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CRIME AND DISORDER (OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY) COMMITTEE
AGENDA

Wednesday 24 July 2013

1. Apologies For Absence

To receive any apologies of absence.

2. Declarations of Interest

To receive declarations of interest from Members including the terms(s) of the Grant of Dispensation (if any) by the Audit Board or Managing Director.

3. Confirmation of the Minutes of the meeting held on 13 February 2013

To confirm the Minutes of the meeting held on 13 February 2013 as accurate.

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. Regulation 9 Notice

To consider any issues arising from the published Regulation 9 Notice for the period 15 June to 31 October 2013.

7. Presentation on Community Safety

To receive a presentation from Mr Jim Parris, Community Safety Manager, Community Safety, KCC.
8. **Performance**

To note the attached Performance report detailing reductions in various crime types and perceptions of anti-social behaviour, as discussed by the Dartford & Gravesham Community Safety Partnership on 13 June 2013.

9. **Community Safety Plan 2013-14**


10. **Outcomes Regarding Certificate of Authority to Disperse Groups (Dispersal Order)**

To note the report originally submitted to Cabinet on 4 July 2013, summarising the outcomes and actions taken, following the decision to impose a Dispersal Order (Certificate of Authority to disperse groups) on the Temple Hill area of the Borough between 31 January and 30 April 2013.

11. **Work Programme**

Members are invited to note the contents of the Committee’s rolling Work Programme for 2013-14 and beyond and comment accordingly.

12. **Annual Report for the 2012-13 Municipal Year**

To approve the attached *draft* Annual Report and Appendices for 2012-13 and to recommend accordingly.
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 13 February 2013.

PRESENT: Councillor R J Wells (Chairman)
Councillor A S Sandhu, MBE (Vice-Chairman)
Councillor M J Bryant
Councillor D J Mote
Councillor Mrs J A Rickwood
Councillor M J Street

ABSENT: Councillor Mrs S P Butterfill

Dartford Borough Council Officers:-
Sheri Green – Strategic Director
Colin Newmarch – Enforcement Manager, CSU
Matt Roberts – Community Safety Officer, CSU

LEAD MEMBERS: Councillor Mrs A Allen

PRESENT TO RESPOND TO ISSUES RAISED BY THE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE:

Insp. Paul Cook – Dartford CSU, Kent Police
Susan Moyse – Kent Probation
Tina Hughes – Kent Probation

14. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors D A Hammock and A R Martin (Committee invitees) and from Chief Inspector Roscoe Walford, Dartford District Commander Kent Police.

The Chairman welcomed Susan Moyse and Tina Hughes from Kent Probation and Inspector Paul Cooke, Neighbourhood Inspector, Dartford CSU. He also noted the presence of the Strategic Director and the Enforcement Manager and the Community Safety Officer from the CSU.

Lead Member Councillor Mrs Ann Allen (Community and Tax Payer Involvement) was also in attendance by standing invitation.

15. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.
16. CONFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 12 SEPTEMBER 2012

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 12 September 2012 be confirmed as accurate.

17. URGENT ITEMS

Newtown shooting - 12 February 2013

The Chairman sought an update from Inspector Paul Cooke (Dartford Neighbourhood Inspector, CSU) on the fatal shooting that had occurred in the Newtown area of the Borough the previous evening, 12 February 2013.

Inspector Cooke confirmed the details circulated earlier in the day to Members by the Strategic Director. Two Dartford residents, a man and a woman, remained in police custody following the fatal shooting of a Dartford man in Overy Street, New Town at approximately 8 pm the previous evening. The name of the victim was being withheld at this stage by the senior investigating officer (SIO) for operational reasons. It was understood that the victim was known to the arrested couple. Given the on-going nature of the enquiry Inspector Cooke was unable to comment further. However he advised that measures had been taken to re-assure local communities.

The Chairman thanked Inspector Cooke for his update and expressed his satisfaction with the Police response to these tragic events and the measures being taken (together with Council staff in the CSU) to re-assure local residents and businesses in the areas concerned.

The Vice-Chairman added his own thanks for the Police response to this tragic incident and for the continuing efforts by Police and Council Officers to re-assure residents and businesses in the area. In his role as Ward Councillor, the Vice-Chairman had issued a statement to the local press in response to the shooting and had expressed his condolences to the family and friends of the deceased man. He added that, in general terms, Dartford remained a safe and friendly environment in which to live and work: it was important to re-enforce this positive message with the public and the media.

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

There were no references from other Committees.

19. CHAIRMAN'S UPDATE
The Chairman proposed that the Committee consider parts I and II of the Strategic Assessment document consecutively [agenda Items 10 and A] rather than taking the EXEMPT papers separately, at the end of proceedings.

20. REGULATION 9 NOTICE

RESOLVED:

That the contents of the Regulation 9 Notice for the period 15 January to 31 May 2013 be noted.

21. REGULATION 10 NOTICE [GENERAL EXCEPTION PROVISIONS RELATING TO KEY DECISIONS] : CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORITY TO DISPERSE GROUPS

The Committee was asked to note the details of a Regulation 10 Notice issued under the General Exception arrangements in accordance with Standing Order 54 (6) (e), in relation to a matter which was a Key Decision: a decision having a significant effect on communities living and working in two or more Wards of the Borough.

The Regulation 10 Notice (originally presented to Cabinet for approval on 24 January 2013) requested authority to issue a Certificate of Authority / Authorisation to Disperse Groups [a Dispersal Order]; in a designated area in and around Temple Hill, Dartford under the Anti-Social Behaviour Act 2003 [part 4, Sections 30-36].

Cabinet delegated authority to the Managing Director (DBC) and the Superintendent (Kent Police) to co-sign the Dispersal Order in response to a significant increase in anti-social behaviour and low level criminal activity on Temple Hill in the preceding weeks of January 2013, which had resulted in a negative impact on vulnerable residents and businesses in the area.

The Strategic Director apologised to the Committee for a procedural error. She advised that the Crime & Disorder (Overview and Scrutiny) Committee Chairman, rather than the Chairman of Scrutiny, should have been asked to co-sign the Regulation 10 Notice. This did not affect the validity of the Certificate of Authority.

The Committee received an update on the implementation of the Dispersal Order and the developments leading up to the decision to take the exceptional action from the Neighbourhood Inspector (CSU).

Inspector Cooke advised that the Dispersal Order had been formally signed on 31 January 2013 for a period of 3 months until 30 April. He explained that in the period immediately prior to signature twenty four (24) separate reports had been completed on victims of low-level crime and anti-social behaviour
(ASB) in Temple Hill, with most of the alleged offenders being youths living in the area. This was an exceptionally high number and a firm indicator that prompt intervention was required to prevent escalation. The Dispersal Order was a preventative measure, aimed at dispersing groups of two or more youths and to bolster public confidence and perception that ASB was being effectively tackled by the authorities. In related initiatives, Police resources were also being deployed to tackle alcohol and drug misuse on Temple Hill. Residents appeared to be gaining in confidence following the new measures and an increasing number of residents were coming forward with information to help the Police and Council Officers in the CSU in their efforts to combat the increase in crime in the area. Businesses in Temple Hill now received daily visits from CSU staff as part of the new measures.

The Vice-Chairman thanked Insp. Cooke for the update and for the joint Police / CSU presentation given the previous week to Ward Members and confirmed his support for the action taken.

He added that from personal observation and his discussions with residents; drug misuse and drug-related crime were also major problems in Newtown and noted that the current Dispersal Order only applied to the Joyce Green and Littlebrook Wards of the Borough and suggested that consideration be given to extending the current Order to cover Newtown. He also noted that only Police Officers were able to enforce dispersal under the Order and expressed the hope that authority to disperse groups would be extended to PCSOs in the future.

The Community Safety Officer (CSO) advised that past experience of a Dispersal Order [which were rarely used and then only in response to specific circumstances] had not lead to a displacement of crime to adjacent areas.

The Neighbourhood Inspector advised that the use of class B drugs in the Borough, particularly cannabis, was being addressed under a separate initiative, including increased searches of addresses of known users. He advised that extending the current Dispersal Order to include Newtown, in isolation, would not effectively address this complex social issue.

The Shadow Chairman added his own thanks for the combined Police and CSU briefing. He underlined the importance of keeping Ward Members fully informed and involved commenting that they had an important pro-active role to play in relaying expressions of concern from residents which, if heeded, could well solve problems before more drastic measures were contemplated / became necessary.

RESOLVED:

That the Regulation 10 Notice be noted.
22. **KENT PROBATION: SERVICE OVERVIEW AND CONTRIBUTION TO CSP**

The Chairman renewed his welcome to Susan Moyse and Tina Hughes from Kent Probation and invited them to address the Committee.

Tina Hughes informed Members that from 1 March 2013, she would be the Local Delivery Unit Director for North Kent. She was attending the meeting in an observer capacity and to gain further insight into Kent Probation’s current work in Dartford and Gravesham, prior to taking up her new role.

Susan Moyes advised Members that she was the Senior Probation Officer for Dartford and Gravesham, in addition to chairing the North Kent Multi Agency Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPA). She proposed to address Members directly (rather than make a formal presentation) on the work that Kent Probation was currently undertaking in the Dartford and Gravesham areas and how it linked into the aims of the CSP. Members were advised of the following principal areas of activity:

**Reducing Reoffending: Appropriate Interventions**

Kent Probation was responsible for assessing individual’s likelihood of reoffending and the risk they posed to others. Identifying the factors that led to reoffending behaviour in individuals and deploying appropriate interventions to reduce reoffending and harm was a key area of work. Ensuring that individual offenders received the most appropriate intervention(s), matched to their learning styles, began at the pre-sentencing stage. Interventions included; one to one supervision, the reducing reoffending stand-alone requirement and a range of Home Office accredited programmes to variously address; domestic violence, anger management, drink impaired drivers, sex offenders and thinking and behavioural deficits.

**Desistence**

Kent Probation also drew on emerging research on the process of ‘desistence’ (stopping offending) and the benefits of the multi-agency collaborative approach for effective one to one work and individually tailored interventions. In all these approaches emphasis was placed on active and engaging supervisory practice that allowed methods to be matched to offender’s individual learning styles.

**Offenders released on Licence**

In addition to continuing to support the work of the Courts, Kent Probation also monitored those offenders released into the community on Licence. Contrary to popular belief, offenders were only granted Licence to return to the community when 50% of their sentence had been served. Allowing an offender to complete the second half of their sentence on Licence was aimed at supporting rehabilitation into the community. However, if reoffending occurred and/or risk increased, the offender was recalled to custody and the
Licence rescinded to protect the public and reduce the likelihood of further victims.

**Community Payback Scheme**

Members were advised that the Community Payback Scheme administered by Kent Probation had celebrated 40 years of operation in November 2012, attracting coverage on both BBC Radio Kent and ITV Meridian News.

The Community Payback team continued to identify and implement community projects to be undertaken by offenders who had unpaid work hours imposed on them by the Courts. Unpaid work successfully punished offending behaviour and made reparations to the community in which the offender lived; in addition to providing a positive form of rehabilitation and reintegration for offenders back into society.

In particular, the Scheme enabled offenders to: address skills deficits (including reading and writing), provided structure and routine for offenders, encouraged personal development and provided opportunities to gain future paid employment. The Payback team continued to receive thanks and praise for completed works in the communities across Kent.

**Prospect Project**

Members received details of a new intervention project which had opened in Gravesham in 2012. ‘Prospects’ was a project run by Gravesend Probation to provide female offenders in the Dartford and Gravesham areas with a safe and secure environment to address their offending behaviour, outside the traditional Probation Office setting.

The Prospect project was being delivered within an all-female environment, facilitated by Probation staff but deploying a multi-agency approach. This approach enabled women offenders to access a variety of services and support structures for employment, training, education and counselling. The project provided an empowering forum to address the causes of crime which for females were often emotion led, with many of the women victims of domestic violence.

The all-female group format enabled the women to form friendships and increase their confidence to communicate and appropriately challenge others. Positive benefits included; a reduction in their reoffending and harm to others, reduced substance misuse and the feeling of isolation; combining to effect greater integration for offenders back into the community. The group covered a different theme each week linked to offending behaviour and emotional needs.

The Prospect project strives to provide continuity in the supervision of women, allowing them to access mentors and positive role models, as well as access to support. The group is currently running in Gravesend and Medway and current evidence suggests a significant reduction in reoffending rates.
Reducing Reoffending Sub-Group

The Reducing Reoffending Sub Group of the CSP had held its first meeting on 11 September 2012. The Sub-Group were conscious of the fact that a number of existing groups with differing approaches were already tackling reoffending including; MAPPA (Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements), IOM (Integrated Offender Management) and the Troubled Families project.

The Sub-Group were mindful of the need to avoid duplicating work being undertaken in the other forums and to link wherever possible, into existing good practice. The Sub-Group had considered a number of pathways leading to reoffending and identified the two areas of Accommodation and Employment as key to successfully reducing reoffending rates. The Sub-Group had agreed to focus on these two key areas and a case study of two offenders from the Dartford and Gravesham areas was being undertaken to identify difficulties and gaps in current provision.

Consultations were on going to identify which Agencies could best contribute to the Sub-Group including; NHS Social Care, Health and Welling Being Board, Job Centre Plus, Housing Departments and the Prison Service and the viability of their staff attending Sub-Group meetings on a regular basis.

The Sub-Group had subsequently met on 28 November 2012 and 1 February 2013 and were currently considering successful initiatives in other areas, to see if they had a Kent application. One such scheme ‘Leicestershire Cares’ enabled local employers in that county to allow several members of staff to mentor ex-offenders on two week work placements with firms, aimed at building self-confidence and experience of practical work in a particular field of interest. Participants received a certificate of completion and a reference to use with future employers.

The Sub-Group had agreed that drug and alcohol misuse by offenders would continue to be considered by the DAAG (Drugs and Alcohol Action Group) Forum to avoid duplication of effort in those areas.

Troubled Families Project / RR SAR’s / DV SAR / CAFCAS

The Senior Probation Officer advised Members that through her work with the Troubled Families project, the IOM (Integrated Offender Management) scheme [see below] and the recently formed Reducing Reoffending Sub-Group of the CSP; she was conscious of the need to link the work being undertaken in the separate Agencies to avoid wasteful duplication and ensure maximum efficiency of resources.

Members were advised that two lead officers had been identified to cover the Dartford & Gravesham Troubled families project and that Probation were linking with local project managers to identify existing interventions that
Probation could commission and adapt for non-sentenced individuals including: RR SAR’s (reduce reoffending stand-alone requirement); the Prospect project and DV SAR (domestic violence stand-alone requirement). In addition, Probation held a contract with CAFCAS (Children & Family Court Advisory Service) to deliver units of their domestic abuse perpetrator programme and cognitive behavioural interventions on a one to one and group basis.

**Integrated Offender Management (IOM)**

Members were advised that the key objectives of IOM were to deliver integrated offender management as a partnership process for managing both adult and young individuals who are or have been causing harm in their communities through criminal and/or anti-social behaviour (ASB).

Focus was placed on those offenders who would benefit from a co-ordinated multi-agency approach, including from; the Police, Probation, accommodation providers, CRI and drug testing of PPO’s (prolific and priority offenders) who were on Licence to Probation. The Senior Probation Officer advised that in the period April to October 2012, offences committed by the adult cohort in Kent had reduced from 85 to 54 offences and in the young offender cohort from 67 offences down to only 33. It was hoped that the downward trend in offences for both cohorts would continue.

Committee Members commended the work being undertaken by Kent Probation and expressed their particular appreciation of the Community Payback Scheme. Dartford had derived significant benefit from the Scheme in several Wards and Parishes and Members expressed their thanks. Members felt that the Scheme helped to break down barriers between offenders and victims, with aged residents in particular regaining confidence from interaction with offenders undertaking Scheme work for them.

Members also noted the distinct benefits for offenders of a daily routine imposed by the Scheme; initially through unpaid work which increased the possibilities of paid employment thereafter, including the prospect of apprenticeships for young offenders. Members asked that their thanks be passed onto the Community Payback team.

Susan Moyse undertook to relay the Committee’s thanks to the Payback team and Reducing Reoffending Sub-Group. She also expressed the hope that the Dartford CSO would resume his membership of the Sub-Group, following completion of his current secondment to the office of the Kent PCC.

The Strategic Director reminded the Committee that Kent Probation had fairly recently become a Responsible Authority within the Dartford & Gravesham CSP; but was a key player if the Partnership was to succeed in its obligation to reduce offending. The Partnership had high expectations that the Reducing Reoffending Sub-Group, under Susan Moyse’s Chairmanship, would provide an effective multi-agency approach in this respect.
The Chairman thanked Susan Moyse for a comprehensive briefing and congratulated Tina Hughes on her forthcoming appointment as North Kent Local Delivery Unit Director for Kent Probation.

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

The Chairman invited the Community Safety Officer (CSO) to summarise Part I of the Strategic Assessment (SA) document [Executive Summary], prior to the Committee going into closed session to consider the EXEMPT material contained in Part II of the document.

The CSO reminded Members of the history of the SA, first introduced in 2007. He advised that Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) were legally obliged to complete an SA (an audit of crime and disorder levels) on an annual basis under the provisions of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998. Production of the SA for the Dartford and Gravesham CSP was undertaken alternatively by the CSO and the Strategic Manager in the Gravesham CSU, who was the author of the 2012 document.

Members were advised that the primary purpose of the SA was to provide an analysis of changes in levels of recorded crime and disorder over the previous 12 month period [1 October to 30 September the following year] and to develop suggested strategic priorities, to form the basis of the Community Safety Action Plan for the following 12 month period [October to September].

The 2012 SA document had been agreed by the Dartford and Gravesham CSP at its meeting on 15 January 2013 and would be used to inform the Community Safety Action Plan for the two Boroughs in the 2013 -14 cycle.

The CSP had concluded that subject to consultation, the priorities for the new Community Safety Plan 2013/14 covering the period 1 October 2013 to 30 September 2014 should be:

- Violent Crime (including domestic abuse);
- Anti-social behaviour (ASB);
- Acquisitive crime;
- Substance misuse;
- Safety on the road;
- Reducing re-offending (as a cross-cutting theme).

It was also proposed that a new Safety on the Road Sub-Group be formed within the CSP to more effectively tackle this growing area of increasing concern during the 2013/14 cycle of activity.

The Chairman thanked the CSO and his colleagues in both the Dartford and Gravesham CSUs for compiling the 2012 SA document and proposed that the Committee move into closed session to consider the EXEMPT material in the remainder of the SA.
24. **EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**

RESOLVED:

That by virtue of paragraph(s) 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A 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 it involves the likely closure of exempt information.

25. **DARTFORD AND GRAVESHAM COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP STRATEGIC ASSESSMENT (SA) : PART II [EXEMPT]**

The Committee considered Part II of the Strategic Assessment (SA) 2012 document in closed session, given the EXEMPT nature of the material.

Members noted the overall reduction of 8.1% for recorded crime for Dartford for the period ended 30 September 2012 compared to the previous 12 month period ending 30 September 2011. Members noted significant reductions in the categories of Criminal Damage, Fraud and Forgery, Sexual offences, Vehicle theft and Anti-social behaviour [for Dartford as a whole]. The reductions were in part offset by increases in Burglary, Robbery and Domestic Abuse.

Members requested that greater narrative detail be provided in future Strategic Assessment documents to give better context to the statistics. Members also renewed their request that offences committed in Bluewater [the 'Bluewater effect'] be separated out from the overall statistics for Dartford, to give Members a clearer indication of the crime profile of the Borough.

The CSO advised that the data sets contained in the SA document came from a range of Agencies outside the control of the Dartford and Gravesham CSUs. However, wherever possible, he and the Gravesham CSU Strategic Manager endeavoured to provide as much anecdotal detail as possible to supplement the statistics. He confirmed that Bluewater data was detailed separately for meetings of the CSP and would ensure that this would be replicated for the 2013 SA document.

Further discussion concentrated on the 9.3% increase in Domestic Abuse in the Borough [Agenda p56 / SA document p14]. In particular, Members sought details of the measures being deployed to protect victims of domestic abuse. Members appreciated the difficulties Local Authorities, Kent Police and the NHS faced in trying to address domestic abuse issues: many victims of abuse were either too afraid to complain, felt they contributed to the abuse in some way or simply accepted abuse as part of their everyday life. Members advocated an integrated approach, involving the Council’s Housing Services, the Police / CSU and the NHS, as being essential to effectively tackling this growing social problem.
The CSO agreed that the issues surrounding instances of domestic abuse were complex. He informed Members that the CSU, North Kent Police and the Council’s Housing Department were all working to reduce instances of domestic abuse and it was hoped that a further drop in the number of cases involving repeat victims [currently down by 0.7 %] would be achieved through this coordinated multi-agency approach.

The CSO further advised that the North Kent Domestic Abuse Forum oversaw a ‘one-stop-shop’ for victims of domestic abuse, enabling them to report offences and seek help on a confidential basis. The service was advertised in the local media and currently based in the Citizens Advice Bureau in Dartford. Other venues were being considered, included local libraries and Darent Valley Hospital’s Accident & Emergency Department. The Hospital’s Clinical Partnership Group was due to report back on the A&E venue proposal in April. The Forum also offered a ‘sanctuary scheme’ to domestic abuse victims to enable them to remain safely in their homes. He added that all victims of domestic abuse were also offered support by trained Police Officers.

In response to a suggestion from the Shadow Chairman; that consideration be given to rolling-out the ‘one-stop-shop’ facility to a variety of locations to increase access for victims; the CSO advised that this could pose logistical difficulties and have resource implications.

Councillor Allen (Leader Member, Community and Tax Payer Involvement) attending by standing invitation, addressed Members at the Chairman’s discretion. She advised that in her role as Kent County Council Member, she had sat last year on the KCC Select Committee considering Domestic Abuse across Kent. The Select Committee’s report had noted, inter-alia, that on average, a victim of domestic violence was abused on 32 separate occasions before making a complaint. A new KCC website for reporting domestic abuse had been introduced to facilitate reporting incidents in confidence, including for males suffering domestic violence from female partners and for those in same sex relationships. The Dartford Local Children’s Trust had also considered domestic abuse, particularly its impact on children and young people and through the Trust, a local Girls Grammar School was running a programme seeking to prevent young girls becoming victims of abusive relationships.

Members thanked Councillor Allen for her input and suggested that domestic abuse might be a future topic for Committee debate. Members looked forward to receiving feedback from the new Health Director at Darent Valley Hospital over the possibility of siting a domestic abuse facility in the A&E Department and asked the Committee Coordinator to obtain copies of the KCC Select Committee’s report on Domestic Abuse in Kent when published.

The Neighbourhood Inspector (CSU) informed the Committee that the North Kent Police Divisional Group was deploying a twin strategy to address the increase in domestic abuse, concentrating resources on:
• The top ten offenders

• The top ten repeat victims

A core issue was how to effectively tackle repeat offenders when the victims withdrew their complaint(s). Getting victims to Court to testify against their attackers and obtaining convictions, was essential to effectively reducing levels of domestic abuse.

The Chairman thanked the Neighbourhood Inspector and the CSO for their contribution to the Committee’s discussion of the 2012 SA document and wished the CSO every success in his short secondment to the Kent Police and Crime Commissioner’s Office.

26. THE MEETING RESUMED IN OPEN SESSION

27. WORK PROGRAMME

The Chairman sought approval of the statutory and discretionary elements of the Committee’s Rolling Work Plan as set out in the published agenda.

The Strategic Director suggested that the Committee might wish to discuss the outcomes of the current Dispersal Order for Temple Hill, in some 6 months’ time, at the Committee’s summer meeting now re-scheduled for July 2013.

The Enforcement Manager (CSU) added that an ‘Exit Strategy’ would form part of the wider Temple Hill Dispersal Order arrangements.

The Community Safety Officer (CSO) advised that new legislation governing measures to combat ant-social behaviour (ASB); updating the present ‘Tools, Powers and Processes’ guidelines; was due to be enacted in the next 18 months of the current Parliament. He suggested that the Committee might usefully review any new legislation that reached the statute book at their summer meeting in 2014.

The Neighbourhood Inspector (CSU) warned that the Dispersal Order and other related initiatives to combat rising drug and alcohol misuse in Temple Hill would inevitably result in an increase in crime statistics. He expressed the hope that any increase in statistics be viewed in the proper context; that of positive Police and CSU action to combat crime, rather than as a negative statistic.

RESOLVED:

That the contents of the Committee’s Rolling Work Programme as set out in agenda pages 41-42 be noted with the following additions:


28. DATES FOR FUTURE MEETINGS

The Strategic Director advised that an amended date for the summer 2013 meeting of the Committee had been agreed with the Member Services Manager, subsequent to the printing of the agenda.

It was now proposed that the summer meeting of the Committee revert to July each year, when the Community Safety Partnership (CSP) considered the Annual Action Plan document. The Committee had met in September 2012 exceptionally, to allow feedback on the London 2012 and Paralympic events held in August that year.

The Committee Co-ordinator was asked to circulate the revised date to Members in due course.

Subject to presentation to Cabinet in March and approval by the General Assembly of the Council at the Annual Meeting on 8 May, Members noted the following dates for future meetings of the Committee in the 2013/14 municipal cycle:

July 2013 [exact date t.b.c.]

Wednesday 12 February 2014

The meeting closed at 8.30 pm

Councillor R J Wells
CHAIRMAN
DARTFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL

LIST OF FORTHCOMING KEY DECISIONS – REGULATION 9 NOTICE

This document lists all key decisions due to be taken in the forthcoming 4 months in accordance with the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meeting and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012. It also lists and contains particulars of any items where it is likely that the public will be excluded because consideration of the matter in public would disclose confidential of exempt information. The reasons for going into closed session are given in each case. An updated list will be published monthly.

All decisions are made by Cabinet collectively.

Cabinet Members:

Councillor J A Kite, MBE, Portfolio: Leader & Overall Strategy
Councillor A R Martin, Portfolio: Deputy Leader, Strategic Council Finances & Strategic Service Provision
Councillor P F Coleman, Portfolio: Front Line Services, Customer Champion & Housing
Councillor C J Shippam, Portfolio: Town Centre
Councillor A Lloyd, Portfolio: Environment, Leisure & Events

All of the reports contained in this list, where open to the public, will be published on the Council’s website www.dartford.gov.uk at least 5 clear days before the day of the meeting or, if later, whenever they become available. All reports provide details of any background documents which have been relied upon to a material degree during production of the report, or relied upon when formulating recommendations or options for decision. Hard copies or extracts from these reports can be obtained on request by emailing memberservices@dartford.gov.uk.

This notice supersedes all previous notices.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE OF REPORT AND BRIEF</th>
<th>DATE OF CABINET/GAC MEETING OR PERIOD WITHIN WHICH THE DECISION WILL BE TAKEN AND BY WHOM</th>
<th>WHO IS TO BE CONSULTED BEFORE TAKING THE DECISION AND HOW</th>
<th>BACKGROUND PAPERS</th>
<th>NAME, TITLE AND CONTACT DETAILS OF REPORT AUTHOR</th>
<th>OPEN OR CLOSED (if closed the reason is specified)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submission of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Schedule</td>
<td>Cabinet 4 Jul 2013 General Assembly of the Council 15 Jul 2013</td>
<td>The Draft CIL Schedule has previously been considered by Cabinet and has been subject to public consultation.</td>
<td>Teresa Ryszkowska, Planning Services Manager Tel: 01322 343631 <a href="mailto:teresa.ryszkowska@dartford.gov.uk">teresa.ryszkowska@dartford.gov.uk</a></td>
<td>OPEN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Non-Domestic Discretionary Rate Relief</td>
<td>Cabinet 4 Jul 2013</td>
<td>To consider granting discretionary rate relief to charities or non-profit making organisations, or to certain businesses in a designated Rural Settlement in the Borough, who have made applications in respect of 2012/2013 and/or 2013/2014 since the report was last referred to Cabinet on 7 March 2013.</td>
<td>Sue Cressall, Revenues Manager Tel: 01322343007 <a href="mailto:sue.cressall@sevenoaks.gov.uk">sue.cressall@sevenoaks.gov.uk</a></td>
<td>CLOSED - if reference needs to be made to the Appendix to this report, which is exempt under Paragraphs 1 and 3 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TITLE OF REPORT AND BRIEF</td>
<td>DATE OF CABINET/GAC MEETING OR PERIOD WITHIN WHICH THE DECISION WILL BE TAKEN AND BY WHOM</td>
<td>WHO IS TO BE CONSULTED BEFORE TAKING THE DECISION AND HOW</td>
<td>BACKGROUND PAPERS</td>
<td>NAME, TITLE AND CONTACT DETAILS OF REPORT AUTHOR</td>
<td>OPEN OR CLOSED (if closed the reason is specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Draft Development Management Plan Consultation** | Cabineet 12 Sep 2013  
General Assembly of the Council 7 Oct 2013 | A previous report has been considered by Cabinet on the scope of the Plan and this has been subject to public consultation. This report proposes to carry out a further stage of public consultation. The Plan will be considered by the LDF Members Working Group before Cabinet. | | Teresa Ryszkowska, Planning Services Manager  
Tel: 01322 343631  
teresa.ryszkowska@dartford.gov.uk | OPEN |

The plan will contain policies for managing development in the Borough which will be used in the determination of planning applications. It will supplement policies in the Core Strategy which are of a more strategic nature. At this consultation stage, draft policy wording will be provided for consideration.
PERFORMANCE PROGRESS REPORT

1. SUMMARY
Performance report detailing reductions in various crime types and perceptions of anti-social behaviour.

2. RECOMMENDATION
To note the attached report, discussed by the Dartford & Gravesham Community Safety Partnership on 13 June 2013.

3. Background and Discussion

3.1 This report has been produced for the Community Safety Partnership (CSP) 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 rolling financial year period of April 2011 to March 2012 against April 2012 to March 2013 and is provided for Members’ scrutiny.

3.2 Members are scrutinising a document that has already been discussed and approved by the main Community Safety Partnership on 13 June 2013.

3.3 It should be noted that the performance report prompted a discussion following an announcement by the report author that the data previously used to write these reports was no longer being made available by Kent Police/KCC.

3.4 Members are invited to consider the report. Representatives of the CSU and 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>
</tbody>
</table>
Administrative Implications | None arising from this report
---|---
Risk Assessment | Any reduction or withdrawal of service would have a negative impact on crime and disorder within the Borough.

6. **Details of Exempt Information Category**

Not applicable

7. **Appendices**

Performance Progress Report

**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>04/07/13</td>
<td>Matt Roberts (01322) 3433502</td>
<td>EARS Strategic</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
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</tbody>
</table>
By: Kath Donald (Strategic Manager, Community Safety, GBC), Matt Roberts (Community Safety Manager, DBC)

To: Dartford & Gravesham CSP – 13 June 2013

Subject: Performance Report

Classification: Open

Summary: This report details performance relating to levels of crime and disorder and changes in public perceptions in respect of anti-social behaviour.

Recommendations

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


1.1 Members will see from the figures on page 2 of this report that there has been a slightly different experience in Dartford and Gravesham in terms of total recorded crime in the period April 2012-March 2013 compared with the previous year. Whilst Dartford has recorded a fall in total crime of 3.0% from 7,382 to 7,159 offences, Gravesham has seen an increase of 6.2% from 6,795 to 7,214 offences.

1.2 Dartford has recorded decreases in virtually all of the 15 crime categories considered whilst Gravesham has seen increases in most offence types. In 2012-13, the general trend across the County has been one of falling total crime rates with all Districts and Medway recording reductions with the exception of Gravesham, Ashford and Sevenoaks. At the end of last year, Dartford’s rate of total crime per 1,000 of population remained the second highest in the County with 73.3 offences per 1,000 population whilst Gravesham saw the third highest rate with 70.9 offences per 1,000 population. These rates compare with a Kent-wide rate of 56.9 offences per 1,000 population.

1.3 Both Boroughs have recorded reductions in certain acquisitive crime types and in particular, in relation to fraud and forgery offences. In Dartford, these offences fell by 48.3% from 567 to 293 offences and in Gravesham by 28.8% from 330 to 235 offences. These reductions are in line with those seen County-wide: all areas have recorded very significant decreases in fraud and forgery in 2012-13 with an average fall of 43.6% (1,797 less crimes County-wide).

1.4 Whilst theft of motor vehicle offences have fallen very slightly by 1.6% in Dartford, the Borough still has a much higher than average level of these offences with a rate of 2.5 offences per 1,000 population compared to a 1.3 Kent average. Gravesham has seen a reduction in thefts of motor vehicles of 13.4%, bringing its rate per 1,000 population to 1.5 offences and practically on a par with the Kent average.

1.5 Both Dartford and Gravesham recorded increases in thefts from motor vehicles although whilst Gravesham’s increase of over a fifth was significantly higher than the 7.5% increased recorded in Dartford, the latter still has one of the highest levels of theft from motor vehicle offences in the County with 6.8 offences per 1,000 population compared to the Kent average of 4.3 offences and Gravesham’s rate of 4.9 offences.
Both Boroughs have also recorded an increase in offences of violence against the person: in Dartford offences have increased by 9.5% from 1,189 to 1,302 offences and in Gravesham they have increased by 11.9% from 1,422 to 1,591 offences. These figures translate to 13.3 offences per 1,000 population in Dartford and 15.7 offences per 1,000 population in Gravesham. Both these rates are amongst the highest in the County and compare to a Kent-wide average of 12.0 offences per 1,000 population.

However, it is very important to note that virtually all areas of Kent have recorded increases in violence against the person offences (the exceptions being Swale and Tonbridge and Malling). Information received in the CSP Violent Crime Sub-Groups has suggested that a significant proportion of violent crime is related to domestic abuse and a further considerable proportion relates to public disorder offences that may not necessarily involve a specific injured party but will nonetheless have been recorded within ‘violent crime’. Increased reporting of domestic abuse can also be substantiated by the rise in the number of people visiting both Dartford and Gravesham’s One Stop Shops that provide advice and support to victims.

Despite increases in some types of violent crime, it is important to remember that ‘serious violent crime’ is rare in both Boroughs: between April 2012-March 2013, there were 33 offences recorded in Dartford (although this represents an increase of 37.5% from 24 offences previously) and 41 offences recorded in Gravesham. The latter has seen a very good reduction in ‘serious violent crime’ of 28.1% (a fall of 16 offences) compared with the same period last year. This is also the third biggest decrease seen at District level. Per 1,000 population, the rate of serious violent crime in Dartford was 0.3 offences, in Gravesham it was 0.4 offences and the Kent-wide average was 0.3 offences.

Dartford’s figures for shoplifting include offences committed within the Bluewater Complex. Of the 1,146 shoplifting offences recorded in April 2012-March 2013, 385 of these were offences committed at Bluewater (approximately a third). On a positive note, the number of shoplifting offences recorded in Bluewater has fallen significantly by 16.3% in 2012-13 compared with 2011-12 and total crime in the complex has fallen by almost a fifth (19.9%).

**Recorded crime in Dartford and Gravesham**

*April 2012-March 2013 compared with the previous year*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime type</th>
<th>Dartford</th>
<th>Gravesham</th>
<th>% +/- Dartford</th>
<th>% +/- Gravesham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Burglary dwelling</strong></td>
<td>Apr 11-Mar 12 299</td>
<td>Apr 12-Mar 13 345</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>Apr 11-Mar 12 475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Burglary other</strong></td>
<td>Apr 11-Mar 12 524</td>
<td>Apr 12-Mar 13 508</td>
<td>-3.1%</td>
<td>Apr 11-Mar 12 559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criminal damage</strong></td>
<td>Apr 11-Mar 12 1208</td>
<td>Apr 12-Mar 13 1135</td>
<td>-6.0%</td>
<td>Apr 11-Mar 12 1309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drug offences</strong></td>
<td>Apr 11-Mar 12 216</td>
<td>Apr 12-Mar 13 226</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>Apr 11-Mar 12 215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fraud and forgery</strong></td>
<td>Apr 11-Mar 12 567</td>
<td>Apr 12-Mar 13 293</td>
<td>-48.3%</td>
<td>Apr 11-Mar 12 330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other offences</strong></td>
<td>Apr 11-Mar 12 72</td>
<td>Apr 12-Mar 13 105</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>Apr 11-Mar 12 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Robbery</strong></td>
<td>Apr 11-Mar 12 59</td>
<td>Apr 12-Mar 13 54</td>
<td>-8.5%</td>
<td>Apr 11-Mar 12 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexual offences</strong></td>
<td>Apr 11-Mar 12 75</td>
<td>Apr 12-Mar 13 64</td>
<td>-14.7%</td>
<td>Apr 11-Mar 12 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shoplifting</strong></td>
<td>Apr 11-Mar 12 1108</td>
<td>Apr 12-Mar 13 1146</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>Apr 11-Mar 12 479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theft from motor veh.</strong></td>
<td>Apr 11-Mar 12 613</td>
<td>Apr 12-Mar 13 659</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>Apr 11-Mar 12 412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theft of motor vehicle</strong></td>
<td>Apr 11-Mar 12 248</td>
<td>Apr 12-Mar 13 244</td>
<td>-1.6%</td>
<td>Apr 11-Mar 12 172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theft of pedal cycle</strong></td>
<td>Apr 11-Mar 12 114</td>
<td>Apr 12-Mar 13 89</td>
<td>-21.9%</td>
<td>Apr 11-Mar 12 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theft offences</strong></td>
<td>Apr 11-Mar 12 1008</td>
<td>Apr 12-Mar 13 928</td>
<td>-7.9%</td>
<td>Apr 11-Mar 12 1001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vehicle interference</strong></td>
<td>Apr 11-Mar 12 82</td>
<td>Apr 12-Mar 13 59</td>
<td>-28.0%</td>
<td>Apr 11-Mar 12 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Violence against the person</strong></td>
<td>Apr 11-Mar 12 1189</td>
<td>Apr 12-Mar 13 1302</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>Apr 11-Mar 12 1422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total crime</strong></td>
<td>Apr 11-Mar 12 7382</td>
<td>Apr 12-Mar 13 7159</td>
<td>-3.0%</td>
<td>Apr 11-Mar 12 6795</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recorded crime in Dartford and Gravesham  April 2012- March 2013
(NB. Burglary dwelling rate per 1,000 households)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime type</th>
<th>Rates per 1,000 population/1,000 households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dartford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary dwelling</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary other</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal damage</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug offences</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud and forgery</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other offences</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual offences</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoplifting</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft and handling stolen goods</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from motor vehicle</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft of motor vehicle</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft of pedal cycle</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft offences</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle interference</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence against the person</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total crime</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.10 Whilst the number of domestic burglaries recorded in North Kent may still be low in real terms and when compared to other areas nationally (last year’s figures translate to less than 2 burglaries per day in Gravesham and less than 1 per day in Dartford), there has been a rise in this offence category that we need to note. Our Boroughs are not unusual – all Districts and Medway (with the exception of Swale) recorded increases in domestic burglary last year that were often considerably higher than the increases seen locally. However, whilst Dartford’s rate per 1,000 population of 8.9 offences is on a level with the Kent average of 9.0 offences, Gravesham’s rate of 15.2 offences is markedly higher.

1.11 Domestic abuse

1.11.1 Along with most other Kent Districts, Dartford and Gravesham have recorded increases in the number of incidents of domestic abuse being reported to Police. Gravesham’s increase of 17.0% to 1,786 incidents in the period April 2012-March 2013, is the biggest seen in the county and significantly higher than the next biggest increase of 10.6% seen in Shepway. Dartford has recorded a much lesser increase of 3.1% with a total number of 1,338 incidents. These figures equate to rates of 17.9 offences per 1,000 population in Gravesham and 14.1 incidents in Dartford compared to a Kent average rate of 13.8 incidents. There is no concrete explanation for why Gravesham should have seen a bigger increase in domestic abuse incidents than elsewhere, however, the Borough may have been hit harder by the national recession, unemployment and the consequential financial strain placed on families – all of which may have a contributory role. There have also been very concerted efforts to encourage victim confidence in local services willingness and ability to provide support and assistance backed by publicity campaigns to raise awareness.

1.11.2 The percentage of repeat victims of domestic abuse in Gravesham is falling slightly (there has been a downward trend since October 2012) and this could be interpreted as demonstrating that as more people are actually coming forward and seeking advice and assistance, so the services provided are having an impact in reducing further victimisation. Gravesham’s percentage of repeat victims of 23.1% and Dartford’s percentage of 22.0% are both slightly lower than the average Kent rate of 24.0%.
## Domestic abuse – incidents and repeat victimisation

District comparison of domestic abuse incidents recorded April 2012-Mar 2013
(NB. MSG comparison not available)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>April 2012-March 2013</th>
<th>% change</th>
<th>Total no. of incidents</th>
<th>No. of repeat victims</th>
<th>% of repeat victims</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashford</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dartford</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>1338</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dover</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>1443</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gravesham</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>17.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1786</strong></td>
<td><strong>413</strong></td>
<td><strong>23.1%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maidstone</td>
<td></td>
<td>-3.0%</td>
<td>1731</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sevenoaks</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.0%</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepway</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swale</td>
<td></td>
<td>-3.7%</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thanet</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>2783</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonbridge &amp; Malling</td>
<td></td>
<td>-6.7%</td>
<td>1184</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunbridge Wells</td>
<td></td>
<td>-3.0%</td>
<td>1001</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCC Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>18670</td>
<td>4480</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medway</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>4605</td>
<td>1106</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>23275</td>
<td>5586</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Comparisons with our Most Similar Group (MSG)

3.1 In respect of total crime, our CSP ranked in 9th position within our MSG in 2012-13, leaving our rate of recorded crime per 1,000 population at slightly higher than the MSG average. Our position has fallen from 6th position in the previous year.
3.2 Our position in the vast majority of crime categories has become worse (i.e. we find ourselves with rates that are higher than the MSG average in most instances). The few exceptions are fraud and forgery, shoplifting and vehicle interference offences, which have all seen improvements.

3. **Anti-social behaviour and public perceptions**

3.1 In April 2012-March 2013, there were 2,960 incidents of ASB recorded in Dartford and 3,852 recorded in Gravesham. In each Borough, this represents a very significant decrease: in Dartford this is a fall of 17.2% from 3,574 incidents in the same period the previous year and in Gravesham this represents a drop of 21.3% from 4,895 incidents the previous year. Gravesham’s reduction is the greatest achieved in any District during this period and compares to an average reduction of 12.8%. These improvements mean that Dartford’s rate of ASB per 1,000 population is now 31.2 incidents whilst Gravesham’s rate is 38.6 incidents. Positions in both Boroughs have has improved steadily throughout the year and these rates compare to a County average of 34.2 incidents.

**ASB Incidents – April 2012-March 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Apr 2011-Mar 2012</th>
<th>Apr 2012-Mar 2013</th>
<th>No. change</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashford</td>
<td>3628</td>
<td>2960</td>
<td>-614</td>
<td>-17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>5042</td>
<td>4281</td>
<td>-761</td>
<td>-15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dartford</td>
<td>2960</td>
<td>2026</td>
<td>-934</td>
<td>-31.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dover</td>
<td>4281</td>
<td>3332</td>
<td>-949</td>
<td>-22.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravesham</td>
<td>3852</td>
<td>2809</td>
<td>-1043</td>
<td>-21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maidstone</td>
<td>4362</td>
<td>3478</td>
<td>-884</td>
<td>-20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medway</td>
<td>10827</td>
<td>9020</td>
<td>-1807</td>
<td>-16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sevenoaks</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>1792</td>
<td>-608</td>
<td>-25.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepway</td>
<td>3827</td>
<td>2828</td>
<td>-999</td>
<td>-25.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swale</td>
<td>4513</td>
<td>3680</td>
<td>-833</td>
<td>-18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thanet</td>
<td>6211</td>
<td>5211</td>
<td>-990</td>
<td>-15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonbridge and Malling</td>
<td>2972</td>
<td>2431</td>
<td>-541</td>
<td>-18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunbridge Wells</td>
<td>2688</td>
<td>2175</td>
<td>-513</td>
<td>-19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>57606</td>
<td>47642</td>
<td>-9964</td>
<td>-17.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 The Kent Crime and Victimisation Survey (KCVS) asks participants for their views on how big a problem they believe seven different types of ASB to be in their local area. As the tables below demonstrate, there have been some very considerable improvements in both Dartford and Gravesham, which tend to support the corresponding reduction in incidents being reported. Data is provided on a quarterly basis, the latest figures available being for the rolling year ending March 2013.

**KCVS Perception data – Dartford**

**Financial year ending March 2012 compared with financial year ending March 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviour</th>
<th>Year ending Mar 2012</th>
<th>Year ending Mar 2013</th>
<th>Kent average (at Mar 2013)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teenagers hanging around</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People drunk or rowdy in public</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism, graffiti or damage</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubbish or litter lying around</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noisy neighbours or loud parties</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People using or dealing drugs</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandoned or burnt out cars</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite of 7 strands</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
KCVS Perception data – Gravesham
Financial year ending March 2012 compared with financial year ending March 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviour</th>
<th>Year ending Mar 2012</th>
<th>Year ending Mar 2013</th>
<th>Kent average (at Mar 2013)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teenagers hanging around</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People drunk or rowdy in public</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism, graffiti or damage</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubbish or litter lying around</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noisy neighbours or loud parties</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People using or dealing drugs</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandoned or burnt out cars</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite of 7 strands</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 The KCVS also asks respondents questions about their overall feelings of safety in their local area and how much they worry about being a victim of crime. It is very encouraging that both Dartford and Gravesham have seen improvements in how safe people feel in their local neighbourhoods – in both Boroughs responses are now higher (better) than the County average. However, in both Dartford and Gravesham the percentage of people who worry about becoming a victim of crime is greater than the Kent average and in Gravesham there has been a slight increase in negative responses to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KCVS measure</th>
<th>Dartford</th>
<th>Gravesham</th>
<th>Kent average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% feeling very or fairly safe in their local area overall</td>
<td>93.4%</td>
<td>97.3%</td>
<td>95.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% very or fairly worried about being a victim of crime</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 Reductions in the levels of reported ASB (the consequences of which are often very visible and therefore, more likely to affect people’s perceptions about crime and disorder generally) are likely to be an explanatory factor in the improvements seen in public opinion on community safety issues affecting their neighbourhood. Specific measures introduced into the way in which ASB repeat calls are dealt with including risk assessments of any repeat victims who are potentially more vulnerable and the continuous monitoring of repeat cases through CSUs, appear to be having a positive impact that is demonstrated not only in actual reported incident levels but also in the perception data above and in public satisfaction of how ASB-related issues are handled.

Kath Donald
Strategic Manager, Community Safety
Gravesham Community Safety Unit
June 2013
The Community Safety Strategy and Action Plan 2013-14 is provided for Members’ consideration (Appendix A).

2. RECOMMENDATION

That the Committee considers the Community Safety Strategy and Action Plan 2013-14 (Appendix A) and comments accordingly.

3. Background and Discussion

3.1 The Committee, at its meeting on 13 February 2013, 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 2013-14. This document guides the work of all 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 2013-14 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  
24 July 2013

6. **Details of Exempt Information Category**

   Not applicable

7. **Appendices**

   Appendix A: Community Safety Strategy and Action Plan 2013-14

---
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Dartford and Gravesham Community Safety Partnership

Our Mission

To make our Boroughs safer and cleaner places to live, work and socialise

Community Safety Plan 2013-14
The joint Dartford and Gravesham Community Safety Partnership (CSP) was formed in December 2006 and since its inception, numerous projects and initiatives have been delivered by partner agencies working together that have helped to reduce crime and anti-social behaviour in both Boroughs very significantly. In the year ending 30 September 2006, there were 24,075 crimes recorded across our Partnership area. In the 12 months ending 30 September 2012, this figure had been brought down to 13,800 offences (6,959 offences in Dartford and 6,841 offences in Gravesham). This is an overall reduction of 42.6% and places our Partnership amongst the best achieving in the country. In real terms this reduction of 10,275 crimes also means thousands less people experiencing crime first-hand.

Local people frequently tell us that better community safety, tackling anti-social behaviour and keeping our neighbourhood environments clean, are some of their main concerns. These are also the issues that the Partnership has made a commitment to tackle. Partner agencies, working with local communities, will aim to provide local solutions to the different community safety issues that are seen as priorities within our neighbourhoods and to meet the needs of local people.

Whilst we have seen a considerable improvement in community safety since the joint Partnership was formed and it becomes more and more challenging to reduce crime and anti-social behaviour further, we recognise that there is still a lot for us to do. We are also aware that reductions in money available for public services means finding new and creative ways of working together to maximize the resources we do have, remaining focused and addressing those issues that really matter.

Our local area is changing: both Boroughs populations are growing and we are proud of the diversity of our local communities as well as the tolerance and mutual respect that people show to one another and their cultures. Making our neighbourhoods safer will also incorporate work to encourage greater cohesion and harmony amongst our different communities.

Strengthening our efforts to reduce crime further will also help us through the current time of recession by continuing to attract business and development and reinforcing the message that both Dartford and Gravesham are good places in which to invest.

Whilst many of the CSP’s partner agencies provide a front-line response to crime and anti-social behaviour, it is the responsibility of all of us who live and work in North Kent to play our part in keeping our neighbourhoods safe. We hope that, through the work that the CSP has planned for 2013-14, we will continue to engage with local people and encourage them to work with us in promoting the well-being of both our Districts – together we can really make a difference.
As highlighted in the Foreword, the success of Dartford and Gravesham’s Community Safety Partnership’s (CSP) annual plans means that there are now far fewer individuals, families and businesses that have been victims of crime and/or anti-social behaviour than when our joint Partnership was first formed. Whilst we are proud of our achievements we know that we need to concentrate our efforts to sustain the reductions we have achieved. To help us do this and to ensure that we are fully aware of changing circumstances, the Partnership completes a Strategic Assessment each year – a report that is used to inform strategic decision-making by gathering together crime and ASB data held by all our partner agencies.

The CSP also takes account of issues coming to our attention through contact with local community groups, residents’ panels, community events (when we encourage local people to offer their views) and local public consultation surveys.

The priorities identified for 2013-14 are:

- Anti-social behaviour;
- Violent crime including domestic abuse;
- Substance misuse (alcohol and drug-related crime and ASB);
- Property crime (domestic burglary and theft offences);
- Safety on the road;
- Reducing re-offending.

Our experience has also taught us that we need to do more to help local people feel safer and whilst tackling the priorities above we will also do our best to:

- Engage with local communities so that we can be clear about their concerns and use local knowledge to identify solutions;
- Communicate effectively about the work we are doing and the outcomes we achieve;
- Ensure that local people are well-informed about local services that are available to them.
CONSULTATION ON THE PRIORITIES

The Partnership recognises that as well as being dependent on all of our partner agencies working together, the success of our Community Safety Plan is also largely dependent on the active involvement and support of local people. Having carried out the Strategic Assessment process, the CSP appreciates that residents and local people are best placed to really know what the community safety issues are that are affecting their local neighbourhoods. Recognising that there may be issues that are not picked up through statistics, local residents and those who work in either Dartford or Gravesham were invited to give their opinion on the recommended priorities.

A brief survey was made available on both Local Authority websites, the CSP’s own website, circulated to all Parish Councils and posted to a Residents’ Panel. In total, 456 responses were received.

440 respondents answered the question that asked whether they felt the priorities we had identified for 2013-14 were the right ones. Of these, 408 (93.0%) agreed that they were the right priorities, 16 respondents (3.5%) felt they were not and 16 respondents (3.5%) said they did not know.

The survey also asked respondents to tell us what level of priority they felt each of the following should be given:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Response count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reducing anti-social behaviour</td>
<td>390 (87%)</td>
<td>56 (12.5%)</td>
<td>3 (0.5%)</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing burglary</td>
<td>365 (81.5%)</td>
<td>80 (18%)</td>
<td>3 (0.5%)</td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tackling theft and handling stolen goods</td>
<td>298 (67%)</td>
<td>137 (31%)</td>
<td>9 (2%)</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing drug and alcohol-related problems</td>
<td>309 (69%)</td>
<td>123 (27.5%)</td>
<td>15 (3.5%)</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tackling domestic abuse</td>
<td>236 (53%)</td>
<td>174 (39%)</td>
<td>36 (8%)</td>
<td>446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with offenders</td>
<td>129 (29%)</td>
<td>246 (55%)</td>
<td>72 (16%)</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving road safety</td>
<td>205 (46%)</td>
<td>195 (43.5%)</td>
<td>47 (10.5%)</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting and engaging with local communities</td>
<td>171 (38.5%)</td>
<td>217 (48.5%)</td>
<td>58 (13%)</td>
<td>446</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top 3 other issues that local people felt should be a high priority included:

- More visible policing/more police patrols;
- Specific road safety issues e.g. irresponsible parking, speeding nuisance bikes;
- Environmental issues e.g. littering, fly-tipping, graffiti and dog fouling.
Respondents were also asked how much of a problem, if at all, they thought each of the following was in their neighbourhood:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>A very big problem</th>
<th>A problem</th>
<th>A slight problem</th>
<th>Not a problem</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Response count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burglaries/break-ins</td>
<td>38 (8.5%)</td>
<td>165 (37.5%)</td>
<td>140 (32%)</td>
<td>35 (8%)</td>
<td>61 (14%)</td>
<td>439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent crime</td>
<td>26 (6%)</td>
<td>73 (16.5%)</td>
<td>117 (26.5%)</td>
<td>147 (33.5%)</td>
<td>78 (17.5%)</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle crime</td>
<td>40 (9%)</td>
<td>106 (24.5%)</td>
<td>178 (41%)</td>
<td>61 (14%)</td>
<td>50 (11.5%)</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teenagers hanging around</td>
<td>81 (18%)</td>
<td>91 (20.5%)</td>
<td>139 (31.5%)</td>
<td>118 (26.5%)</td>
<td>15 (3.5%)</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drunk or rowdy behaviour</td>
<td>57 (13%)</td>
<td>66 (15%)</td>
<td>143 (32.5%)</td>
<td>153 (34.5%)</td>
<td>22 (5%)</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism/criminal damage</td>
<td>64 (14.5%)</td>
<td>111 (25%)</td>
<td>159 (36%)</td>
<td>83 (19%)</td>
<td>23 (5%)</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubbish/litter lying around</td>
<td>141 (32%)</td>
<td>145 (32.75%)</td>
<td>110 (25%)</td>
<td>42 (9.5%)</td>
<td>4 (0.75%)</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noisy neighbours/loud parties</td>
<td>31 (7%)</td>
<td>53 (12%)</td>
<td>110 (25%)</td>
<td>228 (51.5%)</td>
<td>19 (4.5%)</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People using/dealing drugs</td>
<td>48 (11%)</td>
<td>60 (13.5%)</td>
<td>96 (22%)</td>
<td>137 (31%)</td>
<td>99 (22.5%)</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandoned/burnt out cars</td>
<td>8 (2%)</td>
<td>26 (6%)</td>
<td>81 (18.5%)</td>
<td>278 (63.5%)</td>
<td>44 (10%)</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speeding cars/road safety</td>
<td>99 (22%)</td>
<td>121 (27%)</td>
<td>147 (33%)</td>
<td>74 (16.5%)</td>
<td>7 (1.5%)</td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top 3 other issues that respondents felt were a very big or big problem in their neighbourhood included:

- Irresponsible parking/inconsiderate parking on footpaths/at school times/on double yellow lines;
- Nuisance bikes;
- Dog fouling.

The CSP tries to make the consultation survey as widely available as possible within the resources available to it. Respondents are asked to provide brief personal details relating to age, gender and ethnicity in order we can bear in mind how representative the survey sample is of the local population.

The survey also asked respondents to provide their postcode for CSP operational purposes to enable us to better target our resources in addressing issues that may have come to light to those areas identified. Postcode details provided in responses are not listed below as they are intended primarily as an information tool for local agencies.
### Details of the survey sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Under 18</th>
<th>18-24</th>
<th>25-34</th>
<th>35-44</th>
<th>45-54</th>
<th>55-64</th>
<th>65+</th>
<th>No answer</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11.75%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11.75%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11.75%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11.75%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11.75%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11.75%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11.75%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11.75%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11.75%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Ethnicity

- **White British**: 395 (86.5%)
- **White Irish**: 6 (1.25%)
- **White other**: 8 (1.75%)
- **No answer**: 13 (3%)
- **Total**: 456 (100%)

#### Gender

- **Male**: 204 (44.5%)
- **Female**: 239 (52.5%)
- **No answer**: 13 (3%)
- **Total**: 456 (100%)
OUR PARTNERSHIP

Partnership Groups

The Partnership has a very sound structure to ensure that the work set out in this Plan 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 deliver projects on the ground.

Partnership Organisational Structure

Both the Main Joint Strategic Group and the CSP Support Group meet on a quarterly basis. The Chairs of the Sub-Groups attend the Support Group meetings and provide progress reports on projects that their Groups are implementing. Whilst the North Kent Domestic Abuse Forum is not a CSP Sub-Group, it is a key practitioner group for local agencies working directly to reduce domestic abuse, one of the CSP’s own priorities. Therefore, it is important that links between the CSP and the Forum are maintained and this is achieved by the Forum’s Chairman attending CSP Support Group meetings to ensure that there is a clear line of communication.
The CSP Management Group is made up of senior managers from both Local Authorities and Kent Police. This Group oversees the direction of the Partnership and on an annual basis, considers the findings of the Strategic Assessment (a local audit of crime and disorder levels) to identify the priorities for the following year. These priorities are then recommended to the CSP for endorsement.

This structure means that there 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.

**Community Safety Units (CSUs)**

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 make every effort to respond quickly and efficiently to any new issues that come to light. Colleagues from other partner agencies e.g. Kent County Council’s Community Wardens and Town Centre Crime Reduction Initiative Co-ordinators also have a base within the Community Safety Units and regularly attend briefing meetings to ensure that partners are kept appraised of key incidents and the pattern of events.

In both Dartford and Gravesham, the CSUs are based within the Council Civic Offices. Briefing meetings take place on a daily basis to take stock of crime and ASB reports that have been received by the Police and other services in the previous 24 hours. This allows appropriate members of the CSU to be tasked with responding to any issues that arise. It also means that consideration can be given to the different solutions that could be applied e.g. technical options such as mobile CCTV units and ensures that referrals are made to colleagues within other Council service departments best-placed to help or other partner agencies without delay.
# Priority

**Tackling and challenging anti-social behaviour together with local communities**

## Why is this a priority?

Tackling anti-social behaviour (ASB) is a priority both for local partner agencies and for local people. The CSP is committed to driving down levels of ASB by trying to resolve issues at the earliest stages to prevent problems from escalating and taking enforcement action where problems persist despite early intervention. We have achieved significant reductions in reported ASB but we understand the need to continue to focus on nuisance and inconsiderate behaviour that causes damage to local neighbourhoods and affects quality of life.

## What do we want to achieve?

- A continuing reduction in reports of ASB and particularly, a reduction in repeat occurrences;
- A reduction in deliberate fires;
- A reduction in criminal damage offences;
- Continued improvements in public satisfaction in the way in which we deal with ASB.

## How are we going to do it?

- Using appropriate action and tailored interventions to deal with specific individuals who are behaving anti-socially from advice and support to change behaviour to the use of formal action such as ABAs, ASBOs, ASBIs and Possession Orders where necessary;
- Using all our powers to enforce against environmental crime offenders including the use of on-the-spot penalty notices and with our partners, proactively investigating and prosecuting perpetrators;
- Planning and delivering joint work to address seasonal fluctuations in ASB;
- Making full use of licensing laws and powers under licensing legislation to ensure that licensed premises are well-managed;
- Through the Troubled Families Programme, providing support for families to address underlying causes that may be contributory factors to ASB;
- Focussing resources on those geographical areas where ASB is most prevalent and working with local communities in those locations to develop targeted responses that include community participation;
- Utilising the Risk Assessment Matrix process to continue improving the identification of vulnerable adults experiencing ASB and the provision of appropriate support to them;
- Deploying mobile CCTV units (where feasible) to assist with evidence gathering in relation to ASB incidents;
- Working with Kent Probation’s Community Payback Teams to assist local communities in improving the physical appearance of their local neighbourhoods;
- Actively engage with 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.
**How will we measure our success?**

- Anti-social behaviour incident rates and actions (including enforcement measures utilised);
- Criminal damage rates;
- Sustainment of improvements in ASB perceptions as measured by the KCVS and other consultation processes;
- Deliberate fire rates.

**Co-ordinating Group(s)**

Both Dartford and Gravesham have established multi-agency ASB Groups that share information on named perpetrators of ASB (young people and adults). The Groups identify appropriate interventions and actions that may help to resolve the behavioural problems whilst ensuring that victims of the ASB are provided with the necessary support and reassurance they require.
Priority
Reducing violent crime (including domestic abuse)

Why is this a priority?
Protecting people’s personal safety is always a priority for both agencies and local residents alike and whilst there has been a very good reduction in serious violent crime, there is further work to be done to ensure that people are physically safe both in their own homes and when out and about. Approximately a third of all violent crime recorded locally is domestic abuse, affecting hundreds of victims, their children and families each year. The Partnership has worked hard to encourage people to seek help and advice by reporting incidents and is committed to continuing to develop local services to meet the needs of families facing abuse within the home environment.

What do we want to achieve?
- A reduction in incidents of violence against the person;
- A reduction in repeat incidents of domestic abuse;
- Services to support and protect victims of domestic abuse are maintained;
- A reduction in alcohol-related violent crime as part of a wider multi-agency strategy that deals with reducing the harm caused by alcohol misuse to families and communities;
- To prevent repeat offending by those involved in violent crime through rehabilitative programmes.

How are we going to do it?

Responding to domestic abuse
- Focusing on repeat incidents of domestic abuse and supporting and protecting victims;
- Working with the North Kent Domestic Abuse Forum to help deliver the Kent Domestic Abuse Strategy;
- Continuing to raise awareness of domestic abuse issues and the local services available to both victims and perpetrators;
- Ensuring that victims of domestic abuse are able to report and receive advice and information at as many outlets as possible and further developing services provided through our One Stop Shops to tailor assistance to victims’ needs;
- Continuing to support high-risk victims in remaining in their homes by improving home security through the Sanctuary Scheme.

Responding to all violent crime
- Providing multi-agency support to any Police-led targeted operations, targeting geographical locations in which violent crime is more prevalent and known offenders;
- Working with partners such as G-Safe (Gravesham), the Dartford Town Against Crime Initiative and licensed premises to implement measures that will reduce the opportunity for alcohol-related violence e.g. Safer Socialising Schemes, Purple Flag Accreditation, Street Pastors.
How will we measure our success?

- Violence against the person offences rate;
- Repeat incidents of domestic abuse rate;
- No. of people accessing domestic abuse services e.g. IDVA service, visits to One Stop Shops;
- No. of victims benefitting from the services of the Sanctuary Scheme.

Co-ordinating Group(s)

CSP Violent Crime Sub-Groups operate separately for Dartford and Gravesham. Each of them is a multi-agency Group that is led by Kent Police. The North Kent Domestic Abuse Forum operates independently of the CSP but close links are maintained; the Chair of NKDAF reports to the CSP Support Group and the NKDAF is in turn attended by Community Safety Managers and Kent Police Officers who also report to the CSP.
# Priority: Reducing drug and alcohol-related harm

## Why is this a priority?

Substance misuse is inextricably tied up with crime and disorder: there are established links between alcohol misuse and violent crime and between drug dependency and acquisitive (property) crime. Their problematic use also has a major impact on people’s health and well-being and the quality of life of those living in neighbourhoods where these issues are more prevalent. Nationally the focus is currently on reducing demand, restricting supply and building recovery from drug addiction. Alcohol is a major player in anti-social behaviour as well as being a contributory factor in violent incidents, particularly domestic abuse. There is also recognition that young people are accessing alcohol at a younger age, making partnership working especially important in ensuring that educational, preventative and diversionary measures are delivered to reduce the risk of harm from excessive alcohol consumption.

## What do we want to achieve?

- A reduction in drug offences;
- A reduction in alcohol-related offences;
- A reduction in the number of alcohol-related hospital admissions;
- An increase in the number of people accessing drug and alcohol treatment services and completing recovery programmes;
- An improvement in public perceptions of drunk and rowdy behaviour in public as a problem (KCVS);
- An improvement in public perceptions of people using or dealing drugs as a problem (KCVS).

## How are we going to do it?

- Increasing referrals of those misusing drugs and/or alcohol and coming into the criminal justice system into appropriate treatment services;
- Through the Troubled Families Programme, ensure that appropriate steps are taken to safeguard young people whose parents/family members have substance misuse problems and that appropriate interventions are used to encourage the accessing of treatment services by those family members that need it;
- Carrying out multi-agency preventative work to continue to educate and raise awareness of alcohol and drug-related harm, including initiatives targeted at the night-time economy carried out in conjunction with G-Safe (Gravesham) and Dartford Town Against Crime;
- Using Licensing controls (including Late Night Levy and Early Morning Restriction Orders if appropriate) and other enforcement powers to ensure that licensed premises do not encourage binge drinking, sell to those underage or allow drug dealing/consumption on their premises;
- Using appropriate enforcement powers against prolific identified offenders e.g. Exclusion Orders and Drink Banning orders where alcohol is a factor in their offending behaviour;
• Carrying out targeted operations focusing on known offenders to disrupt local drugs markets;
• Ensuring businesses continue to be educated and trained in relation to responsible management of premises and sales of alcohol and to encourage competition in meeting the standards required by the Safer Socialising Scheme;
• Running the Kent Community Alcohol Partnership (KCAP) scheme to promote a culture of responsible drinking amongst young people.

How will we measure our success?

• Drug offences rate;
• Alcohol-related offences rate;
• Alcohol-related hospital admissions;
• Number of people accessing and completing treatment services;
• KCVS public perception data.
• No. of test purchase operations delivered and outcomes;
• No. of licensed premises and young people participating in KCAP schemes;
• No. of licensed premises in receipt of the Safer Socialising Award.

Co-ordinating Group(s)

Work will be co-ordinated by the CSP Drug and Alcohol Action Group which is a joint group covering Dartford and Gravesham. This Group is currently chaired by the Service Manager, Commissioned Services, Supporting People and Kent Drug and Alcohol Action Team (KCC).
Priority
Property crime (domestic burglary and theft offences)

Why is this a priority?

Despite some improvements the volume of theft offences means that this crime category generally accounts for between a fifth and a quarter of all crime committed locally and therefore, needs to be retained as a priority. Increases in theft and other forms of property crime including domestic burglary, have been experienced nationwide: the continuing demand for scrap metal and high asset price of certain metals have continued to drive criminal activity whilst the economic climate may be leading some of those with very little disposable income towards crimes such as shoplifting. Whilst the burglary rate in North Kent is still very low compared to many parts of the country, there has been a slight increase in the last 12 months.

Both tackling domestic burglary and wider theft offences will benefit from multi-agency partnership activity. Partners can work with local communities, whether they are residents in local neighbourhoods or local businesses in our town centres, to help protect against property crime generally, enabling residents to feel secure in their homes and local businesses to feel that our two Boroughs are attractive places in which to trade.

What do we want to achieve?

- A reduction in domestic burglaries;
- A reduction in theft and handling stolen goods offences;
- A reduction shoplifting offences;
- A reduction in metal theft offences.

How we are going to do it?

- Delivering targeted initiatives focussing on locations and groups most at risk to raise awareness and provide practical suggestions for improving security;
- Continuing to work with Kent Police and other partners to enforce legislation in relation to scrap metal dealers, car salvage operators and second hand goods dealers to stamp out illegal activity;
- Targeted awareness-raising activities focussed on properties more likely to be at risk of metal theft and the provision of advice to reduce risks;
- Working with Planning Departments to ensure that alternatives to lead are recommended as part of the planning process and that security of building development sites is always given consideration;
- Proactive operations and multi-agency approaches to identify and prosecute prolific offenders of burglary, theft and shop-lifting (working closely with both G-Safe and Dartford Town Against Crime);
- Providing personal and home safety advice to individuals who may be more vulnerable to certain forms of property crime (e.g. distraction burglary – elderly residents);
- Develop work with local community volunteers to promote and use ‘community messaging’ with a focus on collating intelligence as well as issuing crime prevention advice;
• To make full use of crime prevention measures such as Smartwater and the use of CCTV mobile units, to assist with the identification of offenders;
• To target awareness-raising exercises to key locations where burglary offences are more prevalent and to those times of year when offending levels may be higher e.g. seasonal factors that may influence/create greater opportunity for criminality.

How will we measure our success?

• Domestic burglary rate;
• Rate of theft and handling stolen goods offences;
• Rate of metal theft offences;
• Rate of shoplifting offences;
• Public events delivered to provide advice and information to local residents.

Co-ordinating Group (s)

There is not a specific CSP Sub-Group to deliver work in this area but activity to reduce domestic burglary and theft offences will be largely led by Kent Police supported by partners as appropriate, with some joint work being co-ordinated through the CSUs. The CSP Support Group will be provided with an update of operational work that has taken place to address these crime categories at its quarterly meetings.
Priority: Safety on the road

Why is this a priority?

At a county level road safety is seen as a priority for CSP action in each of Kent’s Districts. The recommendation from Kent County Council is that a partnership approach to road safety will help to counter the impact of reducing public service resources to deal with this issue and to ensure that it remains high on the agenda of preventative work. Whilst Dartford and Gravesham have the smallest land area of Kent Districts the two Boroughs have the greatest number of people per km2. Throughout Dartford there are major trunk roads such as the M25, A282 and A2 whilst Gravesham also benefits from the M2 and A2 – all major roads that facilitate the majority of the traffic through the Districts. Despite reductions in road traffic collisions, Dartford still has the second highest number of collisions in any Kent District and although numbers are very small indeed, the second highest number of casualties from road traffic collisions in which people were killed or seriously injured.

There are numerous development plans for the regeneration of North Kent that will be delivered over the next few years. These will see even greater numbers of people living, working and visiting the area and consequently there will be more pedestrians and vehicles on all of our transport networks. In anticipation of this, the CSP has chosen to make safety on the road a key priority this year to give emphasis to this important community safety issue and to develop further the work that is already taking place between partner agencies to reduce problems arising on our roads. This includes not only the more serious road traffic accidents but other related issues that cause considerable concern in local neighbourhoods such as speeding vehicles and irresponsible parking and that also impact on personal safety.

What do we want to achieve?

- A reduction in road traffic collisions (Dartford) and to maintain the low level of road traffic collisions (Gravesham);
- A reduction in road traffic collision casualties (Dartford) and to maintain the low level of casualties (Gravesham);
- A reduction in incidents involving driving whilst under the influence of alcohol and/or drugs;
- Multi-agency approaches that take full account of the impact on road safety of planned developments in the area.

How are we going to do it?

- Local multi-agency campaigns to raise awareness and linked to speed, seat-belt wearing and preventing injuries;
- Seasonal work to focus on the risks driving whilst under the influence of alcohol and/or drugs (Christmas) and winter road safety services e.g. salting of roads;
- Taking a firm stance in dealing with irresponsible drivers for speeding and parking offences;
- Preventative work around identified ‘hot spots’ e.g. school areas during at school start and
finish times;

- Work with Planning Departments and development agencies to ensure that road schemes do not disadvantage or put at risk pedestrians, cyclists, people with disabilities and public transport users (incorporating a ‘safety audit’ within the design process);
- Investigate areas of concern to the public and consider appropriate responses to deal with any identified problems (subject to financial resources);
- Supporting ‘pre-driver’ training courses for young people;
- Ensuring that selected offenders are referred to appropriate speed awareness training sessions.

### How will we measure our success?

- No. of road traffic collisions and casualties;
- No. of preventative schemes delivered and no. of people participating/benefiting;
- Public perceptions data in respect of speeding vehicles (KCVS) and level of public concern in respect of parking issues (through the annual Community Safety Survey).

### Co-ordinating Group(s)

Multi-agency work to address this priority will be led by Kent Fire and Rescue Service (KF&RS) for the CSP. Activities undertaken will be reported to the CSP Support Group on a quarterly basis.
## Priority: Reducing re-offending

### Why is this 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 are responsible for a significant number of offences and cause disproportionate damage to our local neighbourhoods. Multi-agency approaches through the CSP aim to deliver a balance between enforcement and protecting the public and providing offenders with the help and support that they need to steer them away from offending again in future. Certain factors are recognised as ‘pathways’ to offending e.g. lack of accommodation/housing, lack of employment; Partnership activity to evaluate how we may be able to improve current practices and procedures in respect of housing or assist ex-offenders into training or employment, will make a sound contribution to reducing the risks of individuals re-offending.

### What do we want to achieve?

- A reduction in local re-offending rates;
- An overall reduction in total recorded crime;
- A co-ordinated and integrated response to the resettlement of offenders;
- A reduction in the number of prolific offenders who re-offend due to drug and/or alcohol dependency issues;
- A reduction in the number of repeat offences of domestic abuse.

### How are we going to do it?

- Working with the Integrated Offender Management Unit (IOMU) and Kent Probation in identifying ways of improving multi-agency working arrangements to reduce re-offending for those who have been prolific offenders;
- Tackling youth re-offending through joint initiatives with the Youth Offending Service, through the Troubled Families Programme and through schemes such as the Youth Inclusion Support Project to stop young people entering the criminal justice system;
- Working with partner agencies as appropriate to carry out an evaluation of current practices and procedures for the provision of accommodation/housing for ex-offenders and make any possible improvements;
- Develop and deliver schemes that provide training and work experience to ex-offenders with a view to helping them into employment;
- Rolling out restorative justice practices as appropriate;
- Addressing the high level of repeat offending in domestic abuse (through projects and services developed via the Violent Crime Group and the North Kent Domestic Abuse Forum).
How will we measure our success?

- Local re-offending rates;
- Overall crime rates;
- Rate of repeat offences of domestic abuse;
- No. of ex-offenders assisted into employment, education or training.

Co-ordinating Group(s)

Work in this area is co-ordinated by the CSP Reducing Re-offending Sub-Group. The Sub-Group is led and chaired by Kent Probation.
**CONTACTS**

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

Tel. 01322 343434
www.safedartford.gov.uk

**Gravesham Borough Council**
*Community Safety Unit*
Civic Centre
Windmill Street
Gravesend
Kent DA12 1AU

Tel. 01474 337000
www.gravesham.gov.uk

**Kent Police**
Thames Way
Northfleet
Gravesend
Kent DA11 8BD

Tel. 01474 369055
www.kent.police.uk

**Kent County Council**
*Community Safety Unit*
Invicta House
Maidstone
Kent ME14 1XX

Tel. 08458 247247
www.kent.gov.uk

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

Tel. 01622 692121
www.kent.fire-uk.org

**Kent Probation**
Joynes House
New Road
Gravesend
Kent DA11 0AT

Tel. 01474 569546
www.kentprobation.org

**Dartford and Gravesham NHS**
Darenth Valley Hospital
Darenth Wood Road
Dartford
Kent DA2 8DA

Tel. 01322 428100
www.dvh.nhs.uk

**Kent Police and Crime Commissioner**
1st Floor, Gail House
Lower Stone Street
Maidstone
Kent ME15 6NB

Tel. 01622 677055
www.kent-pcc.gov.uk

**Domestic Abuse Hotline**
Tel. 0808 2000247

**Kent Hate Incident Line**
Tel. 0800 3289162

**Anti-Terrorism Hotline**
Tel. 0800 789321
HELping US TO MAKE YOUR COMMUNITY SAFER

Whilst all the partner agencies work hard together to make Dartford and Gravesham better places to live, as local residents or regular visitors to our Boroughs, you can take some simple steps to help us. Some crime relies on opportunity and could be prevented; some anti-social behaviour issues could be avoided if we all take some personal responsibility and show consideration to our neighbours and our environment. Importantly, reducing crime and anti-social behaviour is largely dependent on having good and reliable information – please report incidents to local agencies so that they have the information they need to act.

• Report incidents of anti-social behaviour – take a stand in your community
• Report incidents of environmental crime such as fly-tipping when you see them – even if the problem is not on your street
• Report incidents of illegal or under-age sales of alcohol
• Get involved – find out about local groups such as Neighbourhood Watch, Residents’ Associations or community volunteering schemes
• Get to know your neighbours
• Don’t leave items on display in vehicles
• Make sure that your home and your vehicle is secure and don’t allow entry to your home to anyone you don’t know without checking their identification
• Make sure your home is not a fire risk – arrange a free home fire safety check and maintain a working smoke alarm
• Respect parking restrictions – consider others when parking, particularly pedestrians and especially when dropping off or picking up children from school
• Remember that noise travels – be considerate towards your neighbours and keep noise to a reasonable level
• Dispose of your rubbish correctly – whenever possible only put rubbish bags out for collection early in the morning of the day of collection or late the previous night
• Make arrangements for the disposal of unwanted large items – your Council will be able to give to further details. If you pay for the removal of waste from your property ensure that the company you use is a registered waste carrier (with the Environment Agency) and ensure you are given a transfer note.

REMEMBER – if you want to report an incident or have any details about a crime that has been committed but do not want to be identified, you can report anonymously using the Crimestoppers Reporting Line on Tel. 0800 555111.

For more information, please visit the websites listed on the contacts page or get in touch with any of the partner agencies directly.
OUTCOME REGARDING CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORITY TO DISPERSE GROUPS

Joyce Green, Littlebrook wards.

1. SUMMARY

1.1 On 24 January 2013 authorisation was given to sign a certificate of authority to disperse groups of two or more persons under the Anti-Social Behaviour Act 2003 (part 4, sections 30-36) during a period between 31 January to 30 April 2013.

1.2 This report provides Members with details of the outcomes following the end of the Dispersal Order, the impact it had and highlights activities that were undertaken.

2. RECOMMENDATION

2.1 That Members note the contents of this report.

3. Background and Discussion

3.1. In the last few months of 2012 there had been a significant increase in anti-social behaviour (ASB) being reported in the Temple Hill area.

3.2. Residents spoke to local PCSOs of their concerns and the number of reports of ASB through the police 101 number grew. Residents complained about feeling victimised, intimidated and scared to walk alone due to the groups of youths being rude, abusive and seeing car wing mirrors being kicked off, fences broken and graffiti scrawled on walls.

3.3. One group consisting of approximately 25 individuals was believed to be responsible for the majority of the issues, gathering in small clusters and becoming a significant nuisance to other residents. Of this group there were nine identifiable ‘ring leaders’ responsible for the worst of the problems, these individuals were actively targeted by police and were known to other agencies including the Council’s Housing department and KCC Families and Social Care (Social Services).

3.4. A large number (22) of Risk Assessment Matrix’s (RAMs) which assess a victim’s level of vulnerability were completed for repeat or vulnerable victims of ASB. These also confirmed that the same individuals were responsible for multiple incidents against different victims.
3.5. It is important to add context in that it was a minority group of young people causing problems but that the overall effect of this was seen as intimidating to the wider community.

3.6. Operation Beethoven was put into place as the Police response to the increase in ASB. It was instigated a few weeks in advance of the Dispersal Order taking effect and consisted of high visibility patrolling and enforcement activities over the period of the Order.

3.7. During the period of the Order seven Acceptable Behaviour Agreements (ABAs) were issued, all with curfews of 19:00hrs and contained strict conditions regarding behaviour.

3.8. One Anti-Social Behaviour Order (ASBO) lasting for two years was gained on the back of a conviction for one of the key ‘ring leaders’ and an ASBO is currently being sought for another individual.

3.9. Approximately 26 groups were dispersed along with;

- 4x arrests for possession with intent to supply cannabis
- 5x cannabis cautions
- 1x arrest for cultivation of cannabis
- 5x arrests for criminal damage
- 1x arrest for Harassment
- 1x PND (Penalty Notice for Disorder) for possession of cannabis
- 5x arrests for shoplifting

3.10. In total over 350 stop checks of individuals and cars were conducted.

3.11. As part of the work around the Order, a Youth Engagement day was held at the Living Well Centre. 15 youth service providers were present, many of which wish to become involved in providing activities for young people within the area.

3.12. The local Neighbourhood Team is now working hard with the Community Safety Team and KCC Youth Service to ensure this good work is built on further.

3.13. Several young people identified as committing ASB have been referred to projects such as Challenger Troop, Fighting Chance Judo Project, Duke of Edinburgh Awards and Charlton Athletic youth services in order to divert them to more positive activities.

4. Conclusion

4.1. The data in the table below shows the reduction in crime types for the affected area, based on the analysis of comparison figures for the
period October 2012 to January 2013 and January to March 2013. Newtown Ward was not included within the Order but figures are included because there were concerns that the problems may have been displaced to the adjoining area. The figures indicate that this was not the case, indeed there appears to have been a positive impact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime Type</th>
<th>Joyce Green</th>
<th>Littlebrook</th>
<th>Newtown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volume Crime</td>
<td>-33.9%</td>
<td>-59.8%</td>
<td>-50.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASB</td>
<td>-42.4%</td>
<td>-62.8%</td>
<td>-29.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2. The reduction in crime and ASB is still very noticeable and the Neighbourhood Team and Council continue to work to ensure that this is maintained.

5. Relationship to the Corporate Plan

This links with the strategic aim to create a safer borough in which to live, work and socialise.

SC2 of the Corporate Plan: to reduce anti-social behaviour (ASB).

6. 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>There will be some further work for the Community Safety Team following this initiative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Implications</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Assessment</td>
<td>The Order has now ceased. There is a risk that the levels of crime and ASB will start to creep up now that police resources have reverted to normal level. It would be impossible to maintain the additional resources provided during the period of the Order.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Details of Exempt Information Category

Not applicable.
8. **Appendices**

None.
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<tr>
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<th>Date / File Ref</th>
<th>Report Author</th>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matt Roberts</td>
<td>(01322) 343502</td>
<td>Community Safety/Strategic</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Summary

1.1 To agree the contents of a rolling Work Programme for the 2013-14 municipal year and beyond.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 That the draft rolling Work Programme attached at Appendix A be approved.

3. Background and Discussion

3.1 At its meeting on 12 September 2012 the Crime and Disorder (O&S) Committee, in consultation with the Strategic Director and other appropriate Officers, agreed a rolling Work Programme for the remainder of the 2012-13 municipal year and beyond.

3.2 During the 2012-13 municipal cycle the Committee reviewed the contributions made by Kent Fire and Rescue Service and Kent Probation to the aims of the Dartford and Gravesham Community Safety Partnership (CSP) and received updates on: the impact of the London Olympic events on Dartford [positive]; the election of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Kent; the formation of the Police and Crime Panel and the imposition of a Dispersal Order in the Temple Hill area of the Borough.

3.3 In addition, on a statutory basis, the Committee reviewed the Dartford and Gravesham Community Safety Partnership’s Community Safety Action Plan for 2013, received a mid-term Performance Progress Report on the CSP’s operations during the 2012-13 cycle and reviewed the Partnership’s Strategic Assessment (SA) 2012 document, used to inform the CSP’s Action Plan for 2013-14.

3.4 A revised rolling Work Programme for the 2013-14 municipal year and beyond (reflecting the work undertaken by the Committee during 2012-13) is attached at Appendix A for discussion and approval.

3.5 Any overview elements proposed for inclusion in the Work Programme are required to be notified to the Dartford and Gravesham Community Safety Partnership (CSP) in advance: ad-hoc scrutiny of performance areas (Drawdowns) are not subject to prior CSP approval.

3.6 The Committee also has a statutory obligation to include within its Work Programme, on an annual basis, consideration of the Strategic Assessment and Community Safety Plan documents produced by the Community Safety Partnership (CSP) each year.
3.7 The Committee’s remit as set out in its Terms of Reference (ToRs) confirmed at the Annual Meeting held on 8 May 2013 and attached at Appendix B; is to scrutinise the discharge of the crime and disorder functions (including anti social behaviour (ASB) and Community Safety) of the responsible local authorities. The Committee may scrutinise the functions of the CSP as a whole, or of individual partnership agencies within the CSP.

4. Relationship to the Corporate Plan

4.1 Scrutiny of the responsible local authorities [in the discharge of their crime and disorder functions] through the provision of an agreed Work Programme, should lead to an increase in public confidence, a reduction in anti-social behaviour and help meet the Safer Community Corporate Objective (SC1 and SC2).

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>Reduction in the incidents of crime and disorder and ASB in Dartford Town Centre and environs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Appendix

Appendix A: Draft rolling Work Programme for 2013-14 and beyond; Appendix B: Terms of Reference (ToRs).
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documents consulted</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>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) Agenda and Minutes of 12 September 2012; Terms of Reference (ToRs) as agreed on 8 May 2013.</td>
<td>June 2013</td>
<td>David Hook 01322 343276</td>
<td>Member Services ED</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CRIME and DISORDER (Overview & Scrutiny) COMMITTEE

_Draft WORK PROGRAMME for the 2013-14 MUNICIPAL YEAR and BEYOND_

**Detail:**

On a discretionary basis and with the prior agreement of the Community Safety Partnership (CSP) as appropriate, a review of the contribution made by the following partner agencies to the aims of the CSP;

- Kent County Council – KCC’s responsibilities for Community Safety, Highways, Youth and Trading Standards under the 2-tier system for the County were obvious areas for Committee interest;

- NHS West Kent – It was agreed furthermore that particular interest in the impact of mental health problems on community safety would be progressed through a review of mental health services in the Borough undertaken jointly with the main Scrutiny Committee and the Policy Overview Committee, once Health structures and personnel are settled.*

**Plus:**

- Review the impact of Police and Crime Commissioners and Police and Crime Panels on community safety in Dartford;
- Other Draw-Downs to be decided on an ad-hoc basis.

**On a statutory basis to:**

- Consider the CSP’s annual Strategic Assessment (SA) document;
- Consider the CSP’s annual Community Safety Plan document

It is suggested that these work plan items be scheduled as shown below. The Work Plan will be reviewed at each meeting and discretionary items can be rescheduled and/or new items added in accordance with the Committee’s wishes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Work Plan Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2013</td>
<td>Community Safety and Action Plan 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review of the contribution of Kent County Council to the CSP and the aims of the CSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Season</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Winter 2014 | Strategic Assessment 2013  
Review of the contribution of Health to the CSP and the aims of the CSP [*Jointly with the Scrutiny and Policy Overview Committees*] |
| Summer 2014 | Community Safety and Action Plan 2014  
Review of the introduction of Police and Crime Commissioners and the Police and Crime Panel and the impact on community safety in Dartford |
| Winter 2015 | Strategic Assessment 2014  
Review any new legislation addressing anti-social behaviour (ASB) and its impact on community safety in Dartford |

Member Services  
June 2013
CRIME AND DISORDER (OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY) COMMITTEE
[REPORTING TO COUNCIL unless otherwise stated in these Terms of Reference]

Chairman: Councillor R J Wells
Vice-Chairman: Councillor A Sandhu MBE
Membership: Councillors M J Bryant, S P Butterfill, D J Mote, Mrs J A Rickwood and MJ Street.

TERMS OF REFERENCE:
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.
Scrubtih 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.
CRIME AND DISORDER (OVERVIEW and SCRUTINY) COMMITTEE
24 July 2013

CRIME AND DISORDER (OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY) COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT 2012/13

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 proposed by Members, the Committee's Annual Report for 2012/13 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 2012/13 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 draft Annual Report 2012/13;
Appendix B: Crime and Disorder (O&S) Protocol (May 2013);
Appendix C: Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with Dartford & Gravesham Community Safety Partnership (CSP) (April 2013);
Appendix D: Terms of Reference (ToRs) (May 2013)
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APPENDIX A

DARTFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL

CRIME AND DISORDER (OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY) COMMITTEE

Draft Annual Report 2012/13
Introduction

In accordance with its Protocol the Crime and Disorder (Overview & Scrutiny) Committee is required to report annually to the Council on its work and may make recommendations for its Work Programme.

The Committee performs the overview and scrutiny functions relating to crime and disorder, community safety including anti-social behaviour (ASB), on behalf of the Council in accordance with the guidelines contained in the Committee’s Protocol (Appendix B).

The Committee met twice during the 2012-13 municipal cycle and in accordance with established practice reviewed Key Decisions as published in the relevant Regulation 9 Notices [Forward Plan] and confirmed the Minutes of their previous meeting.

Annual Report 2011-12

At the first meeting in the 2012-13 municipal cycle on 12 September 2012, the Committee noted the contents of the draft Crime and Disorder (O&S) Annual Report for the preceding municipal year and agreed that it be submitted to the next meeting of the General Assembly of the Council for approval without amendment.

The Committee thanked the Strategic Director, CSU Officers and their Kent Police colleagues, for their input and contributions throughout the period under review. The role of the Committee Coordinator in compiling the annual report was also recognised.

Regular Attendees

The Committee renewed their invitation to Councillor Mrs Ann Allen and Councillor David Hammock to attend their meetings, as Lead Members with portfolio responsibilities for Community and Taxpayer Involvement and Licensing and Enforcement respectively.

The Committee also confirmed their standing invitation to the Dartford District Commander and all Dartford CSU staff (Council and Kent Police) to attend any/all Committee meetings.

WORK PROGRAMME REVIEW

In accordance with its Protocol, the Committee agreed the contents of a rolling Work Programme (WP) for the ensuing 2012-13 municipal year and beyond, at its meeting on 12 September 2012.

Detail:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Work Plan Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 2012</td>
<td>Community Safety Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review of the impact of London 2012 on crime and disorder in Dartford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review of the contribution of the Kent Fire and Rescue Service to the CSP and to the aims of the CSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2013</td>
<td>Strategic Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review of the contribution of the Probation Service to the CSP and to the aims of the CSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2013</td>
<td>Community Safety and Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review of the contribution of Kent County Council to the CSP and to the aims of the CSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2013 / Spring 2014</td>
<td>Strategic Assessment 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review of the contribution of Health to the CSP and to the aims of the CSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2014</td>
<td>Community Safety Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review of the introduction of Police and Crime Commissioners and the impact on community safety in Dartford</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Members agreed that the Work Programme should be reviewed at each meeting of the Committee to enable discretionary items to be rescheduled and/ or new items added.

At its meeting on **13 February 2013** the Committee added the following items to the rolling Work Programme:

Summer 2013: To review the outcome of the Temple Hill Dispersal Order, including the proposed exit strategy;

Summer 2014: Review any new legislation addressing anti-social behaviour (ASB).

**WORK PROGRAMME ITEMS**

**COMMUNITY SAFETY PLAN (CSP) 2012**

At its meeting on **12 September 2012**, in accordance with its statutory obligations, the Committee reviewed the Dartford and Gravesham Community Safety Partnership’s Community Safety Plan (CSP) for 2012.
Members were briefed on the contents of the Community Safety Plan for 2012 and reminded that the 2012 Plan was informed by the Partnership’s Strategic Assessment (SA) 2011 document, considered by the Committee at their meeting on 25 January 2012.

Members were advised that the priorities identified and views expressed by CSP agencies, residents and elected Members in the 2011 Strategic Assessment (SA) had been taken forward into the Community Safety Plan for 2012. This would ensure that the Partnership’s agreed priorities were maintained during the 2012/13 fiscal year.

PERFORMANCE

Also on 12 September, Members noted the latest CSP Performance Progress Report, detailing reductions in various crime types and public perception of anti-social behaviour. The report was due to be submitted to the Dartford & Gravesham Community Safety Partnership for approval later that month.

The Performance report gave details of Kent Police Recorded Crime on a rolling year basis, comparing the periods April – March 2011 to April – March 2012. Figures for the end of the 2012 financial year showed a reduction of 5.7% in total recorded crime for Dartford, continuing the downward trend for the Borough and comparing favourably with the Kent-wide fall of 3.6%.

The Chairman and Members congratulated the Dartford District Commander and the joint CSU team on an excellent set of figures which indicated a continued decrease in the overall crime rate for Dartford.

STRATEGIC ASSESSMENT (SA) 2012

At its meeting on 13 February 2013 the Committee considered the Dartford and Gravesham Community Safety Partnership’s Strategic Assessment (SA) document for 2012. Following consideration of the Executive Summary of the SA document in open session, Members went into closed session to consider the EXEMPT material.

Members were reminded of the history of the SA and the legal obligation placed on the Community Safety Partnership (CSP) to complete an annual SA document under the provisions of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998. The primary purpose of the SA was to provide an analysis of changes in levels of recorded crime and disorder over the previous 12 month period from 1 October to 30 September the following year, and to develop suggested strategic priorities to form the basis of the Community Safety Action Plan for the following 12 month period [October to September].

Members were advised that the 2012 SA document had been agreed by the Dartford and Gravesham CSP at its meeting on 15 January 2013 and would be used to inform the Community Safety Action Plan for the two Boroughs in the 2013 -14 cycle. Priorities agreed by the CSP for the 2013/14 Plan, subject to consultation with interested groups were:
**KENT FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE**

On **12 September** Members received a presentation from representatives of the Kent Fire & Rescue Service (KF&RS) covering the Service’s aims and key performance areas.

The Strategic Director paid tribute to the efforts of KFRS on behalf of the Borough and advised Members that KFRS was a key strategic and operational partner within the Dartford and Gravesham Community Safety Partnership (CSP). KFRS’s work with schools and youth organisations was particularly noteworthy, especially the engagement with young people over anti-social behaviour (ASB) issues and road safety. Members were asked to encourage schools in their Wards to invite KFRS officers to give presentations on the wide range of subjects they covered.

The Chairman and Members echoed the views and sentiments of the Strategic Director and expressed their thanks to KFRS for their contribution to the aims of the CSP.

**KENT PROBATION (KP)**

At their meeting on **13 February 2013** Members received a presentation from Kent Probation representatives giving an overview of the Service and their contribution to the aims of the Community Safety Partnership (CSP).

Members were advised that in addition to supporting the Courts, Kent Probation was responsible for assessing an individual’s likelihood of reoffending and the risk they posed to others. Identifying the factors that led to reoffending behaviour in individuals and deploying appropriate interventions to reduce reoffending and harm, was the key to success in this principal area of work. It was recognised that a multi-agency collaborative approach was crucial to success.

The Reducing Reoffending Sub-Group had been formed in September 2012 to increase co-ordinated activity between Kent Probation, NHS Social Care, Job Centre Plus, the Prison Service, Housing and the local Health and Wellbeing Boards. An example of coordinated multi-agency tackling of crime was the Integrated Offender Management (IOM) partnership process, used to...
manage both adult and young individuals causing harm in their communities, to increasing success. Other areas of Kent Probation activity included: the Community Payback Scheme, Troubled Families Group and the supervision of offenders released under Licence to better aid re-integration into society and reduce the risk of reoffending.

The Chairman and Members thanked the representatives from Kent Probation for a comprehensive briefing.

ONE-OFF INVESTIGATIONS / DRAW DOWNS

POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER (PCC) AND POLICE AND CRIME PANEL (PCP)

On 12 September 2012, Members received an update report on the preparations for the replacement of the Kent Police Authority by an elected Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) and the establishment of a Police and Crime Panel (PCP) for Kent.

Members were briefed by the Strategic Director and the Dartford District Commander, Chief Inspector R. Walford, on the new arrangements, the respective powers of the PCC and the PCP and the relationship between the PCC and CSP going forward.

LONDON 2012 OLYMPIC GAMES: IMPACT ON DARTFORD

Members also discussed the impact of London 2012 on crime levels in Dartford and the surrounding district during the period of the Olympic and Paralympic Games.

Members were advised by the Dartford District Commander that contrary to predicted scenarios, road traffic on the M25, A2 and at the Dartford Crossing and Tunnel had flowed as normal. Ebbsfleet station had operated effectively as the designated Olympic rail transport hub for Kent and the parking arrangements for spectators using a combination of park and rail facilities to reach Olympic venues in East London from Ebbsfleet had also proved effective. The Games had not impacted adversely on crime levels in Dartford, indeed crime levels for the period as a whole had dropped.

Members congratulated the Dartford District Commander and his team and the joint team in the Dartford CSU for their effective performance during the period of the London Games 2012.

REGULATION 10 NOTICE: CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORITY TO DISPERSE GROUPS

At its meeting on 13 February 2013, the Committee noted the details of a Regulation 10 Notice issued under the General Exception arrangements in accordance with Standing Order 54 (6) (e) relating to a Key Decision – a
decision having a significant effect on communities living in two or more Wards in the Borough.

The Regulation 10 Notice, had been approved by Cabinet on 24 January 2013 and requested authority to issue a Dispersal Order in a designated area in and around Temple Hill, Dartford, to combat a significant increase in anti-social behaviour and low level criminal activity on Temple Hill in the preceding weeks of January 2013.

The Committee received an update on the implementation of the Dispersal Order and the developments leading up to it from the Neighbourhood Inspector (CSU).

EXPRESSION OF THANKS

At the conclusion of proceedings on 13 February 2013, the Committee expressed its thanks to the Strategic Director, the Dartford District Commander and the joint CSU staff for attending the Committee's meetings in the municipal year under review and the Committee Coordinator for his administrative support.

The Committee also expressed their appreciation of the informative reports and presentations it had received and the full and detailed responses it had been given in answer to questions.
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‘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 County Council [a responsible authority]
- Kent Fire and Rescue Service [a responsible authority]
- Kent Probation [a responsible body]
- Dartford, Gravesham and Swanley Clinical Commissioning Group [a responsible authority]

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**

1.1 decisions and/or actions of the CSP and the responsible authorities (either collectively or individually);

1.2 the CSP’s annual strategic assessment to inform the Community Safety Plan;

1.3 the CSP’s partnership plan;

1.4 Councillor Calls for Action (CCfAs);

1.5 crime and disorder/community safety related local improvement targets;

1.6 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;

1.7 items related to crime and disorder/community safety referred to in the Members’ Information Bulletin;

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. Matters related to the systemic failure in the discharge of crime and disorder functions irrespective of the fact that there is a right of recourse to a review or right of appeal conferred by or under any enactment (see section E.3).
2. What may be reviewed

2.1 The matters referred to in sections 1.1 – 1.3 and 1.6 – 1.8 of this Protocol.

A. Draw downs

A.1 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 reasonable 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 reg.5 of the Local Authorities (Overview and Scrutiny Committees) (England) Regulations 2012 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.4 of the Local Authorities (Overview and Scrutiny Committees) (England) (Regulations 2012).

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.

This Call-in procedure will only apply to Cabinet decisions/actions, subject to the restrictions/limitations detailed in sections C.8, C.9, C.11, C.13, C.15 and C.16 of this Protocol.

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)(a) of the Local Government Act 2000);

CSP participants

Representatives of the CSP, responsible authorities and co-ordinating body invited to attend Committee meetings (Section 21(13)(b) of the Local Government Act 2000);

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 (reg. 3. of the Overview and Scrutiny (Reference by Councillors) (Excluded Matters) (England) Order 2012).
E.3 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 (reg.4, the Overview and Scrutiny (Reference by Councillors) (Excluded Matters) (England) Order 2012).

E.4 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.

E.5 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 disclosable pecuniary interests or prejudicial interest in the matter.

E.6 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).

E.7 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.

E.8 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).

E.9 The rules relating to provision of information and request for participant attendance, at sections B and D of this Protocol will apply.

E.10 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.

E.11 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.

E.12 The local ward Member may address the Committee (but not vote) on the matter raised.

E.13 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.

E.14 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.
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) of the 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.

The overview and scrutiny of crime and disorder local improvement targets and Community Strategy goals

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 and co-ordinating body may be required by the Committee to have regard to the Committee’s Overview or Scrutiny Report and/or recommendations (Section 9FF(2) of the Local Government Act 2000).

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) [Voting] 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

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.1

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.2

Independent experts, advisers and assessors will be expected to follow the principles referred to in the [Member] Code of Conduct, including the requirement to declare interests and respecting confidentiality.

L.3

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.4

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.5

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 CSP, responsible authorities and co-ordinating body are under a legal obligation to consider the Overview or Scrutiny Report and/or recommendations and respond to the Committee within 28 days (or as soon as reasonably possible) of the date of the Overview or Scrutiny Report, indicating what (if any) action the body proposes to take (see section H.1 above). The same principles shall be applied to Cabinet and GAC.

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 disclosable pecuniary interest or 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;
- 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.
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.

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.

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.

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

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.

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.

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.

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

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.

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 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 may be involved in reviewing a decision in which they have been directly involved.

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 disclosable pecuniary interest or 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

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

Fourth level response

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

Fifth level response

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

Feedback to local ward Member
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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). 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 seven 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 County Council
Kent Fire and Rescue Service
Kent Probation
Dartford, Gravesham and Swanley Clinical Commissioning Group

(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;
- undertaking community consultation and engagement on crime and disorder issues; and
- sharing information among the responsible authorities.
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.4 of the Local Authorities (Overview and Scrutiny Committees)(England) Regulations 2012, 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 and/or other organisations working with the CSP, may be invited under Section 21(13)(b) of the Local Government Act 2000 to attend the Crime and Disorder (Overview and Scrutiny) Committee meetings, to give evidence and/or answer questions.

22. Representatives of the CSP and the responsible authorities and/or other organisations working with the CSP 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 and co-ordinating body may be required by the Crime and Disorder (Overview and Scrutiny) Committee to have regard to the Committee’s Overview or Scrutiny Report and/or recommendations (Section 9FF(2) of the Local Government Act 2000).

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.
CRIME AND DISORDER (OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY) COMMITTEE
[REPORTING TO COUNCIL unless otherwise stated in these Terms of Reference]

Chairman: Councillor R J Wells
Vice-Chairman: Councillor A Sandhu MBE
Membership: Councillors M J Bryant, S P Butterfill, D J Mote, Mrs J A Rickwood and MJ Street.

TERMS OF REFERENCE:
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.
Scrutiny 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.