in the Borough remains almost the highest in the County, the overall improvements in perceptions in the categories above may also support the fact that Gravesham continues to rank 1<sup>st</sup> in the County in respect of how well the Council is dealing with local concerns.

2.3 Dartford has seen some increases, primarily in perceptions of ‘teenagers hanging around’ and ‘rubbish or litter lying around’ but in terms of the perceived high level of ASB, Dartford has one of the lowest rates recorded in Kent Districts, ranking 4<sup>th</sup> in the County. In both Boroughs, these two issues remain those perceived as the biggest problems by local people. In terms of how well people feel the Council id dealing with local concerns, Dartford ranked 3<sup>rd</sup> in the County.

2.4 Perceptions of crime and ASB are recognised as a risk to our core business. Previous CSP meetings have discussed ASB issues occurring in and around the Gravesend Town Centre area associated with new local communities settling in the area. A combination of enforcement and educational initiatives, increased multi-agency projects and improvements in access to services, appear to have had a positive impact: the level of reports of ASB being received by the Police, through the CSU and by other Council services generally appears to have abated, at least for the moment. Plans are being made to reconvene the multi-agency conference that took place in January in order that those involved can receive proper feedback of the work that has been taking place, its impact and further opportunities for joint working can be identified.
2.5 To supplement the information provided by the KCVS perception data, it was felt that it would be helpful to conduct a survey earlier this year at a local level that might provide more detailed information that could then be utilised by partner agencies and both CSUs to better target activity and resources to deal with those issues causing most concern and to tackle factors that might be influencing perceptions. A report on the findings of both surveys will be completed shortly and provided to both CSUs for wider dissemination as appropriate/on request. 480 surveys were completed in Gravesham and 50 in Dartford. The surveys contain slightly different questions, although there are some areas where findings will be able to be combined.

2.6 A draft survey of the Gravesham findings has been prepared and in respect of questions regarding both perceptions and actual experiences of ASB, responses appear to support KCVS data and clearly indicate that the biggest perceived problems are those that relate to environmental issues such as, rubbish and litter, fly-tipping vandalism and dog mess. Both CSUs have been prioritising work within local communities to tackle these types of issues both through joint initiatives with Probation’s Community Payback Teams and through each Borough’s My Place Matters Projects reported to the CSP previously and that are being delivered this year.

Kath Donald
Strategic Manager
Gravesham Community Safety Unit
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