



THE LONDON BOROUGH  
www.bromley.gov.uk

BROMLEY CIVIC CENTRE, STOCKWELL CLOSE, BROMLEY BRI 3UH

TELEPHONE: 020 8464 3333

CONTACT: Steve Wood  
[stephen.wood@bromley.gov.uk](mailto:stephen.wood@bromley.gov.uk)

DIRECT LINE: 020 8313 4316

FAX: 020 8290 0608

DATE: 24th February 2014

To: Members of the  
**PUBLIC PROTECTION AND SAFETY POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

Councillor Kate Lymer (Chairman)  
Councillor Gordon Norrie (Vice-Chairman)  
Councillors Douglas Auld, Jane Beckley, John Canvin, Roxhannah Fawthrop,  
Peter Fookes, David Hastings and Harry Stranger

Non-Voting Co-opted Members –

Terry Belcher, Bromley Community Engagement Forum  
Derec Craig, Bromley Victim Support  
Dr Robert Hadley, Bromley Federation of Residents Associations  
Alf Kennedy, Bromley Neighbourhood Watch  
Andrew Spears, Bromley Youth Council  
Abdulla Zaman, Bromley Youth Council

A meeting of the Public Protection and Safety Policy Development and Scrutiny Committee will be held at Committee Room 1 - Bromley Civic Centre on **TUESDAY 4<sup>TH</sup> MARCH 2014 AT 7.00 PM**

MARK BOWEN  
Director of Corporate Services

***Copies of the documents referred to below can be obtained from***  
**[www.bromley.gov.uk/meetings](http://www.bromley.gov.uk/meetings)**

## **PART 1 AGENDA**

**Note for Members:** Members are reminded that Officer contact details are shown on each report and Members are welcome to raise questions in advance of the meeting.

### **STANDARD ITEMS**

- 1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS**
- 2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**
- 3 QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS AND MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ATTENDING THE MEETING**

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, questions to this Committee must be received in writing four working days before the date of the meeting. Therefore please

ensure that questions are received by the Democratic Services Team by 5pm on Wednesday 26<sup>th</sup> February 2014.

**4 MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC PROTECTION AND SAFETY PDS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 21ST JANUARY 2014 (Pages 1 - 18)**

**5 MATTERS ARISING REPORT (Pages 19 - 22)**

**6 CHAIRMAN'S UPDATE**

**7 POLICE UPDATE**

**HOLDING THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER TO ACCOUNT**

**8 QUESTIONS TO THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND COUNCILLORS ATTENDING THE MEETING**

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, questions to the Portfolio Holder must be received in writing four working days before the date of the meeting. Therefore please ensure that questions are received by the Democratic Services Team by 5pm on Wednesday 26<sup>th</sup> February 2014.

**9 PRE DECISION SCRUTINY OF REPORTS TO THE PUBLIC PROTECTION AND SAFETY PORTFOLIO HOLDER**

**a BUDGET MONITORING 2013/14 (Pages 23 - 30)**

**b PROPOSED JOINT MORTUARY SERVICE WITH LONDON BOROUGH OF BEXLEY (Pages 31 - 34)**

**c CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING Q3 2013/14 & ANNUAL CAPITAL REVIEW 2014 TO 2018 (Pages 35 - 44)**

**POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND OTHER ITEMS**

**10 PRESENTATION BY MR KEITH MILLER--BROMLEY AMBULANCE SERVICE**

**11 VERBAL UPDATE ON ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITY**

**12 OPERATION PAYBACK UPDATE (Pages 45 - 48)**

**13 PERPETRATOR PROGRAMME PROJECT UPDATE (Pages 49 - 52)**

**14 ANNUAL UPDATE ON YOUTH SERVICES - 2013 (Pages 53 - 62)**

**15 WORK PROGRAMME AND CONTRACTS REGISTER (Pages 63 - 68)**

**16 MEMBER VISITS**

.....

## **PUBLIC PROTECTION AND SAFETY POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.00 pm on 21 January 2014

### **Present:**

Councillor Kate Lymer (Chairman)

Councillors Douglas Auld, Jane Beckley, John Canvin,  
Roxhannah Fawthrop, Peter Fookes and Harry Stranger

Terry Belcher, Derec Craig, Dr Robert Hadley, Alf  
Kennedy and Abdulla Zaman

### **Also Present:**

Councillor Nicholas Bennett J.P. and Councillor Tim  
Stevens J.P.

#### **54 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS**

Apologies were received from Councillor Gordon Norrie, and also from  
Andrew Spears from Bromley Youth Service.

#### **55 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Roxhannah Fawthrop declared a personal interest with regard to  
CCTV as she had recently been involved in a motor vehicle accident where  
CCTV footage was being used as part of the investigation.

#### **56 QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS AND MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ATTENDING THE MEETING**

One oral question was received from Mr Bob Mills. The question and  
response are appended to these minutes.

#### **57 MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC PROTECTION AND SAFETY PDS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 5TH NOVEMBER 2013**

The Committee considered the minutes of the meeting of Public Protection  
and Safety PDS Committee held on 5<sup>th</sup> November 2013.

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting held on 5<sup>th</sup> November 2013  
be agreed.

## **58 MATTERS ARISING REPORT**

### **Report CSD14019**

Members considered the matters arising report.

*Concerning Minute 206, Bethlem Royal Hospital Update*, the Chairman advised that the report on the February 2012 incident had been released, and had been seen by some members of the Committee. The Chairman advised that bi monthly meetings were taking place with SLaM, and that relations were improving. The Chairman therefore suggested that it may be appropriate to move on, and that the proposed meeting with SLaM be scrapped.

Councillor Douglas Auld commented that it was two years since this incident had occurred, and that there were still no satisfactory answers. Councillor Auld felt that this was not good enough, and that answers were required from questions that had been raised.

The Portfolio Holder stated that the report was in circulation, and that it was damning against SLaM. The report highlighted inefficiencies, with recommended actions. SLaM were of the opinion that these actions were no longer required as the ward in question was now closed. The Portfolio Holder continued with the suggestion that SLaM be invited to one of the meetings of the Public Protection and Safety PDS Committee.

Councillor Auld commented that he was looking for a way ahead, and said that the attitude of the management at SLaM was negative. The emphasis should now be focused on how everyone involved could learn from past errors, and move forward for the benefit of all concerned.

The Portfolio Holder felt that matters were now moving on in a more positive direction, and that relations with SLaM had greatly improved; this had in part been facilitated by the appointment of a new Director. Further, it was likely that a seat would be offered to someone from the Public Protection and Safety Committee to sit on the SLaM Board of Governors. This was likely to be agreed by February.

The Portfolio Holder highlighted a difference in opinion as to how the security issues were being looked at by SLaM and by the Public Protection & Safety Committee. It was the opinion of the Committee, and of many members of the public, that security needed improving at Bethlem. The view of SLaM was that the facility was a hospital and not a prison, and that serious security issues would be a matter for the Police.

Councillor Jane Beckley commented that it was in SLaM's interests to be open about these matters to allay public concerns.

Councillor Nicholas Bennett expressed concern that this was a matter of public confidence, and questioned why the report could not be published. He stated that the establishment was a forensic unit that accommodated some

very serious offenders. Councillor Bennett stated that he would like to see the new Chief Executive attend a Public Protection and Safety PDS Committee meeting, and also attend a meeting of the West Wickham Resident's Association.

It was agreed that SLaM would be invited to the next meeting of the Public Protection & Safety PDS Committee in July 2014, where these issues could be discussed further.

It was further agreed that copies of the sensitive 2012 report would be made available to Members in a Committee Room an hour before the commencement of the Public Protection and Safety PDS Committee.

**RESOLVED that matters arising from previous meetings be noted.**

## **59 CHAIRMAN'S UPDATE**

The Chairman highlighted the Best Bar None Awards. This was taking place on Friday 28<sup>th</sup> February at 1.00pm. The Chairman stated that all were very welcome but should advise proposed attendance in advance for catering purposes. The person dealing with the catering was Mr Steve Philips.

The Chairman further highlighted that planning was underway for the Safer Bromley Awards. This would be held on Thursday 27<sup>th</sup> March 2014. This event was going to be advertised on the Council Website in an attempt to widen the reach for entries.

The Chairman had previously reported that Boris Johnson would be coming to Bromley to see Community Safety in action. He was previously due to come before Christmas but cancelled due to the visit being planned on the same day as George Osborne's Autumn Statement.

The Chairman advised that the new date for Boris Johnson coming to visit Bromley was Tuesday 11<sup>th</sup> February 2014.

## **60 POLICE UPDATE**

The Deputy Borough Commander Jo Oakley provided an update for the Committee.

There had been a change to the Senior Management Team. A new Chief Inspector had been appointed, Chief Inspector Roy Smith. Chief Inspector Katrina Smith had now retired. The new Chief Inspector would be responsible for the Emergency Response Teams.

Generally speaking, crime levels were going down. Overall crime levels had decreased year on year by eight hundred crimes against MOPAC 7 crime reduction targets. It was acknowledged that there had been some articles in the press concerning Police data integrity.

Year on year, vehicle crime was down by two hundred and fifty. The number of low level assaults had fallen, but the number of serious assaults had increased. It was explained that this increase was resultant from a change in the classification process. Because of these changes, even if a person got a scratch in a domestic violence incident, that would be classed as a serious assault.

There were certain areas in the Borough that were recognised hotspots for motorists and cyclists being either killed or seriously injured; these areas were being targeted and monitored by the Police.

There were 15 current Operations ongoing targeting different types of crime, including anti-social behaviour, serious acquisitive crimes, drugs and gangs.

Following the publication of the findings of the Duggan inquest, there had been an increased Police presence in the Borough, but fortunately there did not appear to be an increase in community tension in Bromley.

Councillor Fookes asked if there had been any further problems with the implementation of the New Policing Model and also if there had been any further updates on the previous shooting that had taken place in Penge. The Deputy Borough Commander responded that the NPM implementation in Bromley was ongoing and evolving, but that generally speaking it was going well. There were ongoing local and central meetings to monitor the progress of the NPM in Bromley. There had been no further updates on the Penge shooting, and this matter was being dealt with centrally.

Councillor Auld asked what time officers came on duty in the Petts Wood area, and how many vehicles were involved in moving officers around when they first came on duty. The Deputy Borough Commander answered by stating that officers came on duty at 7.00am, and that there was a mini bus and two cars involved in the transportation process.

Councillor Auld was of the opinion that too much time was being lost in the transportation of officers between Petts Wood and St Mary's Cray, and this he estimated to be as much as 25% of Police time. Councillor Auld commented on the data integrity of police reporting statistics. The Deputy Borough Commander responded that this matter was being assessed centrally.

Abdulla Zaman from Bromley Youth Council asked if Diversity was being practiced in connection with recruitment to the Police force. The Deputy Borough Commander responded that an active Diversity policy was in place, although Diversity targets had not been reached. The Deputy Borough Commander further stated that on a recent passing out parade that she had attended, it was well represented from a diverse range of ethnic groups.

Dr Robert Hadley mentioned that it was rare to see a visible Police presence in the Farnborough and Crofton areas. The Deputy Borough Commander responded that the Northern Policing Team had increased. It was also the case that the Police were doing the best that they could in difficult times with

many budget cuts. It was also the case that many bases had closed because of cuts.

Mr Terry Belcher from the Bromley Community Engagement Forum asked if the lunch breaks of police officers could be staggered; this was to avoid crime being carried out when the police were on lunch. The Deputy Borough Commander replied and said that there was flexibility with lunch breaks, and that lunch breaks were not made public knowledge for this reason.

Councillor Peter Fookes asked if it was possible for police officers to be briefed using new technology and hand held devices, with the resultant time savings that this would seem to imply. The Deputy Borough Commander responded that this would probably happen in the future, but was not happening at the present time.

**61 QUESTIONS TO THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND COUNCILLORS ATTENDING THE MEETING**

There were no questions from Councillors or Members of the Public.

**62 PRE DECISION SCRUTINY OF REPORTS TO THE PUBLIC PROTECTION AND SAFETY PORTFOLIO HOLDER**

**A) BUDGET MONITORING 2013/14**

The report provided an update on the latest budget monitoring position for 2013/14 for the Public Protection and Safety Portfolio based on expenditure and activity levels up to 30th November 2013. This showed a projected underspend of £19K.

The report outlined the level of expenditure and progress with the implementation of the selected project within the Member Priority Initiatives and provided details of the latest expenditure within the Community Safety Budget.

**RESOLVED that:**

**(1) the Portfolio Holder endorse the latest budget projection for the Public Protection and Safety Portfolio**

**(2) the Portfolio Holder note the progress of the implementation of the Targeted Neighbourhood Activity Project**

## **B) CCTV CONTROL ROOM**

### **Report: ES14011**

The Committee was advised that the Council's CCTV system was over ten years old and was now in danger of failing. It was not cost effective to replace in part, and would need to be replaced in full. There was an existing problem in trying to get new parts.

If this was not dealt with as a priority, the consequences of system failure would be severe. There would be a risk to Community Safety and crime resolution, and there would also be a massive loss in revenue to the Council in terms of parking enforcement; this was estimated to be in the region of £1.2M.

The total estimated cost of refurbishment was £340,000.

Councillor Fookes asked if there was any possibility of a joint venture with partners such as INTU, other private sector partners, and the Police.

Jim McGowan responded that these possibilities had been examined, but were not cost effective, and this was something that the Police were not interested in.

Councillor Nicholas Bennett JP raised the issue of the continued lack of cooperation from TFL with sharing their CCTV capability. Councillor Bennett commented that it was a nonsense that two public bodies should not be cooperating on such important matters, and that the issue should be raised with Boris Johnson on his visit.

Doctor Robert Hadley expressed concern over the lack of CCTV coverage in the Locksbottom and Tugmutton Common areas, and enquired what the policy was in terms of CCTV coverage in parks.

The Portfolio Holder answered that before CCTV could be put in anywhere there had to be a case; it could for example be a recognised crime problem. There appeared to be a strong case for CCTV in Locksbottom, and it was likely that CCTV there would go ahead at some point; there did not appear to be a strong enough case for CCTV to be installed in the Tugmutton Common area. As far as parks were concerned, there would be difficulties, as some parents would be concerned about images of their children on CCTV. There would likely need to be a public consultation in such circumstances.

### **RESOLVED that:**

**(1) the Portfolio Holder be recommended to endorse the bid for capital expenditure for a new CCTV system as outlined in the report.**



## **63 PRESENTATION FROM CROWN PROSECUTION SERVICE**

A presentation on behalf of the Crown Prosecution Service was given by Mr Toks Adesuyan, the Legal & Stakeholder Manager (London South & Youth Team) based in Croydon.

It was explained that the Youth Court Team in London was restructured in 2013, and consisted of a Magistrates Court Division, and a Crown Court Division. Mr Adesuyan worked for the Magistrates Court Division.

The head of the CPS was the Director for Public Prosecutions, and the Attorney General was the person responsible to Parliament. The CPS is independent of the Police and Government.

There was a guidance book called "The Code" issued by the DPP that the CPS had to be guided by and adhere to. The Code sets out a two stage test to be applied when considering prosecutions. These were the Full Code Test and the Threshold Test.

The Full Code Test consists of two stages:

- The Evidential Stage
- The Public Interest

The former refers quite simply to having enough evidence to bring a prosecution, whilst the latter asks if bringing a prosecution would be in the interests of the general public. The latter takes into consideration the seriousness of the offence; culpability of the offender; the circumstances of the case; harm done, and other issues like age. Mr Adesuyan explained that the CPS worked with groups such as the Courts, Witnesses, DV Services and Youth Offending Teams. The primary aim of the CPS was to deliver justice for the public and the CPS worked to twelve core quality standards. Mr Adesuyan outlined that two priority areas for the CPS were racial hate crime and domestic violence. All racial hate crimes had to be referred by the Police to the CPS.

Mr Adesuyan explained that a Domestic Strategy Group had been set up to improve performance in this area, and that prosecutors involved in domestic violence cases benefited from specialist training. The CPS would sometimes use special measures like screens or restraining orders to progress cases where required.

Conviction rates for prosecuted DV Cases in Bromley recently were:

- October 2013            55.2%
- November 2013        79.4%
- December 2013        78.6%

The average conviction rate for London in the same period ranged between 64.8% and 67.8%.

In terms of general prosecutions for all crimes, the conviction rates for Bromley during the last quarter of 2013 ranged between 74% and 84.2%; this compared with an average for London of 82%.

Mr Adesuyan outlined that the CPS had a Youth Court Team for London, and that whenever possible, they would try and avoid custodial sentences for young people. One of the exceptions to this was knife crime; most sixteen to seventeen year olds involved in knife crime were prosecuted.

Mr Adesuyan stated that the CPS was now employing “digital working”, and that now evidence and cases were being processed digitally.

Councillor Douglas Auld asked if the CPS had any controls over Police cautions. Mr Adesuyan responded that the answer to this question was no, and that this was a Police matter. However, it was the case that the DPP had issued guidance in connection with Police cautions. Certain categories of offences had to be referred to the CPS; if the Police issued a caution in breach of the guidance, then the CPS would have to take this matter up with the Police directly.

Councillor Peter Fookes asked if there was scope for closer links and collaboration between the CPS and Bromley Council. Mr Adesuyan responded in the affirmative, and it was hoped that closer links could now be maintained between the two organisations.

Councillor Nicholas Bennett JP was pleased with the strong line being taken with respect to prosecuting domestic violence cases, and also felt that the introduction of case management forms in conjunction with digital working was all positive. Councillor Bennett was glad that the introduction of digital working seemed to have stymied the problem that was endemic previously in terms of files going missing.

Councillor Bennett highlighted that case preparation by individual prosecutors varied considerably; some were very good, but others were very bad. Councillor Bennett asked what was being done to prevent poor advocacy.

Mr Adesuyan responded that in such cases feedback should be provided to the CPS so that they could identify issues of poor performance and take appropriate action. It was felt that with the recent introduction of the Case Review Teams, that cases should be in a better shape before the first hearing.

## 64 PRESENTATION FROM BROMLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH

A presentation was given by Mr Alf Kennedy on behalf of Bromley Neighbourhood Watch. Mr Kennedy updated the Committee as follows:

Bromley Neighbourhood Watch Association (BNWA) had 37,000 residents linked to the Watch in Bromley. The Watch had a good relationship with the Police and Local Council.

The aim of BNWA was to ensure that no one felt afraid, vulnerable or isolated. BNWA wanted to create a community that was of benefit to all, and research showed that communities where NW operated experienced less crime.

The organisation was run by the Police until 1998, after which it became a registered charity.

BNWA has a website that was designed by students at Bromley College and it is used to :

- Manage New Applications
- Manage the database and sticker distribution
- Point Members to Borough Commanders
- Publish a Newsletter and Safer Bromley News
- Publish Trading Standards Advice and warnings and generic advice
- Promote Linked Sites

Bromley Council and the Police were represented on the BNWA Executive. BNWA had a Coordinator Guide, which had been shared with a number of Boroughs; BNWA also had its own unique street signs and window stickers. BNWA held a well-attended AGM and appeared at a number of events across the Borough.

Every London Borough Police Website should now include a reference to the local NW contact, and there was a similar pointer on Bromley Council's Website.

Work was currently underway to provide a system for all 32 Borough Police Forces to use to communicate with the public and the ten thousand Neighbourhood Watches across London. A presentation of the proposed system was expected in the next few weeks.

The "Eyes Over London" poster that was used by London Neighbourhood Watch on the London Underground a few years ago, was going to reappear in a Paddington Bear Movie.

Finally, Mr Kennedy concluded his presentation by informing Members that the Home Office was piloting a scheme called "Neighbourhood Return" which aimed to improve life for people with dementia and for their carers. This would be done by helping them to prepare for, and cope with a common life

changing event, and for situations where someone wandered off and became lost.

## **65 SAFER NEIGHBOURHOOD BOARDS AND SAFER BROMLEY PARTNERSHIP STRATEGY GROUP**

### **Report: ES14010**

The Portfolio Holder provided an update on the current position in relation to the introduction of the Safer Neighbourhood Board into Bromley as requested by MOPAC.

The main points of the update were:

- The £1M Safer Neighbourhood Board Fund had been provided to fund the project nationwide, as a way of encouraging community engagement; approximately £5200.00 per borough would be ring fenced to cover administration costs
- The BCEF would be dismantled, and incorporated into the SNB
- The Safer Bromley Partnership would become smaller, meet less frequently, but become more strategic
- Panel members of the Board would be 20-25 in number, and would be encouraged to change every three years. It was proposed to stagger membership as this would provide greater flexibility
- It was proposed that the SNB would meet four times a year—three formal meetings and one Crime Summit
- There was going to be a meeting on the 30<sup>th</sup> January 2014 to discuss membership and composition of the Board; it was likely that Councillor Tim Stevens JP would be appointed as the Chairman of the SNB, and that the Borough Commander be appointed Chairman of the Safer Bromley Partnership. It was likely that Mr Terry Belcher would be appointed as Vice Chairman of the SNB.
- A primary role of the SNB would be to hold the Police and the SBP to account. Another important role would be to work closely with Ward Panels and residents, and to generally encourage community engagement.

Councillor Auld asked if Bromley would be in competition with other Boroughs for funding. The Portfolio Holder responded that there was an element of this, as other Boroughs had a greater crime problem than Bromley. It was anticipated that Bromley would be allocated between £15k and £20K.

**RESOLVED that:**

**(1) the Committee noted the information contained in the report, and on the MOPAC guidance;**

**(2) the Committee supported the proposals for the Chairmanship of the Safer Neighbourhood Board in Bromley, and for the Partnership Strategic Group.**

**66 TACKLING GANGS IN BROMLEY**

**Report: ES14006**

This report was presented by Mr Peter Sibley, ASB Co-ordinator for Bromley. The report was an update on the Tackling Gangs report that was presented to the Safer Bromley Partnership in September 2012.

A prominent feature of the report was the formation of a Gangs Panel to provide a coordinated and effective response to gang related activity. The Gangs Panel had been set up in February 2013 and consisted of:

- The Police Gangs Unit
- The ASBU
- The Youth Offending Team
- The Probation Service
- The Police Schools Unit
- The LBB Housing Team
- The Targeted Youth Service
- The Tackling Troubled Families Team

The Education Behaviour Service and the Children's and Adult's Mental Health Panel were also due to join the Panel in due course.

Twelve Matrix gang members had been identified, with sixty to eighty fluctuating. Most offences were committed outside of the Borough. Mr Sibley stated that decanting was a problem. The twelve "matrix" gang members were all linked to one gang, and were united by drugs and money. No female gang members had been identified, and the oldest gang member was aged forty.

The Committee expressed their satisfaction of the progress that had been achieved.

**RESOLVED that:**

**(1) the success and progress made on the implementation of the recommendations of the action plan outlined in the "Tackling Gangs Report" presented to the SBP in September 2012 be noted.**

**67 ANNUAL UPDATE REPORT ON BROMLEY YOUTH  
OFFENDING TEAM PARTNERSHIP**

**Report: CSD14017**

The Annual Update Report on the Bromley Youth Offending Team Partnership is an annual report presented to the Care Services and Public Protection and Safety Portfolio Holders. The purpose of the report was to provide an update on the performance of the Bromley Youth Offending Team Partnership during 2012/13, and also to provide an update on related operational and strategic developments.

The report came to the Public Protection and Safety PDS Committee in the form of an information briefing, and Mr Paul King (Head of Bromley Youth Support Programme) was available to answer any questions that may have arisen.

Congratulations were offered from Councillor Douglas Auld relating to the progress made, especially in view of cutbacks and efficiency savings.

**RESOLVED that:**

**(1) the contents of the information briefing were noted.**

**68 ANNUAL UPDATE ON SUBSTANCE MISUSE 2012/13**

**Report: CSD14017**

Claire Lynn (Strategic Commissioner for Mental Health and Substance Misuse) informed the Committee that KPI's were outlined in the Public Health Outlook Framework, and that these KPI's were for drug treatment only. It was acknowledged that admission to hospital in Bromley for alcohol misuse was more than expected. There were also problems with older people taking prescribed and over the counter medications. It was highlighted that screening questions would apply to any age, and that this would include older people going to Accident and Emergency after falling.

Attention was drawn to section **2.3.5** of the report by the Committee which outlined **Harm Reduction and Healthcare Indicators**, and to the fact that Bromley was still underperforming in this area. The Commissioner responded that this was not in fact a helpful indicator. It had to be noted that Bromley was still performing above London and National performance targets. It had to be noted that the baseline was all people accessing treatment, whereas only those who had clinical indicators were offered a vaccination or test. The Service was providing vaccinations at point of assessment if required, and performance in this area was improving.

Councillor Auld drew attention to the last paragraph of page 80 (section 2.3.2) which referred to opiate users receiving treatment for 6 years, and that this

seemed a long time. The Commissioner answered that in some Boroughs there were people receiving treatment for twenty years. It was explained that in these cases, work was being done to reduce the subject's prescription and that many found it hard to take the final step. Work was also being undertaken to improve psychological support.

It was noted that there had been an increase in Bromley of cases of young people being admitted to hospital with alcohol related problems.

**RESOLVED that:**

**(1) the contents of the report be noted.**

**69 DRAFT 2014/15 BUDGET**

**Report: FSD14004**

The primary aim of this report was to examine cost pressures and proposed savings for the next financial year, and after doing so, to make any relevant comments back to the Executive.

The Chairman drew attention to Section 3.8 of the report which outlined proposed cost savings to be considered by the Executive.

These were:

- Community Safety and Out of Hours Noise Service £90,000
- Reduction of the Portfolio Holder Grants Budget £60,000
- Efficiency Savings and Cash Limiting of Running Expenses £25,000

So the total savings to be considered by the Executive would be £175,000.

These proposed savings were accepted by the Committee.

Councillor Peter Fookes asked when the new MOPAC bid was formulated, and if funding was available for the Summer Activities Project and the Youth Council.

These questions were taken up by the Portfolio Holder, Councillor Tim Stevens, JP.

The Portfolio Holder stated that:

- The Phoenix Children's Resource Centre was not closing
- The Youth Centre was not closing
- The Duke of Edinburgh Award was continuing.

The Summer Activity Scheme was going ahead as planned.



The MOPAC bids were safe for three years, and would be in place until 2016. This would be the case as long as Bromley hit prescribed targets, and used the money wisely.

**RESOLVED that:**

**(1) the update on the financial forecast for 2014/15 to 2017/18 be noted;**

**(2) the draft savings options proposed by the Executive be endorsed;**

**(3) the initial draft budget for 2014/15 be endorsed as the basis for setting the final 2014/15 Budget.**

**70 WORK PROGRAMME AND CONTRACTS REGISTER**

Report: **CSD14018**

The details of the Work Programme as outlined in the report were noted.

It was further noted that the Committee intended to incorporate two additional items into the Work Programme as a result of this evening's meeting.

These were:

- **A visit by representatives from SLaM for July 2014**
- **A visit to the Committee by representatives from the local ambulance service**

The Chairman indicated that there were some changes to be applied to the Work Programme that had evolved after the current Work Programme (on the agenda) had been drafted.

These were:

1. The Draft Portfolio Plan 2014/15 would be removed from the March 2014 Work Programme, but remain for July 2014
2. An Annual Update on Youth Services Report would be listed for March 2014
3. A Mentoring End of Year Report would be listed for July 2014
4. A Bromley Youth Council End of Year Report would be listed for July 2014



**RESOLVED that:**

**(1) the Work Programme be agreed subject to the inclusion of the new items that were highlighted in the meeting;**

**(2) the Public Protection and Safety Portfolio Contracts be noted.**

**71 SCHEDULE OF VISITS**

It was noted that Members had recently expressed interest in visiting Youth Centre Hubs, the Youth Offending Team, and a revisit to the Local Ambulance Service.

It was further noted that interest had been shown in a visit to the Metropolitan Police Command and Control Centre in Lambeth. The contact to arrange this visit had been located, and it was likely that this visit would be arranged for the near future.

Interest was also shown in a visit to the Police Crime Museum. This would be a very interesting visit, but normally this venue is used as a Police Training Centre. Mr Wood from Democratic Services was waiting for a response from the Museum's curators to a request for the Committee to visit. The Committee would be updated in due course.

## **APPENDIX A**

### **Questions to the Chairman of the Public Protection and Safety PDS Committee for Oral Reply:**

The following questions were raised:

From Bob Mills, Chairman, Chelsfield and Pratts Bottom Safer Neighbourhood Panel.

These questions were referred to the Deputy Borough Commander Jo Oakey to respond as they were questions more appropriate to a Police response.

#### **Question 1:**

Noting that the designated Policeman and PCSO for Chelsfield and Pratts Bottom Ward are required to start and finish their shift at St. Mary Cray Police Station before travelling to their Ward, please can the Chairman find out how many hours in a week are lost by not starting in the Police Office in Green Street Green rather than starting and finishing at St. Mary Cray Police Station?

#### **Reply:**

The Local Policing Model was introduced in September and the whole of London is/has moved towards neighbourhoods as opposed to Wards. Ordinarily it is preferable for there to be one base per neighbourhood, but this has not been possible at this time for Bromley. The neighbourhoods are:

North West: Three bases currently - Copperfield House, Albermarle House, and Croydon Rd.

South West: Four bases currently - Walpole Rd, Main Rd Biggin Hill, Coney Hall Parade, West Wickham.

North East: One base - Bromley Police Station

South East: One Base - The Crays.

It is necessary for officers to parade at the main base so that they can be properly briefed and supervised. In the majority of cases they are dropped at their designated patrol area and there is a minibus which is used for this purpose. All of the neighbourhoods would ordinarily parade at one site but the Bromley Estate is not able to do this as some bases can only hold one or two teams.

Officers parade and are briefed by a supervising officer. This would normally mean that they are deployed after parade. Even if they have to travel to get to

their patrol area, this is advantageous to the broader Bromley community as they will always be travelling through the Borough.

They are properly tasked and briefed so that a corporate message is delivered to the staff on that neighbourhood, rather than self-briefing which often occurred previously.

Chief Inspector Carron Schusler has/is conducting a time study, but this is for internal purposes.

The MPS is going through big changes and the MPS Estate will reduce. Further cost savings will be made (although it is not known what these will be), which is preferable to come from buildings rather than people.

## **Question 2**

(2) Does this apply to other Ward teams, and if so, will the Chairman consider scrutinising the operational effectiveness of this arrangement?

### **Reply:**

The LPM is working well in Bromley, but the Estate still poses a problem for full implementation of patrol bases.

We regularly review the LPM to identify what is working and where improvements could be made. This is submitted centrally.

Under the LPM we have seen an increase in Police officers in Bromley.

Neighbourhood officers now have a broader spectrum of what they are required to do.

As with all officers, their productivity is subject to scrutiny.

There was also a question about where they normally took refreshments. They can take refreshments on their patrol area or at their base. They may have a 45 minute refreshment period.

The Police are held to account against the MOPAC 7 targets, which are over the course of the next 3 years.

Currently we are approximately 800 total notifiable offences down on our previous very good performance as a borough.

The Meeting ended at 9.30 pm

Chairman

This page is left intentionally blank

# Agenda Item 5

Report No.  
CSD14038

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

---

**Decision Maker:** Public Protection and Safety PDS Committee

**Date:** 4<sup>th</sup> March 2014

**Decision Type:** Non Urgent                      Non Executive                      Non Key

**Title:** **MATTERS ARISING**

**Contact Officer:** Steve Wood, Democratic Services Officer  
Tel: 020 8313 4316 E-mail: [stephen.wood@bromley.gov.uk](mailto:stephen.wood@bromley.gov.uk)

**Chief Officer:** Mark Bowen, Director of Corporate Services

**Ward:** N/A

---

1. Reason for report

1.1 **Appendix A** updates Members on matters arising from previous meetings.

---

## 2. RECOMMENDATION

2.1 The Committee is asked to review progress on matters arising from previous meetings.

<b>Non-Applicable Sections:</b>	Policy/Financial/Legal/Personnel
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	Previous matters arising reports and minutes of meetings.

### Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy
  2. BBB Priority: Excellent Council
- 

### Financial

1. Cost of proposal: No Cost
  2. Ongoing costs: Not Applicable
  3. Budget head/performance centre: Democratic Services
  4. Total current budget for this head: £363,070
  5. Source of funding: 2013/14 revenue budget
- 

### Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 10 posts (8.55fte)
  2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: Completion of "Matters Arising" Reports for PP&S PDS meetings can take up to a few hours per meeting.
- 

### Legal

1. Legal Requirement: None
  2. Call-in: Not Applicable
- 

### Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): This report is intended primarily for Members of the Public Protection and Safety PDS Committee.
- 

### Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Not Applicable
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: N/A

<u>Minute Number/Title</u>	<u>Decision</u>	<u>Update</u>
<b>13<sup>th</sup> March 2012</b>		
<b>206. Bethlem Royal Hospital Update</b>	<p>It was resolved that:</p> <p>A report be provided to the Committee following the completion of investigations into the escape incident of February 2012.</p> <p>It was noted that a meeting of SLaM was going to take place in February 2014, when a decision would be made in respect of inviting a member of the PPS/PDS Committee to sit on the Board of Governors.</p>	<p>A report has been drafted and seen by some Committee Members. It is proposed to invite the new Chief Executive of SLaM to the July PPS/PDS meeting. It is further proposed that the report in question be available to Members 1 hour before the meeting in a Committee Room.</p>
<b>27<sup>th</sup> November 2012</b>		
<b>72C. Putting Victims First – More Effective Responses to Anti-Social Behaviour</b>	<p>Although the number of interventions would be reduced by the Draft Anti-Social Behaviour Bill as it removed certain Orders and condensed layers of intervention and noting that the schedule of short, medium and longer term objectives set out at paragraph 3.3 of Report ES13015 would be contained within existing budgets, it was nevertheless recommended that an assessment be made of any additional costs potentially falling to the Council - this assessment to involve engagement with other Council Departments (including Legal) and agencies such as the police.</p>	<p>Work is continuing to assess resource requirements as a result of measures outlined in the <b>Draft Anti-Social Behaviour Bill</b>. As central government guidance has yet to be received on the new arrangements (e.g. allocation of responsibilities, definitions etc.), it has been agreed to provide the report when such information becomes available.</p> <p><b>The Bill is currently at the Report Stage in the House of Lords.</b></p>
<b>18<sup>th</sup> June 2013</b>		
<b>14. MOPAC Crime Prevention Fund – Bid Outcome</b>	<p>At a meeting with the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime on 9th May 2013 the Leader of the Council and the Portfolio Holder expressed their concern over the funding decisions by MOPAC. At the meeting it was agreed that it might be possible to re-allocate the £86k <i>Substance misuse, Intensive Support Programme</i> grant to ASB initiatives, provided a new bid was submitted and approved. A new bid had been submitted but no formal MOPAC decision had been received.</p>	<p>A report is scheduled for the Committee's meeting in July 2014.</p>

<b>21<sup>st</sup> January 2014</b>		
<b>6. Chairman's Update</b>	The Chairman updated the Committee by informing them that the Safer Bromley Awards were taking place on 27 <sup>th</sup> March 2014.	Noted here to remind Members in case they would like to attend.
<b>19. Member Visits</b>	Members expressed interest in visiting:  Youth Offending Team Bromley Youth Centre Hub MET Police Command and Control Centre at Lambeth MET Police Crime Museum	Currently canvassing interest from Members on visit to MET Police Command and Control Centre. This will be arranged shortly.  Visit has been arranged with YOT on March 6th 2014 at 11.30am.  Crime Museum visit is not possible as this is currently being used by the MET Police as a Training Centre.
<b>Future Visits/Presentations to the Committee</b>	Members expressed an interest in the local Ambulance Service presenting to the Committee	Mr Keith Miller who is the new Ambulance Operations Manager for Bromley is planning to attend tonight's meeting.



Report No.  
FSD14023

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

---

**Decision Maker:** Public Protection and Safety Portfolio Holder

**For Pre-decision scrutiny by the Public Protection & Safety  
PDS Committee on**

**Date:** 4th March 2014

**Decision Type:** Non-Urgent Executive Non-Key

**Title:** BUDGET MONITORING 2013/14

**Contact Officer:** Claire Martin, Head of Finance  
Tel: 020 8313 4286 E-mail: [claire.martin@bromley.gov.uk](mailto:claire.martin@bromley.gov.uk)

**Chief Officer:** Nigel Davies, Executive Director of Environmental and Community Services

**Ward:** Boroughwide

---

1. Reason for report

This report provides an update of the latest budget monitoring position for 2013/14 for the Public Protection and Safety Portfolio based on expenditure and activity levels up to 31st January 2014. This shows a projected underspend of £19k.

It reports the level of expenditure and progress with the implementation of the selected project within the Member Priority Initiatives and provides details of the latest expenditure within the Community Safety Budget as set out in Appendix 3.

---

2. **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

2.1 **The Portfolio Holder is requested to:**

2.1.1 **Endorse the latest 2013/14 budget projection for the Public Protection and Safety Portfolio.**

2.1.2 **Note the progress of the implementation of the targeted Neighbourhood activity project.**

2.2 **The PDS Committee is asked to comment on the allocation of Community Safety expenditure as set out in Appendix 3.**

### Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy: Sound financial management
  2. BBB Priority: Excellent Council
- 

### Financial

1. Cost of proposal: Not Applicable
  2. Ongoing costs: Recurring Cost
  3. Budget head/performance centre: Public Protection & Safety Portfolio Budgets and earmarked reserve for Members Priority Initiatives
  4. Total current budget for this head: £3.5m and £150k
  5. Source of funding: Existing revenue budgets 2013/14 and the earmarked reserve for Member Priority Initiatives
- 

### Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 57 ftes
  2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: N/A
- 

### Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Statutory Requirement: The statutory duties relating to financial reporting are covered within the Local Government Act 1972; the Local Government Finance Act 1998; the Accounts and Audit Regulations 1996; the Local Government Act 2000 and the Local Government Act 2002
  2. Call-in: Applicable
- 

### Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): The services covered in this report affect all Council Taxpayers, Business Ratepayers, those who owe general income to the Council, all staff, Members and Pensioners.
- 

### Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Not Applicable
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments:

### 3. COMMENTARY

- 3.1 The 2013/14 projected outturn is detailed in Appendix 1, with a forecast of projected spend for each division compared to the latest approved budget and identifies in full the reason for any variances.
- 3.2 Costs attributable to individual services have been classified as “controllable” and “non-controllable” in Appendix 1. Budget holders have full responsibility for those budgets classified as “controllable” as any variations relate to those factors over which the budget holder has, in general, direct control. “Non-controllable” budgets are those which are managed outside of individual budget holder’s service and, as such, cannot be directly influenced by the budget holder in the shorter term. These include, for example, building maintenance costs and property rents which are managed by the Property Division but are allocated within individual departmental/portfolio budgets to reflect the full cost of the service. As such, any variations arising are shown as “non-controllable” within services but “controllable” within the Resources Portfolio. Other examples include cross departmental recharges and capital financing costs. This approach, which is reflected in financial monitoring reports to budget holders, should ensure clearer accountability by identifying variations within the service that controls financial performance. Members should specifically refer to the “controllable” budget variations relating to portfolios in considering financial performance. These variations will include the costs related to the recession.
- 3.3 Council on 26<sup>th</sup> March 2012 approved the setting aside of £2,260k in an earmarked reserve for Member Priority Initiatives. The Public and Protection and Safety Portfolio is responsible for the delivery of one of the projects – Targeted Neighbourhood Activity with an allocation of £150k.
- 3.4 Appendix 2 has the details of the progress of this scheme.
- 3.5 Within the 2013/14 Community Safety Budget there are a number of budgets that are subject to Portfolio Holder authorisation and for information these budgets are listed below: -

#### Expenditure requiring Portfolio Holder approval

	2013/14 Budget £	Allocation Agreed to Date £	Current Bids £	Balance of Budget Unallocated £
Portfolio Holder Initiative Fund Grants	59,700	59,700	0	0
Youth Diversion Expenditure	52,100	52,105	0	-5
Safer Neighbourhood Development Grants	39,980	39,455	520	5
Operation Payback	8,400	8,400	0	0
	<b>160,180</b>	<b>159,660</b>	<b>520</b>	<b>0</b>

### 4. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 The Resources Portfolio Plan includes the aim of effective monitoring and control of expenditure within budget and includes the target that each service department will spend within its own budget.
- 4.2 Bromley’s Best Value Performance Plan “Making a Difference” refers to the Council’s intention to remain amongst the lowest Council Tax levels in outer London and the importance of greater focus on priorities.
- 4.3 The four year financial forecast report highlights the financial pressures facing the Council. It remains imperative that strict budgetary control continues to be exercised in 2013/14 to minimise the risk of compounding financial pressures in future years.
- 4.4 Chief Officers and Departmental Heads of Finance are continuing to place emphasis on the need for strict compliance with the Council’s budgetary control and monitoring arrangements.

## 5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 The latest projections from managers show that a projected underspend of £19k is expected for the Public Protection and Safety Portfolio for 2013/14.
- 5.2 The projected variance has arisen due to an underspend within the staffing budget of £43k which is offsetting projected shortfalls of income from the provision of CCTV services to registered social landlords of Dr £14k, Dr £12k from scientific sciences and Dr £18k from other income streams. More details of the reasons for the variances are included in Appendix 1.
- 5.3 An underspend of Cr £10k is also projected for the Coroners service for 2013/14.
- 5.4 Appendix 2 shows that an amount of £56k has been spent/committed for the Targeted Neighbourhood Activity project.
- 5.5 To date, a total of £159,660 has been committed/spent from the community safety budgets as detailed in Appendix 3, leaving an unspent balance of £520. A bid of £520 to hold a safe guarding adults multi-agency event has been submitted to be considered by the Portfolio Holder.

<b>Non-Applicable Sections:</b>	Legal, Personnel
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	2013/14 budget monitoring files within ECS finance section

## Public Protection &amp; Safety Portfolio Budget Monitoring Summary as at 31st January 2014

2013/14 Actuals £'000	Division Service Areas	2013/14 Original Budget £'000	2013/14 Latest Approved £'000	2013/14 Projected Outturn £'000	Variation £'000	Notes	Variation Last Reported £'000	Full Year Effect £'000
573	Public Protection Community Safety	430	432	432	0	1	0	0
297	Mortuary & Coroners Service	339	328	318	Cr 10	2	0	0
2,438	Public Protection	2,456	2,506	2,497	Cr 9	3	Cr 10	0
<b>3,308</b>	<b>TOTAL CONTROLLABLE FOR PPS</b>	<b>3,225</b>	<b>3,266</b>	<b>3,247</b>	<b>Cr 19</b>		<b>Cr 10</b>	<b>0</b>
298	<b>TOTAL NON CONTROLLABLE</b>	6	6	6	0		0	0
321	<b>TOTAL EXCLUDED RECHARGES</b>	229	217	217	0		0	0
<b>3,927</b>	<b>PORTFOLIO TOTAL</b>	<b>3,460</b>	<b>3,489</b>	<b>3,470</b>	<b>Cr 19</b>		<b>Cr 10</b>	<b>0</b>

## Reconciliation of Final Budget

£'000

## Original budget 2013/14

3,460

Allocation of Localisation &amp; Conditions Pay Awards

26

Budget Transfer with ECS Department

Cr 2

Drawdown of central contingency funds re increased fuel costs

5

## Latest Approved Budget for 2013/14

3,489

**REASONS FOR VARIATIONS****1. Community Safety £0k**

The projected overspend on staffing of £46k due to the late notification of revised MOPAC funding has been funded by the agreed diversion of the Prevent monies of Cr £46k.

**2. Mortuary & Coroners Service Cr £10k**

There is a projected underspend of £10k for 2013/14, mostly on the coroners service, based on the initial annual request from Croydon for Bromley's contribution to the coroners service. The London Borough of Croydon, who administer the Coroners Service on behalf of a consortium of four local authorities including Bromley, have recently requested around £30k from Bromley for back pay of Coroners' salary costs. Negotiations are taking place as to the extent of Bromley's liability however, a refund agreed for 2012/13 before the back pay issue was raised, is for a similar amount. This can be held against the liability until the matter is resolved.

**3. Public Protection Cr £9k**

There is likely to be a net surplus of £9k within Public Protection. This is due to the secondment of the Head of Public Health Nuisance to Executive Assistant for 2013/14 offset by the effect of delays in implementing the budget options for 2013/14 and other minor variations. This has resulted in a net underspend of Cr £43k. This is more than offsetting a projected shortfall in income of £44k of which £14k relates to the provision of CCTV to registered social landlords, £12k to scientific services income, and a net £18k across other income lines.

The number of dogs being kept in kennels and associated mediacl costs during the winter months have been less than expected, (Cr £10k).

**Summary of variations within Public Protection**

	<b>£'000</b>
Net variations within employee costs	Cr 43
Income from registered social landlords	14
Income from scientific services	12
Stray dogs kennelling contract	(10)
Net deficit across other income streams	18
<b>Total variations within Public Protection</b>	<b>Cr 9</b>

**Waiver of Financial Regulations:**

The Council's Contract Procedure Rules state that where the value of a contract exceeds £50k and is to be exempted from the normal requirement to obtain competitive quotations, the Chief Officer has to obtain the agreement of the Director of Resources and Finance Director and (where over £100,000) approval of the Portfolio Holder, and report use of this exemption to Audit Sub committee bi-annually. Since the last report to the Executive no waivers have been actioned.

**Virements Approved to date under Director's Delegated Powers**

Details of virements actioned by Chief Officers under delegated authority under the Financial Regulations "Scheme of Virement" will be included in financial monitoring reports to the Portfolio Holder. Since the last report to Executive, no virements have been actioned.

**Analysis of Members' Initiatives - Earmarked Reserves @ 31.01.14**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Divison / Service Area</b>	<b>Responsible Officer</b>	<b>Allocation £'000</b>	<b>Spend To Date £'000</b>	<b>Commitments £'000</b>	<b>Total Spend &amp; Commitments £'000</b>	<b>Balance Available £'000</b>	<b>Comments on Progress of Scheme</b>
Targetted Neighbourhood Activity	PPS - Public Health Complaints & Anti-Social Behaviour	Jim McGowan	150	43	13	56	94	
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>150</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>94</b>	

## Portfolio Holder Funds 2013/14

## 2013/14 REVISED SUMMARY

	Budget Allocation £	Actual Spend £	C'mitmnts To date £	Current Bids £	Budget Balance £
<b>Portfolio Holder Initiative Fund Grants (£59700)</b>					
Operation Condor- Licensing Visits		2,400	0	0	
Best Bar None		15,000	0	0	
Mottingham Community Day		913	0	0	
Cray Festival Part 1		1,012	0	0	
Cray Festival Part 2		375	0	0	
Enforcement project		20,000	0	0	
Locksbottom CCTV		0	20,000	0	
	<b>59,700</b>	<b>39,700</b>	<b>20,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Youth Diversion Expenditure (£52,100)</b>					
Summer Diversion Activities		42,000	0	0	
Youth Manifesto		1,654	0	0	
Junior Citizen		0	1,980	0	
Junior Citizen		1,200	0	0	
Streetscene - music and dance festival		1,831	0	0	
Punchez		0	3,440	0	
	<b>52,100</b>	<b>46,685</b>	<b>5,420</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-5</b>
<b>Safer Neighbourhood Grants (£39,980)</b>					
Doorstep Crime Rapid Response Awareness		3,756	0	0	
Crime Summit		1,840	0	0	
Dog Microchip service bid (awaiting sign off)		4,560	0	0	
Keep Safe booklet		2,998	0	0	
LFB Impact Factor & LIFE programme		15,000	0	0	
Keep Safe Booklet (Braille)		0	301	0	
Impact Factor Part 2		11,000	0	0	
Safe guarding adults multi-agency event		0	0	520	
	<b>39,980</b>	<b>39,154</b>	<b>301</b>	<b>520</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Operation Payback (£8,400)</b>					
	<b>8,400</b>	<b>8,400</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
					<b>0</b>
<b>Total Portfolio Holder's Grants 2013/14</b>	<b>160,180</b>	<b>133,939</b>	<b>25,721</b>	<b>520</b>	<b>0</b>



Report No.  
ES14025

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

---

Decision Maker: **PUBLIC PROTECTION AND SAFETY PORTFOLIO HOLDER**

**FOR PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY BY THE PUBLIC PROTECTION AND SAFETY PDS COMMITTEE**

Date: **4<sup>th</sup> March 2013**

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Executive Key

Title: **PROPOSED JOINT MORTUARY SERVICE WITH LONDON BOROUGH OF BEXLEY**

Contact Officer: Jim McGowan, Head of Environmental Protection  
Tel: 020 8313 4651 E-mail: Jim.McGowan@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Nigel Davies, Executive Director of Environment & Community Services

Ward: All Wards

---

1. Reason for report

- 1.1 The current arrangements for the provision of Mortuary Services for the London Borough of Bromley has come to an end and discussions are currently being held with regard to utilising a contract placed by the London Borough of Bexley as an alternative to the re tender process on the open market. Members have requested an update on the current position.
- 

2. **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

2.1 **The Portfolio Holder is asked to:**

**Consider and note the contents of the report with regard to the services provided to Bromley Council for its Mortuary services and agree to the use of the London Borough of Bexley Contract as the basis of service requirement.**

### Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy
  2. BBB Priority: Excellent Council
- 

### Financial

1. Cost of proposal: £99k per annum
  2. Ongoing costs: £99k per annum
  3. Budget head/performance centre: Mortuary Budget
  4. Total current budget for this head: £99k
  5. Source of funding: Existing revenue budget 2013/14
- 

### Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 0.1FTE
  2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: 0.1fte
- 

### Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Statutory Requirement
  2. Call-in: Applicable
- 

### Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): Approximately one million residents within the HM Southern District
- 

### Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Not Applicable
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: N/A

### **3. COMMENTARY**

#### **The Mortuary Service**

- 3.1 The Coroners service is provided by a consortium of the Boroughs of Bromley, Croydon, Sutton and Bexley as a shared service, on behalf of Doctor Roy Palmer, HM Coroner, Southern District. As part of this service each Borough is required to provide its own suitable mortuary service.
- 3.2 The provision of mortuary facilities was historically provided within the Borough of Bromley in its own Public Mortuary, but in 2004/5 the Bromley Public mortuary, which was owned and operated by LB Bromley, developed serious structural building faults and had to be partially demolished.
- 3.3 The public mortuary facilities were moved on a temporary, informal basis to the Princess Royal University Hospital (PRUH). The decision was subsequently taken not to return to the public mortuary building and the building was returned to the LBB property portfolio; at the same time it was agreed to continue using the PRUH for the Borough's mortuary services. The arrangements with the PRUH were subsequently formalised through an SLA, which has now come to an end. Concerns have been raised regarding the renewal of the agreement with the PRUH as a single specialist contractor and whether this provides value for money; the contract has been extended to allow for consideration of joint contracts with neighbouring Boroughs or a public open tender for these services.
- 3.4 Discussions have taken place with Doctor Palmer, the HM Coroner for Southern District, who expressed a strong preference not to have the mortuary services outside his HM Coroner District and he further informs that the mortuary cannot legally be positioned further than an adjacent Borough .
- 3.5 Discussions have also taken place with the three Boroughs within HM Coroners Southern District all of whom are experiencing similar problems with the provision of this service and a shortage of available facilities for its delivery.
- 3.6 Bexley has now also closed their own public mortuary in Queen Mary's hospital and has moved all of their mortuary work to the PRUH. Discussions have taken place with LB Bexley with a view to adopting their specified service requirement and operating on a common basis with the PRUH.
- 3.7 Croydon would consider taking on additional mortuary services but would need to extend their buildings, build in more capacity for body storage and take on more staff and as such would not provide an immediate solution to the further provision of this service.
- 3.8 Using a hospital outside the HM Coroner's district would mean varying the contract with Dignity for body transportation within the Coronal District and would incur additional costs for Bromley to transfer bodies outside of the District. If an inner London mortuary were to be awarded this contract then this would involve a congestion charge for each cadaver as well as the additional movement charge by the contractor. These additional charges were also factored in when deciding on the option to combine with London Borough of Bexley.
- 3.9 The services provided by the PRUH mortuary service are the same for both Bexley and Bromley and currently include the following:
  - 24/7 access to the Mortuary facility
  - Use of the refrigerated body stores and the body freezers for the storage of up to 700 deceased persons in any year, under the jurisdiction of HMC Southern District
  - Mortician call-out outside normal working hours

- Access to Post Mortem facilities and the use of hospital mortuary staff to support Post Mortem examinations carried out on behalf of HMC Southern District
- Provision of all post mortems as directed by the Coroner or his staff
- Provision of all consumables and overspill nutwell cube supplementary systems
- Provision of specialist Home Office Post Mortems

3.10 The specification within the LB Bexley contract mirrors that of the current London Borough of Bromley contract specification and as such both services could run off the same contract. The LB Bexley current fees are the same as Bromley fees. Bromley would save an element of officer time by not having to re tender and have the economy of scale necessary to achieve a best value price when the contract extension is negotiated with the PRUH (now Kings NHS Trust), as well as allowing for future joint contracting and service arrangements.

#### **4. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 4.1 The existing Bromley Mortuary Service provided at the Princess Royal University Hospital is budgeted at £99k per annum.
- 4.2 It is expected that a joint contract with LB Bexley would cost the same per annum, £99k.

#### **5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 5.1 The existing Coroners Act 1988 requires Local Authorities to pay to pay all Coronial expenses.
- 5.2 There is also an existing duty on Local Authorities to provide mortuary facilities (S.198 Public Health Act 1936) as amended by S.2 Local Government Act 2000 power of well being

Non-Applicable Sections:	Policy and Personnel Implications
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	

# Agenda Item 9c

Report No.  
FSD14020

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

---

**Decision Maker:** PUBLIC PROTECTION & SAFETY PORTFOLIO HOLDER

**Date:** For pre-decision scrutiny by the Public Protection & Safety PDS Committee on 4<sup>th</sup> March 2014

**Decision Type:** Non-Urgent Executive Non-Key

**Title:** CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING Q3 2013/14 & ANNUAL CAPITAL REVIEW 2014 TO 2018

**Contact Officer:** Martin Reeves, Principal Accountant  
Tel: 020 8313 4291 E-mail: martin.reeves@bromley.gov.uk

**Chief Officer:** Director of Finance

**Ward:** (All Wards);

---

1. Reason for report

On 12th February 2014, the Executive received a report summarising the current position on capital expenditure and receipts following the 3rd quarter of 2013/14 and presenting for approval the new capital schemes supported by Council Directors in the annual capital review process. The Executive agreed a revised Capital Programme for the five year period 2013/14 to 2017/18. Prior to the Executive meeting, there were no capital schemes for this Portfolio, but this report highlights the one new scheme approval, £340k to refurbish the CCTV control room.

---

2. **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

The Portfolio Holder is asked to confirm the changes agreed by the Executive on 12<sup>th</sup> February 2014.

## Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy: Capital Programme monitoring is part of the planning and review process for all services. Capital schemes help to maintain and improve the quality of life in the borough. Affective asset management planning (AMP) is a crucial corporate activity if a local authority is to achieve its corporate and service aims and objectives and deliver its services. The Council continuously reviews its property assets and service users are regularly asked to justify their continued use of the property. For each of our portfolios and service priorities, we review our main aims and outcomes through the AMP process and identify those that require the use of capital assets. Our primary concern is to ensure that capital investment provides value for money and matches the Council's overall priorities as set out in the Community Plan and in "Building a Better Bromley". The capital review process requires Council Directors to ensure that bids for capital investment provide value for money and match Council plans and priorities.
  2. BBB Priority: Excellent Council; Safer Bromley
- 

## Financial

1. Cost of proposal: £340k
  2. Ongoing costs: Not Applicable
  3. Budget head/performance centre: Capital Programme
  4. Total current budget for this head: £340k for the PP&S Portfolio over five years 2013/14 to 2017/18
  5. Source of funding: Capital grants, capital receipts and earmarked revenue contributions
- 

## Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 0.25 fte
  2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: 9 hours per week
- 

## Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Non-Statutory - Government Guidance
  2. Call-in: Applicable
- 

## Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): N/A
- 

## Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? No
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: N/A

### **3. COMMENTARY**

#### **Capital Expenditure**

3.1 A revised Capital Programme was approved by the Executive on 12th February, following a detailed monitoring exercise carried out after the 3rd quarter of 2013/14. Prior to the Executive meeting, there were no PP&S schemes in the approved Capital Programme, but the Executive also considered and approved new capital schemes supported by Council Directors in the annual capital review process and Members are asked to note the one new PP&S scheme approved by the Executive.

#### **Annual Capital Review – new scheme proposals**

3.2 In recent years, we have steadily scaled down new capital expenditure plans and have transferred all of the rolling maintenance programmes to the revenue budget. Our general (un-earmarked) reserves, established from the disposal of our housing stock and the Glades Site, have been gradually spent and have fallen from £131m in 1997 to £31.8m (including unapplied capital receipts) as at 31<sup>st</sup> March 2013. Our asset disposal programme has diminished and any new capital spending will effectively have to be met from our remaining revenue reserves.

3.3 As part of the normal annual review of the Capital Programme, Chief Officers were invited to come forward with bids for new capital investment. Invest to Save bids were particularly encouraged, but none were received, and it is assumed that any such bids will be submitted in due course through the earmarked reserve that was created in 2011. Apart from the normal annual capital bids relating to school and highway schemes, four bids were recommended for approval, with a total value of £2.2m, all of which would require funding from the Council's resources. One of these, the refurbishment of the CCTV control room, comes under this Portfolio and details are provided in paragraph 3.4.

3.4 The Council's CCTV cameras are operated by both the Public Protection and Parking Enforcement services and both share the same common operating and recording systems. The control room itself was installed in 1997 and has been regularly upgraded to keep it operating without failure. The current equipment is nearly ten years old, however, and is no longer supported by its manufacturers and, as such, substantial faults can no longer be repaired. As a consequence, there is significant risk of failure and the systems are in need of refurbishment. The bid appraisal form is attached at Appendix 1. The scheme, which was estimated to cost £340k and had previously been supported by the Public Protection and Safety Portfolio Holder on 21<sup>st</sup> January 2014, was approved by the Executive on 12<sup>th</sup> February 2014.

#### **Post-Completion Reports**

3.5 Under approved Capital Programme procedures, capital schemes should be subject to a post-completion review within one year of completion. Following the major slippage of expenditure at the end of 2010/11, Members confirmed the importance of these as part of the overall capital monitoring framework. These reviews should compare actual expenditure against budget and evaluate the achievement of the scheme's non-financial objectives. A post-completion report on the CCTV control room scheme will be reported to this PDS Committee within a year of completion.

### **4. POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

4.1 Capital Programme monitoring and review is part of the planning and review process for all services. The capital review process requires Chief Officers to ensure that bids for capital investment provide value for money and match Council plans and priorities.

## 5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 These were reported in full to the Executive on 12th February 2014. Changes agreed by the Executive for the PP&S Portfolio Capital Programme are set out in paragraph 3.4.

<b>Non-Applicable Sections:</b>	Legal and Personnel Implications
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	Departmental monitoring returns January 2014. Approved Capital Programme (Executive 20/11/13). Capital appraisal forms submitted by Chief Officers in November 2013. Report to Council Directors' meeting 15/01/14.



**CAPITAL PROJECT APPRAISAL – NEW SCHEMES**

**A. PROJECT SPECIFICATION**

1. Project title and description CCTV control room refurbishment  
(Parking and Community Safety)

2. Total estimated capital cost £340.000

3. Proposed start date August 2014

4. Justification for “early” start (i.e. before 2014/15), if applicable  
N/A

5. Proposed completion date October 2014

**B. POLICIES AND OBJECTIVES**

6. What are the aims and objectives of the project?  
To secure the operation of the community safety and traffic enforcement control rooms into the future  
To refurbish the CCTV operating and recording systems, which are ten years old and no longer fit for purpose and the evident risk of loss of service and the Council's reputation

7. Which objective(s) of the Council’s Plans and Strategies (specifically the “BBB 2020 Vision” Sustainable Community Strategy, Corporate Operating Principles, Portfolio/Service Plans, Asset Management Plan and I E & E Plans) will be met by the project, and how?  
BBB 2020 Vision  
Portfolio Plan Public Protection & Safety  
Asset Management Plan

8. What are the expected additional outputs and outcomes from the proposed project? (including increase in service users, additional jobs, etc.)  
Improvement in response to incidents in the Community Safety control room as operators will be able to review recorded images at their workstations  
Improved working conditions including, for instance, increased resolution of video display

9. What, if any, statutory requirement or government initiative(s) will the project contribute towards?  
Highways management  
Community safety

10. What, if any, partnership working will be involved, and how?  
Highways management and maintaining clear routes, reducing congestion through enforcement of parking and moving traffic offences.  
Safer Bromley Partnership has a set of strategic aims and key priorities for the reduction of

crime and disorder. The community safety CCTV control room contributes to the achievement of these and the Police and Council civil enforcement staff work closely with the control room management and operators in developing video evidence for the response to and prosecution of offences.

11. Who are the interested stakeholders and what consultation has taken place with them?

Metropolitan Police Service has been consulted about the continued value of the CCTV service and its contribution to the crime reduction partnership. TfL and highways management. Safer Bromley Partnership Shop Safe town centre radio scheme that connects business with each other and the CCTV control room supports the improvements offered as well as continued operation of service.

Parking services has been consulted over the community safety service continuing to maintain operation of CCTV and help points in two major car parks.

Street Services and TfL has been consulted over the CCTV service continuing to operate Bromley High Street drop down bollard system and audio control link

**C. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS**

12. Total estimated capital cost

£340.000

13. Analysis of capital cost (including elements to be funded by other bodies).

	2013/14 (early start)	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	TOTAL
	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000
Land					
Construction/Works					
Furniture & equipment		325	15		340
Fees					
Other (please specify)					
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>325</b>	<b>15</b>		<b>340</b>

14. Analysis of potential external funding (see also Q16 re ring-fencing of external funding).

e.g. Government grants, other local authorities, private sector, other (please specify)	2013/14 (early start)	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	TOTAL
	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000
<b>TOTAL</b>					

15. Revenue implications of capital expenditure. (Note: Given the Council's financial outlook, COE has indicated that bids of an "invest to save" nature will be especially welcome).

	2013/14 (early start)	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	TOTAL
	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000
Capital financing (leave blank)					

Employees					
Building maintenance					
Energy costs					
Rates					
Other (please specify)					
Less: Income					
TOTAL					

16. Is the external funding in 14 above ring-fenced? If not, please provide a justification for allocating the funding to cover this proposal in preference to allocating to cover general capital expenditure.

N/A

17. Will any capital receipt arise from the proposal? If so, please give details

N/A

**D. RISK MANAGEMENT**

18. Please identify any potential risks associated with the project. (These could include risks associated with land acquisition, planning, development, management, marketing, etc.)

The principal risks relate to not carrying out the project, so none are listed here, see 20 below

19. What contingency arrangements would be in place to address these risk factors?

N/A

20. What, if any, would be the consequences of not undertaking the project?

a) At all?

The system is ten years old and due for replacement. Hardware faults are frequent and increasingly expensive to fix. Neither the camera operating system nor the recording system, which are used by both the community safety and the parking control rooms, are supported by their manufacturers and any failure will require their replacement. The existing maintenance contractor is supporting the system but software, as opposed to hardware faults cannot be corrected. Income levels of up to £1.027m per annum would be at risk if the system fails.

The (Meyertech) camera control system is an early version and no longer supported by its manufacturer continued operation the system be refreshed, the operator workstations including servers should be replaced with current models along with associated equipment that is no longer performing to the operational requirements.

The recording system and associated monitor wall has significant faults and are no longer supported by the manufacturer. The manufacturer, Vigilant, has made an end-of-life announcement and ceased to support the Council's equipment from September 2012. Software support is limited as no further development will take place and, although the CCTV maintenance contractor has worked with the manufacturer to correct faults, the servers that manage the recording and video wall are five years old and are no longer supported and require replacement.

The control room UPS (uninterruptable power supply) batteries were installed over 10 years ago and are due for replacement. This system ensures continuity of electrical power thus preventing electrical spikes that might damage the equipment and safe switchover to the

generator in the event of a general power failure.

b) In the proposed timescale?

*The system is now close to collapse and requires replacement within the timescale proposed if services are to be maintained.*

Replacing individual components rather than the whole system will be more expensive in the long term as there will be less room to negotiate on price with existing suppliers than if the Council is to competitively tender for the equipment all at one time.

## E. SUSTAINABILITY

21. Has any consideration been given to social, environmental and financial outcomes arising from the project? Please provide details.

Environmental -

Reduction in energy used by the recording system, video display system and, as a consequence, heat produced which must be removed by air conditioning or the equipment will fail

Reduction in congestion – parking enforcement contributes to reduced emissions.

Financial-

Reduction in cost of repair and maintenance of redundant equipment, not replaced piecemeal  
Retain high performance of Parking control room and revenue of £1.027m pa

Social

Contribution to town centre management, financial health of town centre

Contribution to reduction of crime and disorder and health of night-time economy

22. Have the whole life costs of the scheme been fully considered (i.e. have all the key stages of the scheme been considered, from design through to potential disposal), and have the social, environmental and economic impacts and costs, both positive and negative, been identified? Please provide details.

### Whole life cost

Supply and installation – £340,000

Maintenance and servicing (total for 7 years) – £115,000 included in existing revenue budget

### Non-cashable savings

- The latest technology will ensure greater reliability and serviceability and ensure the continued operation of the service
- Improved staff morale and confidence in the service on seeing investment in the CCTV control room
- Improved integrity of the recording medium and process
- Quicker and easier operation of equipment, selection of cameras and flexibility of operation where each operator can view and operate any camera within the control room

Social sustainability – The successful contractor must present a health and safety plan for approval before the works can commence, this will address both the safety of its employees and others when working in both public areas and council's premises. The CCTV operators are

recruited locally and will be trained in the operation of the digital equipment, developing their skills and improve prospects for future employment.

Economic - The tender will be competitive which will ensure that the services and works provide the best value for money. The contract will require that the manufacturer supports the equipment for at least 7 years, preventing unnecessary replacement of what should be serviceable equipment.

Environmental – Upgrading the CCTV system and replacing the recording system for a low energy alternative supports the council’s policy to reduce its impact on the environment by delivering a reduction in the use of electrical energy.

## F. GENERAL

### 23. VAT IMPLICATIONS

Are there any VAT implications arising from the proposed scheme? (These will need to be signed off by Maria Wiles and/or Tracey Pearson before the bid can progress).

N/A

### 24. ASSESSMENT OF PRIORITY

What would you assess the overall priority for this project to be? (please tick as appropriate).

	High	Medium	Low
Departmental	X		
Public	X		
Council Members	X		

### 25. PROJECT MANAGER / RESPONSIBLE OFFICER

Name

Job Title

Date

This page is left intentionally blank

Report No.  
ES14024

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

---

**Decision Maker:** PUBLIC PROTECTION AND SAFETY POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

**Date:** 4th March 2014

**Decision Type:** Non-Urgent Non-Executive Non-Key

**Title:** OPERATION PAYBACK UPDATE

**Contact Officer:** Amanda Mumford, Community Safety Coordinator  
Tel: 020 8313 4395 E-mail: amanda.mumford@bromley.gov.uk

**Chief Officer:** Nigel Davies, Executive Director for Environment & Community Services

**Ward:** All

---

1. Reason for report

- 1.1 As requested by the Public Protection and Safety Policy Development and Scrutiny Committee, this report provides details of the current position with Bromley's Community Payback Scheme.
- 

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

**Members of the Public Protection and Safety PDS Committee are asked to consider the contents of the report.**

## Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy: Safer Bromley Partnership Community Safety
  2. BBB Priority: Safer Bromley :
- 

## Financial

1. Cost of proposal: Not applicable:
  2. Ongoing costs: £8.4k:
  3. Budget head/performance centre: Portfolio Holder grant for Operation Payback
  4. Total current budget for this head: £8.4k
  5. Source of funding: Existing revenue budget 2013/14
- 

## Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): Not applicable
  2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: Not applicable
- 

## Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Non-Statutory - Government Guidance:
  2. Call-in: Not Applicable:
- 

## Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): The community at large benefit from the scheme; specifically, improvements in recycling across the borough are undertaken via the scheme.
- 

## Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Not Applicable
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: Not applicable



### **3. COMMENTARY**

- 3.1 The Community Payback Scheme is operated on behalf of the National Offender Management Service to deliver Community Sentences issued by the Court. Community Payback is unpaid work to improve the environment of a local community, usually in an area local to the offender. Offenders are sentenced to between 40 and 300 hours depending on how serious the crime is.
- 3.2 The scheme, which was previously run by London Probation, has been contracted out since October 2012, Serco have taken over delivery of this service in Bromley and across London. Serco currently hold this contract until October 2016.
- 3.3 Historically, Bromley Council had a very good relationship with partners in the London Probation Community Payback Team; as a result the team were regularly deployed to assist with maintenance of parks and clearance of neglected areas of land. As a large borough with lots of green space this was particularly beneficial to Bromley.
- 3.4 Since Community Payback has been run by Serco, in order for Bromley Council to deploy the team to dedicated projects – either one off or on-going – requests have been made for team supervisor costs to be covered, transport provided and other considerations made for refreshment breaks. As a result of the new requirements and concerns around the associated costs of community payback projects Bromley Council only benefits from Community Payback support with the sorting of materials for recycling, as opposed to the comprehensive service that was once received.
- 3.5 Community Payback continues to be utilised at the Depot. The primary function of the activity currently is to improve the cardboard recyclates that pass through the waste transfer station, which is generated from direct deliveries of the public at the Reuse & Recycling Centre or from the network of on-street recycling banks.
- 3.6 The Community Payback Scheme at this location is highly dependent on the ratio of offenders per day to supervision costs and it is the desire of Serco to increase the number of offenders on-site to an average of 10. Serco had made a request to reduce the operating days from 5 days to 3, but this would limit the viability of this project as the area set aside to operate the scheme would be redundant for 4 out of 7 days. This would not be an efficient use of the limited space available at the waste transfer station to support enhanced recycling activities.
- 3.7 In spite of challenges faced by working with offenders and by the change in management to Serco, we have experienced a better, more reliable supervision of the offenders on the site locally and we continue to have a constructive working relationship between our organisations.
- 3.8 The concerns raised in this report are being picked up at a London-wide level. Locally the Community Safety Team continues to work with the local Payback Manager to explore feasible opportunities for the Borough to benefit from the scheme.

### 3.9 Community Payback projects and number of hours worked across South East London

	Total hours in 2013	Number of offenders as of 09/07/2013	Types of Placements
<b>Bexley</b>	2,390.27	196	Churches, school, parks, charity shops
<b>Bromley</b>	2,959.13	249	Farms, charity shops, recycling and lunch clubs
<b>Greenwich</b>	3,530.78	274	Charity shops, estates, parks, sports clubs
<b>Lambeth</b>	4,448.87	332	Charity shops, community centres, parks
<b>Lewisham</b>	4,147.92	287	Crematoriums, gardens, playgrounds, churches, estates
<b>Southwark</b>	3,035.32	244	Estates, playgrounds, churches, charity shops and farms

#### 4. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 The Community Payback Scheme aims to see that justice is done and is seen to be done by enforcing unpaid labour intensive work for those who commit less serious crimes. The scheme aims to punish criminals while also making them aware of the consequences of their actions - and at the same time give a boost to recycling levels in the borough.

#### 5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 In 2013/14 an allocation of £8,400 has been made towards the costs of operating the community payback work at the waste disposal site at Waldo Road.

#### 6. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 The scheme is run by Probation in partnership with Bromley Council and Police.

<b>Non-Applicable Sections:</b>	Personnel Implications
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	

# Agenda Item 13

Report No.  
ES14026

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

---

**Decision Maker:** PUBLIC PROTECTION AND SAFETY POLICY DEVELOPMENT  
AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

**Date:** 4th March 2014

**Decision Type:** Non-Urgent Non-Executive Non-Key

**Title:** PERPETRATOR PROGRAMME PROJECT UPDATE

**Contact Officer:** Clare Elcombe, Domestic Abuse & VAWG Strategy Coordinator  
Tel: 020 8313 4290 E-mail: Clare.Elcombe@bromley.gov.uk

**Chief Officer:** Nigel Davies, Executive Director of Environment & Community Services

**Ward:** All

---

1. Reason for report

To provide an update regarding the perpetrator programme for quarters one to three of 2013/14 and lay out the future delivery plans.

---

2. **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

2.1 That Members note the report and agree that further updates on the programme be included in the general progress reports covering all MOPAC-funded projects.

### Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy & New Policy:  
Safer Bromley Partnership Community Safety Strategy  
Safer Bromley Partnership Domestic Abuse and Violence Against Women & Girls Strategy
  2. BBB Priority: Safer Bromley:
- 

### Financial

1. Cost of proposal: Estimated Cost: 2013/14 - £28k
  2. Ongoing costs: Recurring Cost: £28k per annum until and including 2016/17
  3. Budget head/performance centre: Public Protection and Safety
  4. Total current budget for this head: £28k subject to performance,
  5. Source of funding: MOPAC Funding
- 

### Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): N/A
  2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: Approx 1-2 hours per week – Domestic Abuse & VAWG Strategy Coordinator.
- 

### Legal

1. Legal Requirement: None:
  2. Call-in: Not Applicable:
- 

### Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): Targeted to complete work with 30 male perpetrators and their ex/partners over the course of a year. Estimated to therefore indirectly impact approximately 40 children in those families.
- 

### Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Not Applicable
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: Borough-wide project

### 3. COMMENTARY

#### Introduction

- 3.1 Following a positive pilot in 2012 and successfully securing funding through MOPAC (and local sources for the first two years) to deliver a perpetrator programme in Bromley, TRYangle were commissioned jointly with LB Lewisham to deliver a full programme supporting behavioural change for male perpetrators along with comprehensive support and safety work for their ex/partners.
- 3.2 TRYangle have been delivering a programme accessible to both Bromley and Lewisham residents and consisting of:
- A 24 week group programme for male perpetrators promoting attitudinal and behavioural change by exploring beliefs about relationships, gender roles, communication skills, conflict management, the impact of abusive behaviour on children, and emotional regulation. This is delivered as a rolling programme so men can enrol at any point without having to join a waiting list; and each man referred to the project is individually assessed for suitability and motivation to change before being offered a space. This work can also be provided in a 1-2-1 setting with men who require language support.
  - A 12 week support group for the ex/partners of men engaged in the programme providing education regarding abuse, exploring the impact of abuse on themselves and children, building self-confidence, and learning how to spot abusive behaviour and ensure they stay safe. This group is also delivered as a rolling programme and women can attend more than one cycle should they wish. This group is delivered in a Children & Family Centre with free crèche provision.
  - Up to 20 sessions of individual counselling for both the men and women engaged in the project to explore individual issues which cannot be addressed in group work. This is also available to individuals who are not attending the group programmes as they are receiving support elsewhere – i.e. men who are also attending the Probation IDAPA (Integrated Domestic Abuse Programme – Accelerated) programme or women who are attending The Freedom Programme.
  - A women’s safety worker provides professional liaison between couples engaged in the service to ensure that ex/partners understand the reality of any change in behaviour, and are able to accurately assess any risks to themselves and take actions to mitigate these.
  - The project links closely to the Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conference (MARAC) to ensure high risk situations are dealt with robustly, and also with Children’s Social Care to address any child protection concerns.
- 3.3 TRYangle began taking referrals from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2013 and the first groups began eight weeks later (to allow for enough individuals to be assessed to form a group). The number of referrals received are as follows:

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	2013/14 to date
Total referrals for men	22	9	10	-	41

These 41 referrals are broken down into the following outcomes:

- 5 declined assessment
- 25 assessed
- 16 currently awaiting assessment
- 10 accepted onto programme after assessment but declined to engage
- 15 engaged in programme
- 6 completed programme, 9 still attending

As a comparison 41 referrals have also come in from Lewisham, with very similar levels of engagement.

- 3.4 Currently six men have recently completed and TRYangle are in the process of collecting qualitative outcome data as follows:
- Perpetrator’s assessment of changes in their behaviour
  - Victim’s feelings of safety
  - Referring professional’s assessment of changes in behaviour
  - Referring professional’s assessment of impact on any children
  - Any changes in child protection involvement
  - Referrals to MARAC for families engaged in the programme (assessed one year after completion)
  - Police involvement (assessed one year after completion)
- 3.5 The current performance of the project is very similar to other voluntary perpetrator programmes across London.

#### 4. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 Provision of a perpetrator programme (subject to funding) is to be included as a priority within the upcoming Domestic Abuse and Violence Against Women & Girls Strategy. The strategy will lay out a holistic plan to tackle Domestic Abuse & VAWG in the borough including prevention and early intervention work, crisis provision, and rehabilitation and recovery work for both victims and perpetrators.

#### 5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 An amount of £28k is available for 2013/14 from MOPAC funding for this project subject to the delivery of specific agreed outcomes.

#### 6. PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 None. Minor commitment required from Domestic Abuse & VAWG Strategy Coordinator and relevant stakeholders to oversee project.

<b>Non-Applicable Sections:</b>	Legal Implications
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	

## London Borough of Bromley

### PART ONE - PUBLIC

Report No.  
CSD14048

---

**Decision Maker:** Public Protection and Safety PDS Committee

**Date:** 4<sup>th</sup> March 2014

**Decision Type:** Non Urgent                      Non Executive                      Non Key

**Title:** Annual Update on Youth Services - 2013

**Contact Officer:** Stephen Wood, Democratic Services Officer  
Tel: 020 8 313 4316 E-mail: stephen.wood@bromley.gov.uk

**Chief Officer:** Mark Bowen, Director of Corporate Services

**Ward:** N/A

---

1. Reason for report

1.1 **Appendix A** updates Members on the work of the Borough's Youth Services.

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

2.1 **The Committee is asked to note the contents of the report for information purposes.**

<b>Non-Applicable Sections:</b>	Policy/Financial/Legal/Personnel
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	Information and reports provided by contact officer.

## Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy
  2. BBB Priority: Excellent Council
- 

## Financial

1. Cost of proposal: No Cost
  2. Ongoing costs: Not Applicable
  3. Budget head/performance centre: Democratic Services
  4. Total current budget for this head: £363,070
  5. Source of funding: 2013/14 revenue budget
- 

## Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 10 posts (8.55fte)
  2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: Completion of "Matters Arising" Reports for PP&S PDS meetings can take up to a few hours per meeting.
- 

## Legal

1. Legal Requirement: None
  2. Call-in: Not Applicable
- 

## Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): This report is intended primarily for Members of the Public Protection and Safety PDS Committee.
- 

## Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Not Applicable
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: N/A



# London Borough of Bromley

## PART 1 - PUBLIC

### Briefing for

### Public Protection Policy Development and Scrutiny Committee- 4 March 2014

### Education Policy Development and Scrutiny Committee Tuesday 18 March 2014

## **ANNUAL UPDATE ON YOUTH SERVICES - 2013**

Contact Officer: Paul King, Head of Service, Bromley Youth Support Programme

Chief Officer: Terry Parkin, Executive Director of Education, Care & Health Services

### Summary

The purpose of this report is to provide an update on the work of the Borough's Youth Services for the calendar year 2013.

### **THE BRIEFING**

The scope of the Borough's Youth Services and the statutory responsibilities that they are intended to meet are detailed in Appendix 1 to this report.

These services contribute to meeting Council responsibilities to:

- a. support young people to remain in Education, Employment and Training
- b. promote and provide things for young people to do outside of school time
- c. deter young people from anti-social and offending behaviour
- d. safeguard and support young people if they do offend and enter the youth justice system
- e. manage work experience and educational visits

The Bromley Youth Support Programme (Targeted and Universal), Education Business Partnership and the Youth Offending Service Teams are situated within the Education, Care and Health Services Children's Care Service Division. Together these services employ 67 full time equivalent staff who are located at the Civic Centre, 4, Masons Hill and at the 4 Youth Centres across the Borough.

The Bromley Youth Music Trust, the Duke of Edinburgh Awards, Youth Council, Summer Activities Programme, Bromley Mentoring Initiative and the Borough's Youth Centres are examples of services that fall within the area of the Council's services to Young People. Additionally, officers within the service have a role to play in supporting and promoting private and voluntary sector youth services.

Service performance reports are presented each year for the Bromley Youth Support Programme (Targeted and Universal), Bromley Youth Council, Duke of Edinburgh Awards, Youth Offending Team and Bromley Youth Music Trust. From 2014, the Education Business Partnership will also be producing an annual performance report.

This report provides an update on the work of the Bromley Youth Support Programme (Targeted and Universal).

## **Bromley Youth Support Programme (BYSP) Headline Attendance and Participation Numbers**

From January 2013 to December 2013 The Bromley Youth Support Programme has had contact with 4,486 individual young people with these young people participating in activities 17,961 times. This is an increase on last year with 945 more young people accessing BYSP centres and projects.

### **Universal Youth Support**

#### **Duke of Edinburgh Award**

Delivery of the Award across the borough is at an all-time high, with over 21 schools and groups delivering to 2,500 young people currently undertaking the Award and over 400 young people due to receive Awards this March. The award raises young people's aspirations, builds their resilience, informs their decisions – and thereby reduces teenage pregnancy, risky behaviours such as substance misuse, and involvement in crime and anti-social behaviour.

The current level of participation is representative of over 7,000 hours of volunteering that connects young people with their communities, enabling them to belong and contribute to society, through volunteering and supporting them to have a voice in decisions which affect their lives.

#### **Youth Involvement**

The work of the Youth Involvement Team includes the running and development of Bromley's Youth Council and associated activities.

Bromley Youth Council (BYC) is currently undertaking its biennial elections in Schools, Colleges and associated groups. In 2012, 8946 young people in the borough voted in the Youth Elections, and a higher number is expected in 2014.

The Youth Council held its Annual Manifesto Event in March 2013 to which representatives from all secondary schools and colleges were invited. This event informs the campaign areas run by the Youth Council for the year. In 2012 BYC ran a highly successful Anti Bullying campaign with all schools across the borough signing up to the BYC Anti Bullying Pledge. In 2013, the Youth Council has run an equally successful Mental Health and Wellbeing Awareness campaign; with BYC lesson plans and a BYC awareness film being used in PSHE lessons across the borough.

Bromley Youth Council enables young people to have a say in how local services are organised and connects them with local democracy. The Youth Council meets regularly to discuss issues which are relevant to young people in Bromley and works to influence policy and development within the local authority on behalf of young people. In addition BYC has representatives on both United Kingdom Youth Parliament and British Youth Council.

Youth Council representatives are co-opted members on Public Protection and Safety PDS, Recreation and Renewal PDS, Care PDS and Education PDS. The Youth Council are in the

process of establishing representation on Bromley Safeguarding Children's Board and Police Youth Advisory Board.

During the current two year period, young people have been represented from 13 schools alongside representatives co-opted from Living in Care Council and Bromley Young Advisers.

### **Detached and Mobile**

This year has seen development of the mobile and detached team to undertake both more targeted delivery, and also to undertake external contracts, via a partnership with Affinity Sutton Housing Association. The team also takes the leading role in the organisation of the BYSP summer parks programme.

This targeted extension has resulted in the team delivering three Information, Advice and Guidance drop in sessions for young people each week. These are delivered at the central library, and two from Bromley college campuses, with the aim of supporting young people to stay in EET.

The team has successfully undertaken a one year contract with Affinity Sutton, primarily delivering to young people in Mottingham and Penge areas. Negotiation of a further contract is currently underway.

The mobile and detached team have worked on the streets with 818 individual young people between April and December 2013 and have recorded 2046 attendances by young people (not counting all young people seen via summer programmes).

### **Phoenix youth group**

This group is open to young people with special needs aged between 10 and 25 years. The service operates on two evenings per week, and this year delivery has been split into age appropriate sessions, with one evening for 10 – 15 yr olds, and one for 16 plus age range.

For many of the group members the club is the only social activity they undertake each week, offering an invaluable opportunity to participate and engage in social and informal educational activities. In addition it offers valuable respite for parent and carers.

The project has worked with 94 individual young people between April 13 and December 13. This represents 1588 actual attendances and a sessional average attendance of 23 people.

### **Summer programme**

Between Saturday 20 July and Sunday 1 September 2013, the BYSP ran a 36 day programme in parks across the borough which was a collaboration between universal and targeted youth support services. The programme was aimed at young people aged between 10 and 19 (or up to 25 for those with disabilities). It included activities such as sports; football, basketball, hula hoops and rounders; creative activities including henna tattoos, jewellery making, nail art, paper mache statues and smoothie making. Delivery was through a combination of commissioned and directly delivered services organised by the Bromley Youth Support Programme.

The programme was set a performance target to exceed the level of participation achieved by the previous years' programme by 20%. As total participation in the previous year's programme had been 6,451 with an average of 179 people attending each individual event a target of 7,500 was set.

At the end of this year's programme 11,293 people had attended the programme with an average of 314 attending each event. 5,278 under 8's attended and 6,015 over 8's attended.

Given that many of the under 8's also attended with their parents we can reasonably assume that roughly 5,000 parents also attended the park days.

The programme successfully met its key objectives of:

- increasing individual participation
- encouraging community participation
- providing a diversion from anti-social and criminal activity
- providing an opportunity for Council partners to reach more people
- increased participation in other services provided by Bromley Youth Support Programme

### **Targeted Youth Support Programme (TYSP)**

TYSP has provided direct one to one support for 1,701 young people through 2,020 face to face interventions. This is an increase of 829 compared to the same period last year. Detailed below are the specific areas where direct support has been provided to vulnerable young people.

### **Support for young people at risk of becoming Not in Education Employment and Training**

A key part of BYSP's support is the identification of young people who are Not in Education, Employment and Training (NEET). Last year schools and partners referred 39 young people in year 11 for one to one support where they considered the young person to be at risk of becoming NEET on leaving Year 11, of these 39 young people who received one to one support 77% are now in some form of EET.

TYSP also provided tailored group work packages in school (Power to Progress) for young people at risk of becoming NEET as identified in year 11 by schools. In the last academic year 28 young people were supported through this programme across 3 schools. These young people were followed up in Year 12 and of the original 28, 96% are in some form of Education Employment or Training.

### **Drop in Sessions**

Each week BYSP provides 7 Information, Advice and Guidance drop in sessions for young people who are NEET across the borough. These are delivered at each of the 4 Hubs, Bromley College (at both Orpington and Bromley campus) and the Central Library. Last year 543 young people received advice and support in finding training, college courses or work through these sessions.

### **Targeted Youth Activity Provision**

Each Hub runs 4 youth work sessions each week. In the last year from January to December 2013 TYSP supported 2,433 young people who attended local Hubs 16,922 times. Evening provision is directly linked to the one to one and targeted group work by encouraging the young people worked with during the day to engage in evening activities. This means that they benefit from further informal education but also get on-going support and the opportunity to build positive relationships with youth support professionals. The informal education offer includes project work that ranges from planning an allotment and cooking the produce to writing and performing a music track that describes living in their local area. It also covers key issues relevant to young people including, drugs and alcohol, sexual health, mental health, Black History. In addition young people have been involved in working with their local community on a wide variety of projects but most notably the development of the skate park in Biggin Hill and the BMX facility in Mottingham.

### **Support for young people at risk of entering the criminal justice system and at risk of exclusion.**

BYSP provides one to one support for young people from Year 6 upwards. This will involve anything from primary to secondary transition support, anger management, access to positive activities or support to access other voluntary sector providers. In the last year 262 referrals were received from other services for this type of support which has resulted in outcomes such as young people making successful transitions from primary to secondary school to being better able to deal with their anger in school.

### **LAC NEET Support**

This support focusses around monthly meetings with key managers in LAC, Leaving Care and the Virtual Head to identify and provide support to LAC and Leaving Care young people who are at risk of becoming or who are NEET. This work will assess the best type of support for a particular young person whether it is mentoring provided by BEBP, the Youth Contract or one to one IAG support. In the last year TYSP has worked intensively with 17 LAC/Leaving Care young people who were referred to the service by social care of these 23% are currently NEET.

### **YOT NEET Support**

Within the YOT, BYSP provides 2.5 days a week of IAG support. This means that all post 16 young people in the YOT who are NEET get to meet a Youth Support Worker and are supported to find a suitable EET offer. BYSP also holds monthly YOT NEET panel meetings. These meetings review all the current post 16 YOT NEET to ensure that all young people are being effectively supported and engaged and that where blockages are occurring concerns are escalated to other services to see if additional support can be provided.

### **NEET contact**

BYSP have a responsibility for contacting NEET young people and providing them with support into Education, Employment or Training. This support has developed over the last year to the extent where the team produced its best ever September Guarantee result with just 68 young people who did not have a confirmed Education, Employment or Training destination.

### **Tracking of young people's participation in EET**

BYSP also tracks all young people between the ages of 16 and 19 to ascertain what they are doing and if they need any support to enter or remain in EET. In the last year our tracker alone updated the destination and made contact with 6,814 young people. Where a young person is Not Known and they are not responding to letters and telephone calls a home visit is undertaken to ascertain if they are still living at the address or have moved out of the area and the nature of the support they require.

This page is left intentionally blank

**SUMMARY OF STATUTORY DUTIES MET THROUGH BROMLEY YOUTH SUPPORT PROGRAMME**

<b>INFORMATION ADVICE AND GUIDANCE (IAG)</b>	<b>PROMOTING POSITIVE ACTIVITIES</b>	<b>YOUTH OFFENDING TEAM/SERVICE</b>
<p>Under Section 68 of the Education and Skills Act of 2008, Local Authorities have a duty to ‘assist, encourage and enable’ young people aged 13-19 (and young adults with a learning difficulty and/or disability up to the age of 25) to participate in education or training. Services provided under this duty were previously delivered under the ‘Connexions’ brand which was replaced by an all-age careers service by April 2012. Local authorities are no longer required to provide a universal careers guidance offer, but do retain a responsibility for providing targeted support for vulnerable young people. There are no stipulated requirements and the method by which they meet this duty is at the discretion of individual Local Authorities.</p>	<p>Under Section 507B of the Education Act 1996, Local Authorities have a duty to ensure that young people have access to sufficient educational leisure-time (Positive) activities which are for the improvement of their well-being and personal and social development, and sufficient facilities for such activities; that activities are publicised; and that young people are placed at the heart of decision making regarding the positive activity provision. There are no stipulated requirements and the content and mode of delivery of a local “youth offer” is largely at the discretion of the Local Authority.</p>	<p>Under Section 39 (1) of the 1998 Crime and Disorder Act Local Authorities, acting in co-operation with partners (who are also under a duty to co-operate with the Local Authority) have a duty to establish in their area one or more Youth Offending Teams.</p> <p>The introduction of the Legal Aid Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act 2012 from December 2012, places an increased duty on the Local Authority with respect to the safeguarding and care of all young people held on remand.</p>
<p>Section 72 places a duty on Local Authorities to secure and provide information about learner and participation in education and training. The content of the information required is defined by a Department for Education specification to which an individual Local Authority is required to adhere. Local Authorities are permitted to discharge this duty via a third party.</p> <p>Both Section 68 and 72 are integral to Local Authorities duties in respect to the Raised Participation Age which will be effective from September 2013.</p> <p>Section 139A of the Learning and Skills Act 2000 places a duty on Local Authorities to arrange for an assessment of needs of young people with Learning Difficulties and Disabilities who are making a transition between places of learning after Year 11 of their compulsory education. The Act stipulates the required competence of staff undertaking the assessment and the points at which assessment must be made.</p>	<p align="center"><b>MANAGEMENT OF WORK EXPERIENCE</b></p> <p>Under Section 112 of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998, the enactments relating to the prohibition or regulation of the employment of children do not apply to the employment of a child in his last two years of compulsory schooling if the employment is in pursuance of arrangements made—</p> <p>(a) by a local education authority, or</p> <p>(b) by the governing body of a school on behalf of such an authority,</p> <p>with a view to providing him with work experience as a part of his education.</p> <p>Therefore, although it does not have a duty to provide work experience, the local authority needs to maintain a policy setting out conditions whereby a governing body may act on its behalf and monitor provision made under this delegated authority.</p>	<p align="center"><b>MANAGEMENT OF EDUCATIONAL VISITS</b></p> <p>The main legislation covering this area is the Health and Safety at Work etc Act 1974 and regulations made under that Act.</p> <p>Regulations made under the Health and Safety at Work etc. Act 1974 set out what actions employers are required to take.</p> <p>Health and safety arrangements must be set out in a written health and safety policy and employers must ensure that employees receive relevant training.</p> <p>Where the local authority is the employer, it may give a direction concerning the health and safety of persons (including pupils) on the premises or taking part in activities elsewhere. Under section 29(5) of the Education Act 2002, governing bodies of schools must comply with any such direction from the local authority.</p> <p>The employer (the local authority, governing body or proprietor) is responsible for health and safety, though tasks may be delegated to staff.</p>

**SUMMARY OF SERVICES PROVIDED BY OR THROUGH THE BROMLEY YOUTH SUPPORT PROGRAMME IN MEETING STATUTORY DUTIES**

CAREERS IAG FOR ALL	ACTIVITY DELIVERED DIRECTLY BY THE TARGETED YOUTH SUPPORT PROGRAMME (TYSP)	ACTIVITY DELIVERED DIRECTLY BY THE UNIVERSAL YOUTH SUPPORT PROGRAMME (UYSP)	ACTIVITY DELIVERED DIRECTLY BY THE YOUTH OFFENDING TEAM	ACTIVITY DELIVERED DIRECTLY BY BROMLEY EDUCATION BUSINESS PARTNERSHIP (BEBP)
<p>The programme signposts young people to Impartial Careers Information, Advice and Guidance via websites/helpline and local services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National Careers Service website/ helplines (and other as appropriate)</li> <li>School/College Careers Education and Work Related Learning programmes and sources of Careers IAG</li> <li>Bromley Education Business Partnership activities purchased by schools/colleges</li> <li>Library (self service IAG access points)</li> </ul>	<p>1-1 and groupwork Support from BROMLEY TARGETED YOUTH SUPPORT PROGRAMME (BYSP)</p> <p>Specialist support to young people with LDD to meet statutory duties re. Section 139A Assessments.</p> <p>TYSP also provides source of <b>referrals</b> for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ESF employability support projects</li> <li>Princes Trust</li> <li>Bromley Employment Project</li> <li>Bromley Education Business Partnership:                             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bromley Mentoring Initiative</li> <li>Pre-apprenticeship programme</li> <li>Work Experience</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	<p>Youth centre based activity programme operated at 4 Youth Support Hubs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Duke of Edinburgh Award Scheme</li> <li>Mobile Youth Support Team</li> <li>Youth Involvement (including Youth Council)</li> <li>Youth Offer for young people with disability</li> </ul> <p>ACTIVITY DELIVERED BY THE UYSP THROUGH COMMISSIONS AND COLLABORATION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bromley Music Education Service (Bromley Youth Music Trust)</li> <li>Bromley and Downham Youth Club</li> <li>Darrick Wood Youth and Community Youth Centre</li> <li>Bromley Council for Voluntary Youth Services Grant funded activity</li> <li>Bromley Mytime Arts Train and Myfutures</li> <li>Pro-Active Bromley Sports Partnership Programme</li> </ul> <p>Promotion of total Bromley Youth Offer via Borough's marketing channels</p> <p>Lead delivery partner for the Community Safety parks based summer and Easter diversionary programme</p>	<p>The YOT team delivers a remit of court and community and prevention and intervention work that is statutorily required to include the following activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the provision of assistance to young people to determine whether reprimands or warnings should be given</li> <li>the provision of support for children and young people remanded or committed on bail while awaiting trial or sentence</li> <li>co-ordination with Children Social Care to facilitate the placement in local authority accommodation of children and young people remanded or committed to such accommodation under section 23 of the Children and Young Persons Act 1969</li> <li>the provision of reports or other information required by courts in criminal proceedings against children and young people</li> <li>provision of activity appropriate to the prevention of first time entry to the youth justice system and to the support and supervision of young people on return from custody</li> </ul>	<p>Develops and maintains the local authority's policy, procedures, guidance for provision of work experience for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>children below MSLA who attend Bromley education establishments</li> <li>children and young people who are placed by (or on behalf of) LBB teams</li> </ul> <p>Monitors compliance with work experience standards through range of support services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>review meetings, consultancy and helpline</li> <li>specialist training and bespoke systems</li> <li>placement vetting and cross-borough partnerships</li> </ul> <p>Supports the Council's arrangements as a work experience placement provider.</p> <p>Promotes and brokers apprenticeship and work experience opportunities for young people by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1:1 support and job preparation workshops for young people including vulnerable and hard to reach individuals</li> <li>Advice and recruitment campaigns for employers</li> <li>Marketing campaigns and direct employer engagement</li> </ul> <p>Manages a comprehensive service offer that promotes enterprise, employability and positive activities and improves participation in EET by young people including provision for LAC/LC, YOT and plus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bromley Mentoring Initiative involving 100+ community and business mentors through MOPAC</li> <li>Key Stage 4 engagement programme – identifying those at risk, raising aspirations and improving attendance</li> </ul> <p>Develops and maintains the local authority's policy, procedures, guidance and service offer for management of educational visits by schools and LA teams.</p> <p>Represents the BYSP and education business link partners at BCSB Education Committee and LBB Education Safety Committee and implements safeguarding / H&amp;S action points relating to BYSP / BEBP provision.</p> <p>Triggers ESF funding, national grants and in excess of £1m match-funding per annum.</p> <p>Provides referrals to TYSP Post-16 and contributes to tracking of NEET / EET</p>
<p>Collection and management of information to assist with targeting of support and learner provision and to demonstrate levels of post-16 learner participation in education and training (Year 11-14).</p>				



Report No.  
CSD14039

## London Borough of Bromley

### PART ONE - PUBLIC

---

**Decision Maker:** Public Protection and Safety PDS Committee

**Date:** 4<sup>th</sup> March 2014

**Decision Type:** Non-Urgent                      Non-Executive                      Non-Key

**Title:** **WORK PROGRAMME AND CONTRACTS REGISTER**

**Contact Officer:** Stephen Wood, Democratic Services Officer  
Tel: 020 8313 4316 E-mail: stephen.wood@bromley.gov.uk

**Chief Officer:** Mark Bowen, Director of Corporate Services

**Ward:** All

---

1. Reason for report

1.1 Members are asked to review the Committee's Work Programme and to consider the contracts summary for the Public Protection and Safety Portfolio.

---

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

2.1 **That the Committee:**

- (i) reviews its Work Programme (Appendix 1); and
- (ii) Notes the Public Protection and Safety Portfolio Contracts (Appendix 2).

### Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy: Committees normally receive a report on matters outstanding at each meeting.
  2. BBB Priority: Excellent Council Safer Bromley
- 

### Financial

1. Cost of proposal: No Cost
  2. Ongoing costs: Not Applicable:
  3. Budget head/performance centre: Democratic Services
  4. Total current budget for this head: £363,070
  5. Source of funding: 2013/14 revenue budget
- 

### Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 10 posts (8.55fte)
  2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: Maintaining the Committee's work programme normally takes less than an hour per meeting.
- 

### Legal

1. Legal Requirement: None:
  2. Call-in: Not Applicable: This report does not involve an executive decision.
- 

### Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): This report is primarily for the benefit of Committee Members.
- 

### Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? No
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: N/A

### 3. COMMENTARY

#### Forward Programme

- 3.1 The table at **Appendix 1** sets out the Public Protection and Safety PDS Forward Work Programme. The Committee is invited to comment on the schedule and to propose any changes it considers appropriate.
- 3.2 Other reports may come into the programme - schemes may be brought forward or there may be references from other Committees, the Portfolio Holder or the Executive.

#### Contracts Register

- 3.3 A Public Protection and Safety Contracts Register Summary is at **Appendix 2**.

### 4. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 Each PDS Committee is responsible for setting its own work programme.

<b>Non-Applicable Sections:</b>	Financial/Legal/Personnel
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	Previous Work Programme Reports

## PP&amp;S PDS COMMITTEE - FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME

<b>PUBLIC PROTECTION AND SAFETY PDS – 8<sup>th</sup> July 2014</b>
Matters Arising
Chairman's Update
Police Update
Visit from SLaM (proposed)
Report on Anti-Social Behaviour Crime and Policing Bill (pending information)
Budget Monitoring
Mentoring End of Year Report
End of Year Bromley Youth Council Report
Provisional Outturn 2013/14
Draft Portfolio Plan 2014/15
MOPAC UPDATE
Stray and Abandoned Dogs Contract
Enforcement Activity-Oct 2012--March 2013
Bromley Youth Council Manifesto 2013/14
Work Programme and Contracts Register
Schedule of Visits
<b>PUBLIC PROTECTION AND SAFETY PDS – 7<sup>th</sup> October 2014</b>
Matters Arising
Chairman's Update
Police Update
Report on Anti-Social Behaviour Crime and Policing Bill (pending information)
Budget Monitoring
Draft Portfolio Plan 2014/15
Work Programme and Contracts Register
Schedule of visits
<b>PUBLIC PROTECTION AND SAFETY PDS – 12<sup>th</sup> November 2014</b>
Matters Arising
Chairman's Update
Police Update
Draft Portfolio Plan 2014/15
Budget Monitoring
Work Programme and Contracts Register
Schedule of Visits

## Public Protection and Safety Contracts Register Summary

<b>Contract</b>	<b>Start</b>	<b>Complete</b>	<b>Extensi on granted to</b>	<b>Contractor</b>	<b>Total Value £</b>	<b>Annual Value £</b>	<b>Public Protection &amp; Safety PDS</b>
CCTV Maintenance	1.4.2012	31.03.2017		Eurovia	Fixed 3 years £214,256	£42,851	24 Jan 2012 referred to Executive on 1 <sup>st</sup> Feb 2012
CCTV Control Room	1.4.2012	31.03.3017		OCS	£1,263,258	£252,652	24 Jan 2012 referred to Executive on 1 <sup>st</sup> Feb 2012
Dog Collection – Stray and Abandoned Dogs Gateway Review	1.12.2012	31.03.14		SKID Environmental Ltd	£63,566	£63,566	PP&S PDS 18 Sept 2012 Extended to 31.03.14
Kennels – Stray and Abandoned Dogs Gateway Review	1.12.2012	30.11.14		Woodland Annual Care Ltd	£96,000	£96,000	PP&S PDS 18 Sept 2012 Extended to 31.03.14
Vets Animal Welfare Enforcements	1.4.2013	31.3.2014	1 year	Corporation of London Veterinary Service	£11,000	£11,000	Waiver agreed by Director of Environmental Services

This page is left intentionally blank