A meeting of the above Committee will be held on

**Wednesday 22 July 2015**

at 7.00pm at the Civic Centre, Dartford
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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 11 February 2015**

4. **Urgent Items**

   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. **Chairman’s Welcome and Update**

7. **Regulation 9 Notice**

   To note the contents of the Regulation 9 Notice for the period 15 June to 31 October 2015.

8. **Kent Police and Crime Panel (PCP)**

   At the Committee’s invitation, to receive a verbal update from the Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Chris Shippam, Dartford’s representative on the PCP.
9. **Performance**

To note the attached Performance report detailing crime statistics and public perception of anti-social behaviour (ASB) as discussed by the Dartford and Gravesham CSP on 11 June 2015.

10. **Community Safety Plan 2015-16**

To note the contents of the Dartford and Gravesham Community Safety Partnership (CSP) Community Safety Plan 2015-16 (attached at Appendix A to the report) agreed by the CSP at its meeting on 19 March 2015 and comment accordingly.

11. **Work Programme**

Members are invited to note the contents of the Committee’s *draft* rolling Work Programme for the current 2015-16 municipal year and beyond and comment accordingly.

12. **Committee Annual Report for the 2014-15 Municipal Year**

To consider the attached *draft* Annual Report and Appendices for the 2014-15 municipal year prior to submission to the General Assembly of the Council.
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 11 February 2015.

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

ABSENT: Councillor M J Bryant

Dartford Borough Council Officers:
Sheri Green – Strategic Director (ES)
Mark Salisbury – EARS Manager, CSU

CABINET & LEAD MEMBERS: Councillor Mrs A D Allen MBE, Councillor D A Hammock and Councillor A R Martin

PRESENT TO RESPOND TO ISSUES RAISED BY THE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE:

Paul Brandon – Deputy Chief Constable, Kent Police
Mike Stepney – Chief of Staff, Office of Kent Police & Crime Commissioner
C.I. Paul Anderson – Dartford District Commander, Kent Police
Insp. Gary Woodward – Dartford Neighbourhood Inspector, Kent Police

14. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors M J Bryant, J A Kite MBE, A R Lloyd and M I Peters.

The Chairman advised that due to an unexpected family commitment, Mrs Ann Barnes, Kent Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) had been unable to attend and make her presentation to Members as planned. He welcomed the PCC’s Chief of Staff, Mr Mike Stepney and confirmed that Mr Stepney would be addressing Members on behalf of the Commissioner.

The Chairman extended a warm welcome to Paul Brandon, Deputy Chief Constable, Kent Police, together with his Staff Officer, the Dartford District
Commander C.I. Paul Anderson and Dartford’s Neighbourhood Police Inspector Gary Woodward, based in Dartford’s CSU.

The Chairman also welcomed the Deputy Leader in his capacity as Dartford’s representative on the Police and Crime Panel (PCP), Lead Members Councillor Ann Allen (Community Involvement) and Councillor Dave Hammock (Licensing & Enforcement) and noted that several other Borough and Parish Members had accepted his invitation to attend and participate in the joint presentation on future Policing in Kent [Agenda Item 7].

The presence of the Strategic Director (External Services) and the newly appointed Enforcement and Regulatory Services Manager, Mark Salisbury, was also noted and welcomed.

15. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

16. CONFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 23 JULY 2014

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the Committee’s meeting held on 23 July 2014 be confirmed as accurate.

17. URGENT ITEMS [IF ANY]

The Chairman confirmed that there were no urgent items for consideration by the Committee.

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

There were no references from other Committees.

19. REGULATION 9 NOTICE

RESOLVED:

That the contents of the Regulation 9 Notice for the period 27 January 2015 to 31 May 2015 be noted.

20. JOINT PRESENTATION ON THE VISION FOR POLICING IN KENT

The Chairman renewed his welcome to Mark Stepney Chief of Staff in the PCC’s Office and invited him to make his presentation to Members on behalf of the Commissioner.
The Chief of Staff (CoS) informed Members that Mrs Barnes had been particularly disappointed not to be able to address the Committee that evening as planned. He advised that his contribution to the presentation on the ‘Joint Vision for Policing in Kent’ - would focus on the Commissioner’s role and responsibilities as PCC. The Deputy Chief Constable (DCC) would then make his presentation on behalf of the Chief Constable, followed by a joint Q & A session with Members.

The Committee received an initial PowerPoint presentation from the CoS detailing the key aspects of Mrs Barnes role as Kent Police and Crime Commissioner under the following headings:

**Responsibilities**

- Determining the Strategic Direction for Kent Police
- Setting the Budget
- Consulting with the Public to give a single voice on policing issues
- Hiring [and firing] the Chief Constable
- Holding the Chief Constable to account
- Working with partners e.g. Police and Crime Panel (PCP)

**Police and Crime Plan [7 key elements]**

- 1: Cut crime and catch criminals
- 2: Protect the public from serious harm
- 3: Prevent crime, anti-social behaviour (ASB) and reduce repeat victimisation and offending
- 4: Ensure visible community policing is at the heart of policing in Kent
- 5: Put victims and witnesses at the heart of the process
- 6: Deliver value for money (VfM)
- 7: Meet national commitments for policing

Members were reminded that following elections held in November 2012, forty one (41) Police and Crime Commissioners (PCC’s) had been elected to office in England and Wales. The role of a PCC, as defined by the Prime Minister David Cameron in May 2012 was ‘To be a ‘Voice for the people, someone to lead the fight against crime and to be held to account if they didn’t deliver’. The CoS added that the continued role and function of PCC’s going forward would be determined by the outcome of the General Election in May 2015 and which Party or Coalition of Parties gained power.

The CoS advised Members that the strategic direction taken by Kent Police was dictated by the 7 key elements contained within the Force’s Police and Crime Plan [as listed above]. A Police and Crime Plan was a statutory document for all Forces covering a 4 year cycle and refreshed by an annual update exercise. The current Plan for Kent Police had been drawn up by the
Commissioner in consultation with the present Chief Constable, Alan Pughesley. The PCC and CC shared a ‘joint vision for policing in Kent’ based on the treatment of victims and the safeguarding of witnesses within a responsive and caring policing regime. The Commissioner’s Engagement Strategy with the public ensured that public concerns were addressed and where appropriate prioritised within the Plan. Holding the CC to account was a statutory obligation of the PCC’s Office and achieved through a mixture of formal and informal forums, including 1 to 1 sessions between the Commissioner and the Chief Constable. Setting the Kent Police budget in the continuing climate of fiscal restraint had been challenging. Savings of £46M had been required during the lifetime of the current Plan, achieved primarily through a reduction of some 400 officers and civil support staff. Following completion of the refresh exercise in February 2015, Kent’s Police and Crime Panel (PCP) had agreed the Commissioner’s proposal to commit some £1.6M of funding for the preservation of 30 (thirty) permanent Police Officer posts. However this had been an isolated ‘gain’ in the general downward trend of funding cuts and staffing efficiencies that had been required in the current 4 year cycle. The refreshed Plan for the current year would additionally include new measures to prevent child sexual exploitation and to engage with Youth.

Members were informed that in terms of meeting present day national commitments for policing; the Kent Force led the way regarding the accurate recording of crime, following an inspection of Kent Police by Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) in 2013 and now achieved an accuracy rate in terms of recording crimes of between 96-97% which compared very favourably with other Forces. The HMIC inspection process to evaluate the accuracy levels for recording crime was now being rolled-out across all Forces nationwide, with HMIC requiring all Forces in England and Wales to pass the ‘Kent Test’ and achieve crime recording levels of 90% or above.

The CoS advised that the Commissioner and the Chief Constable shared a common vision for the County based on the District model, held together by a ‘golden thread’ of victim support and witness protection. This enabled Kent to be an effective Police Force that valued quality of delivery, humanity and cultural diversity and displayed the ability to face and rectify mistakes when made. The District model worked well in terms of meeting public expectation and was endorsed by Councils at all levels throughout Kent.

Looking to the future, the CoS advised Members that even greater financial challenges faced Kent and all Forces nationally in the continuing climate of fiscal restraint versus increased demand for police services. A further £60M in cuts needed to be found in the next 4 year cycle which would be a very difficult target to achieve. The £46M of savings secured by Kent Police to date had been achieved through significant cuts in front-line staff. Back-room operations for HR, IT and Finance were now shared with Essex Police and all ‘low-hanging fruit’ in terms of savings taken. The projected £60M of further savings represented 60% of the Kent police budget in the next 4 year cycle, and posed the question of how long the current policing model at local / district / national level could be maintained. Staffing costs continued to account for 80% of Kent’s budget, despite advances in technology e.g. body
cameras, virtual courts and shared back-office functions with Essex Police. Continued partnership working between Forces and other Agencies e.g. Fire and Rescue, Probation and Public Health Services would become increasingly important in this scenario. A particular fear and threat was that Agencies would begin to focus increasingly on their own core business [in the face of continued budget and staffing cuts] shrinking their partnership roles and leaving Police Forces nationwide to ‘fill the gaps’ and pick up the pieces. A national debate on the current and future models for policing would be required sooner rather than later.

The Chairman thanked the CoS for his presentation and invited the DCC to speak on behalf of the Chief Constable.

The DCC advised Members that Kent was an excellent Force, held a good record in relation to inspections and was intelligence led. Kent faced unique geographical challenges given its position as the U.K.’s gateway to Europe and the threat that posed, in addition to North Kent’s proximity to the Metropolitan area and the influx of cross-border crime from London and Essex, exacerbated by the major arterial routes of the M25 and the A2. Recent infrastructure developments in Kent, including the London Paramount project in the Swanscombe Peninsular were positive, but also brought fresh challenges with highly professional London gangs targeting vehicle and tool theft in particular from construction sites. Child exploitation was another increasing area of current work across the County but particularly in East Kent. Improvements in technology such as body worn cameras and tablets, were allowing officers to stay out longer and submit reports from the field. Collaboration with Essex Police continued to strengthen through combined intelligence and joint operations and the sharing of back-room functions e.g. HR, IT and Finance. Dealing with members of the public and offenders with mental health issues, continued to be a significant drain on Police staff and resources. Despite the fact that the Police were not always the most suitable Agency to deal with such incidents, having been contacted they had to respond, at least in the first instance.

The DCC confirmed that the Chief Constable and the Commissioner shared a joint vision for Policing in Kent and also confirmed the cultural shift by Kent Police away from a policy of numerical targeting to one of quality service to the public. The most recent monitoring of victims had recorded a satisfaction rating of 80%. Performance delivery was being achieved by putting Local Policing at the centre of the model, giving equal priority to operational demand, visible local policing and local reassurance, aimed at reducing overall demand in the face of the requirement for continued savings. Better use of technology and collaboration with partner Agencies and Essex Police had helped achieve the savings of some £47M required under the Coalition Government’s first Comprehensive Spending Review [CSR1]. However, the Chief Constable had significant concerns over the ability of the Kent Force to sustain the £60M of further savings required under CSR2 and continue to operate in its current format. Some current Police functions and areas of activity would have to be re-assessed even cease, and a comprehensive
communications strategy would be required to positively engage with the public and key partners.

Members were advised that at present, Kent Police were managing continuity and change through improved focus on Local District Policing Teams, as exemplified in Dartford by the joint CSU operation based in the Civic Centre staffed by both Police and Council officers. Kent retained 3 Police Divisions at present, but the future shape and size of the Force remained subject to further debate and review moving forward. In 2015/16 some £20M of further savings would be required under CSR2. The DCC noted that the number of mental health cases in Police custody continued to be a drain on resources, as was the requirement for Police to respond to incidents when contacted by the public ‘out-of hours’, when Health and other Agencies were not readily available. Historic sex abuse cases in the wake of the Saville inquiry and Operation Yew Tree were a growing area of investigation, frequently labour intensive and time-consuming, given the lack of readily accessible historical evidence to give victims closure. A further major concern was the current high level of perceived terrorist threat.

The Deputy Chief Constable and the Commissioner’s Chief of Staff confirmed the following further points in response to subsequent questions from Members:

- **London Paramount development in Greenhithe Peninsular** – possible impact in terms of acquisitive and vehicle crime for Dartford and North Kent: Kent Police had held talks with London Paramount in December 2014 to flag the importance of appropriate security arrangements at major construction sites. A written response from London Paramount was awaited, but Kent Police were committed to working positively with the consortium given their investment in the Dartford area;

- **Stray and unattended Horses**: Kent Police powers were limited to road traffic issues, as and when unattended horses strayed onto roads and highways. However the issue had been noted for inclusion in the Kent Police and Crime Plan going forward;

- **Attendance by PCSOs at Parish meetings** – visible policing: resources had reduced in the current CSR1 cycle. PCSOs were highly valued by the Force and public alike, but CSR2 would necessitate hard choices between competing demands for resources. In the interim, the Dartford Neighbourhood Inspector undertook to examine the request that PCSO’s, where available, attend Parish meetings;

- **Neighbourhood Watch meetings**: Members noted the effectiveness of the schemes and that Police attendance was good, in particular by the Neighbourhood Inspector, most recently at the Swanscombe & Greenhithe Neighbourhood Watch event;
• **Local Communications** - Police follow-up to initial reports of crime: Members expressed particular frustration at the Parish level following the initial reporting of crime to the Police. Parish Clerks bore the brunt of subsequent public dissatisfaction over an apparent lack of follow-up action by the Police. The Neighbourhood Inspector agreed that it was important to let the public know of any progress and the need for CSU’s to follow-up with the victims of crime and would re-enforce this point with his team. He also mentioned use of the ‘Track my Crime’ application which was proving extremely popular;

• **Radicalisation of minorities and fundamentalists**: The DCC confirmed that the work of Kent Police in combating radicalisation was ongoing given recent events in mainland Europe, the threat posed by British Jihadee’s returning from conflicts in the Middle East and elsewhere and Kent Police’s efforts to tackle these issues. He also highlighted for Members some of the challenges in this area of operation;

• **Merging of Police Forces**: Kent Police were now most closely aligned to and co-operated with Essex Police in the Eastern Region to generate savings and share services. Co-operation with Surrey and Sussex remained however in terms of cross-border crime, particularly Metropolitan crime;

• **Public consultation over Cuts**: the PCC was keen that the public should be consulted over the nature of cuts and their impact, but operational decisions were, by law, the remit of the Chief Constable. However, given their shared vision for Policing in Kent the PCC was able to input into the process. Difficult decisions lay ahead and it would be important to convey them to the public in a positive and open communications strategy.

The Chairman thanked the Deputy Chief Constable and the Commissioner’s Chief of Staff for their presentations and for responding to Members subsequent questions.

21. **KENT POLICE AND CRIME PANEL (PCP) UPDATE**

The Committee received a verbal update from the Deputy Leader, Councillor Tony Martin, in his role as Dartford’s representative on the Kent and Medway Police and Crime Panel (PCP). Available Minutes from previous Panel meetings held on 24 July and 9 September 2014 were also included in the Committee’s agenda papers as background.

The Deputy Leader briefly updated Members on business at recent Panel meetings, particularly with regard to the PCC’s Police and Crime Plan 2015/16 Refresh and Council Tax Precept proposals, which the PCP had agreed. However, the Panel continued to have concerns over the
Commissioner's proposal to increase Council Tax per se to finance future unspecified spending, rather than adopting an analytical approach to the present budgetary provision, to determine future need. The Deputy Leader conceded that the role of the PCC as an elected official with a mandate and manifesto to implement was a difficult one. He also expressed frustration over the limited role of PCP’s and felt that PCP’s needed more powers to ensure that Panels and Commissioners developed a strong and constructive relationship.

22. CSP STRATEGIC ASSESSMENT 2014

The Chairman welcomed Mark Salisbury to his first meeting of the Committee, following his appointment as Enforcement and Regulatory Services (EARS) Manager in the Council’s Community Safety Unit (CSU). He asked that the efforts of the previous Manager, David Court, be recorded in the Minutes in recognition of his contribution to the work of the Crime and Disorder (O&S) Committee from its inception in October 2009. Members echoed the Chairman’s sentiments.

Mark Salisbury advised Members that he had taken up his duties as EARS Manager on 5 January 2015 and felt particularly privileged to be working in Dartford CSU which was widely regarded as the exemplar model throughout Kent for effective collaborative multi-agency working.

In presenting the Dartford and Gravesham Community Safety Partnership (CSP) Strategic Assessment 2014 document to the Committee for noting; the EARS Manager reminded Members that the CSP was required to publish a Strategic Assessment (SA) each year under the terms of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998. The Committee, as an Overview function, was then required to consider the SA on an annual basis. He highlighted the following key points in the 2014 SA for Members:

- The principal aim of the SA was to record crime and anti-social behaviour (ASB) levels in both Dartford and Gravesham and identify priorities to inform a joint Strategic Action Plan to tackle crime and ASB issues across both Boroughs;

- Data relating to crime and ASB collated for the 2014 SA covered the period October 2013 – September 2014. It was important to note that it was not possible to present comparison figures from previous years due to changes in the definitions of several crime categories introduced in 2013;

- It was also important to note the significant changes in the Home Office Counting Rules for Recorded Crime, introduced following an initial inspection by Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) of Kent Police also in 2013. As the Committee had already been
informed, Kent now had a very high ethical standard for crime recording which other Police areas had yet to implement. This fact impacted on the relative position of Dartford & Gravesham within its Most Similar Group of CSP’s, drawn from some Police areas who had yet to implement the new Home Office rules for recorded crime;

- The CSP’s 6 Key Priorities for 2015-16 remained the same as those identified for the previous year which were: Violent Crime and Domestic Abuse, Anti-Social Behaviour (incorporating Criminal Damage related to ASB), Acquisitive and Property Crime, Substance Misuse, Reducing Re-offending and Road Safety;

- The Counter Terrorism and Security Bill (Act when passed) would have significant implications for Agencies within CSPs under the terms of the ‘Prevent’ strategy, based within the Government’s Counter Terrorism ‘Contest’ plan. The ‘Prevent’ strategy would place new duties on individual Agencies and CSPs to work together to prevent people being radicalised and drawn into terrorism;

- Violent Crime and Domestic Abuse (DA) had risen in Dartford which, in positive terms, reflected increased reporting of both crime categories by the public, based on increased confidence in the Police and other Agencies to tackle both issues. Further evidence of public confidence and satisfaction was the increased use by victims of the services provided by the Borough’s ‘Domestic Abuse 1 Stop Shop’ facilities;

- Substance Misuse –CSP partners were concentrating on efforts to deal with the complex needs of alcohol users currently resistant to accessing support and services and addressing so called ‘Legal Highs’; extended joint working between the Troubled Families Programme’s Family Workers and local substance misuse service providers (CRI and KCA) was being undertaken to increase referral numbers to those services;

- Reducing Re-offending: the CSP’s Sub-Group continued to support the CRI-led initiative to improve multi-agency working in dealing with the needs of complex alcohol users often involved in repeat offending in both criminal activity and ASB including through the ‘Making every Adult Matter’ project [see above]; a ‘Learning Shop’ based in Bluewater was a further initiative to assist [re] offenders; the Community Payback Scheme under which ex-offenders undertook community work continued to draw public praise and be valued by local authorities;

- Acquisitive Crime: targeted work in key geographical locations would be undertaken to reduce repeat victimisation and provide support to vulnerable residents and businesses; close working and information – sharing would also be maintained between G-Safe, D-TAC, CCTV and Kent Police with additional measures such as Exclusion Orders used as appropriate;
Road Safety: tackling speeding and nuisance parking (particularly outside schools) were priorities being tackled with the aid of local residents and multi-agency initiatives aimed at promoting responsible driving behaviour through ‘pre-driver’ programmes and preventative work with new drivers.

In conclusion, the EARS Manager reinforced the importance of community engagement by the CSP and its partner Agencies, the ‘Golden Thread’ advocated jointly by the Kent Police and Crime Commissioner and the Chief Constable and embodied in the Kent Police and Crime Plan.

In response to subsequent questions from Members, the EARS Manager and Dartford’s District Commander and Neighbourhood Inspector gave the following responses:

- Vandalism and Car Theft: It was acknowledged that Dartford figures in both categories continued to be higher than the Kent average. Major contributing factors were the Bluewater shopping complex which accounted for 11% of Dartford crime and the Borough’s proximity to the A2 and M25 major arterial routes allied to high-speed rail services which facilitated cross-border crime. Highly organised London gangs with sophisticated technology were successfully circumventing electronic safeguards to steal top-range vehicles in the Borough; tool van theft was also on the increase in the wake of new construction in Dartford and the Swanscombe peninsular. The CSP, Kent Police and Dartford CSU continued to work hard to address both crime categories, but also encouraged public awareness and self-help through Neighbourhood Watch schemes, given reduced Police numbers. Going forward, it was hoped that a baseline level of crime had been established for the CSP in the current Assessment, to enable annual comparative exercises in the future, following the changes to several crime categories in 2013;

- Fly-Tipping: Council and Kent Police Officers from the CSU continued to address the problem with some success, including increased CCTV coverage at ‘hot-spots’. Parish and Borough Members were asked to report any/all new incidents to Dartford CSU, including those raised by Members that evening in Sutton–at-Hone and Hawley Parish. It was confirmed that the Council would retain overall resource levels in the CSU, despite planned personnel changes;

- Bluewater Complex: Continuing Member concern over the distorting effect Bluewater crime had on Dartford’s overall crime statistics [+11%] and the potential detrimental impact an inflated crime rate posed for Dartford in terms of attracting new residents to the Borough, was acknowledged by Officers. It was noted that the Bluewater ‘inflation factor’ had been separated out in paragraphs 4.1 and 4.2 [pages 27/28] of the SA document detailing ‘Theft and handling excluding vehicle interference’. Removing offences occurring within the Bluewater
Complex in this category would bring down Dartford’s overall figure significantly and much more in line with the Kent average;

- **Acquisitive and Property Crime**: Members had expressed concern that the reduction in Street Lighting by KCC had contributed to the incidences of burglary in the Borough in that thieves targeted dwellings during periods of reduced lighting. The Neighbourhood Inspector advised that temporal times for offences were monitored on a 2 weekly basis and Police resources deployed on a prioritised basis within the overall constraints of a reduced Force. The EARS Manager understood that the KCC Cabinet Member, Councillor Brazier, had undertaken to re-introduce street lighting during hours of darkness. A KCC Member present confirmed that this was the intention under a KCC reduced cost LED lighting initiative which was due to commence in September 2015 in rural then urban areas. It was noted in this respect that turning street lighting ‘down’ rather than ‘off’ was an alternative option;

- **Community Payback Scheme**: Members were advised that the Scheme was being privatised following the recent split of probation and offender management work between the national Probation Service and privately run Community Rehabilitation Companies (CRCs) who would manage low risk offenders. At present, Dartford CSU supported the Community Payback Scheme in terms of providing tools and some supervision and support. There was the potential that CRCs [Kent, Surrey and Sussex CRC for Dartford] could charge for the Scheme in the future; the current view of Dartford Officers was that such charging would be inappropriate and would not be supported. When matters became clearer, Members would be advised, including through the CSP Support Group.

The Chairman thanked the EARS Manager for his comprehensive presentation and the Neighbourhood Inspector and District Commander Kent Police for attending and responding to the Committee’s questions.

### 23. WORK PLAN UPDATE

RESOLVED:

That the contents of the Committee’s rolling Work Programme as set out in the report be noted.

### 24. DATES FOR FUTURE MEETINGS

Members were asked to note the dates for future meetings of the Committee in the forthcoming 2015-16 municipal cycle, subject to final approval by the General Assembly of the Council at its Annual Meeting on 27 May 2015.
The meeting closed at 9.00 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 C J Shippam, Portfolio: Deputy Leader, Strategic Service Provision & Town Centre
Councillor Mrs A D Allen, MBE, Portfolio: Community Development
Councillor P F Coleman, Portfolio: Front Line Services, Customer Champion & Housing
Councillor K M Kelly, Portfolio: Transport and Infrastructure
Councillor A R Lloyd, Portfolio: Strategic Council Finances & Major Capital Projects
Councillor Mrs P A Thurlow, Portfolio: Events, Leisure & Heritage

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>Development Policies Plan - ‘Publication’ stage document</th>
<th>Cabinet</th>
<th>The document is reflecting the outcome of Draft Plan &amp; Options public consultation (Dec 2014 – Jan 2015) and other input such as the LDF Members Working Group.</th>
<th>Mark Aplin, Planning Policy Manager Tel: 01322 343202 <a href="mailto:mark.aplin@dartford.gov.uk">mark.aplin@dartford.gov.uk</a></th>
<th>OPEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To agree the latest version of this Local Plan document as ‘sound’ and to allow a final stage of public representations to be made on it.</td>
<td>10 Sep 2015</td>
<td>General Assembly of the Council 12 Oct 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CRIME AND DISORDER (OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY)
COMMITTEE
22 July 2015

COMMUNITY SAFETY PERFORMANCE REPORT

1. SUMMARY

The performance report [attached at Appendix A] details performance relating to levels of crime and anti-social behaviour (ASB).

2. RECOMMENDATION

That the attached report, which was discussed by the Dartford & Gravesham Community Safety Partnership on the 11 June 2015, be noted.

3. Background and Discussion

3.1 This report has been produced for the Community Safety Partnership (CSP) and details performance in relation to levels of crime and disorder and anti-social behaviour (ASB) recorded in Dartford and Gravesham for the financial year period of April 2014 to March 2015 and compares them against anticipated crime levels, as provided by Kent Police. The report is provided for Members’ information.

3.2 Members are considering a document that has already been discussed and approved by the main Community Safety Partnership on 11 June 2015.

3.3 The CSP questioned what could be done to improve Dartford’s position against other areas of Kent, and also sought explanation given that nearly half of the crime types had seen higher levels recorded than anticipated. In addition the Dartford and Gravesham CSP’s ranking in our ‘Most Similar Group’ (see 1.2.4 on page 2 of appendix A) has improved from 14th position in 2013-14 to 13th in 2014-15. The CSP was advised as follows.

3.4 Following the HMIC inspection into crime recording practices that was carried out in 2013 at the behest of the Kent Police & Crime Commissioner (PCC); Kent Police has the highest accuracy for recording crime nationally. HMIC carried out reviews of recording practices in other Forces between February and August 2014; and as other police forces adopt the same recording practices (now known as the ‘Kent Test’), it is likely that other areas will in turn see similar increases in their levels of recorded crime.

3.5 The anticipated crime figures are calculated from five years’ worth of recorded crime and are used to avoid target driven performance that focuses on only a previous year’s crime. Instead reducing risk and
harm are now the key drivers for performance, and this was the message disseminated to the public by Kent Police.

3.6 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>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Implications</td>
<td>None arising from this report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Assessment</td>
<td>Any reduction or withdrawal of service would have a negative impact on crime and disorder within the Borough.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Details of Exempt Information Category

Not applicable

7. Appendices

A - CSP Performance Report (May 2015)

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>15th May 2015</td>
<td>Kit Weller, Community Safety Officer</td>
<td>EARS</td>
<td>Strategic (ES)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
By: Kit Weller (Community Safety Officer, DBC)
To: Crime & Disorder (Overview and Scrutiny) Committee
Subject: Performance Report
Classification: Open
Summary: This report details performance relating to levels of crime and anti-social behaviour recorded in Dartford and Gravesham during the financial year 2014-15 and the boroughs’ positions when compared to other Kent Districts and areas within our ‘Most Similar Group’.

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


1.1 This report presents crime and anti-social behaviour (ASB) data recorded in the last financial year, 1 April 2014 to 31 March 2015. Data from 2013-14 was subject to review as part of HMIC’s audit of Kent Police’s crime recording practices, with changes made to recording methods as a result of this. In addition the Home Office altered several of the classifications for certain crime types, particularly violence offences. For these reasons comparisons are not made between 2013-14 and 2014-15 figures, however in future, data from 2014-15 could be used as a base line for future performance reports. This report provides data published by Kent Police for both victim-based crimes and crimes against society, and compares figures with the anticipated number of offences.

1.2 Overview – Total Crime

1.2.1 Members will see from the table on page 2 that Dartford has recorded a higher number of crimes than anticipated, while Gravesham has experienced less than anticipated. Dartford recorded 8,193 offences, 174 higher than anticipated; and Gravesham recorded 7,457 offences, 361 less than the anticipated figure. Across Kent there is no identifiable pattern, with all districts within several percent of their anticipated level. Canterbury exceeded their anticipated level by the largest amount (7.5%); while Shepway fell below their anticipated figure by 6.2%.

1.2.2 At the end of the last financial year Dartford’s rate of total crime per 1,000 population remained the second highest in Kent, with 82.8 offences per 1,000 population; whilst Gravesham saw the third highest rate with 72.5 offences per 1,000 population. These rates compare with a Kent-wide rate of 63.1 offences. However direct comparison between other Kent districts is not straightforward, and using the national ‘Most Similar Group’ (see 1.2.4) gives a better indication of performance against areas with similarities to Dartford & Gravesham.

1.2.3 In Dartford, it is a relatively even split between crime categories recording higher figures than anticipated and those recorded at less than the anticipated level. Worthy of note are figures for Burglary Dwelling, and Burglary Other Than Dwelling; 126 and 48 under anticipated level respectively. In Gravesham, the majority of crime types were recorded at a lower than anticipated level. Gravesham reported 23 less sexual offences than anticipated, and 23 less robberies. Burglary Dwelling and Burglaries Other Than Dwelling were recorded at 127 and 103
less than anticipated respectively. Both boroughs recorded lower than anticipated levels of Crimes Against Society (48 and 186 respectively).

### Total recorded crime – Kent
April 2014-March 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Total recorded crime</th>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Anticipated</th>
<th>No. change</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Per 1000 pop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashford</td>
<td></td>
<td>6602</td>
<td>6658</td>
<td>-56</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td></td>
<td>9223</td>
<td>8578</td>
<td>+645</td>
<td>+7.5</td>
<td>60.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dartford</td>
<td></td>
<td>8193</td>
<td>8019</td>
<td>+174</td>
<td>+2.2</td>
<td>82.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dover</td>
<td></td>
<td>6716</td>
<td>6414</td>
<td>+302</td>
<td>+4.7</td>
<td>60.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravesham</td>
<td></td>
<td>7457</td>
<td>7818</td>
<td>-361</td>
<td>-4.6</td>
<td>72.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maidstone</td>
<td></td>
<td>9431</td>
<td>9173</td>
<td>+258</td>
<td>+2.8</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medway</td>
<td></td>
<td>18754</td>
<td>17637</td>
<td>+1117</td>
<td>+6.3</td>
<td>69.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sevenoaks</td>
<td></td>
<td>5699</td>
<td>5782</td>
<td>-83</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepway</td>
<td></td>
<td>6177</td>
<td>6584</td>
<td>-407</td>
<td>-6.2</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swale</td>
<td></td>
<td>9830</td>
<td>9411</td>
<td>+419</td>
<td>+4.5</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thanet</td>
<td></td>
<td>11788</td>
<td>11963</td>
<td>-175</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>86.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonbridge &amp; Malling</td>
<td></td>
<td>5466</td>
<td>5646</td>
<td>-180</td>
<td>-3.2</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunbridge Wells</td>
<td></td>
<td>4951</td>
<td>5186</td>
<td>-235</td>
<td>-4.5</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td></td>
<td>110287</td>
<td>108869</td>
<td>+1418</td>
<td>+1.3</td>
<td>63.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.2.4 Comparisons with our Most Similar Group (MSG)

In respect of total crime, our CSP ranked in 13th position within our Most Similar Group (MSG) last year, leaving our rate of recorded crime per 1,000 population across our Partnership area higher than the MSG average. Our position has improved from 14th in 2013-14, however we are some way off our previous rankings of 6th in 2011-12, and 9th in 2012-13. Other forces have followed Kent in reviewing their recording practices, and this may result in future changes to the levels of crime they record. This could affect future MSG standings as other CSPs adopt the ‘Kent Test.’
1.3 Violent crime

1.3.1 Both Dartford and Gravesham recorded significantly higher levels of violent crime during 2014-15 than anticipated. In Dartford, there were 2,144 violent offences recorded - 289 offences higher than predicted; whilst in Gravesham 2,220 violent offences were recorded –137 greater than expected. It is important to note that this is not unique – every District in Kent and Medway also recorded higher (and in some cases significantly higher) levels than the anticipated rates. Per 1,000 population, Dartford and Gravesham have the third and fourth highest levels in Kent (21.7 and 21.6 offences respectively). When comparing rates across Kent Districts and Medway, the rate is 18.4 offences; an increase on the 2013-14 Kent rate of 16.8 offences.

1.3.2 The majority of violent offences fell under the violence against the person category. There were 1,925 offences of violence against the person in Dartford and 2,001 in Gravesham, accounting for 23% and 26% of all crime recorded in each area respectively. Whilst these proportions are significant it is important to remember that a minor assault, such as a push without injury, would still be recorded as violent crime and that ‘serious violent crime’ remains low in both areas.

1.4 Domestic abuse

1.4.1 As explained in 1.1, it is not possible to draw direct comparisons between offences recorded in the last financial year and the previous year. However, in 2014-15 there were 1,699 domestic abuse incidents recorded in Dartford and 2,083 incidents recorded in Gravesham. A considerable proportion of these incidents will also have been included within the offences recorded within the violent crime category.

1.4.2 There is positive news in that the percentage of repeat victims has been falling across the county, and reductions have been seen in both Dartford and Gravesham. In 2013-14, repeat victims accounted for 24.7% of domestic abuse victims in Dartford and 25.2% in Gravesham; with the county average at 25.0%. By March 2015 this had fallen to 23.4% in Dartford and 23.9% in Gravesend, with the county average at 23.6%. In actual terms, this means that there were 22 less repeat victims in Dartford, and 27 less in Gravesham. This may be as a result of Multi-
Agency Risk Assessment Conferences (MARAC) held by Police to support high-risk victims; and support offered to victims by Independent Domestic Violence Advisors (IDVA), which are part funded by the CSP.

1.5 Acquisitive crime

1.5.1 There were 293 burglary dwelling offences recorded in Dartford in 2014-15 and 493 offences recorded in Gravesham. Dartford’s figure was 126 offences less than the anticipated number whereas Gravesham’s was 127 offences below that expected. In terms of rates of offences per 1,000 households; Gravesham had the third highest rate of offences (10.7) in the county whilst Dartford’s rate of 7.3 offences per 1,000 households was in line with the Kent average of 7.4 offences.

1.5.2 There were a total of 808 vehicle crime offences recorded in Dartford last year which translates to 8.2 offences per 1,000 population. In Gravesham there were 751 vehicle crimes, and per 1,000 population this equates to 7.3 offences. In terms of offences per 1,000 population, these are the highest and second highest in Kent, with the Kent average rate being 5.2 offences per 1,000 population.

1.5.3 In respect of theft and handling offences, Dartford recorded 2,597 offences last year – 117 offences higher than anticipated – whilst Gravesham recorded 1,699 offences, 2 offences less than expected. As with previous years; it is essential to note that 47% of all theft and handling offences in Dartford fall within the category of shoplifting, and of the 1,230 shoplifting offences recorded, 581 or 47% of these offences took place in the Bluewater Complex. Shopliftings in Bluewater therefore account for 22% of Dartford’s Theft and Handling offences.

1.5.4 If the Bluewater offences are removed, the rate of shoplifting offences in Dartford drops to 6.6 offences per 1,000 population – this brings it close to the average rate in Kent of 6.2 offences. Gravesham’s rate of shoplifting offences per 1,000 population was below the County average at 5.0 offences. Both Borough CSUs work very closely with their respective Town Centre Crime Reduction Initiative Schemes (DTAC/G-Safe) and the sharing of intelligence, links with CCTV, and use of tools such as Exclusion Notices make a positive contribution towards reducing shoplifting. Local business security staff have also been placing greater emphasis on deterring would-be shoplifters rather than concentrating mainly on apprehending them once an offence has been committed and this too is proving effective.
### Recorded crime in Dartford and Gravesham
April 2014-March 2015 compared with anticipated levels and rates per 1,000 population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dartford</th>
<th></th>
<th>Gravesham</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volume</td>
<td>Anticipated</td>
<td>No. change</td>
<td>*Per 1000 pop/hsehlds</td>
<td>Volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim based crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Crime</td>
<td>7719</td>
<td>7497</td>
<td>+222</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>7015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Violence Against The Person</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>+274</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sexual Offences</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>+22</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Robbery</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary Dwelling</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>-127</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary Other than Dwelling</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>-48</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Crime</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>-116</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Theft Of Motor Vehicle</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>+35</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Theft From Motor Vehicle</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>-151</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Interference</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>+27</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft and Handling</td>
<td>2597</td>
<td>2480</td>
<td>+117</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>1699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Shoplifting</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>1094</td>
<td>+136</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Theft of Pedal cycle</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Other Theft</td>
<td>1284</td>
<td>1298</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>1106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Damage</td>
<td>1211</td>
<td>1110</td>
<td>+101</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>1183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crimes against society</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>-48</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Offences</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>-39</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession of weapons</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public order offences</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other crimes</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Crime</td>
<td>8193</td>
<td>8019</td>
<td>+174</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>7457</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Please note: for Burglary Dwelling offences rates are calculated per 1,000 households.
1.6 Crimes against society

1.6.1 Under the revisions to reporting rules in 2013, drug offences are recorded as a crime against society. In 2014-15, there were 168 drug offences recorded in Dartford and 139 offences recorded in Gravesham. In both cases these figures were lower than anticipated (by 39 and 110 respectively). Per 1,000 population, the county average was 1.7 drug offences. Dartford sits exactly at this figure, while in Gravesham the rate was 1.4 offences per 1,000 population. It is important to clarify that unlike burglaries or vehicle thefts, drug offences are not reported by a victim. A drug offence is generally only recorded as a result of proactive police work which leads to drugs being found; such as if a person is searched on the street, or a warrant is executed at a property.

1.7 Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB)

1.7.1 ASB definitions were not altered when the reporting rules were amended in 2013, therefore comparisons with 2014-15 figures are still able to be drawn. During April 2014-March 2015, there were 2,735 ASB incidents recorded in Dartford compared to 2,911 incidents the previous year, representing a decrease of 6%. Gravesham also recorded a small reduction of 5.4% from 3,720 to 3,520 offences during the same period. The Kent average for 2014-15 is a 3% reduction. The local reductions continue a downward trend and follow 1.6% and 3.4% reductions last year respectively. Whilst Ashford has seen a 23% reduction it is worth remembering that Dartford and Gravesham saw ASB drop by 17.2% and 21.3% respectively in 2012-13 period.

### ASB Incidents – April 2014-March 2015 compared to the previous year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Apr 2013-Mar 2014</th>
<th>Apr 2014-Mar 2015</th>
<th>% change</th>
<th>Per 1,000 population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashford</td>
<td>2375</td>
<td>1825</td>
<td>-23.2</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>4421</td>
<td>4448</td>
<td>+0.6</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dartford</strong></td>
<td><strong>2911</strong></td>
<td><strong>2735</strong></td>
<td><strong>-6</strong></td>
<td><strong>27.7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dover</td>
<td>3711</td>
<td>3587</td>
<td>-3.3</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gravesham</strong></td>
<td><strong>3720</strong></td>
<td><strong>3520</strong></td>
<td><strong>-5.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>34.2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maidstone</td>
<td>3752</td>
<td>3800</td>
<td>+1.3</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medway</td>
<td>9557</td>
<td>9327</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sevenoaks</td>
<td>2146</td>
<td>2066</td>
<td>-3.7</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepway</td>
<td>3471</td>
<td>3144</td>
<td>-9.4</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swale</td>
<td>4232</td>
<td>4096</td>
<td>-3.2</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thanet</td>
<td>5973</td>
<td>6082</td>
<td>+1.8</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonbridge &amp; Malling</td>
<td>2392</td>
<td>2596</td>
<td>+8.5</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunbridge Wells</td>
<td>2426</td>
<td>2335</td>
<td>-3.8</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kent</strong></td>
<td><strong>51087</strong></td>
<td><strong>49561</strong></td>
<td><strong>-3</strong></td>
<td><strong>28.3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.7.2 However, the table above demonstrates that the rate of ASB incidents per 1,000 population (27.7) in Dartford is lower than the county average; whereas Gravesham’s rate (34.2) is the third highest recorded county-wide.

Kit Weller
Dartford Community Safety Unit
15 May 2015
CRIME AND DISORDER (OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY)
COMMITTEE
22 July 2015

COMMUNITY SAFETY PLAN 2015-16

1. Summary
The Community Safety Plan 2015-16 is provided for Members’ consideration (Appendix A).

2. RECOMMENDATION
That the Committee considers the Community Safety Plan 2015-16 (Appendix A) and comments accordingly.

3. Background and Discussion
3.1 The Committee, at its meeting on 11 February 2015, considered the annual Strategic Assessment prepared by and for the Dartford and Gravesham Community Safety Partnership (CSP). The priorities identified, together with views expressed by partner agencies, residents and elected Members, were taken forward into this Community Safety Plan written for 2015-16, which was discussed and agreed by the CSP on 19 March 2015. The Plan guides the work of all CSP 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 Plan 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>
6. Details of Exempt Information Category

Not applicable

7. Appendices

Appendix A: Community Safety Plan 2015-2016
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DARTFORD AND GRAVEHAM COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP

COMMUNITY SAFETY PLAN 2015-2016

“Our goal is to make our boroughs safer and cleaner places to live, work and socialise”
FOREWORD BY THE PARTNERSHIP

The Dartford and Gravesham Community Safety Partnership (CSP) was formed in December 2006 following a merger between the two district CSPs. In the years since its inception this joint partnership has undertaken many successful projects that have helped to significantly reduce crime and disorder and successfully tackle anti-social behaviour across both Boroughs. These achievements have only been possible because of the excellent working relationship between the partner agencies which makes up the CSP, this includes: both Borough Councils, Kent Police, Kent Fire and Rescue Service, Kent County Council, Dartford, Gravesham and Swanley Clinical Commissioning Group, the cooperative arrangements in place with Kent’s Police and Crime Commissioner and now the new Kent Surrey and Sussex Community Rehabilitation Company which has been introduced to address offending by those who frequently reoffend and are given short term sentences.

Residents who live and work in our local communities frequently tell us that keeping our communities safe, tackling anti-social behaviour and ensuring that our neighbourhoods are clean are the things which they are most concerned about. This is why the Partnership has made a commitment to tackle these issues through local agencies, working with local communities, aiming to provide the best solutions to meet the needs of the communities we serve.

In the years since the joint Partnership was formed we have managed to achieve considerable reductions in both crime and anti-social behaviour. Of course, we continue to work hard for further reductions but it is becoming ever more challenging to achieve reductions year on year.

Our boroughs are changing: our populations are growing in both size and diversity, we are proud of our local communities for the tolerance and mutual respect that people show to one another and their cultures. Continuing to keep our neighbourhoods safe will also incorporate work to encourage greater cohesion and harmony amongst our different communities.

We recognise that even though the recession has seen reductions in public funding we must continue to strive for success. There is still a lot for us to do and a lot that we can do, finding new and creative ways of working together to maximise the resources available, remaining focussed and addressing those issues that really matter. 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 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, everyone shares a responsibility to play their part in keeping our neighbourhoods safe. We hope that, through the work that the CSP has planned over the next twelve months, we will continue to engage with local people and encourage them to work with us in promoting the wellbeing of both our Districts – together we can really make a difference.
INTRODUCTION

Dartford and Gravesham's Community Safety Partnership is made up of statutory agencies brought together under a shared responsibility placed upon them by the Crime and Disorder Act 1998. The act has been amended over the years since its introduction to include responsibilities to not only lower crime but to tackle anti-social behaviour and substance misuse issues that affects the quality of life for our communities and reduce the reoffending of those who frequently commit crime.

To help us to 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 decision-making by gathering together data from partner organisations along with other relevant and supportive information. This year the strategic assessment process has been affected by two main changes, firstly; the definitions of categories used to record crime introduced by the Home Office in 2013 has meant that direct comparisons with crime levels of previous years is no longer possible. And secondly; by significant changes in the way Kent Police records crime which were introduced following an inspection of recording practices by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabularies (HMIC).

Kent Police now has a very high ethical standard of recording crime; other police forces across the country are beginning to introduced the same or similar standards, an approach that has become known as the 'Kent Test', which affects the way we compare our performance against other areas with a similar demographic, a better way to gauge performance than comparing to other areas of Kent which are less similar. There has also a fundamental shift from an approach whereby performance management was measured primarily by meeting numerical targets to a victim-centred approach prioritising resources and activity according to the assessed levels of threat, harm and risk to the community. Crime is now measured against an anticipated level, estimated from previous years recorded crime rates, rather than trying to reduce the level recorded during the same month of the previous year.

So what does all this mean? Well, most districts in Kent have seen recorded crime levels that are higher than anticipated, and this is the case for Dartford. For the period covered by the strategic assessment, Dartford’s recorded crime figure was 8,318 offences – 300 offences higher than the anticipated total of 8,018. However, in Gravesham, the anticipated total crime figure for this period was 7,819 offences compared to the actual number recorded of 7,701 offences - 118 offences less.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Anticipated</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dartford</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim based crime</td>
<td>7795</td>
<td>7496</td>
<td>+299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crimes against society</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gravesham</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim based crime</td>
<td>7180</td>
<td>7190</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crimes against society</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>-108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This would suggest that in terms of overall crime there is a pattern of increase in Dartford and one of a small decrease in Gravesham.
Priorities for 2015-2016

Analysis of our 2014 Strategic Assessment identified that we need continue to focus on the same priorities that were identified during the assessment the year before so we are not proposing to alter our key priorities this time around.

- **Anti-social behaviour**
- **Violent crime including domestic abuse**
- **Substance misuse** (alcohol and drug-related crime and anti-social behaviour)
- **Property crime** (domestic burglary and theft offences)
- **Reducing re-offending**
- **Road Safety**

The Partnership 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 consultations. Doing so has shown 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.

Preventing Violent Extremism

For several years work at a local level has concentrated on delivery of the Government’s Prevent Strategy. Prevent is a key part of CONTEST, the Government’s counter-terrorism strategy that aims to respond to the ideological challenge of terrorism and those who promote it, prevent people from being drawn into terrorism and work with sectors and institutions where there are risks of radicalisation.

The CONTEST strategy is based around four key areas of work;

- **Pursue:** the investigation and disruption of terrorist attacks;
- **Prevent:** work to stop people becoming terrorists or supporting terrorism and extremism; (this is the key strand for local authorities)
- **Protect:** improving our protective security to stop a terrorist attack; and
- **Prepare:** working to minimise the impact of an attack and to recover from it as quickly as possible.

Work includes disrupting extremist speakers, removing material online and intervening to stop people being radicalised.

The UK national terrorist threat level is ‘severe’. The new Counter-Terrorism and Security Act 2015 responds to the increased threat and sits alongside pre-existing powers already used to combat terrorist threats.

The new legislation is highlighted in this plan as aspects of the Bill concern the role that statutory agencies will be expected to play in reducing the risks of terrorism and particularly of the potential radicalisation of vulnerable people. The Prevent programme relies on the cooperation of many organisations to be effective, organisations that are already actively engaged in this Community Safety Partnership.
Safeguarding & Child Sexual Exploitation

Safeguarding children - the action we take to promote the welfare of children and protect them from harm - is everyone's responsibility. It might be difficult to accept, but every child can be hurt, put at risk of harm or abused, regardless of their age, gender, religion or ethnicity.

Child sexual exploitation (CSE) has become a major policy priority in recent years following a number of high profile group-based CSE cases across England and a growing evidence base on both the nature and scale of the issue and required responses to it.

CSE is often a hidden crime. Young people usually have trust in their abuser and don't understand that they're being abused. They may depend on their abuser or be too scared to tell anyone what's happening. They may be tricked into believing they're in a loving, consensual relationship, be invited to parties and given drugs and alcohol. They may also be groomed online. Some children and young people are trafficked into or within the UK for the purpose of exploitation. Exploitation can also happen to young people in gangs.

The official definition is as follows;

Sexual exploitation of children and young people under 18 involves exploitative situations, contexts and relationships where young people (or a third person or persons) receive 'something' (e.g. food, accommodation, drugs, alcohol, cigarettes, affection, gifts, money) as a result of them performing, and/or another or others performing on them, sexual activities.

Child sexual exploitation can occur through the use of technology without the child's immediate recognition; for example being persuaded to post sexual images on the Internet/mobile phones without immediate payment or gain. In all cases, those exploiting the child/young person have power over them by virtue of their age, gender, intellect, physical strength and/or economic or other resources. Violence, coercion and intimidation are common, involvement in exploitative relationships being characterised in the main by the child or young person's limited availability of choice resulting from their social/economic and/or emotional vulnerability.

The exploitation of children is completely unacceptable, the only effective way to tackle CSE is through good multi-agency and partnership working. Dartford and Gravesham’s Community Safety Partnership will work closely with the Kent and Medway Safeguarding Children's Board, Local Children's Trusts, Kent Police and other partners to ensure that the safeguarding of young people is not overlooked, and that key actions are undertaken to identify and deal with perpetrators.
PARTNERSHIP STRUCTURES

The Partnership has been structured to ensure that the priorities in this Plan can be effectively delivered and that performance and progress is regularly monitored with appropriate checks and balances in place to keep work on track. As well as a joint overarching strategic group that brings together the statutory agency represented at the most senior level, the Partnership has a number of operational sub-groups that deliver projects on the ground.

Both the Strategic Group and the Support Group meet on a quarterly basis. Each of the subgroups has a Chair from the agency most appropriate to take the lead on that topic. The chairs attend the Support Group meetings and provide progress reports on projects that group is implementing.

The CSP Executive Group is made up of senior staff from both Local Authorities and Kent Police Area Commanders. This Group oversees the direction of the Partnership and on an annual basis, considers the findings of the Strategic Assessments to identify the priorities for the following year. These priorities are then recommended to the CSP for endorsement.
Community Safety Units (CSUs)

The Community Safety Units based are in the Civic Centres in each Borough, they are jointly staffed by both Kent Police and Council Officer and on a day-to-day basis monitor both the progress being made overall in tackling our key priorities while responding 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.

Community Safety Partnership Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Each of the Borough Councils operates a committee which is made up of elected Councillors, the committee ensures that the CSP is operating effectively and that partners are fulfilling their statutory obligations with regard to community safety and cooperating well.
### Priority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

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 we aim to do;

- Establish authorisations, policies and procedures as necessary to ensure that new powers under the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 can be readily utilised in appropriate cases;
- Extend joint working between the Troubled Families Programme’s Family Workers and relevant partner agencies to ensure that there is regular and effective information-sharing and monitoring of interventions;
- Consider the use of restorative justice practices in appropriate cases of environmental crime linked to ASB.

### 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>VIOLENT CRIME (DOMESTIC ABUSE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Reducing violent crime, repeat incidents of domestic abuse and support victims of violence.**

Protecting people's personal safety is a high priority and whilst there has been a very good reduction in serious violent crime over the years, there is further work to be done to ensure that people are safe both in their own homes and when out and about. Approximately 30% 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, this includes situations where children face or are being exploited.

**What we aim to do;**

- Violence occurring in town centres (in both evening and day-time economies) – targeting key perpetrator groups and locations;
- Violent crime that is alcohol-related (taking place in both domestic settings and in town centre environments) needs to continue to be prioritised;
- Continue as far as possible, funded projects e.g. IDVA, ISVA, Sanctuary Scheme;
- Review current One-Stop Shop services and any opportunities for extending provision;
- Continue referrals to and holding of MARACs;
- Continue to identify gaps in service and ways of closing them;
- Develop stronger links between the Troubled Families Programme’s Family Workers and specially trained DA staff.
- Ensure that there is appropriate awareness of child sexual exploitation (CSE) and that training is provided to key staff.

**Co-ordinating Group(s)**

Work undertaken for this priority will be split between the North Kent Domestic Abuse Forum and the Drugs and Alcohol Action Group (DAAG). Both groups are long standing and well established with very good chairman who have a good track record of successful work in these areas. Recently a local working group has been formed to identify key actions and ensure a co-ordinated approach to address CSE.
## Priority

**SUBSTANCE MISUSE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reducing drug and alcohol-related crime, violence against the person, anti-social behaviour and increase the number of people accessing treatment.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Substance misuse is inextricably tied up with crime and anti-social behaviour: there are well 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 from 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### What we aim to do;

- Raise awareness of the dangers of the use of so-called ‘Legal Highs’ and New Psycho-active Substances (NPS) and tackle their use in public spaces that causes anti-social behaviour;
- Extend joint working between the Troubled Families Programme’s Family Workers and local substance misuse service providers (CRI and KCA) to consider how referrals to these services can be increased;
- CSP partners to have an active role in the CRI-led project to improve multi-agency working in dealing with the needs of complex alcohol users currently resistant to accessing support and services through the Making Every Adult Matter project (to be piloted in Gravesham in 2015);
- Continue to deliver outreach work in those geographical locations where either drug and/or alcohol misuse is more prevalent;
- Assess whether there is the need for more tailored work to be completed to ensure that new migrant individuals and families settling in our areas are made aware of and have access to services.
- The DAAG will also facilitate the local delivery of the Kent Alcohol Strategy which aims to; Reduce alcohol-related deaths; reduce alcohol related disorder and violence; raise awareness of alcohol related harm; increase numbers referred into treatment.

### Co-ordinating Group(s)

Work will be co-ordinated by the CSP Drug and Alcohol Action Group (DAAG) which is a joint group covering Dartford and Gravesham. This Group is currently chaired by the Locality Manger for adult substance misuse service, CRI.
**Priority**

**ACQUISITIVE & PROPERTY CRIME**

---

**Reduce domestic burglary, shoplifting and other acquisitive crimes.**

The economic climate may be leading to an increase in crimes such as shoplifting. Both Dartford and Gravesham saw fewer burglaries than predicted in the year period leading up to the end of September 2014, this reduction was in line with an average fall seen across the County. 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 we aim to do;**

- Target work in key geographical locations to reduce repeat victimisation and provide support to vulnerable residents and businesses;
- Continue to maintain and extend close working and information-sharing between G-Safe, D-TAC, CCTV and Kent Police and the use of measures such as Exclusion Orders as appropriate;
- Dartford & Gravesham Community Safety Strategic Assessment 2014
- Carry out joint work with new Kent Police Rural Teams and KCC Wardens to increase provision of target hardening advice and raising public awareness in key locations as appropriate;
- Carry out targeted work in geographical locations in which BOTD offences are more prevalent;
- Establish any links between criminal damage offences (particularly repeat locations/offenders/victims) and ASB/other criminal behaviour and identify possible interventions;
- Identify and develop further seasonal partnership crime prevention initiatives and campaigns;
- Consider how the use of restorative justice can be increased in resolving certain property crime offences.

---

**Co-ordinating Group (s)**

Both town’s Business Crime Reduction Partnerships; Dartford Town Against Crime (DTAC ) Gravesham Shop Safe (GSAFE) are focused at reducing crime in both Town Centres. While there is no specific CSP Sub-which focuses on reducing domestic burglary and theft offences as this 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Road Safety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Improve the safety of young drivers and tackle road nuisance.**

Road safety is seen as a priority for action in each of Kent’s Districts and is part of the Kent County Community Safety Plan. 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, in fact the majority of those involved in accidents are not residents of either borough. Horses that stray onto the highway have been causing a serious risk to the public.

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 we aim to do:**

- Continue to identify local road safety ‘hot spots’ and work with partner agencies and local residents to address concerns (with a particular focus on areas immediately around schools);
- Continue to support Speed Watch Schemes and increase the number of volunteers as necessary;
- Support multi-agency initiatives aimed at promoting responsible driving behaviour and raising awareness of issues such as driving under the influence, speeding etc. through ‘pre-driver’ programmes and preventative work for new drivers.
- Work with landowners and a multi-agency group to seize horses which are fly-grazing.

**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.
Reducing re-offending is priority that sits within all of the partnerships priorities.

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 we aim to do;

- Support the CRI-led initiative to improve multi-agency working in dealing with the needs of complex alcohol users often involved in repeat offending (both criminal activity and ASB) currently resistant to accessing support and services through the Making Every Adult Matter project;
- Continue to address high levels of repeat offending occurring in respect of certain crime categories e.g. domestic abuse;
- Continue to gather further information to better understand factors influencing offending behaviour and to identify practical interventions and support that can help prevent re-offending;
- Consider how CSP partner agencies can further contribute to work being delivered through the Troubled Families Programme to further reduce levels of re-offending;
- Work with the Kent, Surrey and Sussex Community Rehabilitation Company (CRC) to reduce the offending of prolific offenders through the Integrated Offender Management (IOM) process in partnership with Kent Police.

Co-ordinating Group(s)

Work in this area is co-ordinated by the CSP Reducing Re-offending Sub-Group which is chaired by Kent, Surrey & Sussex Community Rehabilitation Company.
## CONTACTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
<th>Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dartford Borough Council Community Safety Unit</td>
<td>Civic Centre, Home Gardens, Dartford, Kent DA1 1DR</td>
<td>Tel. 01322 343434</td>
<td><a href="http://www.safedartford.gov.uk">www.safedartford.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravesham Borough Council Community Safety Unit</td>
<td>Windmill Street, Gravesend, Kent DA12 1AU</td>
<td>Tel. 01474 337000</td>
<td><a href="http://www.gravesham.gov.uk">www.gravesham.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent County Council Community Safety Unit</td>
<td>Invicta House, Maidstone, Kent ME14 1XX</td>
<td>Tel. 08458 247247</td>
<td><a href="http://www.kent.gov.uk">www.kent.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent Fire and Rescue Service</td>
<td>The Godlands, Straw Mill Hill, Maidstone, Kent ME15 6XB</td>
<td>Tel. 01622 692121</td>
<td><a href="http://www.kent.fire-uk.org">www.kent.fire-uk.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent Police</td>
<td>Thames Way, Northfleet, Gravesend, Kent DA11 8BD</td>
<td>Tel. 01474 369055</td>
<td><a href="http://www.kent.police.uk">www.kent.police.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent, Surrey &amp; Sussex Community Rehabilitation Company</td>
<td>Joynes House, New Road, Gravesend, Kent DA11 0AT</td>
<td>Tel. 01474 569546</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ksscrc.co.uk">www.ksscrc.co.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHS Dartford, Gravesham &amp; Swanley Clinical Commissioning Group</td>
<td>2nd Floor, Gravesham Civic Centre, Windmill Street, Gravesend, Kent DA12 1AU</td>
<td>Tel. 03000 424903</td>
<td><a href="http://www.dartfordgraveshamswanleyccg.nhs.uk">www.dartfordgraveshamswanleyccg.nhs.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent Police and Crime Commissioner</td>
<td>1st Floor, Gail House, Lower Stone Street, Maidstone, Kent ME15 6NB</td>
<td>Tel. 01622 677055</td>
<td><a href="http://www.kent-pcc.gov.uk">www.kent-pcc.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Abuse Hotline</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tel. 0808 2000247</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent Hate Incident Line</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tel. 0800 3289162</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Terrorism Hotline</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tel. 0800 789321</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Calling 101 for situations that do not require an immediate police response helps keep 999 available for when there is an emergency. An emergency is when a crime is happening, someone suspected of a crime is nearby, someone is injured, being threatened or a life is at risk, or there is a traffic incident involving personal injury or danger.

You should only call 999 when a crime is in progress or life is in danger.

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 Crime Stoppers 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.
WORK PROGRAMME: 2014-15 MUNICIPAL YEAR and BEYOND

1. Summary

1.1 To agree the contents of a rolling Work Programme for the 2015-16 municipal year and beyond.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 That the draft rolling Work Programme attached at Appendix A be approved subject to any amendments/additions Members may wish to make with the guidance of the Strategic Director (ES).

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 2014-15 municipal cycle the Committee:

- Received a presentation from the Dartford, Gravesham and Swanley Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) on its contribution to the aims of the Dartford & Gravesham Community Safety Partnership (CSP);
- Were updated on the meetings of the Kent and Medway Police and Crime Panel (PCP) from Dartford’s representative on the Panel, Cllr. Tony Martin and invited the Deputy Leader to attend the Committee on a regular basis as Dartford’s PCP rep.;
- Renewed their invitations to Lead Members Councillor Mrs Ann Allen MBE and Councillor Dave Hammock, to attend the Committee’s proceedings given their respective portfolios for Community & Taxpayer Involvement and Licencing and Enforcement;
- Received a joint presentation on ‘Policing in Kent’ from Paul Brandon, Deputy Chief Constable, Kent Police and Mark Stepney, Chief of Staff, Kent Police & Crime Commissioner’s Office.

3.3 In addition, and on a statutory basis; the Committee reviewed the Dartford and Gravesham Community Safety Partnership (CSP) Community Safety Plan for 2014-15, received a mid-term Performance Progress Report on the CSP’s operations during the 2014-15 cycle and reviewed the Partnership’s Strategic Assessment (SA) 2014 document, used to inform the CSP’s subsequent Action Plan for 2014-15.
3.4 A revised rolling Work Programme for the 2015-16 municipal cycle and beyond (reflecting the work already undertaken by the Committee during 2014-15) is attached at Appendix A for discussion and approval. Members and Officers may have further topics they wish to suggest for possible consideration by the Committee.

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 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 Council Meeting held on 27 May 2015 (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 2015-16 and beyond;
Appendix B: Terms of Reference (ToRs – 27 May 2015).
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CRIME and DISORDER (Overview & Scrutiny) COMMITTEE

ROLLING WORK PROGRAMME 2015-16 and Beyond

Detail:

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

Plus:
- To note the Minutes of the Kent and Medway Police and Crime Panel (PCP) and receive updates from the Council’s Panel representative.
- 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 intermediary Performance Report;
- Consider the CSP’s annual Community Safety Plan document.

The Work Programme, as set out in the Work Plan, is subject to review at each meeting of the Committee. Discretionary items may be rescheduled and/or new items added, in accordance with the Committee’s wishes and the guidance of the Strategic Director (External Services).
Draft Work Plan 2015–16 and Beyond

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Work Plan Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2015 (July)</td>
<td>Community Safety Plan 2015-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kent Police and Crime Panel (PCP) Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2016 (February)</td>
<td>Strategic Assessment 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kent Police and Crime Panel (PCP) Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2016 (July)</td>
<td>Community Safety Plan 2016-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kent Police and Crime Panel (PCP) Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2017 (February)</td>
<td>Strategic Assessment 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kent Police and Crime Panel (PCP) Update</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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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 S Sandhu MBE
Membership: Councillors S R Jarnell, M B Kelly, R Lees, C S McLean, M A Maddison and D J Mote.

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

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.
1. Summary

To consider a report of the work carried out by the Crime and Disorder (Overview and Scrutiny) Committee during the preceding 2014/15 municipal year.

2. RECOMMENDATION

That, subject to any amendments proposed by Members, the Committee’s Annual Report for 2014/15 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 [Appendix B] the draft Crime and Disorder (O&S) Committee Annual Report 2014/15 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 2014/15;
Appendix B: Crime and Disorder (O&S) Protocol [June 2015];
CRIME AND DISORDER (OVERVIEW and SCRUTINY)
COMMITTEE
22 July 2015

Appendix C: Terms of Reference (ToRs) (27 May 2015);

Appendix D: Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with Dartford & Gravesham Community Safety Partnership (CSP) [June 2015]

BACKGROUND PAPERS
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CRIME AND DISORDER (OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY) COMMITTEE

Draft Annual Report 2014-15
Introduction and Background

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

The Council appointed the Crime and Disorder (Overview & Scrutiny) Committee in October 2009 under the provisions of the Police and Justice Act 2006 and the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 and in direct response to the provisions of the subsequent Crime and Disorder (Overview and Scrutiny) Regulations 2009.

The 2006 and 2007 Acts and the 2009 Regulations granted the Council the power to scrutinise both crime and disorder matters and hold the Dartford and Gravesham Community Safety Partnership (the CSP) and other partner organisations to account for their performance, including their work with the Council to meet specific local targets, as set out in detail in the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the Council and the CSP (attached at Appendix D).

The Crime and Disorder Committee’s Protocol (attached at Appendix B) requires it to review and scrutinise, and make reports and recommendations, regarding the functioning of the responsible authorities listed below which comprise the Dartford and Gravesham CSP:

Dartford Borough Council

Gravesham Borough Council

Kent County Council

Kent Police

Kent Fire and Rescue Service

Kent Surrey and Sussex Community Rehabilitation Company

Dartford, Gravesham and Swanley Clinical Commissioning Group

Work carried out by the Crime & Disorder Committee compliments the work of the Scrutiny and Policy Overview Committees, whose remits are set out in their respective Protocols.

The Committee’s Protocol requires it to report to the Council annually on the work it has undertaken in the preceding municipal year. This Annual Report provides a summary of the Committee’s work during the 2014/15 Municipal Year drawn from the comprehensive Minutes of individual meetings as published in full on the Council’s website.
**Annual Report for 2013-14**

On **23 July 2014** at the first meeting in the ensuing 2014-15 municipal cycle the Committee noted the contents of the *draft* Crime and Disorder (O&S) Annual Report for the preceding **2013-14** municipal year and agreed to submit the document to the next meeting of the General Assembly of the Council for adoption as submitted.

**Regular Attendees**

The Committee renewed their invitation to Councillor Mrs Ann Allen, Lead Member for Community and Taxpayer Involvement and Councillor David Hammock, Lead Member for Licensing and Enforcement to continue to attend Crime & Disorder meetings given their respective portfolio responsibilities.

Members also renewed their invitation to the Deputy Leader, in his role as the Council’s representative on the Kent Police and Crime Panel (PCP), to continue to attend the Committee’s meetings and provide updates on the Panel's principal activities and ongoing relationship with Kent’s Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC).

Standing invitations were also renewed to the Strategic Director (ES), Dartford’s District Commander (Kent Police) and all Dartford CSU staff (Council and Police) to attend the Committee’s meetings as and when required and their principle duties permitted.

**WORK PROGRAMME REVIEW**

The Committee met twice during the **2014-15** municipal cycle on **23 July 2014** and **11 February 2015** receiving reports on individual WP items, updates on the work of the Kent and Medway Police and Crime Panel (PCP), noted the contents of any extant Regulation 9 Notice [formerly the Forward Plan] and confirmed the Minutes of the previous meeting on each occasion.

On **23 July 2014** in accordance with its Protocol, the Committee agreed the contents of the rolling Work Programme (WP) for the ensuing **2014-15** municipal year and beyond as set out in the table below:

**Rolling Work Plan 2014-15 (and Beyond)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Work Plan Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2014 (July)</td>
<td>CSP Community Safety and Action Plan 2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dartford, Gravesham and Swanley Clinical Commissioning Group (DGS CCG): Contribution to the Aims of the CSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PCP Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree Work Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Board Item Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2016 (February)</td>
<td>CSP Strategic Assessment 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2016 (July)</td>
<td>CSP Community Safety and Action Plan 2016-17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Committee agreed that the Work Plan set out above would be reviewed at subsequent meetings, to enable existing items to be rescheduled if necessary and discretionary items added or removed. Details of completed Work Plan items in the **2014-15** municipal cycle under review are set out below.

**WORK PLAN ITEMS COMPLETED in 2014-15**

**23 July 2014**

**ITEM 1: DARTFORD, GRAVESHAM AND SWANLEY CLINICAL COMMISSIONING GROUP (CCG): CONTRIBUTION TO THE AIMS OF THE DARTFORD & GRAVESHAM COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP (CSP)**

The Committee received a presentation from the CCG’s Chief Operating Officer, Mrs Debbie Stock, outlining the Group’s contribution to the aims of the CSP.

Members were informed of the CCG’s structure and that it worked in partnership with the Public Health Directorate of Kent County Council (KCC) to commission health services in Dartford, Gravesham and Swanley. The
principal role of the CCG, in consultation with GPs across the Group area, was to identify issues and services that were not working effectively and to commission further resources as required, to meet perceived patient need. Securing financial savings in the commissioning of those services was vital in the continuing climate of budgetary constraint.

Members received a PowerPoint presentation that outlined the CCG’s vision to:

- Reduce health inequalities and prevent ill health;
- Deliver high quality and safe care including primary care;
- Commission comprehensive Healthcare focused around patient care and experience - ‘right care, right place, right time, right outcome’;
- Drive efficiency and value for money (VfM), without reducing care quality;
- Ensure effective engagement with patients, carers and the wider population;
- Lead continued innovation, research, education & training to stay ahead of the field and successfully plan for the future;
- Maintain organisational health, robust governance and continued good reputation.

The presentation explained how the CCG worked in partnership with Health and Wellbeing Boards in the area to tackle the key CSP priority areas of Domestic Abuse, Substance Misuse and Mental health issues. Details included:-

**Domestic abuse**

- The CCG had undertaken work with Healthy Young Minds (KCC service), CAMHS, KMPT and Public Health Kent to improve the emotional wellbeing of victims, especially children, to ensure health practitioners knew how to spot the signs of domestic abuse;
- Domestic abuse had been under reported historically, but reporting had increased in Dartford which was considered to be positive. Where cases of domestic abuse resulted in significant physical and health impacts for the victims the necessary resources were commissioned by the KCC Public Health team.

**Substance misuse**

- The CCG continued to work closely with KCC Public Health and drug and alcohol teams to address drug and alcohol abuse;
- Linked with Public Health to look at alcohol pathways and improving referrals to treatment (Integrated Care Pathway processes both from the acute hospital and in the community);
- Supported integrated primary care teams working to identify and support patients with problems and ensuring appropriate referral mechanisms;
- Reviewed data at GP practice level to help support the targeting of interventions.
Mental health

- The CCG held the core commissioning responsibility to improve access to mental health services for both adults and children to ensure effective early prevention treatment was provided;
- Supported emotional resilience and wellbeing programmes in the community in conjunction with Public Health, KCC;
- Developed the Personality Disorder peer support group – enabling sufferers to share issues and concerns and receive support from others who had experienced similar situations and help build confidence and social skills;
- Worked with KCC on developing and implementing an all age pathway for people with autism and ADHD;
- Helped to increase access to psychological therapy support;
- Commissioned ‘Early Intervention’ workers to support young people with psychosis and their families to access the right support;
- Commissioned the ‘Porchlight’ service to provide individually tailored support to individuals with mental health needs to access community resources and reduce social isolation.

The Chief Operating Officer concluded her presentation to Members with a summary of the roles of the key health service providers:

- Public Health (KCC): key commissioner of preventative services to achieve a positive impact on the Community Safety Plan;
- NHS England: responsible for commissioning health and preventative services within prisons;
- CCG(s): commissioning of Mental health services to support people with a wide level of mental health needs;
- DGS Health and Wellbeing Board: vehicle for improving joint working between agencies in Kent.

Members also received a presentation from the Acting Director of Public Health KCC, Mr Andrew Scott-Clark, on the contribution of his Directorate to CSP aims.

The Committee were informed that under the provisions of the Health and Social Care Act 1977, Kent County Council had been allocated the entire health budget for Kent amounting to £49.9M in the 2014-15 Financial Year. Previously Primary Care Trusts (PCTs) had commissioned single services from the KCC Communities Directorate, but under new arrangements all drug and alcohol interventions throughout Kent were now commissioned through the Kent Drugs and Alcohol Action Team (KDAAT).

The KDAAT contract had been inherited from the NHS and was separate to KCC’s Public Health Directorate provision and that of Kent’s CCGs. However, it remained the case that KCC Public Health, KDAAT and Kent CCGs had to compete for their finances from a single budget provision for Kent as a whole [£49.9M in 2014-15]. The impact alcohol and substance misuse had on public health was acknowledged by KCC Public Health and Kent CCGs, who now worked together with KDAAT in a new co-ordinated strategy tailored to the aims of the CSP as a whole, linked to local Health and Wellbeing Boards.
through a shared plan. In the longer term, the aim was to pursue a strategy of prevention [of alcohol and drug misuse] through Kent Police and the schools system – “getting the right work done at the right time in the right place”.

The Chief Operating Officer and the Acting Director further advised the Committee in response to subsequent specific questions from Members that:

- A co-ordinated intervention by Public Health and partner agencies was required to address the rise in hospital admissions being recorded for the historical problem of liver damage caused by alcohol abuse;
- Public Health needed to do more to re-enforce the message and highlight the dangers to the public of excessive drinking;
- Local Authorities needed to continue to review licences and intercede with landlords and club owners when concerns were raised by the public over excessive drinking and/or anti-social behaviour;
- Low alcohol pricing by supermarkets and other retail outlets was acknowledged as a ‘driver’ of increased home consumption and ‘pre-loading’ prior to joining the night-time economy, but the pricing of alcohol was the remit of central Government;
- Local commissioning of services by CCGs was an important step to addressing these and other health issues, with GP Boards adopting a clinical approach based on patient need;
- The major change in commissioning patient health services from a hospital to a community based CCG operation would continue to be challenging, given the need to integrate the requirements of CCGs, KCC Public Health and Wellbeing Boards.

The Committee were further advised by the Acting Director that, in previous years, PCTs had been responsible for commissioning all health services in Kent, employing a national template to try to address all local needs. The change to commissioning by a variety of health bodies including NHS England, Local Authority Public Health, CCGs and Wellbeing Boards was complex and required the separate bodies to follow an integrated agenda with both dedicated central and tertiary health pathways, clear commissioning to maximise resources and avoid overlap to obtain maximum outcomes. Members were advised by the Strategic Director (External Services) that the Health Profile for Dartford (in common with several other areas in Kent) had highlighted violent crime as a continued cause for concern. The success of the Community Safety Partnership (CSP) and the Dartford Community Safety Unit (CSU) demonstrated the benefits of co-located multi-agency working.

Similar integration of health providers, would, in time, derive similar advantages and benefits and enable health agencies to work in a more co-ordinated and structured fashion; including more effective links with the CSU, Kent Police and the Council’s Housing team, in a holistic approach to meeting patient need in frequently inter-related areas. The role of Health and Wellbeing Boards and their sub-groups in the effective integration of health service provision would grow, with Boards providing important linking mechanisms to address all the needs of patients and victims of crime, many of whom required assistance in frequently inter-related areas of health provision.
The Committee received an address from Councillor Mrs Ann Allen, in her role as a Dartford representative on the Dartford and Gravesham and Swanley Health and Wellbeing Board. Members were advised of the progress that had been made by the Board in conjunction with KCC, the Children’s Board and the Children’s Operating Board in terms of partnership working. Useful work had also been undertaken in schools with Head Teachers through the ‘Freedom Programme’ for kids, with a particular area of work having been undertaken with young boys who had verbally or physically abused their mothers. The Dementia Society had also been successful in addressing the community transport needs of their members in co-operation with the Go-Ahead bus company and the Youth Council had assisted in the training of children who had to cope with dementia sufferers in their families.

The Committee expressed their thanks to the Chief Operating Officer, the Acting Director for Public Health, Councillor Allen and Officers for their attendance and contribution to the proceedings that evening.

**ITEM 2: KENT POLICE AND CRIME PANEL (PCP) - UPDATE**

The Committee received a second update on the activities of the Kent Police and Crime Panel (PCP) from Dartford’s representative on the Panel. Members were advised that the PCP had met twice in the intervening period on 28 May and 5 June 2014, since the Committee were last updated in February that year.

On 28 May 2014 the PCP had considered a report on the recording of crime in Kent, requested by the Panel following the decision by the Police and Crime Commissioner earlier in 2013, that Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) undertakes an audit of how crime was recorded by Kent Police. The HMIC audit had revealed that only 90% of reported crime in Kent was accurately recorded and deemed the inspection outcome ‘Unsatisfactory’. Accuracy levels for Kent Police had risen to 97% (June 2014) and compared favourably with other Forces subsequently inspected by HMIC in England and Wales who only averaged 80% accuracy for recorded crime.

On 5 June 2014 the PCP had met the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) to discuss the airing of the controversial Channel 4 (C4) documentary - ‘Meet the Police Commissioner’. The Panel felt that the C4 documentary had reflected poorly on the PCC and her judgement and may by extension have damaged the reputation of Kent Police. The Panel had, as a consequence, sought, and accepted, an explanation from the PCC concerning her decision to participate in the documentary.

Following the broadcasting of the C4 documentary on 29 May 2014 the Panel had asked the PCC to reconsider her Communications Protocol and requested that she bring a revised document to the Panel’s next meeting in July 2014 meeting for discussion and subsequent approval by PCP Members.

The Deputy Leader was thanked by the Committee for his further update on PCP matters and it was agreed that PCP Minutes would be included within the Crime & Disorder Committee’s agenda papers in future, to provide background and context to verbal updates from the Council’s representative on the PCP.
ITEM 3: PERFORMANCE

The Committee considered the Performance Report (PR) presented to the Dartford and Gravesham Community Safety Partnership (CSP) on 26 June 2014.

The PR had detailed performance in relation to levels of crime and anti-social behaviour (ASB) recorded separately in the Boroughs of Dartford and Gravesham during the financial year 1 April 2013 to 31 March 2014. The Committee were advised by the Community Safety Officer (CSO) that the rise in crime statistics recorded across most categories in the PR should be viewed in the context of the major changes that had taken place since 2013 in the methodology for recording crime and monitoring performance. The changes in crime recording, which impacted directly on performance assessment, had been instituted following the 2013 inspection of Kent Police by Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC). The inspection had been requested by Kent’s Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC), who had expressed concerns over the accuracy of crime recording by Kent Police.

Following the HMIC inspection in 2013 Kent Police now recorded all crime under two distinct categories:

(i) ‘Victim-based crime’ - e.g. assault; and
(ii) ‘Crimes against society’ - e.g. arrest for the possession of drugs.

The total of the two new categories for crime recording in Kent were then compared against an anticipated crime rate, created from statistics for total recorded crime in the County over the preceding five year period. The 5 year comparison exercise had established a performance trend that would be used to establish a base-line going forward for future annual performance comparator exercises. Prior to 2013 performance monitoring had been based on a comparator exercise based on recorded crimes committed in consecutive 12 month periods. This had led Kent Police to adopt a ‘target driven’ culture to combat crime, which had now been replaced by the new focus on lowering ‘risk and harm’ to the public, rather than chasing numerical performance targets.

The Committee were informed that following the HMIC inspection in 2013, the accuracy of crime recording by Kent Police had risen from 90% to 96%. Both ratings compared favourably with those of other Forces subsequently inspected by HMIC, which had revealed accuracy levels for recording crime as low as 60% with an average figure between 70-75%. All Forces in England would have to adjust their future recording of crime in the same way as Kent had done, a process now known as the ‘Kent Test’.

Members were asked to note that the new crime recording categories imposed by HMIC on Kent Police had yet to be rolled-out across all Forces listed in our Most Similar Group (MSG) – CSP’s with a similar demographic to the joint Dartford & Gravesham CSP. As a consequence, Dartford & Gravesham’s recorded position within the MSG table was not truly representative. It was confirmed that the recording of crime in Bluewater for
both theft from retail outlets and vehicle crime was reported separately from the figures for Dartford.

Members were advised of a further important factor to be taken into account regarding the increase in recorded crime in the PR. Following the HMIC inspection of the Kent Force in 2013, some two thousand (2,000) historic reports (mainly of domestic abuse) had been added to the 2012-13 recorded crime figures on a retrospective basis. This had inevitably led to an increase in recorded crime in the 2013-14 PR, in addition to skewing the actual ‘in-year’ figures. Positive outcomes recorded in the PR included a fall in repeat incidents of domestic violence (DV), allied to increased victim reporting of domestic abuse. The latter development was seen as a positive indicator of victim confidence in the Police and other Agencies dealing with domestic abuse.

The Strategic Director (ES) advised Members that the CSP might never reach a stable base-line for the calculation of recorded crime given the likelihood of further changes in crime categories by the Home Office in the future.

What was important was to make the best use of available data and statistics and to contextualise that information in the Most Similar Group (MSG) comparator exercise. The Committee resolved to note the contents of the Performance Report.

**ITEM 4: COMMUNITY SAFETY PLAN 2014-15**

The Committee received a briefing from the Community Safety Officer (CSO) on the Dartford & Gravesham Community Safety Partnership’s Community Safety Plan 2014-15.

Members were advised that the key priorities identified in the 2014-15 Community Safety Plan were the same as those identified in the 2013-14 Plan considered by the Committee on 12 February 2014 as part of the CSP’s annual Strategic Assessment document. The key priorities for 2014-15 were confirmed as combating:

- Anti-social behaviour (ASB)
- Violent Crime including domestic abuse (DA)
- Substance misuse (alcohol and drug-related crime and ASB)
- Property crime (domestic burglary and theft)
- Reducing re-offending
- Road Safety

The Committee was advised that whilst the 2014-15 Plan retained the same priorities as identified in the 2013-14 document, new Sub-Groups had been established with revised action plans for each priority area. The Violent Crime Groups had been disbanded and their work re-distributed between the Domestic Abuse Forum (DAF) and the Drugs and Alcohol Action Group (DAAG). Detailed work undertaken by DAF in the period under review had included new prevention injunction mechanisms; including ‘Claire’s Law’ which enabled people to see if their new partners had a prior history of domestic abuse. The enhancement of multi-agency co-operation through 1-
Stop-Shops to address Domestic Abuse and a programme to support children who had witnessed DA had been other areas of important activity.

The work of the Drugs and Alcohol Action Group (DAAG) (Substance Misuse Group) had included looking at ways to combat the increased use of ‘legal highs’ such as nitrous oxide inhalation and addressing alcohol related violence. Combating property crime had been pursued by supporting the efforts of the Business Crime Reduction Partnership, Dartford Town against Crime (DTAC).

Kent Probation had been split to form a National Probation Service (responsible for ‘high risk’ offenders) and a number of area based Community Rehabilitation Companies (CRCs) responsible for all other categories of offender. Work with local CRCs had been undertaken by the Reducing Reoffending Group (RRG) to establish better ways to address issues caused by repeat offenders who had served sentences of 12 months or less - a group which frequently committed high numbers of offences over their criminal lifetimes. Other Interventions undertaken aimed at reducing re-offending had included voluntary tagging under the ‘Operation Buddy’ scheme. The Buddy scheme provided boundaries for offenders who, by being tagged, were given an ‘excuse’ to avoid their peers who might otherwise have involved the Scheme participants in further criminal activity.

The Scheme also enabled the Police to save valuable time and resources by checking the whereabouts of tagged offenders at all times via GPS tracking. This enabled the Police to discount tagged offenders from their enquiries of new crimes at an early stage, rather than automatically seeking out past offenders when a new crime fitted their profile.

The Road Safety Group had worked to improve road safety measures and Dartford had benefited from a drop in the number of those killed or seriously injured (KSI). It was again noted in this context that Dartford’s proximity to the major arterial routes of the A2 and M25 meant that 75% of those involved in KSIs in the Dartford area were non-residents and not truly representative of the Borough’s drivers.

The Committee resolved to note the contents of the CSP’s Community Safety Plan for 2014-15 and thanked the CSO for his presentation.

11 February 2015

Item 1: Presentation – ‘Joint Vision for Policing in Kent’
Members received a joint presentation from Mr Mark Stepney Chief of Staff in the Police and Crime Commissioner’s Office and Paul Brandon, Deputy Chief Constable, Kent Police.

The PCC’s Chief of Staff (CoS) began the joint presentation to Members with a summary of the Commissioner’s role and responsibilities Mrs Barnes’ principal responsibilities as PCC for Kent and Medway were to:

- Determining the Strategic Direction for Kent Police;
- Set the Police Budget;
- Consult with the Public to give a single voice on Policing issues;
- Hiring [and firing] the Chief Constable;
- Holding the Chief Constable to account;
- Working with key partners e.g. Kent’s Police and Crime Panel (PCP).

Members were informed that the strategic direction taken by Kent Police was dictated by the 7 key elements contained within the County’s Police and Crime Plan which, for Kent, were to:

- 1: Cut crime and catch criminals;
- 2: Protect the public from serious harm;
- 3: Prevent crime, anti-social behaviour (ASB) and reduce repeat victimisation and offending;
- 4: Ensure visible community policing was at the heart of Kent policing;
- 5: Putting victims and witnesses at the heart of the Police process;
- 6: Deliver value for money (VfM);
- 7: Meet national commitments for policing.

A Police and Crime Plan was a statutory requirement for all Forces and covered a 4 year financial cycle, refreshed on an annual basis. The current 4 year Plan for Kent Police had been drawn up by the Commissioner in consultation with the present Chief Constable, Alan Pughsley.

The Committee were advised by the Chief of Staff that that the PCC and the CC shared a joint vision for policing in Kent based on the treatment of victims and the safeguarding of witnesses within a responsive and caring policing regime. The PCC’s Engagement Strategy with the public ensured that public concerns were addressed and where appropriate prioritised within the Plan. Holding the Chief Constable to account was a statutory obligation of the PCC and was achieved through 1 to 1 sessions between the Commissioner and the Chief Constable and a mixture of formal and informal forums with partner agencies and the public. Setting the current Kent Police budget in the continuing climate of fiscal restraint had been challenging. Savings of £46M had been required during the lifetime of the current [4 year] Plan and had been achieved primarily through a reduction of some 400 officers and civil support staff. The last Plan refresh exercise completed in February 2015 and approved by Kent’s Police and Crime Panel (PCP), had agreed additional funding of £1.6M to preserve 30 (thirty) permanent Police Officer posts. New fiscal measures had also been agreed with the PCP to further engage with Youth and to help prevent child sexual exploitation. In terms of meeting present day national commitments for policing; Kent Police led the way for the accurate recording of reported crime; following an inspection of the Force by Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) in 2013. Kent Police now achieved an accuracy rate in terms of recording reported crimes of between 96-97%. This compared very favourably with other Forces in England and Wales subsequently inspected by HMIC, who now required all Forces in England and Wales to pass the ‘Kent Test’ and achieve crime recording levels of at least 90%.

Members were advised that the vision for future policing in Kent was based on the District policing model, which was held together by a ‘golden thread’ of victim support and witness protection. The District model enabled Kent to be an effective Police Force that valued quality of delivery, humanity and cultural
diversity and to face and rectify mistakes when made. The District model worked well in terms of meeting public expectation and was endorsed by Councils at all levels throughout Kent. However, the District model faced significant challenges in the next 4 year fiscal cycle, given the need for a further £60M in projected cuts to the existing Kent Police operation. The £46M of savings already secured by Kent Police had been achieved through significant cuts to front-line staff; augmented by further savings achieved through the sharing of back-room operations for HR, Finance and IT with Essex Police.

The projected additional savings required of £60M [over the next 4 year cycle] equated to 60% of the current Kent police budget and would pose significant challenges for the existing District policing model at both the local and national level. Despite advances in technology such as body cameras and virtual courts [conducted by video link] allied to other shared back-office functions with Essex Police; staffing costs continued to account for 80% of Kent’s police budget. Given the increased scale of additional savings required in the next 4 year cycle, partnership working between Police Forces and Agencies e.g. Fire and Rescue, Probation and Public Health Services, would become increasingly important and necessary.

Members received a second presentation from the Deputy Chief Constable (DCC) Paul Brandon. He advised Members that Kent had an excellent Force which held a good record in relation to inspections and was intelligence led, characteristics which were vital to meet the unique geographical challenges Kent faced as the U.K.’s gateway to Europe. North Kent’s proximity to the Metropolitan area posed further challenges for Kent Police from the influx of cross-border crime from London and Essex, facilitated by the major arterial routes of the M25 and the A2. Recent infrastructure developments in Kent, including the London Paramount project in the Swanscombe Peninsular of Dartford would also present fresh challenges for Kent Police. Combating Child Exploitation was another increasing area of current work across the County, particularly in East Kent. Improved technology e.g. body worn cameras and tablets allowed Officers to remain in the field longer and submit reports remotely. Collaboration with Essex Police continued to strengthen through combined intelligence and joint operations and the sharing of back-room functions for HR, IT and Finance. Members of the public and offenders with mental health issues continued to be a significant drain on Police staff and resources, the Police were not always the most suitable Agency to deal with such incidents, but once contacted, they had a duty to respond, at least in the first instance.

The DCC confirmed that the Chief Constable and the Commissioner shared a joint vision for Policing in Kent going forward, building on the cultural shift undertaken Kent Police away from a policy of numerical targeting to one of quality service to the public. He advised that the most recent monitoring of victims of crime had recorded a satisfaction rating of 80%. Performance delivery had been achieved by placing Local Policing at the centre of the District model which gave equal priority to operational demand, visible local policing and local reassurance measures, aimed at reducing overall demand in the face of the requirement for continued savings. Better use of technology and collaboration with partner Agencies and Essex Police had achieved the savings of some £47M required under the Coalition Government’s first
Comprehensive Spending Review [CSR1]. However, the Chief Constable had significant concerns over the ability of the Kent Force to sustain the £60M of further savings required under CSR2 and continue to operate in its current format.

Members were informed that Kent Police had managed continuity and change to date through improved focus on Local District Policing Teams as exemplified in Dartford by the joint CSU operation based in the Civic Centre staffed by both Police and Council officers. Kent retained 3 Police Divisions but the future shape and size of the Force remained subject to further debate and review. Moving forward, Kent Police would be required to identify further savings of £20M in 2015/16, the first year of CSR2. These savings would be required despite the increased demand on Police resources posed by mental health cases in Police custody; historic sex abuse cases in the wake of the Saville inquiry and Operation Yew Tre; increased measures to combat current cases of child exploitation and combating the high level of perceived terrorist threat. The DCC advised that some Police functions and areas of current activity would have to be re-assessed further, perhaps even cease altogether. If that proved to be the case a comprehensive communications strategy would be required by Kent Police and the PCC’s Office to positively engage with the public and key partner Agencies.

The Committee and other Borough and Parish Members present then participated in a Q & A session with the Deputy Chief Constable and the Crime Commissioner’s Chief of Staff. Salient points confirmed in that further discussion included:

- **London Paramount development in Greenhithe Peninsular**: Kent Police (KP) had held talks with London Paramount in December 2014 to flag the importance of appropriate security arrangements at major construction sites to combat acquisitive and vehicle crime for Dartford and North Kent. KP awaited a written response from London Paramount, but were committed to working positively with the consortium given their investment in the Dartford area;

- **Stray and unattended Horses**: Kent Police powers were limited to road traffic issues e.g. when unattended horses strayed onto roads and highways. However the issue had been noted for inclusion in the Kent Police and Crime Plan going forward;

- **Attendance by PCSOs at Parish meetings**: Visible policing resources had reduced in the current CSR1 cycle. PCSOs were highly valued by the Force and public alike, but CSR2 would necessitate hard choices between competing demands for resources. In the interim, the Dartford Neighbourhood Inspector undertook to examine the request that PCSO’s (where available) attend Parish meetings;

- **Neighbourhood Watch meetings**: Members noted the effectiveness of the schemes and that Police attendance was good, in particular by the Neighbourhood Inspector, most recently at the Swanscombe & Greenhithe Neighbourhood Watch event;
• **Local Communications**: Members expressed particular frustration at the Parish level at the lack of Police follow-up following the initial reporting of crime. Parish Clerks bore the brunt of subsequent public dissatisfaction over the [apparent] lack of follow-up action by the Police. The Neighbourhood Inspector agreed that it was important to let the public know of any progress and the need for CSU’s to follow-up with the victims of crime. He undertook to reinforce this point with his team;

• **Radicalisation of minorities and fundamentalists**: The DCC confirmed that the work of Kent Police in combating radicalisation was ongoing, given recent events in mainland Europe and the threat posed by British Jihadee’s returning from conflicts in the Middle East and elsewhere;

• **Merging of Police Forces**: Kent Police were most closely aligned to and co-operated with Essex Police in the Eastern Region, to share services and generate savings. Co-operation with Surrey and Sussex focussed on cross-border crime, particularly from the Metropolitan area;

• **Public Consultation**: The PCC was keen that the public should be consulted over the nature of cuts and their impact, but operational decisions were, by law, the remit of the Chief Constable. Difficult decisions lay ahead and it would be important to convey them to the public in a positive and open communications strategy.

The Committee expressed their thanks to the Deputy Chief Constable and the Commissioner’s Chief of Staff for their presentations and for responding to Members subsequent questions.

**Item 2: Kent Police and Crime Panel (PCP)**

The Committee received a verbal update from the Deputy Leader, Councillor Tony Martin, in his role as Dartford’s representative on the Kent and Medway Police and Crime Panel (PCP). Available Minutes from previous Panel meetings held on 24 July and 9 September 2014 had been included in the Committee’s agenda papers as background.

The Deputy Leader briefly updated Members on business at recent Panel meetings, before concentrating his comments on the PCC’s Police and Crime Plan 2015/16 Refresh and Council Tax Precept proposals. The PCP had agreed the PCC’s 2015/ Refresh proposal, but had continued to show concern over the Commissioner’s proposal to increase Council Tax to finance future unspecified spending. The Panel would have preferred the PCC to have adopted an analytical approach to existing budgetary provision to determine future need. The Deputy Leader conceded that the role of the PCC as an elected official with a mandate and manifesto to implement was a difficult one. However, he also expressed frustration over the limited role of Police and Crime Panels and felt that PCPs needed more powers to ensure that Panels and Commissioners developed a strong and constructive relationship.
**Item 3: CSP Strategic Assessment 2014**

The Committee congratulated Mark Salisbury on his appointment as Enforcement and Regulatory Services (EARS) Manager CSU and asked that the efforts of his predecessor, David Court, be recorded in the Minutes in recognition of his contribution to the work of the Committee from its inception in October 2009.

The new EARS Manager advised that it was a particular pleasure and privilege to be working in Dartford CSU which was regarded as the exemplar model in Kent for effective collaborative multi-agency working. He reminded the Committee that the Dartford and Gravesham Community Safety Partnership (CSP) was required to publish a Strategic Assessment (SA) each year under the terms of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998. The Committee was required to consider the SA annually, as an Overview function. Members’ attention was drawn to the following key points in the 2014 SA document:

- The principal aim of the SA was to record crime and anti-social behaviour (ASB) levels in Dartford and Gravesham and identify priorities to inform a joint Strategic Action Plan to tackle crime and ASB issues across both Boroughs;

- Crime and ASB data collated for the 2014 SA covered the period October 2013 – September 2014. Comparing figures for previous years is not possible, due to changes in the definition of several crime categories during 2013. Further significant changes had also been introduced in 2013 by the Home Office in their Counting Rules for Recorded Crime, following an inspection of Kent Police by Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC). The Kent Force now held a very high ethical standard for crime recording, which other Police Forces had yet to implement;

- The CSP’s 6 Key Priorities for 2015-16 remained the same as those identified for 2014-15, to combat Violent Crime and Domestic Abuse, Anti-Social Behaviour (incorporating Criminal Damage related to ASB), Acquisitive and Property Crime, Substance Misuse, Reducing Re-offending and Road Safety;

- The Counter Terrorism and Security Bill (when en-Acted) would hold significant implications for individual Agencies and CSPs under the terms of the ‘Prevent’ strategy, based within the Government’s Counter Terrorism ‘Contest’ plan. The ‘Prevent’ strategy in particular would place new duties on individual Agencies and CSPs to work together to prevent people becoming radicalised and drawn into acts of terrorism;

- Violent Crime and Domestic Abuse (DA) had risen in Dartford but in positive terms reflected increased public reporting of both crime categories in the community and reflected increased confidence in the Community that the Police and other Agencies could effectively tackle both issues. Increased use by victims of the services provided by the
Borough’s ‘Domestic Abuse 1 Stop Shop’ facilities was a further indicator of public confidence;

- **Substance Misuse**: CSP partner Agencies had been concentrating their efforts dealing with the complex needs of alcohol users resistant to accessing support and services for their condition. Addressing so-called ‘Legal Highs’ was another area of requiring increased Agency and CSP efforts. Other schemes / projects included extended joint working between the Troubled Families Programme’s Family Workers and local substance misuse providers CRI and KCA, to increase client referral numbers to both services;

- **Reducing Re-offending**: the CSP’s Sub-Group had continued to support the CRI led initiative to improve multi-agency working to deal with the complex needs of alcohol users involved in repeat offending in both criminal activity and ASB. The ‘Making every Adult Matter’ project - a ‘Learning Shop’ based in Bluewater was a further initiative aimed at assisting repeat offenders in particular. The Community Payback Scheme under which ex-offenders undertook community work continued to draw public praise and be valued by both Boroughs;

- **Acquisitive Crime**: targeted work would be undertaken in key geographical locations to reduce repeat victimisation and provide support to vulnerable residents and businesses. Closer working and information - sharing would be maintained between G-Safe, D-TAC, CCTV and Kent Police with additional measures such as Exclusion Orders used as appropriate;

- **Road Safety**: priorities were to tackle speeding and nuisance parking (particularly outside schools) with the aid of local residents. Multi-agency initiatives aimed at promoting responsible driving behaviour through ‘pre-driver’ programmes and preventative work with new drivers were also being deployed.

The EARS Manager concluded his presentation of the 2014 SA document by underlining the importance of community engagement by the CSP and its partner organisations to achieve the ‘Golden Thread’ jointly advocated by Kent’s Chief Constable and Police and Crime Commissioner as embodied in the current Kent Police and Crime Plan.

In a subsequent Q and A session with Members the EARS Manager, Dartford’s District Commander and the Neighbourhood Inspector confirmed the following points:

- **Vandalism and Car Theft**: Dartford figures in both categories higher than Kent average but suffered from 2 major contributory factors; (i) the Bluewater shopping complex accounted for 11% of Dartford crime and (ii) the Borough’s proximity to the major A2 and M25 arterial routes (allied to high-speed rail services) greatly facilitated cross-border crime, in particular from the Metropolitan area;
London based criminal gangs with sophisticated technology continued to circumvent electronic safeguards to steal top-range vehicles in the Borough. Van tool theft had also increased in the wake of new construction projects in Dartford and the Swanscombe peninsular. The CSP, Kent Police and Dartford CSU continued to work to address both crime categories and also encouraged public awareness and self-help through Neighbourhood Watch schemes;

**Fly-Tipping**: Council and Kent Police Officers from Dartford CSU had continued to address this perennial problem with some success through enhanced use of CCTV cameras at known ‘hot-spots’. Parish and Borough Members were encouraged to report any/all new incidents to Dartford CSU;

**Bluewater Complex**: Officers acknowledged continued Member concern over the distorting effect Bluewater crime had on Dartford’s overall crime statistics [+11%]. Officers advised that the Bluewater ‘inflation factor’ had in fact been separated out in paragraphs 4.1 and 4.2 of the SA document [pages 27/28] which detailed ‘Theft and handling excluding vehicle interference’. Excluding offences within the Bluewater Complex from this category would reduce Dartford’s overall crime figure significantly bringing it in line with the Kent average;

**Acquisitive and Property Crime**: Members had expressed concern that the reduction in Street Lighting by KCC had contributed to the incidences of burglary in the Borough. The Neighbourhood Inspector advised that ‘temporal’ times for offences were monitored by the Dartford CSU on a fortnightly basis and Police resources prioritised accordingly [within the overall constraints of the reduced Force]. The EARS Manager advised that KCC had undertaken to re-introduce street lighting during the hours of darkness [confirmed by a KCC Member present as September 2015 for the KCC scheme to resume in rural areas];

**Community Payback Scheme**: This was being privatised following the recent division of responsibility for probation and offender management work between the Government’s Probation Service and privately run Community Rehabilitation Companies (CRCs). CRC’s would manage low risk offenders, with the Probation Service retaining responsibility for high risk and long-term prisoners. Dartford CSU supported the Community Payback Scheme in terms of providing tools and some supervision and support. There was a proposal that CRCs might charge for the CP Scheme in the future [Kent, Surrey and Sussex CRC for Dartford]. Members would be advised (including through the CSP Support Group) when matters became clearer.

The Committee resolved to note the Dartford & Gravesham CSP Strategic Assessment 2014 document and thanked the EARS Manager for his comprehensive presentation and the Neighbourhood Inspector and Dartford’s District Commander from Kent Police for attending and responding to the Committee’s questions.
CRIME AND DISORDER (OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY) COMMITTEE PROTOCOL

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

Introduction

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

Terms of Reference

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

- Dartford Borough Council [a responsible authority]
- Gravesham Borough Council [a responsible authority]
- Kent Police [a responsible authority]
- Kent County Council [a responsible authority]
- Kent Fire and Rescue Service [a responsible authority]
- Kent Surrey and Sussex Community Rehabilitation Company [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.

| 1.8 | 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

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 Coordinator 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 to 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.
F. Committee member business

Subject to the rules on draw down detailed in section A.2 of this Protocol, any Committee or (sub-committee) member has the legal right [Section 21A(1) 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.

GH. The duty to have regard to reports/recommendations

G.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).

G.2

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

H. Co-option

H.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

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

L.2 The criteria for selection will be;

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

L.3 Independent experts, advisers and assessors will be expected to follow the principles referred to in the [Member] Code of Conduct, including the requirement to declare interests and respecting confidentiality.

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

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

L.6 In considering independent experts’, advisers’ and assessors’ recommendations, the Committee will have regard to the advice of the Council’s Statutory Officers (Chief Finance Officer/Section 151 Officer and Monitoring Officer) who are legally bound respectively, to report to the GAC on inter alia:
- the corporate approach of the Council;
- contravention of law and/or Standing Orders, Financial Regulations;
- unlawfulness, maladministration or injustice;
- vires and propriety of expenditure;
- overall integrity of the budget, capital and revenue and the fiduciary duty and responsibility of all Members (Section 112 and 114 Reports).

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

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

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

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

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

M.5 The 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.

M.6 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.7 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.8 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;
- 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.

Q.7 Consultation undertaken by the Committee in accordance with its Terms of Reference will not compromise/prejudice consultations undertaken by any other Committee/Board of the Council.
R. Conduct of meetings

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

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

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

S. Task groups/informal Member working groups

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

S.11 The rules detailed in sections G, H and M of this Protocol will apply.

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.
- Before agreeing, Director to undertake screening/filter checks (section 6 of Guide).
- Agree to champion.
- Refuse to champion and provide constituent/local ward Member with written reasons for refusal.

**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.
- Concern resolved.

**Third level response**
- Crime and Disorder (Overview and Scrutiny) Committee rejects CCfA (see Committee’s Protocol for procedure).
- Local ward Member notified with written reasons.

**Fourth level response**
- 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.

**Fifth level response**
- Cabinet/GAC, CSP etc. consider recommendations and respond within 2 months, setting out reasons for any inaction.
- Crime and Disorder (Overview and Scrutiny) Committee considers and publishes responses to scrutiny recommendations.
- Feedback to local ward Member.
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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 S Sandhu MBE
Membership: Councillors S R Jarnell, M B Kelly, R Lees, C S McLean, M A Maddison and D J Mote.

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

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.
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 Surrey and Sussex Community Rehabilitation Company
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 and 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.