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CRIME AND DISORDER (OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY) COMMITTEE
AGENDA

Wednesday 15 February 2017

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

2. **Declarations of Interest**
   
   To receive declarations of interest from Members including the term(s) of any Grant(s) of Dispensation.

3. **Confirmation of the Minutes of the meeting held on 27 July 2016** (Pages 1 - 12)
   
   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 Update**

7. **Regulation 9 Notice** (Pages 13 - 18)
   
   To note the contents of the Regulation 9 Notice for the period 17 January 2017 to 31 May 2017.

8. **Kent Police & Crime Panel (PCP) Update** (Pages 19 - 36)
   
   To note the attached Minutes for the Kent and Medway Police and Crime Panel (PCP) meetings held on 8 September 2016 and 15 November 2016 and to receive a verbal update from Dartford’s PCP representative.
9. **Neighbourhood Watch - Sharing Best Practice: Presentation by Kent Police**

10. **Bluewater Safety Shop / Community Safety at Home Facility - Presentation by Kent Police**


   Members to note the attached update report from the Community Safety Officer (CSO).

12. **Dartford and Gravesham Community Safety Partnership Strategic Assessment 2016**

   To consider the Dartford & Gravesham Community Safety Partnership (CSP) Strategic Assessment 2016 document as presented to the CSP on 26 January 2017 [Appendix A to this report - included as Item A in the EXEMPT agenda papers on the grounds of Confidentiality].

13. **Work Programme 2016-17: Update**

   To note the proposed amendments to the Committee's rolling Work Programme for the remainder of the 2016-17 Municipal Cycle and beyond.

14. **Next Meeting**

   Subject to confirmation at Annual Council [10 May] the next meeting of the Committee will take place on **Wednesday 26 July 2017**.

**EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

TO RESOLVE: That, under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended), the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of Confidential information supplied to the Council In-Confidence.

A. **CSP Strategic Assessment 2016**
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 27 July 2016.

PRESENT: Councillor R J Wells (Chairman)
Councillor A S Sandhu, MBE (Vice-Chairman)
Councillor R Lees
Councillor M A Maddison
Councillor D J Mote

ABSENT: Councillors: C J Shippam, S R Jarnell, Mrs. M B Kelly and C S McLean.

Dartford Borough Council Officers:-
Sheri Green – Strategic Director(External)
Tony Henley – Community Safety Manager, CSU
Lewis Kirnon – Town Centre & Business Manager
Mike Morgan – D-TAC Intelligence Manager
Kit Weller – Community Safety Officer, CSU

CABINET MEMBERS: Councillor Ann Allen MBE, Portfolio Holder for Community Development

PRESENT TO RESPOND TO ISSUES RAISED BY THE SCRUTINITY COMMITTEE:
Insp. Gary Woodward – Dartford CSU Inspector, Kent Police

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors: C J Shippam, S R Jarnell, C S McLean and Mrs. M B Kelly.

Councillor Ann Allen was in attendance as Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Community Development, at the invitation of the Committee.

The Chairman gave a special welcome to Tony Henley the Community Safety Manager (CSM) who was attending his first C&D (O&S) Committee meeting and paid tribute to his predecessor, Matt Roberts, for his contributions to the Committee’s work over the previous 7 years.

Officers in attendance included the Strategic Director (External Services), the Town Centre & Business Support Manager, the D-TAC Intelligence Manager, the Community Safety Officer and the Dartford CSU Kent Police Inspector.
2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest from Members.

3. CONFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 10 FEBRUARY 2016

RESOLVED:

1. That the Minutes of the Committee’s meeting held on 10 February 2016 be confirmed as an accurate account of those proceedings.

4. URGENT ITEMS

The Chairman proposed and the Committee agreed; that Item 12 in the published agenda ‘Performance Report’ be taken after Item 14 so as to facilitate reference to the EXEMPT appendix A to the report, in the closed part of the meeting, should that be necessary.

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

There were no references from other Committees to consider.

6. REGULATION 9 NOTICE

RESOLVED:

That the contents of the Regulation 9 Notice for the period 17 June 2016 to 31 October 2016 be noted.

7. COMMITTEE PROTOCOL & LEAD MEMBER PARTICIPATION

The covering report from the Head of Legal Services asked Members to consider the revised Crime and Disorder (Overview and Scrutiny) Committee Protocol which detailed the process for Lead Member participation in the Committee’s proceedings.

The Strategic Director (External Services) confirmed that the Scrutiny Committee Protocol had undergone a similar revision to provide for the participation of Lead Members in those proceedings and commended the revised C&R (O&S) Protocol for adoption.

In the absence of any questions from Members it was RESOLVED:

1. That the contents of the report be noted;
2. That the revised Crime and Disorder (Overview and Scrutiny) Committee Protocol as attached at Appendix A to the report be adopted.

8. KENT POLICE AND CRIME PANEL (PCP) UPDATE

The Chairman briefed Members in the absence of Councillor Shippam, the Council’s nominated representative on the Kent & Medway Police and Crime Panel (PCP).

The Chairman advised that he had attended the November 2015 and February 2016 meetings of the PCP as Substitute for Cllr. Shippam but that Dartford had not been represented at the most recent Panel meeting held on 14 June 2016.

Members were referred to the Minutes of the PCP meetings held on 17 November 2015, 2 February 2016 and 14 June 2016 included in the Agenda pack. The principal item of note was the appointment of the new Police & Crime Commissioner (PCC) for Kent and Medway, Mr Matthew Scott.

The new Commissioner had been invited to attend the next meeting of the Committee on 15 February 2017 and his office had recently confirmed his attendance to Member Services.

In the absence of any questions from Members the Committee RESOLVED:

1. To note the contents of the Minutes of the Kent & Medway Police and Crime Panel (PCP) meetings held on 17 November 2015, 2 February 2016 and 14 June 2016 as enclosed in the agenda pack [pages 41-60].

2. To congratulate the new Kent and Medway Police and Crime Commissioner, Mr Matthew Scott, on his appointment and to welcome his attendance at the next meeting of the Committee on 15 February 2017.

9. DARTFORD TOWN AGAINST CRIME (D-TAC) PROGRESS REPORT

The report updated the Committee on the progress made by the Dartford Town Against Crime (D-TAC) Scheme to date and asked Members to note the objectives and targets outlined in the Scheme’s 2016-18 Business Plan (attached at Appendix A to the report). Appendices B-D gave details of D-TAC’s current operating statistics plus the Kids Safe and Vulnerable Persons Schemes.

In addition to the agenda papers the Committee received a PowerPoint presentation from the Town Centre & Business and D-TAC Intelligence Managers. Members were informed that:
The Dartford Town Against Crime (D-TAC) Scheme had been established in December 2002 as a partnership between the local business community, Kent Police, and other public service providers including the Council and promoted the concept of a safe and secure Town Centre environment to encourage investment and growth;

The Scheme enabled Town Centre Partners to adopt a positive co-ordinated response to threats of crime and anti-social behaviour (ASB) through a pro-active approach to identify and target the most serious, prolific and professional criminals targeting the Town Centre and those engaged in petty crime and anti-social behaviour (ASB) including in the 'Night-time Economy';

Membership of the Scheme had grown significantly since 2002 and now stood at 66 full members paying £360 p.a. for the provision of: a digital radio handset (the Shop Safe Radio system); access to DISC (Database for Safer Communities) to share information and photos of known offenders; the support of the D-TAC Intelligence Manager; DBC CCTV facilities and assistance from the Orchards Shopping Centre Control team. The Scheme generated some £31K income annually including; affiliate fees from businesses on Temple Hill Square, various Charity Shops and allied services/clients;

The fundamental benefit of the Scheme to members was the sharing of information on persistent known offenders operating in the Town Centre ('Dartford’s Top 10') in accordance with the Scheme’s obligations under the Data Protection Act 1988. Monthly meetings of retailers, licensed premises owners, drugs charities, Council Officers, Kent Police and representatives of the Probation Services addressed issues of criminal gangs, mobile criminals, individual offenders, persistent offenders and ASB. This sharing of information strengthened the partnership mechanism and created added value benefits for Scheme members;

D-TAC operated as a sub-group of both the Dartford Town Centre Partnership and the Dartford and Gravesham Community Safety Partnership with its own formal constitution, terms of reference, Board of Management and active Steering Group. The Council’s Intelligence Manager co-ordinated the dissemination of information and promoted activity which resulted in positive action being taken against persistent offenders;

D-TAC in conjunction with the business community and relevant agencies had identified the following areas for growth:

a) Development of the radio infrastructure to ensure coverage across the Borough;
b) Expansion of the membership over the next 3 year period to 140 clients (including affiliates);

c) Increased number of members using DISC [including via WhatsApp];

d) Provision of radios for lone workers across the Borough where needed e.g. Housing staff;

e) Increase revenue by 50% to £42K per annum.

In summary; D-TAC in conjunction with the Council’s CSU team, Kent Police, Orchard Shopping Centre Security and town centre stakeholders, effectively dealt with a wide variety of crime in the Town Centre.

Councillor Allen, Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Community Development, praised the efforts of the D-TAC Scheme, in particular the excellent ‘Shop Safe – Stay Safe’ arrangements for vulnerable adults.

In a subsequent Q & A session D-TAC and CSU Officers and the CSU Kent Police Inspector, confirmed the following detailed points for Members:

- It was intended to enlarge the present D-TAC Scheme from the Town Centre base across the Borough including Eastern Dartford;

- The CSU was aware of historical problems of ASB around Co-op stores in Swanscombe and Longfield and was re-visiting possible options for those sites despite past difficulties;

- It was hoped that a new transceiver would extend the present ‘Shop Safe Radio System’ beyond Temple Hill to the wider Borough, but the positive co-operation of individual store managers was crucial to expanding the present Scheme;

- Membership of the D-TAC Scheme had dipped in 2007 following the financial crisis but a membership push was now underway following the appointment of the new Intelligence Manager who was networking effectively with current members and publicising the Scheme by word of mouth;

- Measures proposed to enhance the current D-TAC service for existing members included: publication of the new D-TAC Business Plan for 2016-18; the proposed roll-out of the WhatsApp facility across the Borough to access DISC by telephone, tailored primarily to help SMEs and Licenced Premises without computers; connecting more members beyond Temple Hill to the ‘Shop Safe Radio’ network (including radio training sessions from the D-TAC Intelligence Manager) and increased co-operation with Kent Police; were all. Advertising for new D-TAC
members would follow the successful bedding-in of the proposed measures detailed above;

- The proposed growth in D-TAC membership over the next 3 year period would enhance the DISC data-base system in terms of both quantity and quality of intelligence gathering and sharing. DISC could accommodate some 500-600 users [D-TAC members can register multiple DISC users]. A review of present DISC usage was proposed to identify regular users and ensure that current intelligence held, was both relevant and up to date;

- The Council had links to Darenth Valley Hospital and The Bridge development for recording incidents of crime and ABS, but data for the Bluewater shopping complex was held separately by that organisation. Ebbsfleet Garden City Management Company also held its own crime and ASB data, but a possible role for D-TAC was envisaged in the future, as the infrastructure of Ebbsfleet International expanded;

- It was hoped in the future, to extend the concept of ‘Dartford’s top 10 offenders’ to encompass e.g. ‘Swanscombe top 5 offenders’ and similar identified groupings across other areas of the Borough;

RESOLVED:

1. That the progress made to date by the D-TAC Scheme as set out in the report be noted;

2. That the proposals detailed in the Scheme’s 2016-18 Business Plan, as set out in Appendix A to the report, be noted;

3. That the Committee receive further annual progress reports on the Scheme each July, to coincide with the Dartford & Gravesham’s Community Safety Partnership’s (CSP’s) mid-term Performance report.

10. COMMUNITY SAFETY STRATEGY 2016-19

This report asked Members to consider the Dartford and Gravesham Community Safety Partnership’s Community Safety Strategy 2016-19 document (attached as Appendix A to the report) and comment accordingly.

The report informed Members that the priorities identified, and the views expressed by partner agencies and elected Members in the CSP’s annual Strategic Assessment document considered by the Committee in February 2016 had been taken forward into the new Community Safety Strategy 2016-19 (Appendix A to the report). The CSP had considered the new Strategy document at their subsequent meeting on 24 March 2016. Detail:

Priorities
Violent Crime and Domestic Abuse
Anti-Social Behaviour (incorporating Criminal Damage related to ASB)
Acquisitive and Property Crime
Substance Misuse
Reducing Re-offending
Road Safety

The common factors and links between these 6 areas of work contributed to the three (3) overarching themes of the Strategy of:

**Themes**

1. Protecting vulnerable people from harm;
2. Disrupting and preventing organised acquisitive crime;
3. Protecting and strengthening communities.

The Community Safety Manager (CSM) advised Members that the CSP had recognised that the personal safety of residents was paramount and had identified as a particular priority the protection of vulnerable people from harm and risk on a personal level and in the wider community.

He explained that within the CSP the role of Kent Police was to focus on the arrest and detention of perpetrators as required. The focus and core business of the Community Safety Unit(s) was to address Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB), Environmental crime, Alcohol-related violence and Domestic Abuse (DA). Significant other areas of CSP work which required a multi-agency approach by the Partnership were: child sexual exploitation (CSE); modern slavery and human trafficking; combating terrorism and protecting people at risk of being drawn into terrorism, through the adoption of the Government's Prevent & Channel strategy.

In response to specific questions from Committee Members the following points were confirmed by Officers and the Kent Police CSU Inspector:

- **Off-road motorcycle joy-riding:** Kent Police recognised this issue as a pan-Dartford problem which also affected Sevenoaks and Bexley and a combined approach was being adopted. Criminal gangs were involved and Police action hampered by road safety considerations which precluded chasing joy-riders in Police vehicles. There was no 'golden bullet' solution but collaborative efforts were aimed at; making open spaces more defensible, using Community Wardens, educating offenders at the local level through schools, parent groups and the Police and employing new Housing and ASB legislation. A specific Councillor suggestion which the CSM undertook to take forward at Ward level, was a mailshot to the parents of identified joy-riders warning them of the consequences of their children's continued antisocial behaviour in terms of fines and restriction Orders;
• **Accuracy of CSP data**: Gathering CSP partner agency data was challenging as the emphasis evolved away from the traditional Police-led statistical approach based on empirical numbers. CSPs now judged their performance on a series of Performance Indicators drawn from raw data provided by each of their partner agencies. However, agency data gathering differed in format, timing and recording periods which combined to complicate the task of compiling [previous] annual Strategic Assessments and the new evolving three year Strategic Strategy document;

• **Domestic Abuse (DA) data**: Obtaining DA data for victims attending hospital A&E facilities and G.P. surgeries was notoriously difficult for a variety of reasons. Third Sector input from Dartford charities and cultural groups helped in the assessment of DA in the Borough and it was hoped that a national initiative to fund specialist DA nurses in hospitals, would be extended to Dartford, and add to the DA data gathering process. Other key sources for DA data gathering included the Dartford, Gravesham and Swanley Clinical Commissioning Group [as a CSP partner] and the corresponding Health & Wellbeing Board. Ultimately, success for the CSP would be judged on results e.g. the number of visitors to Dartford’s ‘1 Stop Shop’ facility for victims of DA, tempered by the knowledge that a victim suffered abuse on average 10 (ten) times before seeking help;

• **Awareness Training**: Dartford’s changing community demographic, allied to Kent-wide changes, underlined the need for relevant Council staff to receive ‘awareness’ training in the early identification of vulnerable people in safeguarding issues such as DA, CSE, Modern day slavery and Domestic extremism, to enable them to become vigilant within their everyday roles. The Committee discussed extending ‘awareness’ training of these safeguarding issues to Councillors to help them to deal more effectively with resident’s issues encountered in their regular Ward surgeries, many of which were increasingly conducted on-line and via Facebook. The CSM proposed a short Briefing Note of ‘Possible Indicators’ of safeguarding issues plus appropriate action to be taken e.g. reporting their concerns to the Police/Council Officers. Member Services undertook to add the briefing material to Member’s Induction Packs as and when it became available;

• **Protecting Vulnerable People from Harm**: The Government’s Prevent Strategy and recent Acts of Parliament addressing Policing, Serious Crime, Anti-Social Behaviour, Modern Slavery, Safeguarding and Child Exploitation would be reflected in the work of CSPs over time. Police and other partner agency co-operation within the Dartford and Gravesham CSP were evolving to meet the new challenges and policy drivers enshrined in these Acts. The change to an overarching three year Community Safety Strategy was evidence of that change. The CSP’s Community Safety Strategy 2016-19 was a ‘living’ document which would continue to evolve and be assessed annually to
ensure it met challenges of crime and anti-social behaviour (ASB) faced by both Boroughs.

RESOLVED:

1. That the Committee note the report and the Dartford and Gravesham Community Safety Partnership’s Community Safety Strategy 2016-19 (attached as Appendix A to the report).

11. COMMITTEE ROLLING WORK PROGRAMME 2016-17 AND BEYOND

The report asked Members to agree the contents of a Rolling Work Programme for the Committee for 2016-17 and beyond as set out in the attached Appendix A to the report.

The Strategic Director (External Services) confirmed two amendments to the Agenda papers [Work Plan - Appendix A agenda p.114]:

- Consideration of Kent’s current Domestic Abuse (DA) Framework [July 2016] would now take place in July 2017; following the completion of a pan-Kent consultation exercise of users and providers which was likely to result in a re-tendering of the DA Service in Kent. Deferment to July 2017 would enable the Committee to consider the new pan-Kent provision to combat Domestic Abuse (DA), Dartford’s provision within the new DA Framework and the role of the CSP and partner agencies within the new arrangements;

- The proposed 6 monthly D-TAC Update would be changed to an annual report, presented to the Committee each July, to coincide with the Committee’s consideration of the CSP’s Performance Report.

RESOLVED:

1. That the Rolling Work Programme for the Committee for 2016-17 and beyond (attached as Appendix A to the report) be approved, with the addition of the amendments set out above.

12. COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT FOR THE 2015-16 MUNICIPAL YEAR

The draft report and Appendices recorded the work carried out by the Committee during the preceding 2015-16 municipal year and asked Members to approve its submission to the next meeting of the General Assembly of the Council.
The Chairman thanked the Committee Co-ordinator for compiling the Committee’s Annual Report for 2015-16 and the Strategic Director commended it to the Committee for approval.

RESOLVED:

That the Committee’s Annual Report for the 2015-16 municipal cycle as attached at Appendix A to the report, be submitted to the next meeting of the General Assembly of the Council without amendment.

13. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

The Chairman advised that, under Section 100A (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended), he was required to ask that all members of the press and public present vacate the Chamber prior to discussion of the final Item on the agenda.

No members of the press or public were present.

14. COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP (CSP) PERFORMANCE REPORT - JUNE 2016

The covering report from the Community Safety Officer (CSO) asked the Committee to consider the Dartford and Gravesham Community Safety Partnership (CSP) June 2016 Performance Report (attached as EXEMPT Item A). The CSP had discussed the Performance Report (PR) at their meeting on 13 June 2016. The PR detailed performance in relation to levels of crime, anti-social behaviour (ASB) and other indicators as set out in the Dartford and Gravesham Community Safety Strategy 2016-19 document considered elsewhere in the Agenda.

The CSO advised Members that the format for the June 2016 PR differed from that used in previous years. A revised set of Performance Indicators had been utilised [as advised in the CSP’s 2016-19 Safety Strategy – Min. No. 10].

The new Indicators were less Police-led than in previous years and more reliant on data from CSP partner agencies. In some cases data was taken directly from front-line recording systems; such data was not generally in the public domain and had been provided to the CSP on a confidential basis. CSP agency data also varied in terms of frequency of submission and reporting periods covered. Wherever possible a comparison had been provided between the information supplied for the 2015 Performance Report and the revised data used in 2016.

Members were further advised that CSPs across Kent had adopted a range of alternative measures which demonstrated progress made in tackling risk and harm and improving life for residents, rather than the traditional Police-led statistical approach of previous years. However, there was no standard dataset used by the 12 (twelve) Local Authorities and CSU Officers had to make individual enquiries of each Agency to obtain the information each
In response to subsequent questions CSU and Kent Police Officers confirmed the following points for Members:

- **Domestic Abuse - One Stop Shop (OSS) Services** [Agenda p. 163]: The intended relocation of the Dartford OSS had been forced, when the previous premises had become unavailable. Moving to new premises would provide for an increased range of services to be made available to visitors. Health workers had a vital role to play in the work to identify and tackle domestic abuse (DA) and good links already existed with the Health sector through the work of the DA Forum. It was acknowledged amongst professionals, that children who had witnessed DA were more likely to become either perpetrators or victims themselves, and several programmes existed to support young people who were at risk of DA or becoming a perpetrator;

- **Increased issue of ‘Cannabis Warnings’** [Agenda p. 169]: The new Cannabis Website whereby residents could report their concerns direct to the Police including via a mobile App. (rather than phoning 101) was proving to be a great success. The information was shared with CSP partner and National agencies and the CSU Inspector welcomed feedback from Members. He saw a role for Councillors to play in their communities by encouraging residents to report their suspicions, either when holding their surgeries or via their individual resident constituent newsletters;

- **Safer Socialising Scheme for Licensed Premises** [Agenda p. 165]: The Safer Socialising Scheme was administered in Dartford by D-TAC in conjunction with DBC Licensing and the Town Centre team. In 2012 seven (7) premises had received awards under the Scheme but no awards had been made subsequently. D-TAC and DBC Licensing had identified the Safer Socialising Scheme as an area of work worthy of a re-visit;

- **Channel Referrals** [Agenda p.171]: Members were assured that Kent and its residents were in no greater danger than any other part of the UK with regard to the likelihood of a terrorist incident being perpetrated in the County given its proximity to the Continent. Co-operation with the French authorities had been intensified following the recent horrific murder of a French priest in Rouen, but no specific threat to the County had been perceived. Kent had a good overall strategy in place to combat terrorism and PREVENT and all other national policies had been rolled out in the County to help prevent terrorist incidents occurring. In addition, the newly elected Kent Police and Crime
Commissioner (PCC) had confirmed that greater numbers of armed police officers would now be deployed in Kent, in response to the directive issued by the (previous) Home Secretary. In relation to the PREVENT scheme of measures to combat terrorism, applicants who wished to obtain a Dartford Borough Council Mini-Cab licence now had to undergo training to raise awareness of safeguarding issues and measures including; PREVENT, child exploitation, child trafficking and slavery. Feedback from applicants to date had been very positive. Relevant Council staff had undertaken similar training.

RESOLVED:

1. That the Committee noted the contents of the Performance Report June 2016 document, discussed by the Dartford and Graveshaw Community Safety Partnership (CSP) on 12 June 2016, which detailed performance in relation to levels of crime, anti-social behaviour (ASB) and other indicators as set out in the Dartford and Graveshaw Community Safety Strategy 2016-19 document.

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>TITLE OF REPORT AND BRIEF</th>
<th>DATE OF CABINET/GAC MEETING OR PERIOD WITHIN WHICH THE DECISION WILL BE TAKEN AND BY WHOM</th>
<th>WHO IS TO BE CONSULTED BEFORE TAKING THE DECISION AND HOW</th>
<th>BACKGROUND PAPERS</th>
<th>NAME, TITLE AND CONTACT DETAILS OF REPORT AUTHOR</th>
<th>OPEN OR CLOSED (IF CLOSED THE REASON IS SPECIFIED)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultation on Ebbsfleet Implementation Framework</td>
<td>Cabinet 26 Jan 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OPEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Benefit Overpayment Write-offs</td>
<td>Cabinet 26 Jan 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CLOSED - if reference needs to be made to the Appendix to this report, which is exempt under Paragraphs 1 &amp; 3 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TITLE OF REPORT AND BRIEF</td>
<td>DATE OF CABINET/GAC MEETING OR PERIOD WITHIN WHICH THE DECISION WILL BE TAKEN AND BY WHOM</td>
<td>WHO IS TO BE CONSULTED BEFORE TAKING THE DECISION AND HOW</td>
<td>BACKGROUND PAPERS</td>
<td>NAME, TITLE AND CONTACT DETAILS OF REPORT AUTHOR</td>
<td>OPEN OR CLOSED (if closed the reason is specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write-off of National Non-Domestic Rates</td>
<td>Cabinet 26 Jan 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sue Cressall, Revenues Manager Tel: 01732 227041 <a href="mailto:sue.cressall@sevenoaks.gov.uk">sue.cressall@sevenoaks.gov.uk</a></td>
<td>CLOSED - if reference needs to be made to the Appendix to this report, which is exempt under Paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue and Capital Budgets 2017/18</td>
<td>General Assembly of the Council (Budget) 27 Feb 2017</td>
<td>Consultation – December to January</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tim Sams, Financial Services Manager Tel: 01322 343148 <a href="mailto:tim.sams@dartford.gov.uk">tim.sams@dartford.gov.uk</a></td>
<td>OPEN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To consider writing-off Non Domestic Rate debts where it has not been possible to obtain payment because of insolvency, because the ratepayer cannot be traced or where the debt is otherwise irrecoverable.

To set the levels of expenditure for Dartford Borough Council capital and revenue budgets for 2017/18, to approve the level of rents chargeable for Housing Revenue Account dwellings for 2017/18, to agree the level of Council Tax for Dartford Borough in its parished and unparished areas for 2017/18, to approve the Pay Policy Statement for 2017/18 and to determine sundry related matters.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE OF REPORT AND BRIEF</th>
<th>DATE OF CABINET/GAC MEETING OR PERIOD WITHIN WHICH THE DECISION WILL BE TAKEN AND BY WHOM</th>
<th>WHO IS TO BE CONSULTED BEFORE TAKING THE DECISION AND HOW</th>
<th>BACKGROUND PAPERS</th>
<th>NAME, TITLE AND CONTACT DETAILS OF REPORT AUTHOR</th>
<th>OPEN OR CLOSED (if closed the reason is specified)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for Dartford Town Centre</td>
<td>Cabinet 9 Mar 2017</td>
<td>Stakeholder involvement is underway through a variety of means, but this decision would enable formal public consultation.</td>
<td>Mark Aplin, Planning Policy Manager Tel: 01322 343202 <a href="mailto:mark.aplin@dartford.gov.uk">mark.aplin@dartford.gov.uk</a></td>
<td>OPEN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone Lodge - Appropriation for Planning Purposes</td>
<td>Cabinet 9 Mar 2017</td>
<td>Appropriation for planning purposes to be advertised post in principle decision by Cabinet.</td>
<td>Marie Kelly-Stone, Head of Legal Services Tel: 01322 343634 <a href="mailto:marie.kelly-stone@dartford.gov.uk">marie.kelly-stone@dartford.gov.uk</a></td>
<td>OPEN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent Thameside Strategic Transport Programme Annual Report</td>
<td>Cabinet 9 Mar 2017</td>
<td>There is consultation on the Forward Delivery Programme with key stakeholders through the STP Steering Group. Public consultation takes place on individual schemes within the Programme before they are implemented.</td>
<td>Teresa Ryszkowska, Head of Regeneration Tel: 01322 343631 <a href="mailto:teresa.ryszkowska@dartford.gov.uk">teresa.ryszkowska@dartford.gov.uk</a></td>
<td>OPEN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TITLE OF REPORT AND BRIEF</td>
<td>DATE OF CABINET/GAC MEETING OR PERIOD WITHIN WHICH THE DECISION WILL BE TAKEN AND BY WHOM</td>
<td>WHO IS TO BE CONSULTED BEFORE TAKING THE DECISION AND HOW</td>
<td>BACKGROUND PAPERS</td>
<td>NAME, TITLE AND CONTACT DETAILS OF REPORT AUTHOR</td>
<td>OPEN OR CLOSED (if closed the reason is specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Infrastructure Levy Governance Arrangements</td>
<td>Cabinet 9 Mar 2017</td>
<td>The report sets out arrangements for consulting stakeholders on the forward programme for infrastructure delivery.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Teresa Ryszkowska, Head of Regeneration Tel: 01322 343631 <a href="mailto:teresa.ryszkowska@dartford.gov.uk">teresa.ryszkowska@dartford.gov.uk</a></td>
<td>OPEN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

187. Minutes of the Police and Crime Panel held on 14 June 2016
(Item 4)

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 14 June be signed by the Chairman as an accurate record.

188. Confirmation Hearing - Commissioner’s Chief Finance Officer
(Item 5)

1. The Panel was provided with a report by the Commissioner in advance of their meeting. That report set out the Commissioner’s proposed job description and person specification for his Chief Finance Officer and explained the recruitment process in detail. The report advised the Panel that, at the conclusion of the selection process, the Commissioner proposed to appoint Mr Robert Phillips and set out the reasons for this proposal. The Panel was satisfied that this report provided them with the information set out in Schedule 1(9) of the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011.

2. The Panel noted that the Commissioner had advertised nationally and locally and had decided, on grounds of value for taxpayers’ money, not to use a recruitment agency. The Panel noted that 11 applications had been received, which they felt was a good number, and that 4 were shortlisted, although one unfortunately withdrew before the interview stage. The Commissioner advised the Panel that he felt Mr Phillips was very well suited to the role, had a great deal of relevant experience, and that he had particularly welcomed Mr Phillips’ positive approach to collaboration.
3. The Panel heard from Councillor Todd, who had observed the interview process at the invitation of the Commissioner. Councillor Todd said that 3 high calibre candidates had been robustly and fairly tested through the selection process and that he commended the proposal to appoint Mr Phillips.

4. Mr Phillips described to the Panel his extensive background in a variety of local government finance roles and his experience as Deputy Chief Finance Officer to 2 PCC’s.

RESOLVED that the Panel support the Commissioner’s proposed appoint of Mr Phillips as Chief Financial Officer.

189. Updated Police and Crime Plan
(Item 6)

1. The Panel were provided with the Commissioner’s draft updated Police and Crime Plan, together with a report explaining the main changes. The Panel were satisfied that the draft Plan met the legal requirements placed on the Commissioner. The Panel noted that, as the plan was being introduced partway through the year, the budget and medium-term financial strategy were unchanged.

2. The Panel noted that the updated Plan honoured the commitments made in the previous Plan for commissioning allocations to Community Safety partnerships and others. The Panel also noted that the updated Plan contained changes to governance arrangements with an increased focus on the Commissioner’s Governance Board, where the Commissioner holds the Chief Constable to account in a meeting held in public. The Panel noted the Commissioner’s invitation to all Panel members to attend meetings.

3. The Panel noted that the updated plan was based on the six-point Plan put forward by the Commissioner during the election and that mental health was a “golden thread” running through the Plan.

4. The Panel noted that value for money appeared to be given a higher priority than in the previous Plan and asked what the Commissioner intended. The Commissioner explained the collaboration work being undertaken with Essex in relation to back office work and also drew attention to the options to collaborate more closely with Kent Fire and Rescue Service. The Commissioner also commented that he saw opportunities to work more closely with other police forces and partners, referring in particular to the KCC Community Warden service.

5. The Panel asked whether the budget still contained provision for additional firearms officers, as provided for in the previous Plan. The Commissioner confirmed that funding for 24 additional officers remained in the budget, and it
was an operational decision for the Chief Constable whether he chose to recruit a higher number. The Panel noted that the Commissioner was working with the Chief Constable to encourage officers to consider volunteering for this role but noted the difficulties as other Forces were also seeking additional officers.

6. The Panel asked about the proportion of the pay budget that was spent on overtime and asked whether this money could be better spent on additional officers. The Commissioner explained that, of the £258m pay budget, approximately £5m related to police officer overtime and £1m related to police staff overtime (including PCSO’s). The Panel felt this was a very low proportion and that it could be shown separately in the budget to highlight the relatively low proportion.

7. The Panel noted with approval the emphasis in the Plan to increase the visible presence of police officers, noted the intention to recruit police officers and asked whether this was replacing losses or was a net gain. The Commissioner confirmed that this would enable a net gain of personnel to officer strength of 3260 and PCSO strength of 300, based on current expected funding.

8. The Panel pointed out that the Commissioner’s priorities, based on his six-point plan, placed emphasis on local policing, which they felt probably reflected the priorities of local people and asked about the Commissioner’s commitment to national priorities and strategic policing issues. The Commissioner explained that he was fully committed to national priorities and that he felt that local people would also understand Kent’s strategic position and the need to devote resources to counter terrorism and other national priorities.

RESOLVED that the Panel note the Commissioner’s updated Police and Crime Plan.

190. Accounts 2015/16 - Statutory Requirement
(Item 7)

1. The Commissioner introduced the report on historical accounts for information as it was a statutory requirement and that consideration by the panel of previous funding arrangements would be helpful in his long term financial planning. Since taking office, the Commissioner had met with the external auditors to scrutinise the historic accounts and was pleased to report that 6 weeks ahead of schedule, the 2015/16 accounts had been approved with an unqualified opinion.

2. Responding to Panel questions regarding use of Reserves, the Commissioner explained that the majority had been earmarked for use on specific projects in relation to larger revenue and capital investment programmes, while a smaller amount was planned for re-investment into core frontline policing. It was anticipated that almost all the earmarked reserves would be spent by 2020.

3. Paul Curtis (Kent Police’s Chief Financial Officer) explained that 10% of reserves were always maintained for addressing additional risk factors, managing change and taking advantage of unplanned policing opportunities. Mr Phillips advised the
Panel that the level of reserves held by Kent were not excessive and that many other Forces maintain higher levels.

4. Responding to questions from the Panel, Mr Curtis explained that the pension deficit of £3bn related to the complicated calculations of Actuary Valuations and that these had been significantly impacted by market instability. Work was ongoing to monitor this issue and manage it accordingly.

RESOLVED that the Panel note the Accounts from 2015/16.

191. Mental Health Strategy - Initial Thoughts
(Item B1)

1. The Commissioner advised the Panel that he was pleased to have the opportunity to explain why mental health was such an important topic and why he was keen to focus on its relationship with Policing during his time as Commissioner. He described mental health as the ‘golden thread’ of how he wants to improve policing, given that it is so heavily involved in a large amount of policing activity. The Commissioner gave an example showing that dealing with one case of significant mental health issues could occupy two Police Constables for their entire shift, preventing them from dealing with other calls from the public or undertaking any kind of meaningful neighbourhood policing. The Commissioner was concerned that the support and interventions for people suffering from mental health were available from the agencies responsible for providing them, but they do not have the capacity to meet the demand and manage the issues effectively.

2. The Commissioner further explained that current estimates suggest that 33% of all police time is spent dealing with mental health issues. To address this, he has already set up a system of employing representatives from the mental health charity, MIND, to work in the Force Control Room to offer support and assistance at the peak times for when such issues present. The Commissioner explained that he had been working with partners across Kent and that the CEO of the Kent and Medway Partnership Trust is very committed to working with the Police on joint mental health plans. Similarly, the Commissioner stated that he was planning to set up a Mental Health Board to link with partners both locally and nationally. A capital bid has been submitted to the Department for Health (as part of a tranche of bids relating to s136) and that this will be supported through some revenue support from his office and the Clinical Commissioning Groups.

3. To highlight the growing issue, the Commissioner advised that Panel that s136 detentions (where a person is detained on the grounds that their mental health presents a risk to themselves or others), are increasing year on year. However, from 2017, Police custody cells would no longer be a legal option for such detention for adults except in extreme circumstances and never for children. As a result, the responsible organisations would need to develop and manage legally compliant alternatives. He explained that this would not mean that Kent Police had no involvement with working with people with mental health issues but he was encouraged that there were already many positive internal discussions taking place regarding improved plans for managing mental health better in terms of how it impacts on policing.
4. The Panel welcomed the Commissioner’s initial thoughts on his Mental Health Strategy and expressed broad support, particularly the use of MIND staff in the Force Control Room at times of peak demand for mental health related police support. It was suggested that the Commissioner should involve the Clinical Commissioning Groups as much as possible to share good practice and resources where possible, in addition to working on joint bids for funding.

5. Responding to additional questions, the Commissioner explained that he was optimistic that close working with KMPT would help raise awareness of this key issue and attract support from relevant bodies. Additionally, he advised the Panel that he was aware of the need for good training for Officers and staff on how to deal with mental health issues effectively, both in terms of members of the public but also in terms of supporting colleagues. However, a key priority within this was improved demand management that ensured the Police were not the default service when other agencies more suited to dealing with mental health issues were not available.

RESOLVED that the Panel note the Commissioner’s update on mental health and that a further report be brought back to the Panel in 2017.

192. Roads Policing (oral item)  
(Item B2)

1. The Commissioner noted that Kent includes a very large strategic road network and that roads policing was a subject often raised by the Public and councils. He advised the Panel that he works with the Safer Roads Strategy Board and Highways England.

2. The Commissioner stated that he was supportive of Community Speedwatch programmes but that the issue of road safety needed to be broadened out beyond speeding and the ‘killed and seriously injured’ figures (KSI). He advised the panel that Assistant Chief Constable Tony Blaker had recently been appointed and one of his responsibilities was roads policing. The Commissioner advised the Panel that he was mindful of the issues presented by HGVs parking inappropriately around the county and reassured them that he was working with relevant organisations to consider the wider strategic issues and would continue to highlight the importance of achieving long term solution, including additional lorry parking facilities. He was hopeful that the proposed lorry park in Kent would help alleviate the problems caused by Operation Stack and he noted that it was positive that this had now been recognised as a national issue.

3. Members raised local traffic issues of concern relating to the Thanet Way and Dover, commenting on a perceived lack of police presence and capability to provide enforcement. The Commissioner advised that he would look into specific issues outside the meeting and commented generally that while enforcement was an important part of managing traffic issues, preventative measures and behaviour change initiatives were far more effective at delivering improvements to road safety and traffic calming.

RESOLVED that the Commissioner’s verbal update be noted by the Panel.
193. Independent Members - Possible Allowance Payment
(Item C1)

(The Independent Members, Mr Sandher and Mrs Bolton, withdrew from the meeting room for the duration of the item, both having potential financial interest in the decision to award allowances to Independent Members.)

1. The Chairman explained the proposal to introduce an allowance of £500 annually, in line with KCC’s constitution rate for independent co-optees. Consideration of such an allowance had been deferred when the Panel was created due to an expectation of further Home Office Guidance, which never materialised. The Chairman highlighted the positive contribution of the current and previous independent members, in terms of the wider experience and expertise they provided and recommended the proposed allowance to the Panel.

2. Officers responded to Member questions regarding allowances, clarifying that the allowance would be reviewed when KCC next reviewed its allowance scheme.

RESOLVED that the Panel's Terms of Reference be amended to show that Independent Members of the Police and Crime Panel will, from the 2016/17 financial onwards, receive an annual allowance of £500, in addition to any other reasonable travel expenses (in line with claim processes for elected Panel Members).

194. Review of Panel Communications Protocol
(Item C2)

1. A Member commented on the need to consider Social Media in addition to engagement with professional media.

RESOLVED that the updated Panel Communication Protocol be approved.

195. Future work programme
(Item C3)

RESOLVED that the Work Programme be noted.

196. Questions to the Commissioner
(Item )

1. Mr Hill:
   I see from a recent blog that you had a meeting with New Schools Network “to talk about the now Prime Minister’s suggestion that PCCs could be involved in the setting up of new kinds of free schools”. You stated that “I am a supporter of this idea in principle and will be working with NSN to scope the possibilities in the county based on need”. Please can you explain your thinking to the Panel?

   The Commissioner explained that his plans to investigate the potential for being involved in the development of Free Schools were based on proposals made by Theresa May when she was the Home Secretary. This work had been piloted by the Northamptonshire Commissioner and the feasibility of this taking place in Kent
was still being scoped. The Commissioner explained that he was supportive of working with young people and that the Free School element was just one avenue being explored.

2. Mr Sandher: 
*Please could the PCC explain how he intends to ensure that his proposed cadet scheme will reflect the diversity of Kent in terms of socio-economic background and ethnicity?*

The Commissioner explained that Police Cadets are being reintroduced around the county on a phased basis, with cohorts initially planned in Tonbridge, Canterbury and Medway. The Commissioner stated that he believed the cadet scheme was a good opportunity for young people to learn about the Police and the wider public sector and that thirty enquiries about places on the scheme had already been received. He noted that it was important that the scheme be open to all and be inclusive. To that end, referral schemes and bursaries were being investigated to ensure financial or social pressures were not barriers to young people taking part.

3. Mr Latchford: 
*Please can the Commissioner provide an update on the Police Investigation into the alleged electoral fraud in Thanet South in the 2015 Parliamentary election?*

The Commissioner explained that he could make no comment as the investigation was still ongoing. He provided reassurance that he had raised the issue with the Chief Constable at the last Governance Board meeting. The Commissioner stated that no update would be possible until the investigation had been concluded.

4. Mrs Bolton: 
*It was recently reported in the media that Kent Police had been ordered to pay aggravated damages in a race discrimination case at an Employment tribunal. The Employment Tribunal panel were damning about a range of issues, which included the actions of the Chief Constable, the Professional Standards department and a Detective Chief Inspector. This will obviously affect public confidence and staff morale. What is the Police and Crime Commissioner doing to hold the Chief Constable to account to ensure that this does not happen again?*

The Commissioner explained that he was unable to comment as Kent Police were appealing the decision and it was therefore still an ongoing legal matter. However, he reassured the Panel that relevant issues in regard to preventing discrimination had been raised with the Chief Constable and that he expected all recommendations from the eventual judgement to be complied with.

RESOLVED that the Panel thank the Commissioner for providing answers to Member questions.

**197. Procurement of External Audit Services**
*(Item E1)*
1. The Chairman commented on the positive development of the decision recording system now in place and noted that it was helpful for the Panel in their considerations.

RESOLVED that the Panel note the Commissioner's decision.

198. Mind Project - FCR  
(Item E2)

RESOLVED that the Panel note the Commissioner’s decision.

199. Interim s151 Officer  
(Item E3)

RESOLVED that the Panel note the Commissioner’s decision.

200. Minutes of the Commissioner's Governance Board meeting held on 2 August 2016  
(Item F1)

1. A Member commented that it would be useful if an action sheet was included within the Governance Board minutes to assist with monitoring outcomes.

RESOLVED that the 2 August 2016 Governance Board minutes be noted.

The next Governance Board was scheduled for 7 November 2016 at 14:00
UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

201. Minutes of the Police and Crime Panel held on 8 September 2016
(Item 4)

1. Subject to the correction of the inconsistency around the description of the Independent Member throughout the minutes it was:

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 8 September 2016 be signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

202. Support for Victims
(Item B1)

1. The Commissioner introduced this item and highlighted Compass House in Ashford which provided a co-ordinated hub for victim services in Kent. HMIC had recently visited Compass House as part of their fact finding and were very complimentary about the services on offer. The Commissioner praised his staff for their work on developing Compass House prior to his arrival.

2. The Commissioner referred Members to paragraph 17 of the report which evidenced greater numbers of victims able to access support, victim satisfaction was very high and the Commissioner paid credit to the Victim Support team. There had been a drop in overall victim satisfaction from 79% to 74% but the Commissioner and his team were working with Kent Police to understand the reasons and learn lessons to improve satisfaction levels.

3. Referring to specialist victim services £450,000 had been allocated to charities and the Commissioner highlighted some including East Kent Rapeline and Family Matters, who were working with child victims of sexual assault, the charity DAVSS which provided support for male victims of domestic violence and Choices DA
service in Dartford which was providing an Independent Domestic Violence Adviser for men and LGBT victims. The Commissioner was aiming to visit all the charities he had provided funding to.

4. A Member asked whether victims had to travel to Compass House, had any work been done on whether victims were willing to travel and where the visitors to Compass House were coming from. The Commissioner explained that Victim Support operate Compass Points, making themselves available in every district for those people who are not able to travel to Ashford. The Commissioner offered to submit a report to a future meeting of the Panel setting out the number of victims visiting Compass House.

5. Another Member asked whether there were particular hard to reach or isolated communities which could really benefit from the services available but did not access them? If there were pockets across Kent which did not access the support available due to, for example, culture or race, what action was Compass House taking to support these groups? The Commissioner confirmed that Compass House focussed on being accessible and breaking down cultural barriers and offered to talk to Compass House about this issue and to provide a report back.

6. One Member asked whether there was any value in a Kent wide group sharing good and bad practice across victim support services. The Commissioner explained that the Victim Support contract ensured Kent wide coverage, and his office also tried to ensure Kent wide coverage when deciding on grant allocations. The Commissioner also outlined an important project with Essex Police focused on child sexual exploitation and Modern Day Slavery, with a Coordinator working hard to break down barriers within certain communities and promote the support available. The domestic abuse contract was also county wide with triage provided by the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner and services provided within the districts.

7. A Member asked how success was defined in relation to specialist victim services, particularly in relation to support for victims of hate crime who had autism or learning difficulties. The Commissioner explained that services such as ‘Talking Therapies’ had had a tremendous impact on the waiting list for counselling support for young people. The Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) were being challenged to do all they could to support vulnerable people.

8. A Member congratulated Victim Support on being awarded the core victim services contract in December 2015. The Commissioner explained that money had been received from the Ministry of Justice to procure the service.

9. In response to a comment from a member about how crime was perceived, the Commissioner explained that the classification of hate crime was a decision for the Force. Since the EU Referendum there had been an increase in reported incidents of hate crime linked with race and religion.

10. The Commissioner was asked what his opinion was of the consultation from the Minister for Policing, Fire, Criminal Justice and Victims on the devolution of the remaining nationally commissioned victim’s services. The Commissioner explained that he was in favour of services being joined up where appropriate; he
would be supportive of the devolution of the remaining nationally commissioned victim’s services.

11. A Member asked about support for businesses as victims of crime. Businesses wanted to have confidence in the charging process and confidence in the prosecution process. The Commissioner explained that business crime across the county was extremely important to him. The Commissioner had been very active meeting businesses in Kent and had recently travelled to Ramsgate to meet businesses there. The Federation of Small Businesses had been consulted on their views and concerns. Referring to the prosecution process the Commissioner said it was a decision for the Crown Prosecution Service over whether to pursue cases to prosecution. If more powers were devolved and Commissioners got oversight of performance of the criminal justice system the Commissioner would have more powers in this area. The Commissioner also referred to ‘Track my Crime’ which could be used more with victims to ensure they had confidence that the policing service was robust.

12. The Chairman closed this item commenting that victims and policing should not be seen as separate entities, the Commissioner confirmed that victims and witnesses were his priority and also that of Kent Police.

RESOLVED that the Panel note the Commissioner’s report on Support for Victims.

203. Update on expenditure to support the Police and Crime Plan
(Item B2)

1. The Commissioner explained that up to the summer he had honoured the funding commitments made by the former Commissioner. The Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC) published, via its website, all expenditure over £500. The Commissioner paid tribute to Safer Kent for their support with administering the Youth Diversion Fund.

2. The Commissioner highlighted the work of the Kenward Trust which delivered sessions to young people hosted by a reformed drug addict. The Commissioner had attended a session and the presenter had had a huge impact on the young people not only demonstrating the effects of drugs on his body and health but on his community from a real life scenario.

3. The Commissioner explained a number of the projects set out within the report which had received funding from the OPCC in the last six months.

4. The Commissioner was reviewing the funding available to ensure it was achieving value for money.

5. The Commissioner was congratulated on the projects set out within the report and for the transparency offered by the OPCC in producing the report outlining how OPCC expenditure was being spent. The Member asked for a fuller list showing the grants in other areas which were not so high profile.

POST MEETING NOTE: A list of all OPCC expenditure (April – October 2016) was circulated to Members of the Panel via email on 22.11.16.
6. In response to a question about feedback received from community groups the Commissioner explained that all groups in receipt of funding were required to complete monitoring forms to ensure that money had been spent where agreed and the results monitored. If the funding was not spent it would be returned and the group might not receive funding in the future if there were poor results.

7. In response to a question about the importance of role models the Commissioner confirmed that he thought role models to be very important, Kenward Trust had mentors with real life experience of working with young people across Kent and Medway. Any overlaps found between the groups receiving funding were challenged and lessons learned.

8. A Member commended the report but asked how many young people were not being reached by the groups set out within the report. The Commissioner explained that it was his hope that no part of the county was forgotten, he worked with Kent Youth County Council and Medway Youth Parliament to promote the groups and encouraged direct engagement with young people to ensure the right message was getting out into communities.

9. A Member pointed out that acknowledgement had not been given to the OPCC within the sponsorship section on the website of one of the groups, Urban Blue Bus Ltd. The Commissioner explained that it was a requirement attached to the funding that acknowledgement was given, he was sure it was an oversight but it would be checked.

10. The Chairman suggested that future reports on expenditure could be prepared in consultation with Panel officers, who might suggest particular items to highlight. The Commissioner agreed to this suggestion.

RESOLVED that the Panel note the Commissioner’s Update on expenditure to support the Police and Crime Plan and that future reports be prepared in consultation with Panel officers.

204. Mobile Policing & Emergency Services Network  
(Item B3)

1. The Commissioner introduced this report and explained that it gave an update on mobile policing within Kent Police and the national Emergency Services Network that would be operational by 2020. The aim was to provide officers with the tools needed on the front line. Body worn cameras had been rolled out force wide and had proved to be a fantastic, robust piece of equipment which officers could use to show evidence to lawyers and the public resulting in earlier guilty pleas and moderating the behaviour of all involved.

2. The Commissioner outlined an example of where the body worn cameras had been successful, during one incident where police were called by a victim of domestic violence, the victim had changed her mind about the incident by the time the police arrived but footage taken by the body worn camera revealed injuries caused by the perpetrator.

3. Smartphones had also been rolled out across Kent Police and now forces were looking for integrated mobile solutions.
4. A Member asked whether there was a mechanism in place to hold the force to account for the delivery of officer free time as mentioned in paragraph 6 of the report, as well as how the PCC would oversee this project. Paragraph 26 of the report stated that the Commissioner’s Chief of Staff chaired a quarterly IT Delivery Board where progress against the delivery of all Kent Police IT projects was reviewed. The Commissioner explained that the saving of 1 hour per officer per shift of transaction time was an early estimate based on pilot projects. It was necessary to review quantitative and qualitative data and the equipment would be very valuable in allowing officers to complete paperwork, whilst monitoring offenders at A&E, for example. The Commissioner assured Members that he was very hands on with monitoring IT projects and held regular meetings to review progress.

5. A Member asked about the cost of the scheme and the mobile coverage provided. The Commissioner explained that the costs were difficult to clarify at this stage as the handsets had not been purchased yet, since the technology would improve over the next couple of years and it was important to get the right device, at the right time. In terms of operational cost, the Commissioner referred to the decision on page 25 of the agenda and explained that this was indicative of the costs to Kent Police. The Commissioner explained that the coverage and operability function had to be 99.999% otherwise the scheme would fail at a critical time.

6. In response to a question from a Member about whether fingerprint technology would be used the Commissioner explained that it currently would not. Members raised concerns about the mobile coverage provided and the ability of the mobile phone operators to deliver a national project, the Commissioner confirmed that he would do everything possible to hold the providers to account and he was aware that sometimes time could not be quantified when it came to saving officer time.

7. Another Member expressed nervousness about changing contracts and asked whether it would be a gradual phase in of the new technology and whether there would be a pilot scheme. The Commissioner explained that a gradual roll out was planned, other forces would adopt the new technology before Kent and Kent would learn lessons from the other forces. A lot of thought would go into the mobile devices to ensure the handset had the right functionality for Kent.

8. Mr Phillips, the Commissioner’s Chief Finance Officer, confirmed that the cost of the handsets had been built into the programme; it was not an unexpected cost.

9. A Member asked for assurance that the hand held devices were fit for purpose and could be used when supplying aid to other forces. Mr Harper, the Commissioner’s Chief of Staff, explained that it was a national project and that all handsets and vehicles would use the system and that the devices were interoperable.

10. In response to a query about the timescale for the roll out of this project the Commissioner explained that it would be rolled out in Kent during 2018/19.

11. Mr Phillips explained that the budget for mobile policing was £5.9 million over the next 4 years and the budget for the Emergency Services Network project was £9.5 million, this was a huge national project.
12. In response to a concern from a Member about the capacity of the mobile network in the case of a national emergency the Commissioner explained that the emergency services network would always be prioritised.

13. The Chairman closed this item by asking whether the project would extend to other partners and the Commissioner confirmed that he would look into this.

RESOLVED that the Panel note the Commissioner’s report on Mobile Policing and the Emergency Services Network.

205. Mental Health - verbal update  
(Item B4)

1. The Commissioner opened this item and thanked the Councillors and Kent MPs for lobbying for funding for the Kent health based places of safety. With regards to outreach work there would be a Thanet mobile engagement vehicle and in West Kent a crisis café available in partnership with West Kent Mind. This had been part funded by West Kent Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and part funded by the Commissioner. The Commissioner thanked everyone who had supported the bid.

2. The Commissioner referred to the Police and Crime Bill, which would ban police cells from being used as a place of safety for children and severely restrict their use for adults. West Kent CCG was holding an engagement day in December to help understand existing processes and to develop alternative pathways. The Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner’s relationship with the Kent and Medway NHS and Social Care Partnership Trust (KMPT) continued to grow.

3. A Member asked about support given to dementia patients, the Commissioner explained that his office had been dementia friendly trained as had all Kent Police staff. There was a partnership with Kent Fire and Rescue Service which was undertaking preventative work to ensure safety in homes. Community Wardens also had the role of checking on residents with dementia ensuring visits by carers had been made etc.

4. In response to a question about the relationship with the CCGs the Commissioner explained that through the Talking Therapies for Children scheme the Commissioner’s Office had been engaging with the CCGs, mental health scorecards had been produced for mental health services in Kent and it was clear that some areas were good and some not so good. It was necessary to question the CCGs on why they were underperforming in some areas and determine methods of accountability.

5. The Chairman referred Members to a virtual dementia experience which he had learned of.

RESOLVED that the Panel note the Commissioner’s verbal update on Mental Health.

206. Questions to the Commissioner  
(Item )
1. Mr Sandher:

*Can the PCC provide an update on how many responses he has had to date with the consultation on the crime plan, the last I read there had been 800? Are there any districts which are showing a low response to date, and if so what will he and the team be doing to increase the response rate if applicable?*

The Commissioner explained that the majority of responses had been online. The consultation document had been advertised on the PCC’s website and the Officers were doing their best to promote the consultation. A youth forum event was taking place at which it would be promoted and the Commissioner was looking at ways to extend the reach of the consultation and was willing to consider any ideas Members had.

**POST MEETING NOTE:** A breakdown of responses is available [here on KCC’s website](https://www.kent.gov.uk).

2. Mr Sandher:

*In light of the recent BBC 5 LIVE investigation report nationally about the use of strip searches by police forces, are you in a position to provide an update on what the figures are for Kent including figures on under 18?*

The Commissioner explained that the figures had not yet been verified however he was assured that they were very low with less than 10% strip searches. Once the data was verified he would present it to the Panel. For clarity the definition of a ‘strip search’ under the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 is: ‘a search involving removal of more than outer clothing… outer clothing includes shoes and socks’. The Commissioner read out the safeguards in relation to use, which included:

- the police officer carrying out must be same sex as detainee;
- the search taking place in an area where detainee cannot be seen by anyone else, or member of opposite sex;
- whenever involves exposure of intimate body parts, must be at least two people present other than detainee;
- having proper regard to sensitivity and vulnerability of detainee, and every effort made to secure detainees cooperation and minimise embarrassment;
- detainees not normally required to remove all clothes at the same time;
- record made on custody record, including reason, those present and result.

3. Cllr Gooch:

*Of the 63 requests for Maidstone’s mobile camera deployment in 2015/16, 53 requests came from Kent Police in order to, for example, detect parcels being thrown over the wall at Maidstone Prison, criminal damage, drug issues. Mindful that CCTV evidence is useful for detecting and investigating crimes, saving the Police a considerable amount of time through guilty pleas, how far will the reduction in CCTV, whether static or mobile, impact on valuable police time?*
The Commissioner explained that partnerships were vital, the public and businesses benefited most from CCTV and it helped to protect the public from harm. CCTV was one of the issues over which the PCC was contacted most frequently. Kent Police were not in a position to provide a contribution to CCTV but they did fund the radio network which feeds into the Force Control Room.

With regards to the impact on police time the Commissioner confirmed that he had considered the impact on police time and would urge operators to be mindful of the value provided by CCTV in the past.

4. Mr Latchford:

*Following the Commissioner’s visits last week to a number of Parish Councils in Thanet (within my division) I understand that you undertook to look into the question of PCSOs and extending their powers. Can I ask what the current situation is please?*

The Commissioner confirmed that he had made a commitment to reviewing the discretionary powers of the Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs). There were currently 20 Standard Powers and 22 Discretionary Powers available to Chief Constables to delegate. Kent’s PCSOs already had 10 of the discretionary powers and these were published on the PCC’s website. The Commissioner would discuss further with the Chief Constable the powers of the PCSOs and would present a further report at a future meeting of the Panel.

RESOLVED that the Panel thank the Commissioner for providing answers to Member’s questions.

207. Commissioner's Decisions - 008 - 010

* (Item D1)

1. With regard to the decision over the Dedicated Complaint Managers, a Member explained that she understood that Kent Police should be undertaking this function. The Commissioner explained that there was an underspend in the Police budget and the proposal was to fund dedicated complaint managers. The PCC holds the Chief Constable to account however the only statutory duty that the Commissioner had in relation to complaints was around those made about the Chief Constable personally. The Commissioner’s staff dip checked police records to ensure a consistent service was being provided and Members of the Police and Crime Panel were invited to attend the Commissioner’s Governance Board to watch the PCC challenge the Chief Constable.

RESOLVED that the Panel note the Commissioner's Decisions.

208. Future work programme

* (Item E1)

RESOLVED that the Panel note the future work programme.
(a) FIELD
(b) FIELD_TITLE
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1. Summary

1.1 This report provides background on the new tools and powers introduced under the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 and the use of those powers to date.

2. Recommendation

2.1 That the Committee notes the contents of the report.

3. Introduction

1.1 The Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 reformed existing legislation to tackle anti-social behaviour; putting victims at the heart of agencies’ responses to anti-social behaviour and simplifying the process taken by professionals whilst giving flexibility to deal with any given situation. The majority of these powers came into effect on 20 October 2014, apart from the Civil Injunction power which was introduced several months later due to legal amendments being required before it could be introduced.

1.2 What is seen as anti-social behaviour will vary from person to person. It is a broad term used to describe criminal damage, nuisance and disorder that can seriously impact people’s lives, causing them alarm and distress. Issues range from litter and vandalism to public drunkenness, aggressive dogs or noisy or abusive neighbours. Such a wide range of behaviours means that responsibility for dealing with anti-social behaviour is shared between a number of agencies, particularly the police, local authorities and social landlords.

1.3 The focus of the Act is not on the behaviour in question but rather the impact it has on the victim. In many cases what could be perceived as being ‘low level’ behaviour can have devastating effects on a victim’s life when this behaviour is persistent and targeted against the most vulnerable.

1.4 The Act also included two new measures which are designed to give victims and communities a say in the way anti-social behaviour is dealt with:

3.4.1 The Community Trigger gives victims the ability to demand a review of their case where the locally defined threshold is met. It is tantamount to a ‘complaints’ process for the handling of anti-social behaviour cases, however, does not replace the complaints process for individual organisations. In Dartford the Community Trigger can be used if at least three incidents of anti-social behaviour have been reported to a relevant organisation within the previous six months and action to address the issue not taken. These are incidents where the same behaviour, nuisance or problem has reoccurred and was reported within one month of it happening. To date there
have been no Community Trigger activations in Dartford.

3.4.2 The co-location of the local policing team and DBC's Community Safety team, with DBC Housing also occupying the Civic Centre, mean that information exchange occurs more effectively than may be the case in other local authorities across the country and allows the staff who can provide the principal response to anti-social behaviour in Dartford to speak in person.

3.4.3 As part of the ongoing management of ASB cases, the Community Safety team remain flexible to the circumstances and scrutinise their own actions, giving consideration to potential outcomes. Professionals’ meetings may be called when other agencies, such as Registered Social Landlords, are involved in cases; and if necessary other agencies are held to account and complaints made and duly escalated within organisations until a suitable response is received.

3.4.4 This awareness of the wider sphere of working means that the case-review and recommendation process intended by the Community Trigger process is already effectively taking place, albeit in a less formal manner and therefore generally results in action being taken before a Community Trigger application becomes applicable.

3.5 The Community Remedy is a plan produced by the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) and sets out how victims get a say in the out-of-court punishment for perpetrators of low-level crime and anti-social behaviour. The PCC carried out a consultation before completing the Community Remedy document, the outcomes of which will be delivered in Kent through the process known as Community Resolution. The Community Resolution process can be used in low-level cases when both victim and offender agree, and can see one of the following actions used as appropriate:

- Financial Compensation (payment of cost of damage or replacement of property)
- Reparation (repair of damage to victim’s property or work in the community)
- Parenting contract (voluntary agreement signed by the offender’s parent/carer/guardian outlining expected behaviour)
- Acceptable behaviour contract (written agreement specifying behaviour)
- Written apology to the victim
- Verbal apology to the victim
- Restorative intervention (facilitated process between victim and offender to discuss the harm caused)

2 New Powers to Tackle Anti-Social Behaviour

2.1 The Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 replaced the nineteen pre-existing measures with six new powers for tackling anti-social behaviour and introduced new absolute grounds for possession of secure and assured tenancies associated with anti-social behaviour or criminality. Each of the new measures is considered in turn below.

2.2 Civil Injunctions
2.2.1 The injunction is a civil power which can be applied for to deal with anti-social individuals. The injunction is designed to be a fast and effective protection for victims and communities and set a clear standard of behaviour for perpetrators, stopping the person’s behaviour from escalating.

2.2.2 The Council’s Housing team have obtained four Civil Injunctions; with one injunction including a positive requirement to engage with the substance misuse treatment provider.

4.2.3 The Community Safety Unit are considering use of an injunction to deal with anti-social behaviour caused by vehicles congregating and racing in certain parts of the borough.

2.3 Criminal Behaviour Order (CBO)

2.3.1 The CBO is an additional sanction a court can impose during sentencing following a conviction for any criminal offence. The Council can ask the Crown Prosecution Service to apply to the Court for a CBO on behalf of the authority and it can be used as a sanction upon breach of either a Community Protection Notice (CPN) or a Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO). A CBO can include both the more traditional prohibitions, but also positive requirements and it is a criminal offence to fail to comply with an order without reasonable excuse. Breaches of CBO by those aged under 18 will be dealt with in the youth court. In all other cases the offence will be considered by the Magistrates’ Court or Crown Court.

4.3.2 Kent Police have used the powers to impose CBOs on eight individuals in total. Five were convicted relating to repeated incidents of disorder around Temple Hill; two in relation to town centre disorder, and one further individual.

2.4 Dispersal Power

2.4.1 The dispersal power is a flexible power which the police can use in a range of situations to disperse anti-social individuals and provide immediate short-term respite to the local community. Previously, a Dispersal Order had to be agreed by both the Police and the Local Authority; however Local Authority approval is no longer required and dispersal powers can be put in place for up to 48hrs on authority of a Police Inspector.

2.4.2 The power is intended to be preventative as it allows an officer to deal instantly with someone’s behaviour before it escalates. In all instances, the impact on the local community should be considered before using the dispersal power.

2.4.3 Kent Police have utilised this power numerous times since its introduction. For example, a Dispersal Order has been put in place in Dartford Town Centre every weekend as a proactive preventative measure; providing officers with a legal basis to direct troublemakers to leave town. Several uses of this power have come as a direct result of intelligence sharing at the CSU tasking meetings.

2.5 Community Protection Notice (CPN)
2.5.1 The CPN is intended to deal with particular, on-going problems, or nuisances that negatively affect the community’s quality of life by targeting those responsible. CPNs can be used to tackle a wide range of problem behaviours. It can be issued against any person over the age of 16, or a group or organisation including a business. The Home Office noted that councils already took the lead in dealing with these kinds of issues and this power greatly increases the range of behaviours which local authorities can tackle.

2.5.2 There is a three step process in issuing a CPN. First a warning letter (CPW) must be issued directing a person to stop whatever they may be doing that is considered as the ‘detrimental behaviour’ and/or require them to carry out a certain action within a given time limit. For example, it may require a person to clear up an untidy garden within a given period of time.

2.5.3 If this warning letter is not followed the formal Notice can be issued. The Notice must contain similar conditions to the Warning but may contain amendments to the wording and will be worded formally and unambiguously to ensure there are no difficulties in the event that the matter progresses to prosecution. If the problem persists then the following punitive measures exist:

2.5.3.1 Service of a Fixed Penalty Notice of £100;

2.5.3.2 Prosecution in the Magistrates’ Court which could result in:

   A. On summary conviction a fine not exceeding £2,500 for a person or £20,000 for a business.
   B. The court may make whichever order the court thinks is appropriate for ensuring that the notice is complied with.
   C. An order can be made requiring specified work to be carried out, or to allow specified work to be carried out by (or on behalf of) the Council.
   D. The court may require the offender to surrender possession of any item used in their failure to comply with the Notice, to a constable or to a person representing The Council. The court may require this item to be destroyed or disposed of by the police force. A justice of the peace may issue a warrant, authorising a constable or authorised person to enter premises to seize the item.

4.5.4 Point D above means that breaching a CPN which sets a condition around use of vehicles, could result in the vehicle being seized and later disposed of. This point is worth emphasising to those who may consider that the issuing of a CPN is merely another warning, which will not result in action being taken.

4.5.5 Between October 2014 and January 2017 Dartford Borough Council issued 54 Community Protection Warning letters. Of these, four have progressed to Community Protection Notices. None of the Notices have been breached.

4.5.6 The Community Protection process has been utilised by the Community Safety Team, Environmental Enforcement, Licensing Enforcement, Housing Estate
Management, Planning Enforcement, and Environmental Protection teams. This demonstrates that although the title of the Act and power itself suggest it is reserved for the more traditional types of anti-social behaviour, this is a powerful piece of legislation which can be adapted to numerous circumstances where someone is committing behaviour which could impact on the quality of life of others.

4.5.7 The teams within \textit{Enforcement and Regulatory Services} have issued 21 Warning letters. Housing have issued 20, and Environmental Health have issued 13.

4.5.8 Dartford has adopted a system whereby the CSU progresses CPWs in appropriate cases which also impact on demand for local policing team resources. 14 of the 54 CPWs issued relate to matters which are a concern for both Kent Police and at least one DBC department and several others had potential to escalate to police involvement if action had not been taken.

4.5.9 As mentioned above, a Criminal Behaviour Order can be obtained if a person is convicted at court of failing to comply with the conditions of a Community Protection Notice. This expedites the process of getting a substantial order against those who cause nuisance to others, with the CBO carrying penalties of up to six months’ imprisonment, a substantial fine, or both.

2.6 \textbf{Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO)}

2.6.1 The PSPO is intended to deal with a particular nuisance or problem in a designated area which is detrimental to the local community’s quality of life by imposing conditions on the use of the area. This could include placing restrictions on the use of parks, alleyways, or communal areas to prevent problems with misuse of alcohol, dogs or noise. Local authorities are responsible for making a PSPO but Police officers and Police Community Support Officers, as well as Council officers, have enforcement powers.

2.6.2 PSPOs are intended to replace the Designated Public Place Orders (DPPOs) which currently exist; also known as Alcohol Control Zones. The 2014 Act stated that DPPOs would cease to have effect in October 2017 – 3 years after the Act was introduced; therefore if appropriate, authorities can replace DPPOs by introducing a PSPO restricting alcohol use in the same area.

2.6.3 At the time of writing this report, a PSPO has been proposed for Dartford town centre (including Central Park) and Cabinet approval to undertake public consultation sought. This will replace the existing DPPO and will also add further conditions relating to a specific car park which accounts for a significant amount of disorder within the Night Time Economy.

2.6.4 These conditions relate to use of intoxicating substances; prohibition of anti-social use of motor vehicles; a requirement to surrender an open alcohol container; the prohibition of littering, swearing, urinating, defecating, or any other anti-social behaviour.

4.6.5 A PSPO has also been considered as a response to anti-social vehicle use.
2.7 Closure Power

2.7.1 The closure power can be used by local authorities and the police to close premises that are causing nuisance or disorder. The power comes in two stages. The closure notice can be used to provide short term relief up to a maximum of 48 hours. The closure notice can be issued in the first instance for 24 hours, or extended from 24 hours up to a maximum of 48 hours by the Council's Managing Director or other officer designated by him, or by a Police Superintendent.

2.7.2 The notice can then be extended upon application to the Magistrates’ Court for a closure order for a period of up to three months. At any time before the expiry of the closure order, an application may be made to the court for an extension (or further extension) of the order up to a total of six months.

2.7.3 Consideration was given to this power when a joint DBC and Kent Police operation closed down a rented premises causing significant community concern in 2016. Police obtained a warrant, visited the address and then alerted the owner who managed the property from a distance who was oblivious to the anti-social activity. This resulted in the owner reasserting control over the property and ensuring it was no longer used for nefarious purposes, thereby negating the need to obtain a closure notice.

2.8 Absolute Grounds for Possession

2.8.1 The purpose of the new absolute grounds for possession is to speed up the possession process in cases where anti-social behaviour or criminality has already been proven in another court. Landlords no longer have to prove that it is reasonable to grant possession but, instead, courts must grant possession if the landlord followed the correct procedure and at least one of the following specified conditions has been met.

- Convicted for a serious criminal offence,
- Found by a Court to have breached a Civil Injunction,
- Convicted for breach of a Criminal Behaviour Order,
- Convicted for breach of a Noise Abatement Notice, OR
- Tenant’s property closed under a Closure Order.

2.8.2 The Council has had no cause to make use of this power.

3 Relationship to the Corporate Plan

3.1 Contributes to the Safer Community Objective Strategic Aim to create a safer Borough in which to work and live.

4 Financial, legal, staffing and other administrative implications and risk assessments
### Financial Implications
Producing the required signage for PSPO areas will have a small cost attached which can be met from existing budgets.

### Legal Implications
Obtaining Orders or injunctions will require liaison with legal service. Pursing enforcement action could lead to Court action being taken.

### Staffing Implications
None

### Administrative Implications
None

### Risk Assessment
None

## BACKGROUND PAPERS
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DARTFORD AND GRAVESEHAM COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP:
STRATEGIC ASSESSMENT 2016

1. Summary

1.1 To consider the Dartford and Gravesham Community Safety Partnership (CSP) annual Strategic Assessment 2016 as presented to the CSP on 26 January 2017 (Appendix A to this report).

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 That the Committee notes the contents of the Strategic Assessment 2016 document as presented to the Dartford and Gravesham Community Safety Partnership (Appendix A to this report, enclosed as Item A in the EXEMPT Agenda papers).

2.2 That the Committee notes the priorities identified by the Strategic Assessment 2016.

2.3 That the Committee notes the Dartford and Gravesham Community Safety Partnership (CSP’s) intention to refresh the Community Safety Plan to address the priorities identified in the Strategic Assessment 2016 and that the Plan be submitted to the next meeting of the Committee in July 2017.

3. Background and Discussion

3.1 Under the Committee’s Terms of Reference, and as an Overview function, the Committee is required to consider the annual Strategic Assessment in connection with the discharge by the Community Safety Partnership, of its crime and disorder functions.

4. Relationship to the Corporate Plan

4.1 Member review of the annual Strategic Assessment contributes to the Safer Communities Objective and Strategic Aim to create a safer Borough in which to work and live.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implications</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Implications</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<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>Member comment on the proposals as set out in the annual Strategic Assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment should help to focus the CSP’s efforts on ensuring a safer community for Dartford residents.

6. Obligation of Confidence

An obligation of confidence arises in relation to the Strategic Assessment 2016 document (Appendix A to this report) in that the data contained in SA 2016 was provided to the Council In-Confidence. Appendix A will therefore be considered in the EXEMPT part of the Agenda marked as Item A.
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CRIME AND DISORDER (OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY) COMMITTEE
15 February 2017

UPDATED ROLLING WORK PROGRAMME for the REMAINDER of
2016-17 MUNICIPAL YEAR and BEYOND

1. Summary

1.1 To note the revised rolling Work Programme for the remainder of the 2016-17 municipal year and beyond (attached as Appendix A).

2. RECOMMENDATION

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

3. Background and Discussion

3.1 In accordance with its Protocol, the Committee agreed an initial rolling Work Programme for the 2016-17 Municipal Year and beyond, at its meeting on 27 July 2016 [Min. No. 11 refers].

3.2 Subsequently, on 27 September 2016, the Office of the Kent Police and Crime Commissioner advised Member Services that the Commissioner would no longer be able to address the Committee on 15 February 2017 as previously agreed. The attached revised Work Programme seeks to rebalance the content of the agendas for February and July 2017, following the cancellation by the PCC.

3.3 With the kind agreement of Kent Police, Members will now receive two presentations on 15 February originally scheduled for 26 July 2017 on:

(i) ‘Neighbourhood Watch – Sharing Best Practice’; and
(ii) ‘Bluewater Safety Shop/Community Safety at Home Facility’.

3.4 A further invitation has been issued to the PCC’s Office for the Commissioner to address the Committee on 26 July 2017. Members will be advised of the response in due course.

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 (ASB) and help meet the Safer Community Corporate Objectives (SC1 and SC2).
5. Financial, legal, staffing and other administrative implications and risk assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implications</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Implications</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<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: Updated Rolling Work Programme for remainder of the 2016-17 Municipal Year and beyond;
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Appendix A

CRIME and DISORDER (Overview & Scrutiny) COMMITTEE

UPDATED ROLLING WORK PROGRAMME for the
REMAINDER of the 2016-17 MUNICIPAL YEAR and BEYOND

Background:

On a statutory basis to:

- Consider the CSP’s annual Strategic Assessment (SA) document;
- Consider the CSP’s Community Safety Strategy and annual Refresh documents.

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

Plus:

- To consider the CSP’s mid-term Performance Report;
- To receive updates from the Council’s Kent Police and Crime Panel (PCP) representative and to note the Panel’s Minutes as appropriate;
- To receive each July an annual update on the Dartford Town Against Crime (D-TAC) Scheme;
- To consider Draw-Down topics via the Chairman on an ad-hoc basis with the agreement of the Managing Director;
- Discretionary topics as agreed by the Committee under the guidance of the Strategic Director (External Services)

The Committee’s Work Programme is subject to review at each meeting. Discretionary items may be rescheduled and new items added in accordance with the Committee’s wishes and the guidance of the Strategic Director (ES).

An Updated Work Programme for the remainder of the 2016-17 Municipal Year and beyond is attached for Members’ consideration.
Crime and Disorder (Overview & Scrutiny) Committee

Draft Work Programme for the Remainder of the 2016-17 Municipal Year and Beyond

Winter Meeting 2017 – 15 February

- PCP Update;
- ‘Neighbourhood Watch – Sharing Best Practice’: presentation from Kent Police;
- ‘Bluewater Safety Shop/Community Safety at Home Facility’: presentation from Kent Police;
- Strategic Assessment 2016;
- Work Programme Update & Review

Summer Meeting 2017 – 26 July

- PCP Update;
- D-TAC Annual Update;
- Community Safety Strategy 2016-19 (2017 refresh);
- Committee’s Annual Report for the 2016-17 municipal cycle;
- Work Programme 2017-18 Municipal Year and Beyond

Winter 2018 – 14 February

- Address by Kent Police & Crime Commissioner (t.b.c.)
- Strategic Assessment 2017;
- Presentation from Kent, Surrey and Sussex Community Rehabilitation Company (KSS CRC);
- PCP Update;
- Review Work Programme

Member Services February 2017
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