

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

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.00 pm on 17 June 2014

Present:

Councillor Kate Lymer (Chairman)
Councillor Chris Pierce (Vice-Chairman)
Councillors Douglas Auld, Kim Botting, David Cartwright,
Peter Fortune, Tom Philpott, Michael Rutherford and
Richard Williams

Terry Belcher, Derec Craig, Dr Robert Hadley, Alf
Kennedy, Laila Khan and Grace Stephens

Also Present:

Councillor Tim Stevens J.P.

STANDARD ITEMS

**1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF
SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS**

Apologies were received from James Cleverly

2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Chairman and Portfolio Holder declared interests as Members of the
Mentoring Steering Group.

**3 QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS AND MEMBERS OF THE
PUBLIC ATTENDING THE MEETING**

There were no questions from Councillors or from members of the public
attending the meeting.

**4 MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC PROTECTION AND SAFETY PDS
COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 4TH MARCH 2014**

The Committee considered the minutes of the meeting of the Public
Protection and Safety PDS Committee held on 4th March 2014.

**RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 4th March 2014 be
agreed.**

5 APPOINTMENT OF CO-OPTED MEMBERS FOR 2014--2015

Report CSD 14075

The following nominations were submitted for re-appointment to the Public Protection and Safety PDS Committee for the 2014/15 Municipal Year:

- Mr Terry Belcher (Vice Chairman of the Bromley Safer Neighbourhood Board);
- Mr Alf Kennedy (Chairman of Bromley Neighbourhood Watch);
- Mr Derec Craig (Senior Service Delivery Manager, Victim Support); and
- Dr Robert Hadley (Chairman of the Bromley Residents' Federation).

Members were also asked to confirm the appointment of two new nominations from Bromley Youth Council:

- Laila Khan (Chair, Bromley Youth Council); and
- Grace Stephens (Bromley Youth Council).

RESOLVED that:

(1) the contents of the report be noted

(2) the Committee confirmed the re-appointment of existing non-voting Co-opted Members

(3) the Committee confirmed the appointments of new Co-opted Member representation from the Bromley Youth Council

6 MATTERS ARISING

Report CSD 14068

Members considered Matters Arising from previous meetings.

Issues arising from minute number 206. Bethlem Royal Hospital Update (13th March 2012), were dealt with fully with the attendance of senior representatives from SLaM (South London and Maudsley NHS Trust). The report concerning the patient escapes of February 2012 was made available for Committee Members to read before the meeting. Representatives from SLaM attended the meeting and answered questions and queries from the Committee. This is expanded upon in a separate section of the minutes.

It was noted that progress had been made with respect to the Anti-Social Behaviour Bill which had now become law. It was anticipated that a report on this would be presented to the meeting of the Committee in September.

With respect to the MOPAC crime prevention bid outcome, a report regarding this was included for information purposes in Item 14 of the agenda. The Committee agreed that this matter could now be regarded as closed, and could be taken off future Matters Arising reports.

Members were updated with respect to previous visits.

RESOLVED that the contents of the Matters Arising report be noted.

7 CHAIRMAN'S UPDATE

The Chairman informed Members that the next meeting of the Committee on the 9th September would commence at 7.30pm instead of the usual time of 7.00pm. This was because the Committee would be visiting Bromley's CCTV centre before the meeting commenced.

The Chairman stated that the Safer Neighbourhood Board (SNB) had their first meeting on 15th May 2014. The SNB had replaced the Bromley Community Engagement Forum; Councillor Tim Stevens was Chairman, and Mr Terry Belcher had been appointed Vice Chairman. It was noted that the next meeting of the SNB was scheduled for 9th July at Citygate Church, and that the Crime Summit was scheduled for 27th September 2014. It was also mentioned that the Safer Bromley Partnership had met on 13th June 2014. The next meeting of the Safer Bromley Partnership was scheduled for 18th September at 10.00am. The Chairman asked Councillor Tim Stevens to provide more information on the SNB. The Portfolio Holder updated the Committee as follows: The **Safer Neighbourhood Boards** (SNB) had a wide remit and currently eighteen members had been appointed. Some places had not yet been allocated for purposes of flexibility, and there were some organisations that were seeking floating membership. Affinity Sutton were one of these—the idea being that they would attend a local meeting when it was relevant. It had been agreed that two members of the SNB would stand down each year so that new members could be brought in when required. The SNB had been allocated £29,500.00 in funding, and £5,000.00 of this was to fund an administrator. The current administrator was Councillor Kate Lymer. The Board was free to spend the money as it saw fit. The SNB did not currently have a constitution, but did have Terms of Reference which had been agreed by Sarah Denton from MOPAC. The former BCEF (Bromley Community Engagement Forum) had now been dissolved and incorporated into the SNB. A meeting was going to be held to sign off the BCEF accounts. It appeared that BCEF had an underspend of £5,500.00 and this would be transferred into the SNB bank account after the BCEF accounts had been ratified. There would be three sessions at the Crime Summit, and Bromley Youth Council (BYC) would play a key part. The Crime Summit would be funded by the SNB. The Safer Bromley Partnership was being scaled down

and becoming more strategic in function. The Chairman of the SBP was the Borough Police Commander, and the Vice Chairman was Mr Nigel Davies (LBB Executive Director of Environmental and Community Services). Safer Neighbourhood Panels were going to be reviewed by the Borough Commander.

The Portfolio Holder highlighted that he wished to encourage scrutiny of himself, and inspired the Committee to question him, and to bring issues to him so that he could respond. The Committee agreed to do this. In response to this encouragement, Councillor Douglas Auld asked the Portfolio Holder if there was any news regarding the commissioning of Public Protection and Safety Portfolio Funds. The Portfolio Holder responded that there had been some developments, but they had been slow and had encountered various obstacles. The Portfolio Holder commented that if there were any significant updates in this regard, they would be brought to the attention of the Committee in November, and that ultimately, the fate of the Portfolio would lie with the PDS Committee. Councillor Douglas Auld noted that there were ongoing developments concerning commissioning that the Committee had not been informed of.

RESOLVED

(1) that the Chairman's Update be noted

(2) that the Committee be updated in November with respect to any developments regarding commissioning of the portfolio

8 POLICE UPDATE

The police update was given by the Borough Commander Chris Hafford.

The Borough Commander explained that the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) was accountable to MOPAC and to the London Mayor. The MPS were currently working on MOPAC 7 targets which involved reducing costs by 20%, and a 20% increase in customer satisfaction levels. In the last twelve months:

- Burglary had fallen by 8.5%
- Criminal damage was down by 1.9%
- Motor vehicle crime was down by 12.5%
- Violent Crime was up by 14.7%

There had been an increase in Domestic Violence Cases. Of all violent crimes reported, one hundred and seventy five were related to domestic violence. It had been thought by some that this would increase with the onset of the World Cup, but this had not manifested to date. It was noted that public confidence was at 66%, which was 3% better than the previous year. The Commander then updated the Committee with respect to response to emergency calls. It was noted that the response to "1" calls (999 calls) was that 91.6% were responded to within the 15 minute target. "Significant" calls to

the police (requiring a response time of 60mins) were responded to within targeted response times in 92.8% of cases.

With respect to staffing levels, it was noted that the current number of Bromley police staff was 546.3—the odd figure related to part time staff. The target for staffing levels was 543. Twenty seven new recruits were currently being trained, and should be on operational duties in the next month.

The Committee was informed that Deputy Borough Commander Jo Oakley was being promoted; this unfortunately meant that Bromley were losing her as she was being transferred to Lewisham. The transfer was effective from July 7th 2014. Carron Schlusler was also being promoted, and going to Croydon.

The Borough Commander informed the Committee that usually there would be meetings held once a week with the Assistant Commissioner to discuss how Bromley police were performing with regard to the various aims and targets of the London Policing Model (LPM). Areas for discussion included matters such as workloads, performance, sickness rates, and an overview of whether or not the aims and objectives of the LPM were working in Bromley, and if any modifications and flexibility were required. It was also noted that the number of officers on generic Emergency Response Teams (ERT) were in the region of 120-129; the number of ERT Officers working with CID was 108. There had been no reductions in the number of Police Community Support Officers.

The Borough Commander referred to the issue of police officer shift patterns, and recognised that these were not universally popular; reviews were in progress. Another issue that was also being reviewed was the use of Contact Points, as it appeared that the use of contact points was not providing value for money, and was a waste of resources.

The Commander advised that the issue of using an increased number of marked vehicles was being considered, but there were not any imminent plans to make any fleet changes as the MPS fleet was currently under review. The Borough Commander was pleased that Bromley police had a good relationship with Bromley Council and other partners, and that morale was good in the Bromley force.

Grace Stephens (Bromley Youth Council) commented on the lack of visibility of police officers in public. She stated that a higher visibility should be aimed for to make the public feel more secure. The Borough Commander responded that this was a good point, and that he was looking at ways to deal with this issue, and also to encourage and increase public engagement. Monthly meetings were held to discuss these issues.

Councillor Pierce noted that if 91% of emergency calls were being responded to within the fifteen minute response time target, this still meant that approximately one in ten were not being responded to in time. Councillor Pierce asked if this was acceptable. Councillor Pierce also commented on the issue of the use of contact points. He stated that part of the problem of apparent under usage of the contact points may in fact be because members

of the public did not know when they were open. The Borough Commander replied to the question of response times by explaining that sometimes the response time target may be missed by a matter of seconds or minutes. There were sometimes problems with a lack of resources. The police force tried to “triage” real emergencies to the best of its ability, so that these calls were always given priority. Obvious failings would be held to account. With respect to the matter of the contact points and their opening times, the Borough Commander noted that these were mentioned in various places such as the “New Shopper” newspaper, and also on the police web site. Even so, the police would look at ways of re-advertising and marketing the contact points.

Councillor Peter Fortune asked if monies being channelled into the problem of domestic abuse were demonstrating results. The Borough Commander responded that there had been an increase in third party reporting, but that this was a difficult question to answer. Councillor Fortune also queried how the police make people feel safe in these situations. The Borough Commander responded by stating that the police were reviewing how quickly they responded to domestic abuse calls. The police were also looking at increasing the size of its Community Safety Unit, and were also looking at ways to prosecute offenders for other crimes as well as domestic abuse. The Portfolio Holder mentioned that Councillors should defer to Officer Clare Elcombe in matters relating to domestic abuse and perpetrator programmes. Councillor Cartwright stated that members of the public were concerned about the reduced numbers of sergeants and PCSOS’s. The Borough Commander answered that Bromley police were currently 4/5 sergeants below target, but potential new candidates for sergeant positions were being looked at for promotion. Councillor Botting asked why the number of PCSO’s had been reduced. The Borough Commander responded that this was because of promotion and decreased resources.

Councillor Philpott asked a question concerning front counter levels at the West Wickham Contact Point. The Borough Commander indicated that he was in contact with the Volunteer Co-ordinator who was very good, and would get feedback for the Committee.

The Chairman made reference to the Maudsley Hospital site, and a recent meeting with the Chief Executive. Apparently there was previously a mobile police contact point at the hospital that did not appear to be there now. The Chairman enquired if this facility had been withdrawn, and if so—why? The Borough Commander responded that a meeting had been scheduled to discuss the issue.

Laila Khan (BYC) stated that young people were often not aware of why they were being stopped and searched, and that police officers should explain why. Miss Khan also asked what qualified for a 15 minutes response to a 999 call. The Borough Commander explained that if there was a suspect still at the alleged crime scene that required arresting, then that would be one example of a 15 minute response.

Other examples would be when dealing with the elderly because of their vulnerability. Most of the time it revolved around the issue of whether or not a suspect was still available to arrest.

RESOLVED that the Borough Commander's update be noted.

9 UPDATE FROM SOUTH LONDON and MAUDSLEY NHS FOUNDATION TRUST

Further to minute 76 (Matters Arising Report—Report CSD 14038) of the meeting dated 4th March 2014, representatives from SLaM attended the meeting. SLaM is the South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust. The representatives that addressed the Committee were:

1. Dr Martin Baggaley, Medical Director and Lead for Clinical Governance.
2. Ellie Davies, Service Director
3. Professor Tom Fahy, Clinical Lead
4. Dr Matthew Patrick, Chief Executive.

Dr Baggaley introduced the representatives, and gave a brief overview of the Bethlem Hospital. It was a “forensic unit” that had three hundred beds. It undertook a wide range of services, and also provided local services for Croydon. Approximately one third of the inpatients were “forensic” which meant that they were mental health patients that had committed crimes against the criminal justice system. They had been sectioned under the Mental Health Act. The Hospital had featured in the Channel 4 documentary—“Bedlam”.

The representatives from SLaM addressed the Committee specifically around concerns pertaining to the Bethlem Royal Hospital in Beckenham and the issues relating to the absconder incident of February 2012.

Dr Baggaley explained that the Hospital used a “Buddi” system of GPS tracking to monitor patients when they were outside of the Hospital. It was explained that a large part of the work of the Hospital was to facilitate the integration of patients back into the community. Leave was divided into two types, escorted and unescorted. Over the last year, there had been 16,000 cases of unescorted leave, and 6,000 cases of escorted leave. Patients were risk assessed before they went on leave, and the Hospital had the option to use the “Buddi System” when it felt appropriate; this provided real time tracking. It was stated that any issues of patients absconding should be put into perspective; out of 22,000 episodes of leave, there had been just 14 incidents, and only 2 patients had failed to return. Additionally, no episodes of crime were reported and there had in fact been no escapes from the Hospital grounds itself.

The Chairman enquired if all patients on escorted leave were tagged. The answer to this was no, approximately one third of those on leave were tagged. Ellie Davies explained that not all patients were tagged as part of their discharge plan. Ellie Davies outlined that there were planned phases of leave, some would be accompanied by two escorts, some by one escort, and then eventually the patient would be allowed unescorted leave. Each patient was assessed on a case by case basis, and were looked at by a team at the Hospital and also by the Ministry of Justice (MOJ). The Chairman asked if there had been any news regarding Daniel Salaco, and Ellie Davies responded that he was still missing. It was noted that the patient was not tagged in this case. The decision not to tag the patient at that time was based on clinical presentation. Ellie Davies stated that she was not able to discuss the specifics of this case in the public arena because of issues around confidentiality; it would be possible however, to update the Chairman privately if the Chairman required.

Councillor Peter Fortune enquired what the process was when a patient failed to return. Ellie Davies explained that if a patient failed to return on time, or went past a designated boundary, an alarm would be triggered. At this point Bethlem would contact the Chairman, the Portfolio Holder and Nigel Davies as well as the police. It was quite often the case that an absconder would return within twenty four hours. The case of the outstanding absconder was exceptional. It was noted by the Committee that in the absconder incident of 2012, the relevant ward councillor was not contacted as per protocol. This was the ward councillor for Kelsey Park; at the moment this ward councillor was Tom Philpott. Ellie Davies felt that it was probably the case that the protocol needed updating.

The Portfolio Holder pointed out that SLAM would need updating with new councillor details. This was a matter that would be followed up by Nigel Davies.

Councillor Botting asked how the patient in February 2012 managed to “escape”. Ellie Davies reiterated that this was not a case that could be discussed in public, but could be discussed with the Chairman privately. Ellie Davies stated that SLAM did not regard the matter as an “escape”, but that rather the patient had in fact absconded and run away from the escort. This was something that was not expected given the checks that were carried out beforehand.

Councillor Tom Philpott enquired what lessons had been learned from the absconder incident. Ellie Davies replied that lessons had indeed been learned, and that after such incidents, an Incident Review Panel is conveyed, chaired by the Clinical Director. The Incident Review Panel would look at various issues, including:

1. How was the patient reviewed?
2. Were there any lessons to be learned from the MOJ review?
3. How could staff training be improved?

4. Clothing checks to be undertaken before the patient leaves—to make identification/reporting easier in the event of an incident.
5. Photographic images to be taken of the patient before leaving the Hospital, which similarly can be circulated in the event of an incident.

Ellie Davies brought to the attention of Members that matters had to be put into a proper perspective. Bethlem Hospital had the lowest rate of incidents across London, and this was despite a high number of leave episodes. Dr Robert Hadley asked how patients would know what boundaries they could not cross. The response to this was that patients would be briefed on these matters before they left the Hospital.

A Member enquired what the logistics were after an escape or absconder incident was reported. Ellie Davies responded that it was important to note that the absconder may have already left the local area; the police would use what intelligence they had to locate the absconder. The family of the absconder would normally be contacted to see if they could assist. CCTV would be looked at—all parties would work together to get whatever leads they could.

Councillor Peter Fortune enquired what would happen to an absconder upon return, and if there were consequences /sanctions that would result. Ellie Davies responded that there would definitely be consequences, and that incidents of this nature were viewed seriously by both the Trust and by the MOJ. There would normally be a discussion with the patient and with the clinical team and the cause(s) for the incident would be ascertained. There were usually specific reasons for an absconsion. The consequences of an absconder incidence were severe, and there were normally sanctions imposed. Normally a patient's leave would be curtailed. Absconder incidents would normally affect leave and would have an adverse effect on any planned discharge date. It would normally set the progress of the patient back adversely; the MOJ would usually undertake their own review.

The matter of “public perception” was referred to and the Committee was reminded of the Channel 4 programme—“Bedlam”, which featured Bethlem; the idea was to encourage a more positive public perception. The programme was an attempt to break down stigmas. The Committee were informed that the BBC had approached the Trust with a view to making a documentary about the work of psychiatric teams in police stations. In terms of managing public perception, SLAM were looking at ways to encourage the Public to use the site; the site has facilities to play football, undertake nature walks, and has a pool. Additionally the site has a museum. The Committee were also updated with respect to the Hospital's “Sunfayre Day” which is taking place on the 5th July 2014, between noon and 5.00pm. The web link to this is: [Bethlem Sunfayre](#).

The Portfolio Holder was very encouraged by the improvements in the general communication and relationship between the London Borough of Bromley, and SLAM, and noted that joint meetings were now being held four times a year.

Ellie Davies concluded by stating that SLaM would very much like to invite Members to a visit of the Hospital site.

RESOLVED that:

(1) the update from SLaM be noted

(2) a Members visit to Bethlem Hospital be facilitated

10 OVERVIEW OF TRADING STANDARDS

Mr Robert Vale (Head of Trading Standards) provided an update on the work of Bromley Trading Standards. This was part of a programme of updates and summaries provided for information purposes for the benefit of new members to the Committee.

Mr Vale provided an update concerning the work of LBB against doorstep crime, postal scams, and also internet based scams. The Committee was also updated with respect of work that had been undertaken to prohibit the sale of age restricted products such as tobacco, alcohol and fireworks. An update was also provided concerning the work of adult safeguarding.

It was noted that with respect to doorstep crime, a rapid response service existed. LBB's work against doorstep crime had been very successful and had resulted in savings totalling £2,000,000.00 since 2002. LBB had also helped to set up "No Cold Calling Zones". LBB also provided information and advice on prevention. LBB had been partnering with other organisations, and had also produced a booklet on scams. Information concerning doorstep callers and rogue traders could be found on the Bromley Website, the internet link is:

[Rogue Traders and Door Step Scams](#)

If a member of the public needed a rapid response to a suspected doorstep scam or rogue trader, then they should call the emergency response number which was 07903 852090. For non-emergency trading standards queries, the number to call was 0300 303 8657. Trading Standards could also be contacted via email at trading.standards@bromley.gov.uk.

Mr. Vale stated that in the past, he felt that more could possibly have been done to safeguard vulnerable adults, especially the elderly and infirm. It was noted that to try and rectify this, LBB Trading Standards were now working closely with LBB Adult Safeguarding, the police and also Age UK. Joint visits were now being conducted with the police. It was acknowledged that this was resource intensive, but it was felt that it was worth it as it helped people "off the radar" that really needed assistance. LBB were operating as part of the National Intelligence Operating Model.

Mr Vale updated the Committee with the work that LBB had been conducting in partnering with banks; this was a work in progress. Trading Standards had conducted visits to various banks to highlight particular danger signs that may indicate that a scam was in progress. This could include elderly people suddenly coming to banks to withdraw large amounts of cash. Banks could call the Trading Standards emergency number if they felt that a scam was taking place, and there would be an emergency response from the council. Promotional posters and other items would also be left with banks to encourage awareness and participation. There were some difficulties in dealing with banks in this regard on occasion as Banks were cautious because of client confidentiality and the Data Protection Act.

Councillor Peter Fortune enquired as to the demography of rogue traders and doorstep scammers. The response was that they were primarily from the "Travelling Community". Most internet scams originated from overseas.

RESOLVED that the Trading Standards update be noted.

HOLDING THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER TO ACCOUNT

11 MENTORING END OF YEAR REPORT

Report ES14060

This report was written by Mr Paul King, Head of the Bromley Youth Support Programme.

The report provided an annual update on the outcomes achieved by the Bromley Mentoring Initiative (BMI) and the expenditure of the BMI for the 2013/14 financial year with particular reference to the service provided to young people identified as being most at risk of developing criminal and anti-social behaviours. The service had received a MOPAC grant contribution of £54,110.00 in 2013/14 with a similar level of allocation expected for the three financial years 2014/17.

Mr King explained the work of the BMI to the Committee, and highlighted the following details in particular:

The scheme was in the second year of funding from MOPAC, and it was hoped that it would carry on for the next ten years. Mentors were experienced and trusted individuals who provided an important source of support for young people who had educational problems, had contact with the Youth Justice System, or who were part of the NEET Group (Not in education, employment or training). The scheme was subject to external assessment and so far the assessments had always been good. There were 118 active mentors and 62 of these had been matched, whilst 60 were active. The scheme had been working well and had been very successful. The mentors worked with the ASB Unit of the Bromley Youth Offending Team, with Behavioural Services and also worked with external contracts. Most mentees stated that they had felt that they had made good progress on the mentoring programme.

Section 3.6 of the report was highlighted which stated that, “currently there are 51 mentors working with young people who have come to the notice of the ASBU (Anti-Social Behaviour Unit). Of the 77 young people who had a mentor in the 2012-20113 academic year, only 1 escalated to an ABC.” An “ABC” is an Acceptable Behaviour Contract.

Section 3.8 of the report was also noted where attention was drawn to the previous visit to the Bromley Youth Offending Service of the Mayor of London, who was very impressed with the work that was being undertaken.

Mr King concluded by stating that the service was currently seeking new male mentors.

The Chairman congratulated Mr King with respect to all of the good work that had been accomplished by the mentoring programme.

RESOLVED that:

(1) The outcomes achieved by the BMI were noted

(2) The Committee noted the expenditure incurred in providing the service, including MOPAC funding.

12 Budget Monitoring

Report FSD14033

The report was drafted by Claire Martin, Head of Finance.

The report provided an update of the latest budget monitoring position for 2014/15 for the Public Protection and Safety Portfolio based on expenditure and activity levels up to 31st May 2014. The report showed a balanced budget.

The report detailed the level of expenditure and also the 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.

The following is a summation of the main points of the budget report that were highlighted at the meeting:

1. The total budget for Portfolio Holder Initiative Fund Grants for 2014/15 was £44,930.00. Out of this £2,200.00 had been allocated, and £42,730.00 remained unallocated as the budget balance
2. The total allocation of funding for Youth Diversion Expenditure for 2014/15 was £48,250.00; £9,000.00 of this budget had been allocated. £36,000.00 was requested to fund the Summer Youth Diversionary Campaign, whilst £3,250.00 was currently unallocated.

3. The budget for Operation Payback was £7000.00, which had not yet been allocated
4. The allocation for Targeted Neighbourhood Activity was £150,000.00. £55,000.00 of this money had been allocated to projects and £95,000.00 had yet to be allocated. It was noted that a report would be presented to the September PDS Committee that would outline the details for spending the balance of this fund.

The Committee noted that the four year financial forecast outlined the financial pressures that faced the Council. It was advised that it was imperative that strict budgetary controls remained in place for the remainder of 2014/15 to minimise the risk of compounding financial pressures in future years.

RESOLVED that:

- (1) the Portfolio Holder endorse the latest 2014/15 budget projection for the Public Protection and Safety Portfolio**
- (2) the progress made in implementing the Targeted Neighbourhood Activity Project was noted**
- (3) a report be presented to the September PDS Committee with details of the proposals for spending the balance of the Targeted Neighbourhood Activity funding**
- (4) the Portfolio Holder agreed to the allocation of £36,000.00 to the 2014 Summer Diversionary Activities from the 2014/15 Portfolio Holder Grants for Youth Diversion Projects**
- (5) the PDS Committee noted and commented on the allocation of Community Safety expenditure as set out in Appendix 3 of the Budget Monitoring report**

A) PROVISIONAL OUTTURN 2013/14

Report FDS14034

The report was written by Claire Martin, Head of Finance.

The report was written to provide the Portfolio Holder with details of the provisional final outturn position for 2013/14. This indicated that there was a total underspend of £114,000.00.

The report also showed the level of expenditure during 2013/14 for the selected project within the Member Priority Initiatives and provided details of the provisional outturn within the Community Safety Budget.

The main points of the report that were highlighted during the meeting were:

The total variation for the Public Protection and Safety Portfolio was an underspend of £114,000.00.

There was an underspend of £44,000.00 within the staffing budget, mainly due to the secondment of the Head of Public Health Nuisance to the Executive Assistant.

Other variations included an underspend of £28,000.00 across various CCTV budgets and the stray dogs kennelling contract achieved an underspend of £28,000.00 due to a reduced number of dogs being kept in kennels and less medical costs incurred during the winter months.

Other net variations across the Portfolio totalled a credit balance of £8,000.00.

There was a net variation of a Credit balance £6,000.00 for the Mortuary/Coroners service.

Appendix 2 showed that £44,000.00 had been spent up to 31 March 2014 for the Targeted Neighbourhood Activity project, leaving a balance of £106,000.00.

Appendix 3 provided information on the 2013/14 expenditure within the Community Safety Budget that required the authorisation of the Portfolio Holder. A total of £160,082.00 was spent from the available budget of £160,180.00.

RESOLVED that:

(1) the Portfolio Holder endorsed the provisional outturn position for the Public Protection and Safety Portfolio

(2) the Portfolio Holder noted the position in respect of the targeted neighbourhood activity project

(3) the Portfolio Holder noted the final allocation of Community Safety expenditure as set out in Appendix 3 of the Provisional Outturn report.

B) DRAFT PORTFOLIO PLAN 2014/15

Report ES14050

The report outlined the draft of the Public Protection and Safety Portfolio Plan for 2014/15.

The Portfolio Holder explained that targets had been stripped from the Plan except for those targets that were statutory. This was because many of the previous targets used were of limited value.

Councillor Pierce asked how RAG (Red Amber Green) reports would be assessed on a monthly basis. He noted that Appendix 1 gave the Performance Indicators that officers would be working towards, but also noted these appeared to be annual targets.

It was decided by Members that it would not be appropriate to include Waste 4 Fuel in the Plan, as this was entirely the remit of the Environment Agency.

RESOLVED that:

(1) The Draft Portfolio Plan 2014/15 be noted

(2) The Portfolio Holder agreed to adopt the Portfolio Plan for 2014/15 as outlined in the report.

13 SECTION 106 EXPENDITURE

Report ES14061

The report was drafted by Mr Jim McGowan, (Head of Environmental Protection).

The report provided details of a proposed drawdown of Section 106 monies totalling £5,000.00 to improve the CCTV in Orpington Town Centre.

Mr McGowan explained to the Committee that the money requested was to replace a camera on the CCTV system near the Tesco store in Orpington. The work would be actioned as soon as the money was released.

RESOLVED that the request to use £5,000.00 of Section 106 monies to improve the CCTV system in Orpington Town Centre be approved.

14 ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITY--OCT 2013-MARCH 2014

Report ES14051

The report was drafted by Mr Clive Davison, Assistant Director for Public Protection.

The purpose of the report was to advise Members of the activity undertaken by the Public Protection Division during the periods of 1st September 2013 to 31st March 2014 relating to the annual Portfolio Plan and Enforcement under delegated powers.

The main areas for action during this period consisted of:

1. Action against Noise Nuisance from Licensed Premises

2. Action against Fly Tipping
3. Action against Anti-Social Behaviour
4. Action Against Rogue Traders
5. Promoting Health and Consumer Well Being
6. Responding to Requests for Services provided by Trading Standards
7. Actions to Support Local Business
8. Undertaking Food, and Health and Safety Functions
9. Undertaking Licensing Functions

The report outlined objectives achieved against targets.

Councillor Peter Fortune asked why the number of businesses that had received education regarding under age sales was below target. Mr Robert Vale answered that the target figure of two hundred was over optimistic. It was also the case that the Trading Standards Team had been hindered by following up on the results of previous visits, and had to be intelligence led because of limited resources.

Councillor Pierce asked if the expenditure on test purchase operations to detect the sale of age restricted products, had exceeded budget. Mr Vale responded that the operations were within budget.

Councillor Pierce enquired how the target level of sixty for test purchase operations had been calculated. Mr Vale responded that the figure was based on data from the previous year.

The Chairman thanked Clive Davison for his Division's hard work and excellent achievements given their reduced resources.

RESOLVED that:

(1) The contents of the report be noted

(2) The Committee agreed that they should receive half yearly reports on the activity relating to the Portfolio Plan and Enforcement under delegated powers.

15 MOPAC UPDATE

Report ES14052

The report was written by Amanda Mumford, LBB Community Safety Co-ordinator.

The report was provided to update the Committee on the annual submission to MOPAC (Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime).

The report outlined the areas that LBB were seeking funding for:

1. Domestic Abuse Strategy Co-ordinator
2. Domestic Abuse Advocacy Project
3. Community Domestic Abuse Projects
4. Safer Bromley Van
5. Community Safety Mentoring Programme
6. Bromley Anti-Social Behaviour Initiatives.

RESOLVED that the contents of the report be noted.

16 BROMLEY YOUTH COUNCIL MANIFESTO. 2013/14 CAMPAIGN UPDATE AND 2014/15 CAMPAIGN PRIORITIES

Report CSD14088

The Bromley Youth Council Manifesto report was written by Linda King who is the Universal Youth Support Manager. The report was written as an information item that was not only being looked at by the PPS/PDS Committee, but was also going to be looked at by the Education PDS Committee in July.

The purpose of the report was to update Committee Members on the outcome of the Bromley Youth Council Manifesto for 2013/14, and also to advise on the BYC Manifesto priorities for 2014/2015.

It was noted by the Committee that the campaign manifesto for 2013/14 focussed on mental health issues. It was further noted that the BYC Manifesto Campaign for 2014/15 would focus on two areas:

- Portrayal of Youth in the Media
- Domestic Violence

The Chairman asked why there were two campaign priorities and not one. Miss Laila Khan (BYC Chair) explained that it was simply that these were the two most pressing issues that were noted by young people in the Manifest Event of March 2014. An explanation was also given of how youth representatives were elected.

The Chairman thanked Grace Stephens and Laila Khan for attending, and hoped that they enjoyed their first meeting.

RESOLVED that the Bromley Youth Council Manifesto report be noted.

17 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.

18 WORK PROGRAMME AND CONTRACTS REGISTER

Report CSD 14067

The Committee reviewed the Work Programme and Contracts Register.

RESOLVED that:

(1) the Work Programme be noted

(2) the Contracts Register for the Public Protection and Safety PDS Committee was noted

19 VERBAL UPDATE ON PROPOSED VISITS AND CONFIRMATION OF NEXT MEETING DATE

The following visits were being planned for Committee Members:

- A visit to LBB CCTV Centre
- A visit to the Bethlem Hospital
- A visit to the Police Dog Training Centre at Keston.

It was noted that the visit to the CCTV centre was planned to take place (subject to final confirmation) on 9th September 2014 at 6.30pm. This would take place before the commencement of the PPS/PDS meeting on that night, and so on September 9th 2014, the meeting would start at 7.30pm instead of 7.00pm.

The date of the visit to Bethlem Hospital would need confirmation.

The date of the visit to the Police Dog Training Centre at Keston would be the morning of November 20th 2014. The passing out parade would commence at 11.00am. However it had been arranged that Councillors could benefit from a tour of the centre before the passing out parade. The tour would commence at 9.30am.

The Meeting ended at 10.00 pm

Chairman