

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

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.30 pm on 1 October 2014

Present:

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

Terry Belcher, Derec Craig, Dr Robert Hadley and Grace
Stephens

Also Present:

Councillor Tim Stevens J.P.

STANDARD ITEMS

20 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

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

Apologies were received from Alf Kennedy.
Apologies were received from Councillor Peter Fortune and Councillor
Douglas Auld. Apologies were also received from Miss Laila Khan.

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

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

23 MATTERS ARISING

Report 14115

Members considered Matters Arising from previous meetings.

An update was provided by the Chairman concerning the Members visit to the
Bethlem Hospital on 9th September 2014.

It was noted that a report was being presented to the Committee with respect
to the Anti-Social Behaviour Crime and Policing Act, and this is expanded
upon in the minute for agenda number 11.

It was noted that the Portfolio Holder had encouraged greater scrutiny of himself, and this was something that the Committee would be encouraged to pursue in future meetings.

The Chairman was updated by the Borough Commander regarding the procedure for reporting and investigating crime at the Maudsley Hospital. Negotiations were ongoing with SLaM with respect to funding a police officer on site.

The Portfolio Holder informed the Committee that there were no further developments concerning the possible commissioning of Public Protection and Safety Portfolio Holder funds.

The Committee noted that a report was on the agenda for this meeting concerning proposals for the allocation of the £95,000,00 underspend with respect to the Targeted Neighbourhood Activity Project. This is expanded on in the minute with respect to agenda number 10b.

RESOLVED that the Matters Arising Report be noted.

**24 MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC PROTECTION AND SAFETY PDS
COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 17th JUNE 2014**

The Committee considered the minutes of the meeting of Public Protection and Safety PDS Committee held on 17th June 2014..

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 17th June 2014 be agreed.

25 CHAIRMAN'S UPDATE

The Chairman updated the Committee concerning the recent visits to Bethlem Hospital and the London Borough of Bromley CCTV centre. It was noted that the visit to the police dog training centre in Keston was scheduled for 20th November 2014.

Reference was made to the meeting of the Tories on Public Protection and Safety that took place in September. Baseline reports were examined, and the meeting was well attended. It was also noted that the Chairman had attended the BMI Steering Group with the Portfolio Holder.

The Chairman informed the Committee that she had attended one of the summer diversionary park days with her two children. This was the event at Norman Park, when it was estimated that approximately a thousand children had attended.

The Chairman mentioned that the Safer Neighbourhood Board had held their first public meeting in July, and that the Crime Summit had been held the previous weekend. The Chairman thanked all who had attended and

contributed to both the Safer Neighbourhood Board meeting and to the Crime Summit, with particular thanks to Bromley Youth Council who had participated in both.

The Portfolio Holder also expressed his thanks to Bromley Youth Council and to Mr Paul King.

RESOLVED that the Chairman's update be noted

26 POLICE UPDATE

The Borough Commander commented that the police contact point in West Wickham was now open five days per week, and for around three to four hours per day. The Borough Commander also informed the Committee that the police were on target to make the required £575m target for savings this year, and that this had been very challenging. Burglary was down by 6.8% against a target of 6%. The rates of criminal damage offences had increased by 8%. Motor Vehicle crime was down by 22% which was on target. The number of actual bodily harm offences had increased by 139 compared to the same point last year.

The number of "I" calls responded to within the correct timeframe stood at 91%. The Committee were informed that the number of "I" and "S" calls approximated 80-130 per day.

The Borough Commander stated that plans were now underway to initiate Operation Bumble Bee and Operation Equinox. The former was aimed at reducing burglary, and the latter was aimed at reducing violence in the town centre. It was noted that the volume of burglary offences increased as the nights drew in and the hours of daylight decreased.

The Borough Commander mentioned that Parm Sandu was now in place as Deputy Borough Commander in place of Jo Oakley, and that David Tait had assumed responsibility for the Safer Neighbourhood Team. Staffing levels were currently good, and Bromley Police were currently six police officers and sixteen PCO's above staff target levels.

The Borough Commander referenced ASB and burglary related crime in the Crays area, with particular reference to the use of mopeds. It was noted that eight key individuals had been arrested, four had been remanded in custody, and one had been detained at a secure unit in Bedford.

Reference was made to the efforts that the police had made to support the summer diversionary activity projects, and there was positive feedback from Members regarding this. The Committee were updated concerning arrangements in place to ensure that police officers worked at least once every three weekends. This was releasing greater police numbers to deal with incidents arising in town centres on a Saturday night.

The Committee heard that a meeting had taken place with SLaM (South London and Maudsley NHS Trust) concerning how the police were going to deal with incidents at Bethlem Hospital in the future. The plan was that communication would take place with the relevant Team Leader before arriving on site, so that officers would be better informed upon arrival.

Members also heard that a newsletter was in the process of being disseminated.

The Borough Commander informed Members that many officers were now working with body worn video equipment. This had proved particularly useful in dealing with domestic abuse incidents.

Video recordings had been used as evidence in court proceedings. The scheme had been piloted in seven boroughs and the equipment was currently being used by around 54-55 officers.

A Town Centre Team focusing on Orpington Town Centre was being launched on October 22nd.

It came to light during the police update that a large number of asylum seekers had been accommodated at the Mary Rose Inn Hotel at St Mary's Cray. This was a surprise to Members and the Portfolio Holder, who were not aware that around seventy asylum seekers had been transferred to the Hotel from the Queen's Hotel at Crystal Palace. It was presumed that the placements had been initiated by UKBA. It was not known how long the accommodation was planned for, but was estimated at three months. The Portfolio Holder and the Ward Councillor for Cray Valley East expressed concern that they had not been informed. It was the general consensus of the Committee that a protocol or channel of communication be opened up with UKBA to avoid a repeat episode of non communication.

Councillor Kim Botting congratulated the Borough Commander with respect to the good work that the police and the Safer Neighbourhood Team had done in Orpington, particularly with respect to the execution recently of an arrest warrant targeting drug dealers. This was sending out a clear message that drug crime would not be tolerated. The Chairman praised Councillor Botting for being pro-active in this case, and for pushing for a resolution.

Councillor Cartwright thanked the police for all the good work that they had undertaken in Mottingham.

RESOLVED:

(1) that the Borough Commander's Police Update be noted

(2) that communication is made with UKBA to open up more effective lines of communication

HOLDING THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER TO ACCOUNT

27 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.

28 QUESTIONS TO THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FROM THE PPS PDS COMMITTEE

At the previous meeting of the Committee, the Portfolio Holder stated that he wished to encourage greater scrutiny of himself by Members.

The Ward Councillor for Cray Valley East (Councillor Chris Pierce) expressed his dismay that he had received no communication regarding the placement of seventy asylum seekers at the Mary Rose Inn Hotel, which was in his Ward. Councillor Pierce asked for clarification to be provided with respect to the processes and protocols that should be adhered to in these circumstances.

The Portfolio Holder was sympathetic, and also expressed serious concern that he had not been made aware. He would email all Councillors with an update without delay.

The Portfolio Holder stated that he would ask either the Leader or the Executive to investigate with UKBA, and that this would be undertaken with speed and vigour.

The Portfolio Holder was asked by a Member what could be done to prevent incursions by the Travelling Community.

In reply the Portfolio Holder referenced a recent Traveller incursion in the West Wickham area. In this case, the Travellers had removed three large concrete bollards to gain access. LBB were advised by the police that for the short term it was better to leave the Travellers where they were. This was because they were effectively penned in, thus making it easier for the police to monitor them. It was mentioned that such incidents cost money in terms of securing the affected areas and replacing anything (like bollards) that had been damaged. The Portfolio Holder stated that it was a never ending battle.

The Portfolio Holder wondered if it was possible to reduce the timescales on Section 61 Notices to twelve or fifteen hours. The Portfolio Holder stated that every effort should be made to ensure that any evictions were conducted in daylight.

The Executive Director of Environmental and Community Services felt that there was not much to add to this response and concurred that it was a huge challenge. He felt that LBB worked well with the police and that good removal protocols were already in place.

Councillor Pierce asked if signs could be put up by LBB to inform the public that the Council was aware, and that action would be taken in due course.

The Portfolio Holder responded that care had to be taken when dealing with travellers to ensure that LBB complied with the requirements of the Human Rights Act. If signs were erected, they would be torn down. There seemed to be no better way currently to deal with these situations other than the current protocols; these were that LBB would work with the police around the Section 61 notice.

Dr Robert Hadley referenced Dover where the facility existed for concrete blocks to be erected at car parks when Travellers arrived. The Borough Commander commented that there would be a need to identify the relevant sites. The Portfolio Holder added that closing public car parks also led to complaints from the general public.

Councillor Cartwright raised the matter of problems with dog attacks and dogs generally running wild in Mottingham. He suggested that perhaps LBB could look again at the relevant bye-laws. It was noted that the police had a role to play in enforcing existing legislation. The Executive Director commented that walking a dog on a highway without a lead was an offence. Councillor Cartwright mentioned that there were certain areas with multiple dogs where professional dog walkers were employed. He suggested that perhaps the council should erect new signage stating that dogs should be kept on leads, or muzzled.

The Director stated that he would be happy to pick this up.

RESOLVED that:

(1) contact be made with UKBA to establish the protocols and lines of communication to be adhered to when UKBA were considering the placement of a significant number of asylum seekers into the Bromley Borough

(2) an email be sent out by the Portfolio Holder immediately to all Councillors, providing an update concerning the current placement of asylum seekers at the Mary Rose Inn Hotel in Cray Valley East

(3) the Director to take up the issue of problems with dogs in Mottingham, and to look into what could done with respect to bye-laws and signage.

A) BUDGET MONITORING 2014/15

Report FSD14066

This report was written 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 July 2014. This showed a balanced budget.

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.

It was noted that Council on 26th March 2012, approved the setting aside of £2,260,000.00 in an earmarked reserve for Member Priority Initiatives. The Public Protection and Safety Portfolio was responsible for the delivery of one of the projects – Targeted Neighbourhood Activity, with an allocation of £150,000.00.

It was noted that the four year financial forecast report highlighted the financial pressures facing the Council. Members were reminded that it was imperative that strict budgetary control continued to be exercised in 2014/15 to minimise the risk of compounding financial pressures in future years. It was observed that the latest projections from managers showed that there was a balanced budget for the Public Protection and Safety Portfolio for 2014/15.

The Budget Report noted that an amount of £95,000.00 remained uncommitted from the budget allocated to Targeted Neighbourhood Activity Funding. Another report on the agenda (agenda item 10b) outlined proposals for the allocation of the uncommitted funds.

Members also noted that an amount of £41,584.00 remained unallocated from the Community Safety Budget.

The Director of Environment and Community Services indicated that Committee Members were welcome to put forward ideas to the Portfolio Holder for the allocation of uncommitted funds from the Community Safety Budget.

RESOLVED that:

(1) the Portfolio Holder endorse the 2014/15 budget projection for the Public Protection and Safety Portfolio.

(2) the progress of the implementation of the Targeted Neighbourhood Activity Project was noted.

(3) Members were encouraged to submit project ideas to the Portfolio Holder for consideration with respect to the allocation of unallocated funds

(4) the Committee noted and commented on the allocation of Community Safety expenditure.

**B) FUNDING FOR TARGETED NEIGHBOURHOOD ACTIVITY
PROJECT**

Report No ES14074

This report was written by Mr Jim McGowan, Head of Environmental Protection, and was written to advise Members of proposals to spend the remaining balance of the Targeted Neighbourhood Activity Project Fund throughout the Borough.

The Committee were informed that £150,000.00 had previously been allocated to a Targeted Neighbourhood Activity Project, but that only £55,000.00 of this money had been used, leaving an underspend of £95,000.00. The purpose of this report was to put forward project spend proposals for the underspend.

The summary of the spend was summarised in tabular form on page 4 of the report.

Members' attention was drawn to item three on the table which referenced CCTV monitoring at the junction of Maple Road. It was noted that the cost of this was estimated at £14,300; and the question was asked if there was a case for a permanent camera in this location, and also if it was possible to re-use the previous camera instead of purchasing a brand new one. It was acknowledged that the cost of refurbishing the existing camera would be in the region of £4000.00 to £5000.00 and that this was therefore the preferred option.

The Committee were advised that although this was a report outlining plans for the allocation of unspent monies; it was not the case that all the money had to be allocated in the current financial year.

It was noted that Mr McGowan was seeking agreement in principle to the projects outlined in the report, but acknowledged that there was still some fine tuning and changes that would need to be addressed.

Grace Stephens from Bromley Youth Council suggested that BYC (Bromley Youth Council) could be involved with some of the projects in a practical way, and that possibly some funding could be diverted to BYC.

The Director of Environment and Community Services stated that there was some project work that needed to be progressed urgently, and if Members had any suggestions relating to the projects on the report, or new ideas for projects that could be funded, then these ideas should be brought to the attention of himself and the Portfolio Holder in the next week.

RESOLVED that:

(1) the contents of the report be noted

(2) the proposals for the allocation of funding are agreed subject to the following conditions:

- **the CCTV monitoring camera at the junction of Maple Road be refurbished at the reduced cost of approximately £4,500.00**
- **any suggestions for fund allocation to new projects be brought to the attention of the Portfolio Holder and the Executive Director of Environmental and Community Services in the week following the meeting**
- **the Committee agreed in principle to the projects and fund allocation identified in the report; it was agreed that the specific detail of projects and fund allocation would be delegated to the Executive Director of Environment and Community Services, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder and Ward Councillors.**

C) APPROVED TRADER SCHEME PARTNERSHIP

Report No ES14087

This report was written by Mr Rob Vale, Trading Standards Manager.

The report informed Members of the proposals by Trading Standards and Community Safety Teams to engage with a national approved trader scheme to replace the existing Safer Bromley Trader Register which had been operating within the borough since 2009.

Mr. Vale explained that the Safer Bromley Partnership Trader Register had been very successful over the last few years, with over 100 local businesses signing up to the register. However, it was now the view of Trading Standards, that LBB replace the Bromley Trader Register with a new service that would be provided by the national provider Checkatrade. This was a nationally recognised free service offering a business directory of traders that had been comprehensively vetted and performance monitored. The cost to businesses to join this service would be £600.00 per annum.

It was the aim of Bromley Trading Standards to create a hostile environment for rogue traders.

It was pointed out to the Committee that there were currently 50 local businesses registered with Checkatrade that had not been vetted by Bromley Trading Standards. It was explained that any business registered with Checkatrade that would also like to be endorsed by Trading Standards, and display the Bromley logo, would require further vetting by Trading Standards,

and that the final decision on acceptance onto the scheme would remain with Trading Standards.

It was noted the Kent and Surrey Councils had already joined the scheme.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder approve the proposals for the approved trader scheme partnership with the use of the Bromley logo.

**29 ANTI SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR, CRIME AND POLICING ACT 2014
(REFORM OF ANTI SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR POWERS)**

Report ES14086

This report was written by Mr Robert Vale, Head of Trading Standards and Community Safety.

This report aimed to update Members on the review and overhaul of the system of dealing with anti-social behaviour in order that agencies responsible for enforcing the legislation, focus on putting the needs of the victims first. The way anti-social behaviour would be reported in the future would depend on the impact felt by the victim, rather than the behaviour itself.

The Act reformed the tools available to deal with anti-social behaviour including the introduction of civil injunctions to prevent nuisance and annoyance; it included a power to exclude people from their homes for anti-social behaviour where there is a risk of harm to others.

Mr Vale outlined the main points of the Act to the Committee:

It was explained that the Act introduced two new measures which were designed to give victims and communities a say in the way anti-social behaviour is dealt with; these were the **Community Trigger** and the **Community Remedy**.

The Community Trigger would be the means by which individuals or communities would “trigger” a case review to look into allegations of anti-social behaviour and crime that met the relevant threshold, and had not yet been resolved. The Community Trigger would be activated after three complaints that met the locally agreed threshold. The relevant bodies that would have statutory obligations under the Act would be MOPAC (Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime), the local authority, the local Clinical Commissioning Group, RSLs (Registered Social Landlords).

Members noted LBB (London Borough of Bromley) would need to draft a local Community Trigger procedure document. It was further noted that the joined up Community Trigger procedure agreed by the relevant partner organisations, would need to be submitted to MOPAC for approval. This would need to be done in the next few weeks.

The Committee noted that additional staffing resource would probably be required to provide the relevant administrative support needed to administer the Community Trigger Procedure. The Portfolio Holder wondered if there would be MOPAC funding available for this.

A Member commented that this seemed like a case of another burden on the local authority and police, with no further funding. This was a sentiment expressed also by the Borough Commander, who stated that the resource to deal with the Community Remedy would need to come from that already existing, and the responsibility for this would likely fall to the Safer Neighbourhood Teams.

A Member expressed concern that the police may struggle with this extra statutory duty. Another member highlighted the importance of making the scheme accessible to those who were vulnerable.

Members observed that all relevant bodies would have to work together to devise and produce a Community Trigger Strategy. There would need to be an LBB point of contact for making a Community Trigger application, and this was likely to be the LBB Anti-social Behaviour Co-ordinator.

Members were informed that the Community Remedy Document would be designed to provide victims with a say in the out of court punishment of perpetrators for low-level crime and anti-social behaviour. It was a police function and it would be the task of the police to draft a Community Remedy document for Bromley.

Mr Vale concluded his update with a summary of new and revised powers available under the Act:

- Injunction to prevent nuisance and annoyance
- Criminal Behaviour Order
- Community Protection Notice
- Public Spaces Protection Order
- Closure Power.

RESOLVED:

(1) that the report be noted

(2) that resource to administer the Community Trigger procedure be procured, possibly from existing staff resources including the redeployment pool

(3) that work be commenced on drafting the LBB Community Trigger document

(4) that enquiry be made to see if there was any funding to assist from MOPAC

30 VERBAL UPDATE ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AND CCTV

An update was provided on the work of the Environmental Protection team by Mr Jim McGowan subsequent to the tour of LBB CCTV centre.

Mr McGowan explained to the Committee that Environmental Protection was broken down into 7 main areas:

1. CCTV
2. Housing Improvement
3. Housing Enforcement
4. Public Health Nuisance and Noise
5. Stray Dogs, Drainage and Pest Control
6. Scientific Services
7. Coroner and Mortuary Service

It was explained that Housing Improvement included disabled facility grants, and that the budget for this was usually around £1M per annum.

It was noted that Housing Enforcement included dealing with rogue landlords, and with various legal and licensing matters that may arise with Housing of Multiple Occupation.

It was explained that the Public Health, Nuisance and Noise responsibilities incorporated:

- Domestic Violence
- Noisy Parties
- Neighbour Disputes
- Public Health Complaints

Mr McGowan explained that the council had a statutory responsibility for dealing with stray and abandoned dogs. Mr McGowan informed that vicious dogs were destroyed, whilst most other dogs were rehomed. The work of pest control had been contracted out. The Committee were informed that investigations were ongoing to deal with the problem of rats in some of the parks.

Mr McGowan explained that some of the work of Scientific Services was dealing with requests for reports with regard to contaminated plots and land. The council were examining proposals for charging for this.

It was noted that the Coroner and Mortuary Service was currently managed by the Princess University Hospital. This could be the subject of a future tender. The possibility of a shared service contract with other boroughs was being considered.

Mr McGowan went on to discuss CCTV. It was explained that the use of CCTV was essential in terms of crime prevention and deterrent, in addition to generating revenue. There was hard evidence that crime levels reduced in areas where cameras were operating.

The Committee was informed that LBB CCTV evidence had been provided to civil companies, and that LBB had now begun to charge for this service. CCTV was required to comply with legislation and to make the public feel safe. LBB used 180 cameras in total, 75 of these were in car parks and 11 were used for bus lane enforcement. LBB also had use of 2 mobile vehicles fitted with cameras, and a big camera that could be moved to various parts of the borough as required.

The Committee heard that the monitoring contract cost £256,000.00 per annum, and the maintenance contract cost £268,000.00 per annum; hence the total cost of running the LBB CCTV Service was £524,000.00 per annum.

Councillor Botting stated that CCTV was essential and a matter of common sense, particularly with the raised terrorist threat. Other Members expressed a similar view, and that CCTV made shoppers feel safe to shop, and that it was also important that the public felt safe in public car parks.

The Committee noted that the two contracts pertaining to stray and abandoned dogs would need renewal soon.

RESOLVED that:

(1) the contents of the presentation be noted

(2) the matters outstanding with respect to the dog contracts be addressed

31 SUMMER ACTIVITIES UPDATE

Report No: ES14090

This report was written by Paul King, Head of Youth Support Services.

The report was written to inform the PDS committee regarding content, publicity, actual expenditure and income for the Summer Diversionary Activities Programme 2014. This was because the Portfolio Holder had agreed funding totalling £36,000.00 from the Youth Diversionary Fund.

Mr King informed then Committee that the Youth Diversionary Programme was designed for young people aged between 10 and 19 (or up to 25) for those with disabilities. It included activities such as sports; football, basketball, laser, hula hoops and rounders; creative activities including henna tattoos, jewellery making, nail art, paper mache statues and smoothie making; adventure type activities such as Zorbs, Go Karting, Bungee Programme. This

year also included two “Special Saturdays”—comprising of an Open Air Cinema and a Silent Disco.

It was noted by the Committee that although the Programme this year was smaller, the attendance was in fact greater.

Mr King informed the Committee that another report would follow which would provide greater detail concerning age breakdowns and demographic information.

It was noted by the Committee that the total funding allocated to the Programme was £70,720.00, and that the budget spent was £73,000.01. This left a credit balance of £2,281.00.

Mr King informed that LBB had established a web facility for donations to the activities to be made, unfortunately, this had only been utilised by Tesco, Weight Watchers and the Ice Cream Vendor.

The Portfolio Holder commented that the last three weeks of the activities were affected adversely by poor weather conditions. The Portfolio Holder was disappointed with turnout for the “Silent Disco” which was surprisingly poor. The Portfolio Holder expressed his thanks to all those involved, including the police. However, the Portfolio Holder was disappointed that no police cadets attended, and was also dissatisfied with the lack of involvement from Affinity Sutton.

RESOLVED:

(1) that the contents of the report be noted

(2) an investigation to take place to establish how increased external financial donations can be generated for summer 2015

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

REPORT CSD14141

This was an annual report to the Care Services Portfolio Holder, but had come to this Committee for information purposes. The report was written by Paul King, as was the update at the Committee meeting.

Mr King informed the Committee that the Youth Justice Board monitored performance against three key performance indicators; the first one of these referred to at the meeting was the **number of first-time entrants into the Youth Justice System**. It was noted that the data showed that there was a downward trend resultant from the Triage system and the use of out of court disposals.

The secondary KPI referred to was the **Rate of Re-offending by young people who have previously offended**. It was a cause of concern to everyone that the rate of re-offending had been increasing since 2011/12. It was a particular cause of concern that the data for 2013/14 showed that despite a smaller cohort (64) the number of re-offences within 12 months of the original conviction was very high at 146, and that this represented a frequency per 100 of 228. This was bad news.

There had been several suggestions put forward to explain this, directly related to the nature of the cohort in question:

- These young people were generally not engaged in education, training or employment
- This cohort often exhibited special educational needs
- The age group were mainly aged 15 and under
- Problems had been exacerbated by cross border transfers
- This cohort were often associated with gang membership

Mr King felt that the way to try and address these issues was to seek to address via improvement plans, with a specific emphasis on education.

The third KPI referenced was the **number of young people sentenced in court that received a custodial sentence**. It was noted that this figure as a percentage had also increased. This was directly related to the previous KPI and the problem cohort.

Mr King mentioned that there was a problem with the 16+ age group, not engaging well in education, training and employment. A "Not in EET Multiagency Panel" had been set up to try and address this. The Bromley mentoring scheme was also proving effective.

Mr King informed the Committee that the number of young people kept in remand had increased, and that the projected cost of this to LBB by the end of the current financial year would be £242,693.00.

Mr King concluded by stating that the Bromley Youth Offending Service priority for 2014/15 was to address the issue of chronic re-offending by the identified cohort. There were plans in place to achieve this including:

- Input from Bromley Children in Care Virtual School Service
- Speech and Language Therapy programmes
- Working to increase parental involvement
- Input from the Bromley Tackling Troubled Families programme
- Bromley Targeted Youth Support programme

RESOLVED that the contents of the report be noted.

**33 SUMMARY OF THE BROMLEY SAFEGUARDING ADULTS
ANNUAL REPORT 2013/14**

Report CSD14140

This report was being presented to the Public Protection and Safety PDS Committee for information purposes.

It was essentially a summary of the Bromley Safeguarding Adults Board Annual Report for 2013/14. The full Bromley Safeguarding Adults Annual Report 2013/14 was disseminated as an Information Briefing prior to the meeting.

The Committee noted the report.

RESOLVED that the contents of the summary report (CSD 14140) and also the full Bromley Safeguarding Adults Annual Report 2013/14 be noted.

**34 QUESTIONS ON THE BROMLEY SAFEGUARDING ADULTS
ANNUAL REPORT 2013/14**

35 WORK PROGRAMME AND CONTRACTS REGISTER

Report CSD14118

The Committee reviewed the Work Programme and Contracts Register.

Members examined the Work Programme for 2nd December 2014 in particular. It was decided to add the following to the December Work Programme:

- A more detailed report would be provided by Paul King with respect to the Summer Diversionary Activities
- An update report would be written for Members subsequent to the meeting of the Safer Bromley Partnership on 30th October 2014.
- It was decided that Mr Paul Lehane (Head of Food and Occupational Safety) would be invited to present.

RESOLVED that:

(1) the Work Programme be noted, including the amendments referenced above

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

(3) the expiry date of the dog contracts in November 2014 was noted together, with the requirement for the said contracts to either be extended further or a new contractor appointed

36 VISITS AND CONFIRMATION OF NEXT MEETING DATE

It was noted that the next visit for the Committee would be to the Police Dog Training Centre at Keston. An email reminder would be sent out in due course.

The visit to the police dog training centre was scheduled for November 20th 2014; the “passing out” parade would commence at 10.00am. Members would be able to have a pre-parade tour of the facility at 09.00am if they wished.

The next meeting of the Public Protection and Safety PDS Committee would be on 2nd December 2014 at 7.00pm.

The Meeting ended at 9.40 pm

Chairman