



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

DIRECT LINE: 020 8313 4316

FAX: 020 8290 0608

DATE: 8 January 2018

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

Councillor Alexa Michael (Chairman)
Councillor Chris Pierce (Vice-Chairman)
Councillors Julian Benington, Kim Botting FRSA, David Cartwright QFSM,
Mary Cooke, Hannah Gray, Tom Philpott and Richard Williams

Non-Voting Co-opted Members –

Katie Bacon, Bromley Youth Council
Terry Belcher, Safer Neighbourhood Board
Dr Robert Hadley, Bromley Federation of Residents Associations
Alf Kennedy, Bromley Neighbourhood Watch

A meeting of the Public Protection and Safety Policy Development and Scrutiny
Committee will be held at Bromley Civic Centre on **TUESDAY 16 JANUARY 2018**
AT 7.00 PM

MARK BOWEN
Director of Corporate Services

Copies of the documents referred to below can be obtained from
<http://cds.bromley.gov.uk/>

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 OR MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, questions to this Committee must be received in writing 4 working days before the date of the meeting. Therefore please ensure questions are received by the Democratic Services Team by 5pm on January 2nd 2018.

- 4 **MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC PROTECTION AND SAFETY PDS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 21ST NOVEMBER 2017** (Pages 1 - 18)
- 5 **MATTERS ARISING** (Pages 19 - 22)
- 6 **CHAIRMAN'S UPDATE**
- 7 **POLICE UPDATE**

HOLDING THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER TO ACCOUNT

- 8 **PORTFOLIO HOLDER UPDATE**
- 9 **PRESENTATION ON TOWN CENTRE POLICING AND PUBLIC SAFETY, INCLUDING THE NIGHT TIME ECONOMY**
- 10 **PRESENTATION FROM LONDON PROBATION SERVICES**
- 11 **PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY OF PORTFOLIO HOLDER REPORTS**

Portfolio Holder decisions for pre-decision scrutiny.

- a **CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING REPORT** (Pages 23 - 28)
- b **DRAFT 2018/19 BUDGET** (Pages 29 - 42)

POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND OTHER ITEMS

- 12 **EMERGENCY PLANNING AND BUSINESS CONTINUITY SERVICE UPDATE REPORT** (Pages 43 - 50)
- 13 **VERBAL UPDATE ON CRIME AND DISORDER IN THE NIGHT TIME ECONOMY**
- 14 **MOPAC UPDATE REPORT** (Pages 51 - 56)
- 15 **CONTRACTS REGISTER REPORT** (Pages 57 - 64)
- 16 **WORK PROGRAMME** (Pages 65 - 70)
- 17 **MEMBER VISITS**
- 18 **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

19 LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 AS AMENDED BY THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) (VARIATION) ORDER 2006 AND THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 2000

The Chairman to move that the Press and public be excluded during consideration of the items of business listed below as it is likely in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings that if members of the Press and public were present there would be disclosure to them of exempt information.

20 PART 2 CONTRACTS REGISTER (Pages 71 - 72) Information which is subject to any obligation of confidentiality.

21 DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING

The date of the March is Tuesday 6th March 2018.

.....

This page is left intentionally blank

PUBLIC PROTECTION AND SAFETY POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.00 pm on 21 November 2017

Present:

Councillor Alexa Michael (Chairman)
Councillor Chris Pierce (Vice-Chairman)
Councillors Julian Benington, Kim Botting FRSA,
David Cartwright QFSM, Hannah Gray, Tom Philpott and
Angela Wilkins

Katie Bacon, Dr Robert Hadley and Alf Kennedy

Also Present:

Nigel Davies, Terry Gooding, Councillor Kate Lymer, Jim
McGowan, Hedley Pugh, Victoria Roberts, Aileen Stamate
and Rob Vale, and Chief Inspector Clair Haynes

STANDARD ITEMS

36 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Apologies were received from Councillor Richard Williams and Councillor Angela Wilkins attended as his substitute. Apologies were also received from Councillor Mary Cooke.

Apologies were received from the Borough Police Commander, and Chief Inspector Clair Haynes attended as his substitute.

Apologies were also received from Terry Belcher.

37 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor David Cartwright declared an interest as he was listed as a director of Operational Assurance Ltd, a company which undertook independent auditing of emergency planning systems and structures for local authorities.

38 MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC PROTECTION AND SAFETY PDS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 27th SEPTEMBER 2017

The Committee considered the minutes of the meeting of the Public Protection and Safety PDS Committee held on 27th September 2017.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 27th September 2017 be agreed as a correct record.

39 QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS AND MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC TO THE CHAIRMAN OR COMMITTEE

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

40 CHAIRMAN'S UPDATE

The Chairman informed the Committee that the Crime Summit had been well attended. She expressed her thanks to the Portfolio Holder for organising the Summit. The Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime (DMPC) had attended and the matter of the proposed new BCU (Basic Command Unit) amalgamations had been discussed. It was made clear to the DMPC that there was strong opposition at LBB to the proposed amalgamation with Croydon. There was a concern that resources would be moved away from Bromley and allocated to Croydon. The Chairman continued that LB Sutton had also expressed concern with the proposed merger with Croydon. The Chairman asked the Portfolio Holder if she could liaise with her counterpart at LB Sutton so that a joint representation could be made.

The Chairman stated that the most recent SNB (Safer Neighbourhood Board) meeting had taken place at the Fire Station in Orpington. At this meeting the Borough Police Commander had provided an update, and Neighbourhood Watch had given a presentation. The presentation informed the Board that there were now in excess of 600 active Neighbourhood Watches covering approximately 35,000 homes.

The Chairman had recently written to the Mayor of London, expressing the Committee's concerns regarding moped crime, and the inability of the Police to pursue mopeds when offences had taken place. The response to the letter was tabled.

The Chairman had brought a book to the meeting which she had purchased at the Wimbledon Book Fest and recommended to the Committee. The book was called 'Blue: Keeping the Peace and Falling to Pieces' by John Sutherland, a former Borough Commander of Southwark. The Chairman's copy had been signed by the author.

RESOLVED that the Chairman's update be noted, and that the Portfolio Holder liaise with her counterpart in LB Sutton so that a joint representation could be made concerning the membership of the BCU.

41 POLICE UPDATE

The Borough Commander had sent apologies, and so the Police update was provided by Chief Inspector Clair Haynes:

The two current BCU pathfinder mergers were ongoing and still being assessed. No decisions had yet been taken on the final composition of the BCU concerning Bromley. This would be taken by the end of the year. It was expected that two more BCUs would go live in the near future.

Concerning Police numbers, it was sadly the case that £400m of savings was still required. It was anticipated that the current number of Police officers (32,000) would reduce to 31,000 by the end of 2018. Eventually, the total number could fall to as low as 27,500.

The Chief Inspector stated that Bromley had a Burglary Squad which was currently in place, and would be retained. Mention was made of the recent murder that had occurred at Betts Park, and the fact that investigations were ongoing.

There had been an incident in Shortlands involving a moped and an attack on a 70 year old person. CCTV coverage was being pursued and the investigation was ongoing. The Chief Inspector advised that moped crime was a London wide issue, and that various methods of investigation were pursued in such cases which would include forensic tagging, checking dump sites, and generally looking for stolen mopeds and the offenders themselves.

There had been a murder at Knockholt Railway Station recently and a man had been arrested and charged with murder.

A new Detective Superintendent had been appointed as the new Deputy Borough Commander and that was Paul Warnett. He had replaced Trevor Lawry.

The Chief Inspector referred to the demonstration outside of Bromley South Police Station that had been organised by 'Britain First' and assured Members that a comprehensive policing plan had now been drafted in case there were similar incidents in the future.

It was noted that Penge was still a hot-spot for knife crime, and that plans had been put in place with respect to the Christmas markets.

The Chairman asked if there had been any progress with the identification of alternative buildings that could be used by the Police. The Chief Inspector responded that several buildings were currently under consideration. These included The Warren, Biggin Hill Airport and premises that belonged to the Probation Services in Orpington. This was an ongoing piece of work.

The Chairman pointed out that whatever new buildings were used, it would be important to limit the time that officers spent travelling between the buildings and their Wards so that Police time was not wasted. The Chairman suggested that the Police could make themselves more visible by meeting the public in cafes and community centres.

A Member referred to a recent incident on the Ramsden Estate where someone had been stabbed, and asked if any arrests had been made. The Chief Inspector answered that the injury was not life threatening and that the victim was reluctant to cooperate with enquiries. There were no witnesses and the investigation was ongoing. At the time of the meeting, no suspects had been identified.

A Member expressed concern that Ward Officers were removed from Wards to attend incidents at 'Hotspots'. The Chief Inspector answered that it was normal practice to move Ward Officers to 'Hotspots' if required. However, they should not normally be removed for more than one shift. PCSOs (Police Community Support Officers) should not be moved.

A Member highlighted that, since the recent shift changes for the Mottingham Ward Officers, there had been occasions in the Mottingham Ward when both Ward Officers had been moved to incidents in other Wards. The Chief Inspector was surprised to hear this and stated that she would look into the matter and provide clarification.

A Member asked if there was a future for PCSOs. The Chief Inspector advised that in Bromley the intention was to keep the existing PCSOs in place. If anything altered as a result of the Chancellor's Budget, then the position could change, but otherwise the plan was to keep the PCSOs in place.

A Member expressed concern that minor crimes may no longer be investigated. He was concerned that the offence of burglary was low down on Police priorities. The Chief Inspector explained that Bromley still had a dedicated Burglary Squad, and that this would remain in place for as long as possible. It was however possible that the position may change with any BCU merger. In some circumstances, the public were not interested in a Police visit, they just wanted to progress with an insurance claim. Ward Constables were visiting victims and providing advice.

The Chairman was pleased that crimes of burglary were still being taken seriously. She wondered why people would not want to speak to the Police and asked about the Police collecting forensic evidence. The Chief Inspector responded that where there was the opportunity, the Police would investigate cases where there was forensic evidence.

The Chairman expressed the view that shoplifting should also be taken seriously as there could be a link to organised crime. It also sent out the wrong message to people if shoplifting was downplayed. The Chief Inspector assured Members that the Town Centre Police Team had been retained. Plans were in place to deal with shoplifting and pickpocketing over the Christmas period.

A Member expressed thanks to the Borough Commander for the work that the Police had undertaken in connection with the Betts Park murder case. She stated that there had been a reduction in young people attending youth clubs

and that the Council should reconsider decisions that had been made with respect to cutting back on youth services.

A Member praised the work of the Ward Officers and PCSOs in the Orpington Ward. She said that they were excellent and got things done. She stated that she would very much like the PCSOs retained if they wanted to stay. The Committee heard that the application process to become a Ward Officer was stringent. Applicants would need to show that they saw their future in neighbourhood policing.

RESOLVED that the Police update be noted.

42 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING OF THE SAFER BROMLEY PARTNERSHIP STRATEGIC GROUP

The minutes of the previous meeting of the Safer Bromley Partnership Strategic held on 16th October 2017 were added to the agenda for information and comment.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the Safer Bromley Partnership Strategic Group that met on 16th October 2017 be noted.

43 PRESENTATION FROM THE LONDON FIRE BRIGADE

The London Fire Brigade update was provided by the Borough Fire Commander, Mr Terry Gooding.

The LFB ran two youth intervention programmes; these were the LIFE programme and the Impact Factor day. The LIFE intervention programme was run over four days. The aim was to change the attitudes and behaviours of young people aged between 13 and 17. Referrals to the LIFE programme were made by the Youth Offending Team.

The Committee was informed that 44 young people had been referred to the LIFE programme since January. The young people that were referred to the LIFE programme often had very challenging behaviours and on occasions had come from Pupil Referral Units and or may be subject to Court Orders. The Fire Commander briefed the Committee that the young people on the LIFE courses in most cases could relate to the Fire Service and their trainers, and the course was generally regarded as successful in generating positive attitudes and behaviours.

On the most recent LIFE course, nine out of 11 participants had successfully completed the course and made it to the passing out parade. Out of the nine that had finished, six were from Bromley. The two people that had not completed the course had to be removed due to unacceptable behaviour. The funding for the LIFE courses was not just for LBB, but was also for LB Lewisham and LB Bexley. The SNB (Safer Neighbourhood Board) had provided £3k of funding so that the scheme could be extended to 11-13 year olds.

The Chairman enquired as to what happened to young people who dropped out of the Life programme. It was explained that previously, there was no follow up, but now a report was prepared and sent back to the appropriate school. The door was open for the young people to try again. The Life Course was designed to change motivation and attitude, and to teach leadership and team building.

A Member asked if many of the young people had expressed an interest in working for the Fire Service, and how many LIFE courses were run at the Orpington Fire Station. The Borough Commander responded that no courses were run at Orpington. There were physical restrictions on what could be undertaken at Orpington; one of the issues was a lack of proper changing facilities. The Fire Commander was pushing instead for the newly formed Fire Cadets to operate from the Orpington site.

Subsequent to completing the LIFE course, the young people would attend an exit interview. They would be asked about their plans for the future. In some cases they expressed an interest in joining the Fire Service; some of them expressed an interest in joining the army. The Borough Fire Commander stated that he would prefer when possible to direct young people to the Fire Cadets; this was because the Cadets undertook a 9 month training programme, developed a holistic understanding of the Fire Service and also would be awarded a BTEC qualification upon successful completion.

The Committee was informed that there were currently 16 Fire Cadets in total, from different parts of the Borough, and they were all Bromley residents. A Member suggested that the Fire Commander look into the possibility of providing an Apprentice Scheme. The Fire Commander responded that it was an option that could be looked at. Currently, an Apprentice scheme ran for non-uniformed staff. It was suggested that it would be good for Committee members to visit the Fire Cadets. The Borough Fire Commander stated that there was going to be a launch night for the Fire Cadets, and that he would keep the Committee updated concerning this.

The Borough Fire Commander briefed the Committee concerning the 'Impact Factor'. This was a one day concentrated intervention programme and was a multi-agency intelligence led initiative that was normally held in problem schools. The SNB had donated £5.1k to assist with running costs.

The Borough Fire Commander tabled the timetable for an Impact Factor day that had taken place at Langley Park Girls School on Thursday 12th October 2017. Contributors on this course included LFB, Safer London Foundation, the Police, YOS, ChildLine, SO19 and Mighty Men of Valour.

The Borough Fire Commander promised to disseminate the details of future Impact Factor days via the Committee Secretary. The Vice Chairman stated that he had attended an Impact Factor day previously. He reported that it was very effective, hard hitting and well worth a visit.

A Co-opted Member noted that Orpington Fire Station was a PFI (Private Funded Initiative). He cited the recent statement from the PRU that they were currently in the red by £50M, due in large part to their inheritance of the PFI debt. His concern was that the Fire Station would be in the same state due to the similar method of funding. Another Member explained that he was responsible for approving the PFI funding for the building of the new station and he did not see it as a problem.

The Borough Fire Commander referenced the Grenfell Fire Tragedy and informed the Committee that fire personnel from Bromley and Orpington had attended the fire. Keston Police dogs had been used later.

With reference to Housing, it was the case that there was no residential social housing in the Borough where there was an issue with the cladding. All the premises had been visited and internal and external risk assessments had been undertaken. There were however some private sector landlords where problems with cladding had been identified and the landlords of these properties had been encouraged to take appropriate action. A Member asked if the data relating to the private landlords could be made available to Councillors, and the Fire Commander responded that it was possible that the data could be made available to Councillors if required. The Committee was surprised to hear that no legislation currently existed to enforce the installation of sprinklers, and this included the installation of sprinklers in schools.

The Chairman commented on the tendency now to build upwards because of the shortage of housing land. The Borough Fire Commander stated that in future any such buildings would come under very close scrutiny.

The Fire Commander stated that LFB's policy of advising the public to stay put in tower blocks when there was a fire still stood. If the tower block had been built in line with building and fire regulations, residents should be completely safe in their homes for two hours. This was counter intuitive as most people would feel that they would need to vacate the building as soon as possible. A Member agreed with the Borough Fire Commander that the key issue was the integrity of the building. Fire Safety should be built into the integrity of the building. The Chairman commented that this seemed the opposite of fire safety advice given in other situations. If you were working in an office environment, you were normally encouraged to evacuate the building in an orderly and swift manner.

A Member asked what could be done to get hold of a fire fighting vehicle that had a longer ladder. The Borough Fire Commander stated that in the case of the Grenfell fire, a vehicle with a longer ladder was brought in from Surrey. LFB were seeking to obtain three larger fire engines with longer ladders. Sources of funding were being looked at, and the Freemasons had offered to fund the cost of one such vehicle. A Member stated that the longer ladders would extend to approximately 217 feet (66 metres).

A Member expressed the view that in the case of incidents such as Grenfell, longer ladders would not make any difference. What was more important was

the compliance with fire regulations, and safe cladding. A Member asked how they dealt with such issues in cities like New York where there were many tall buildings and sky scrapers. The response was that the issue was largely a matter of money. With respect to buildings like the sky scrapers in New York, fire safety was regarded as a priority, and a large amount of money was spent on fire safety. What was required was confidence in the fire safety engineering of the building.

The Fire Commander briefed that there had been an Open Day at the Orpington Fire station on November 5th, and the Bromley Fire Service now had a Twitter feed. There was also mention of LFB opening up some of their real estate to allow the LAS and the Police to use LFB buildings. The Vice Chairman added that he felt that Orpington Fire Station was a safe neutral environment to use as a meeting place.

A Member asked if LFB gave awards for services to the community. The Borough Fire Commander responded that this was something that was being looked at with the LBB Community Safety Officer. It was currently possible to send 'Borough Commander Congratulations'.

RESOLVED that the Borough Fire Commander presentation be noted.

HOLDING THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER TO ACCOUNT

44 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.

45 PORTFOLIO HOLDER UPDATE

The Portfolio Holder update was given by the Portfolio Holder for Public Protection and Safety, Councillor Kate Lymer.

The Portfolio Holder had recently attended a LIFE passing out parade, and recommended that members of the Committee attend LFB Impact Factor Days and the LBB Environment Services run Road Safety Days in the Borough's senior schools.

Following the recent murder at Betts Park, the Portfolio Holder attended a confidential Gold Group meeting at Bromley Police Station with the Police leads on the investigation.

The Portfolio Holder was planning to attend a meeting at London Councils which would be looking at Tranche 2 of the co-commissioning pot, and lessons learned from Tranche 1.

A safeguarding round table meeting would be held on 29th November and representatives from the gangs' team, CSE, the Police and YOS would be in

attendance. The Vice Chairman would be attending and would report back to the PDS.

A Home Office event in Pall Mall was planned for 27th November which was terror related. In attendance would be the Minister of State for Security, and a representative from Manchester City Council.

A new Deputy Borough Commander had been appointed who was Detective Superintendent Paul Warnett.

The Chairman asked the Portfolio Holder if she could contact her counterpart in LB Sutton so that a joint response could be drafted concerning the proposed BCU amalgamation with LB Croydon. A Member asked the Portfolio Holder if she could also contact her counter parts in the boroughs that were trialling the BCU system. It would be useful to get some feedback from them to ascertain how they felt the trials were working. The Portfolio Holder agreed to both requests.

RESOLVED that

(1) The Portfolio Holder contact her counterpart in LB Sutton so that a joint response could be drafted concerning the proposed BCU amalgamation with LB Croydon.

(2) The Portfolio Holder also contact her counter parts in the boroughs where the BCU trials were taking place to that feedback could be provided to the PDS Committee.

a CCTV PROCUREMENT STRATEGY

Report ES 17084

The update on the procurement strategy for the LBB CCTV Service was provided by Jim McGowan—Head of Environmental Protection.

Mr McGowan informed the Committee that notice had been given of the proposed Council redevelopment proposals for the Civic Centre site, including the likely need to vacate the current premises. It was therefore possible that an alternative location for the CCTV control room may need to be found or an alternative model of service delivery commissioned. The current contract had been extended for a second one year extension, under the delegated Authority of the Executive Director for Environment & Community Services (EDECS) and it expired on the 31st March 2019.

The Committee was briefed that the report to the PPS PDS of September 2016 and to the Executive of March 29th 2017 had proposed four options for consideration and Members had asked for a report with the preferred option to be referred back to the Public Protection and Safety PDS Committee.

The report outlined four options for consideration:

1. Do nothing
2. Retender the provision of a CCTV monitoring service and the management and maintenance of the CCTV system, including the option of relocating to the Waldo Road Depot if required
3. Partner with another local authority or public sector organisation who could be responsible for monitoring and maintenance of the CCTV system on the Council's behalf
4. Outsourcing the provision of the services and the monitoring suite

It had been agreed that option 2 (above) was the most appropriate course of action, and this was also agreed by the Chairman as the correct way to progress.

The Vice Chairman enquired if the CCTV service would be operational if a move took place. Mr McGowan responded that the answer was no. There would be a downtime in the CCTV service of two to four weeks if the service had to be moved.

A Member referenced the 'cost of proposal' of £4.1m outlined in page 3 of the report. He asked if this was the total contract price. The Executive Director for Environmental and Community Services (EDECS) clarified that £4.1m was the estimated contract value based on a 5 + up to 4 year contract. This was detailed in section 9.1 of the report.

A Member mentioned section 3.6 of the report which referenced the Deregulation Act of 2015 which amended the Traffic Management Act of 2004. She expressed the view that LBB should sign up with other boroughs that deregulate, so the LBB could undertake greater enforcement and generate extra revenue. The EDECS advised that this was normally regarded as a Police function, but it was something that could be looked at if Members wanted to. The Member responded that the Police no longer had the resources. The EDECS suggested that this was a question that should be referred to the Environment Portfolio Holder.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder agree the strategy for the continued delivery of the CCTV service, and to go to the market for tender to provide the CCTV monitoring contract and the CCTV service maintenance contract. The contract would also include a price (if required) for the option to move the CCTV control room to the Central Depot.

b BUDGET MONITORING 2017/18

FSD 17087

The Budget Monitoring report for 2017/18 was written by the Head of Finance and presented to the Committee and the Portfolio Holder.

The report was presented to provide an update on the latest budget monitoring position for 2017/18 for the Public Protection and Safety Portfolio, based on expenditure and activity levels up to 31 May 2017. There was an over spend of £30k.

A Member asked what would happen concerning the £30k overspend. The Executive Director for Environmental and Community Services commented that the aim would be to put the budget back in line if possible, and that there had been no flexibility in terms of variations.

The Portfolio Holder was requested to endorse the latest budget projection for the Public Protection and Safety Portfolio.

RESOLVED that the report be noted and that the Portfolio Holder endorse the latest budget projection for the Public Protection and Safety Portfolio.

c GUIDANCE FOR CONSTRUCTION SITES CONTROLLED UNDER THE CONTROL OF POLLUTION ACT

ES 17085

The report on Guidance for Construction Sites Controlled under the Control of Pollution Act was written by Dr Hedley Pugh (Chartered Environmental Health Officer). Dr Pugh attended the meeting to present the report and to answer any questions.

The Committee heard that the current guidance for construction sites in Bromley required updating. This was because of both legislative changes and technological improvements. A revised guidance document was added as an appendix to the report.

The recommendation was that the Portfolio Holder review and agree the proposal to adopt the revised local guidance for construction sites under the Control of Pollution Act 1974.

Dr Pugh stated that Greater London had recently experienced an unprecedented level of large developments. It was the case that planning applications could not be refused on account of construction noise.

The revised code of conduct set out revised criteria:

- A requirement to adhere to the Code
- The re-enforcement of permitted hours of noisy works
- Communication requirements with the local residents before and during the development
- Location of noisy equipment and mitigation
- Drainage requirements
- Site Access

- Monitoring Requirements
- Greater control of emissions
- Guidance pertaining to asbestos
- New guidance relating to dust control

Dr Pugh was hopeful that the Council would agree to adopt the new guidelines.

A Member asked if LBB could reduce the amount of development work undertaken on a Saturday. She also referred to section 3.9 of the report which mentioned that to ensure consistency with neighbouring authorities the revised code was produced in collaboration with members of the South London Cluster Group. She asked who the members of the Cluster Group were. Dr Pugh responded that he was aware that Merton, Sutton, Croydon and Wandsworth were part of the Group. He stated that as far as working hours were concerned, this should be stipulated in the planning application as far as possible. The Planning Department had the ability to incorporate restrictions and controls into planning applications.

The Committee agreed to support the recommendation of the report.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder agree the proposal to adopt the revised local guidance for construction sites controlled under the Control of Pollution Act 1974.

d GATE REVIEW FOR MORTUARY SERVICE

ES 17062

The update on the gate Review for the Mortuary Service was given by Mr Jim McGowan (Head of Environmental Protection).

The report was presented to the Committee because the joint contract with Bexley for the provision of the Public Mortuary Service was ending in October 2018 and it was necessary to recommission the service.

Mr McGowan outlined the three possible options that were available to the Council:

- 1- Do nothing and decommission the service
- 2- Tender the existing service for a 3+3 contract to a restricted list of mortuaries, as agreed with HM Coroner South London
- 3- Partner with three other boroughs within the South London Coroner's district.

The Committee was briefed that it was necessary for LBB to go to the market and tender for the same or another provider. The location of the mortuary should either be within the borough, or in an adjacent borough. Mr McGowan

stated that option 2 (above) was the preferred option, and he was seeking permission to go to market to get a quote.

A future option may be to build a new mortuary together with other boroughs, but that would take several years. If that concept was to be progressed, it would have to be undertaken in collaboration with other boroughs, and the first stage would be to undertake a feasibility study. The results of the feasibility study would then be brought back to Members for consideration.

The Chairman enquired what would happen if several boroughs agreed to collaborate and then one dropped out. Mr McGowan responded that if that happened then a fresh costing would need to be done. The Committee was informed that Croydon had lost its status as the dedicated disaster mortuary.

A Member drew attention to section 4.2 of the report:

'The incumbent (Princess Royal University Hospital (PRUH)) ran out of space completely last winter and, after using up all of their overspill spaces, they set up a Board level "gold" group to authorise the use of distant mortuaries, for which they were obliged to cover the additional costs as part of the contract stipulations. They are currently reviewing their contracts and have stated that they may not be in a position to bid for Bromley and Bexley next year, without investment from their trust to increase the capacity on the PRUH site. Other mortuaries in the vicinity were also in the same position last year and this may further restrict the numbers of interested providers'

There was some concern that the PRUH had ran out of space last year, and without further investment may not be in a position to bid for the Bromley mortuary contract. The Member asked why LBB could not extend the contract rather than going back out to tender. Mr McGowan responded that such an approach would not be looked upon favourably by procurement officers, and would not be compliant with financial regulations.

The Member continued by stating that if there was not much interest from the Provider with respect to a new contract, then why persist in doing so. The Executive Director for Environmental and Community Services stated that LBB was expected to go out and have a look.

A Member asked if LBB would be allocated a fixed amount of mortuary spaces for cadavers. Mr McGowan responded that any mortuary that LBB used would have to comply with laws relating to human tissue requirements, and by fully complaint with all statutory requirements. It would not be feasible to use private funeral directors as they would be too expensive.

The Committee was of the view that the recommendations of the report should be accepted.

RESOLVED that

(1) The Portfolio Holder agree to procure a new contract to provide a public mortuary service for the London Borough of Bromley for a period of 3+3 years.

(2) The Portfolio Holder agree to a limited tender list of suitable mortuaries, acceptable to the HM South London Coroner, having regard to the limitations of HM South London Coronial District. ,

46 COUNTER TERRORISM/PREVENT UPDATE

The Prevent update was provided by Mr Rob Vale (Head of Trading Standards and Community Safety).

Mr Vale informed the Committee that he would report back in the new year with a formal report when more data was available. He was waiting to receive the Counter Terrorism Local Profile (CTLP) information which would impact upon the level of risk in Bromley. The CTLP would drive Bromley's counter terrorism strategy, and would provide the data required to update the Chief Executive and the Counter Terrorism Action Plan.

Mr Vale stated that Bromley was currently regarded as a low level threat authority in respect of terrorism. The Home Office was now becoming more transparent in providing data around the number of people that had been referred to Prevent. Mr Vale was hopeful that a web link providing this information could be sent to Committee members via the Committee Secretary in due course.

The Committee heard that 25% of all Prevent referrals originated from London.

Mr Vale briefed the Committee that the Home Office were in the process of making changes to the Channel referral process. This had been managed by the Police, but the Home Office was now working on changes to allow the local authorities to manage the process instead. With this extra responsibility would come extra funding. Mr Vale stated that he would be attending a meeting at the Home Office the following day to hear more about the new system which had been called 'Project Dovetail'.

The Chairman highlighted the problems associated with online activities, particularly with respect to the 'Dark Web'. Mr Vale acknowledged this and said that the Police have the power to close down Dark Web sites. Pressure was also being levied against social media companies to close down sites that promoted terrorism. A new WRAP* product was being developed by the Home Office to include online radicalisation.

*(Workshop to Raise Awareness of Prevent).

RESOLVED that the Prevent update be noted and that Mr Vale update the Committee further with a formal report in the New Year.

47 DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND VAWG REPORT

ES 17090

The VAWG update report was presented by Victoria Roberts (VAWG Strategic Partnership Manager).

The report had been drafted to outline and update on the VAWG contracted services and project work. Also, it provided background and performance information for the services in 2016-2017, and updated on the recently commissioned DV/VAWG Service.

It was noted that following approval by the Executive on the 14th September 2016, the services were subject to a full tender process. The Committee heard that the new contract to provide VAWG services had been awarded to BCWA (Bromley and Croydon Women's Aid). The new contract had been operational since June 2018 and the work streams had been aligned with MOPAC's (Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime) strategic aims.

IDVAs (Independent Domestic Violence Advisors) had been integrated into social care with the aim of supporting both young and old people.

Ms Roberts outlined the MOPAC supported projects which were:

- The Domestic Abuse Advocacy Project
- The One Stop Shop
- Victim/Survivor Support Groups
- Perpetrator Programme

The Committee heard that VAWG training for staff and professionals had commenced.

The Chairman commented that in her opinion the various new services were working well.

A Member asked if BCWA was the same Women's Aid organisation that the Council was familiar with. It was explained that this was the case, but that additional resource had been added from Croydon.

A member asked for a clarification of staff numbers. Ms Roberts explained that the current staff breakdown was:

- 3 Crisis Intervention Workers
- 1 Project Manager
- 1 part time worker for the Freedom Programme
- Some staff were involved in the Perpetrator Programme

RESOLVED that the VAWG update report be noted.

48 MOPAC UPDATE

ES 17082

The MOPAC update report was written by Mr Rob Vale (Head of Trading Standards and Community safety) and Mr Vale attend the meeting to update on the report and to answer any questions.

The report was presented to update the Public Protection and Safety Policy Development and Scrutiny Committee on the Local Crime Prevention Fund (LCPF) granted by the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC), in particular the progress of the Community Impact Days.

Members of the Public Protection and Safety Policy Development and Scrutiny Committee were being asked to note and comment on the content of the report.

The Committee was briefed that MOPAC grant funding for 2017 to 2019 totalled £643,430. LBB had freedom to decide how the money would be allocated over the financial years 2017-2018, and 2018-2019. A breakdown of the budget allocation over the two years was outlined in the report.

MOPAC funding had been allocated to the following four areas:

- Violence against women and girls
- Wider criminal justice system (IOM)
- Mentoring children and young people
- Neighbourhood policing (ASB and Noise)

Mr Vale commented that 'Community Impact Days' had been very successful. They were intelligence led, and so targeted crime hotspot areas. They had been very well received.

The Chairman enquired if the level of VAWG services would remain the same, and Mr Vale responded that going forward, shortfalls would need to be addressed.

The Chairman stated that ASB was a major issue, and she hoped that funding would be available to retain the post of the ASB Co-ordinator. She expressed the view that it was crucial to retain the role. Mr Vale explained that currently, reduced funding from MOPAC would mean that the post would only be viable for three days. LBB would have to provide funding for an extra two days to maintain the post on a full time basis.

Mr Vale stated that he would be submitting another report in January. This report would outline proposals for any reduction in services that may be required due to a reduction in MOPAC funding.

A Member asked if areas where Community Impact days had taken place were re-visited. Mr Vale answered that the system was flexible and intelligence led, so teams would not go back as a matter of course, but could go back if it was felt that additionally ASB intervention was required.

A Member asked if areas where Community Impact days had taken place were re-visited. Mr Vale answered that the system was flexible and intelligence-led, so teams would not go back as a matter of course, but could do so if it was felt that additional ASB intervention was required.

A Member expressed thanks for the Community Impact Day that had taken place in Mottingham. He stated that the activities had made residents feel more secure and confident.

RESOLVED that the report be noted and that a further report would be submitted to the January PDS with proposals to address a reduction in services in line with reduced funding for 2018/19.

49 WORK PROGRAMME

CSD 17159

The Committee noted the PPS/PDS Work Programme.

RESOLVED that the Work Programme is noted, and that the updated report on Prevent and Counter Terrorism be added to the list of items for January 2018.

50 THE PUBLIC PROTECTION AND SAFETY PDS COMMITTEE BRIEFING--RISK REGISTER

The Public Protection Risk Register had been published previously as an Information Briefing, and the link had been sent to members of the Committee.

No questions had been received on the Information Briefing.

A Member commented that he was glad to see the Risk Register on the agenda.

A Member asked who made the assessment of gross risk. The Executive Director for Environmental and Community Services clarified that the assessment of gross risk was carried out by the Corporate Leadership Team, the Chief Executive and Zurich Insurance.

51 MEMBER VISITS

Committee members checked their diaries so that a date to visit Victim Support at Hannibal House could be finalised.

Two dates were suggested which were 22nd January and 29th January 2018.

Post meeting note:

A response has been received from Victim Support and the date has been confirmed for 22nd January 2018.

52 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

No other business was discussed.

53 DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING

The date of the next meeting as confirmed as 16th January 2018.

The Meeting ended at 9.20 pm

Chairman

Report No.
CSD 18004

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: Public Protection and Safety PDS Committee

Date: 16th January 2018

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

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.

Non-Applicable Sections:	Policy/Financial/Legal/Personnel
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	Previous Matters Arising reports and Minutes of meetings. Previous Agenda Document.

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy
 2. BBB Priority: Safe 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: £343,810
 5. Source of funding: 2017/18 revenue budget
-

Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 8 posts (6.87fte)
 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>Matters Arising</u>	<u>Update</u>
Minute 40 21/11/17 Chairman's Update	Resolved that the Portfolio Holder liaise with her counterpart in LB Sutton so that a joint representation could be made concerning the membership of the proposed BCU amalgamation.	This action has been completed. The letter dated 7 th December to Sophie Lindon, has been circulated to PDS Committee Members. The letter was signed by the Portfolio Holder, and by the Leader of LB Sutton, Councillor Ruth Dombey.
Minute 40 21/11/17 Police Update	A Member highlighted that, since the recent shift changes for the Mottingham Ward Officers, there had been occasions in the Mottingham Ward when both Ward Officers had been moved to incidents in other Wards. The Chief Inspector was surprised to hear this and stated that she would look into the matter and provide clarification.	The Chief Inspector spoke with both the Neighbourhoods Inspector and respective Ward Sergeants. The only incidents that sprung to mind were the recent murder in Betts Park where officers were taken from all over the Borough to support the investigation, and the Community Impact Days that the Police run as a borough whereby local issues are tackled in each of the Wards-- utilising officers and volunteers from across the neighbourhoods for one day a month. The Chief Inspector could not find any other occasions where there had been ongoing abstractions. If any specific incidents/times were noted, then the Chief Inspector has requested to be informed of these and she will look into the matter again
Minute 45 21/11/17 Portfolio Holder Update	The Portfolio Holder to contact her counter parts in the boroughs where the BCU trials were taking place to that feedback could be provided to the PDS Committee.	The letter noted above for minute 40 also contained the following text: <i>'Lessons may well have been learnt from the pathfinders. That said, it is our clear understanding that significant issues have been encountered, not least in respect of response times, which deteriorated, although some recovery has now taken place'</i>
Minute 46 21/11/17 Prevent Update	Resolved that the Prevent update be noted and that Mr Vale update the Committee further with a formal report in the New Year.	The update report will be brought to the Committee at the March meeting.
Minute 46 21/11/17 MOPAC Update	It was resolved that the MOPAC update report be noted and that a further report would be submitted to the January PDS with proposals to address a reduction in services in line	The updated MOPAC report has been incorporated onto the current agenda.

	with reduced funding for 2018/19.	
--	-----------------------------------	--

Report No.
FSD18004

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 16th January 2018

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Executive Non-Key

Title: CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING - 2ND QUARTER 2017/18

Contact Officer: James Mullender, Principal Accountant
Tel: 020 8313 4292 E-mail: james.mullender@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Director of Finance

Ward: All Wards

1. Reason for report

On 6th December 2017, the Executive received the 2nd quarterly capital monitoring report for 2017/18 and agreed a revised Capital Programme for the four year period 2017/18 to 2020/20. This report highlights changes agreed by the Executive in respect of the Capital Programme for the Public Protection and Safety (PP&S) Portfolio. The revised programme for this portfolio is set out in Appendix A. Detailed comments on scheme progress as at the end of the 2nd quarter of 2017/18 are shown in Appendix B.

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

The Portfolio Holder is asked to note and confirm the changes agreed by the Executive on 6th December 2017.

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. Effective 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. 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".
 2. BBB Priority: Excellent Council
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: Nil net effect.
 2. Ongoing costs: Not Applicable
 3. Budget head/performance centre: Capital Programme
 4. Total current budget for this head: £13k for the PP&S Portfolio over four years 2017/18 to 2020/21
 5. Source of funding: Capital receipts
-

Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 1 fte
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: 36 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? N/A
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: N/A

3. COMMENTARY

Capital Monitoring – variations agreed by the Executive on 6th December 2017

3.1 A revised Capital Programme was approved by the Executive in December 2017, following a detailed monitoring exercise carried out after the 2nd quarter of 2017/18. The base position is the programme approved by the Executive on 17th July 2017, as amended by variations approved at subsequent Executive meetings. Changes to the Public Protection and Safety Portfolio are shown in the table below. The revised Programme for the PP&S Portfolio is attached as Appendix A. Appendix B shows actual spends against budget in the second quarter of 2017/18, together with detailed comments on individual scheme.

	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	TOTAL 2017/18 to 2020/21
	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000
Programme approved by Executive 17/07/17	13	0	0	0	13
Variations approved by Executive 20/06/17	0	0	0	0	0
Total Amendment to the Capital Programme	0	0	0	0	0
Total Revised PP&S Programme	13	0	0	0	13

3.2 Schemes re-phased from 2017/18 into future years

There were no re-phasings carried out during the 2nd quarter monitoring exercise. This quarterly report will monitor the future position and will highlight any schemes where rephasing is required.

Post-Completion Reports

3.3 Under approved Capital Programme procedures, capital schemes should be subject to a post-completion review within one year of completion. After major slippage of expenditure in prior years, 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. No post-completion reports are currently due for the PP&S Portfolio, but this quarterly report will monitor the future position and will highlight any further reports required.

4. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

4.1 Capital Programme monitoring and review is part of the planning and review process for all services.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 These were reported in full to Executive on 6th December 2017. Changes agreed by the Executive for the Public Protection and Safety Portfolio Capital Programme are set out in paragraph 3.1.

Non-Applicable Sections:	Legal, Personnel & Procurement Implications, Impact on Vulnerable Adults and Children
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	Approved Capital Programme (Executive 06/12/17) Capital Programme Monitoring – 2 nd quarter report (Executive 06/12/17)

This page is left intentionally blank

Appendix A

PUBLIC PROTECTION & SAFETY PORTFOLIO - APPROVED CAPITAL PROGRAMME 6th DECEMBER 2017								
Code	Capital Scheme/Project	Total Approved Estimate	Actual to 31.03.17	Estimate 2017/18	Estimate 2018/19	Estimate 2019/20	Estimate 2020/21	Responsible Officer
		£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	
939446	CCTV Control room - refurbishment	340	327	13	0	0	0	Jim McGowan
TOTAL PUBLIC PROTECTION & SAFETY PORTFOLIO		340	327	13	0	0	0	

Appendix B

PUBLIC PROTECTION & SAFETY PORTFOLIO - QUARTER 2 2017/18					
Code	Capital Scheme/Project	Approved Estimate Jul 2017	Revised Estimate Dec 2017	Actual to 04.12.17	Responsible Officer Comments
		£'000	£'000	£'000	
939446	CCTV Control room - refurbishment	13	13	Cr 34	The scheme has completed and in defect period. A sum of retention has been applied, the system will need to run successfully for a period of 12 months before final payment is made. This scheme will be reviewed, and any residual balance will be removed from the capital programme in due course.
TOTAL PUBLIC PROTECTION & SAFETY PORTFOLIO		13	13	Cr 34	

This page is left intentionally blank

Report No.
FSD18008

London Borough of Bromley

PART 1 - PUBLIC

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

Date: **16th January 2018**

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Executive Non-Key

TITLE: DRAFT 2018/19 BUDGET

Contact Officer: Claire Martin, Head of Finance
Tel: 020 8313 4268 E - mail: claire.martin@bromley.gov.uk

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

Ward: Borough wide

1. REASON FOR REPORT

- 1.1 The prime purpose of this report is to consider the Portfolio Holder's Draft 2018/19 Budget which incorporates the full year effect of savings agreed as part of the 2017/18 Council Tax Report and any further savings approved during the year which have resulted in reductions in the Council's medium term "budget gap". Members are requested to consider the initial draft budget proposed and also to identify any further action that might be taken to reduce cost pressures facing the Council over the next four years.
 - 1.2 Executive are requesting that each PDS Committee consider the proposed initial draft budget savings and cost pressures for their Portfolio and that the views of each PDS Committee be reported back to the next meeting of the Executive, prior to the Executive making the recommendations to Council on 2018/19 Council Tax levels.
 - 1.3 There are still outstanding issues and areas of uncertainty remaining. Any further updates will be included in the 2018/19 Council Tax report to the next meeting of the Executive.
-

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

The PDS Committee are requested to:

- 2.1 Consider the update on the financial forecast for 2018/19 to 2021/22;
- 2.2 Consider the initial draft 2018/19 Budget as a basis for setting the 2018/19 Budget;
- 2.3 Provide comments on the initial draft 2018/19 Budget for the February meeting of the Executive.

.Impact on Vulnerable Adults and Children

1. Summary of Impact: The draft 2018/19 Budget reflects the Council's key priorities which includes, for example, supporting vulnerable adults with children and being ambitious for all our children and young people.
-

Corporate Policy

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

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: N/A
 2. Ongoing Costs: Recurring cost
 3. Budget head/performance centre: Public Protection and Safety Portfolio Budgets
 4. Total budget for this head £2.708m
 5. Source of funding: Draft revenue budget for 2018/19
-

Personnel

1. Number of staff (current and additional): total employees – full details will be available with the Council's 2018/19 Financial Control Budget to be published in March 2018
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours – N/A
-

Legal

1. Statutory requirement: The statutory duties relating to financial reporting are covered within the Local Government Act 1972; the Local Government Finance Act 1998; the Local Government Act 2000; the Local Government Act 2002 and the Accounts and Audit Regulations 2015.
 2. Call-in is applicable
-

Procurement

1. Summary of Procurement Implications:

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected) - the 2018/19 budget reflects the financial impact of the Council's strategies, service plans etc. which impact on all of the Council's customers (including council tax payers) and users of the services.

Ward Councillors Views

1. Have ward councilors been asked for comments? N/A
2. Summary of Ward Councillor comments: Council wide

3. APPROACH TO BUDGETING, FINANCIAL CONTEXT AND ECONOMIC SITUATION WHICH CAN IMPACT ON PUBLIC FINANCES

- 3.1 Forward financial planning and financial management is a key strength at Bromley and this has been recognized previously by our external auditors. This report continues to forecast the financial prospects for the next 4 years and includes the Government's provisional core funding allocations for 2018/19 to 2019/20. At the time of writing this report, further details on various grant funding is awaited and it is important to note that some caution is required in considering any projections for 2020/21 to 2021/22 as this represents the Government's next Spending Review period.
- 3.2 A strong economy with growth increases revenues which supports the Government's ability to reduce public sector debt as the gap between finances raised and spend on public services is reduced. It is important to consider the key national issues that could impact on public finances over the next four years. The overall national debt stands at £1.8 trillion and, whilst a national budget deficit continues, will increase further to beyond £1.9 trillion. The Autumn Budget 2017 identified that public sector net borrowing is expected to be £49.9bn in 2017/18. The forecast for the last year of the current Spending Round (2019/20) is for borrowing of £34.7bn and by 2021/22 borrowing of £30.1bn. The Chancellor stated that borrowing is still forecast at over £20bn in the first year of the next Parliament. The Chancellor has previously said that he is committed to returning public finances to balance 'as soon as practicable'. Elimination of the annual national budget deficit is expected to be delayed until at least 2030 on the basis of current economic forecasts. This highlights that austerity for local government is likely to continue for some time. The Autumn Budget 2017 identifies planned Government Spend up to 2022/23. From a local government perspective, there is no significant additional funding and on that basis austerity will continue. Even with the planned Green Paper on social care which has now been delayed until Summer 2018, no additional funding was identified in the Autumn Budget 2017 for social care. Therefore, the fiscal squeeze will continue and, with ongoing protection of health, education, police and other security services, the disproportionate cuts in direct funding to local government will continue over the remainder of the four year spending review period.
- 3.3 Recognising there are significant funding cuts facing local government, the Government remains committed with the aims of devolution which includes transforming local government and enabling it to be more self-sufficient. The Government views the new flexibilities such as the future growth forecasts from business rates, to be fully devolved to local government by 2020 combined with scope for an increase in council tax for the adult social care precept and the ongoing ability to increase council tax as methods which can reduce the impact of grant reductions. However, it is not the full solution for local government given its costs pressures and service demands.
- 3.4 The Budget Strategy has to be set within the context of a reducing resource base, with Government funding reductions continuing beyond 2020 – the on-going need to reduce the size and shape of the organisation to secure priority outcomes within the resources available. There is also a need to build in flexibility in identifying options to bridge the budget gap as the gap could increase further. The overall updated strategy has to be set in the context of the national state of public finances, with austerity continuing given the level of public sector debt, and the high expectation from Government that services should be reformed and redesigned with devolution contributing to the transformation of local government. There is also an

on-going need to consider “front loading” savings to ensure difficult decisions are taken early in the budgetary cycle, to provide some investment in specific priorities, to fund transformation and to support invest to save opportunities which provide a more sustainable financial position in the longer term. Any decisions will need to consider the finalisation of the 2018/19 Budget as well as the longer time frame where it is now clear that the continuation of the period of austerity remains for local government.

- 3.5 Bromley has the second lowest settlement funding per head of population in the whole of London. Despite this, Bromley has retained the third lowest council tax in outer London (other low grant funded authorities tend to have higher council tax levels). This has been achieved by having one of the lowest costs per head of population in outer London. Despite being a low cost authority, Bromley has achieved general savings of over £90m since 2011/12 but it becomes more challenging to achieve further savings with a low cost base. Further details are provided in Appendix 3.
- 3.6 One of the key issues in future year budgets will be the balance between spending, council tax levels, charges and service reductions in an organisation starting from a low spending base. It is important to recognize that a lower cost base reduces the scope to identify efficiency savings compared with a higher cost organisation.

4. CHANGES SINCE THE 2017/18 BUDGET THAT IMPACT ON THE FINANCIAL FORECAST

- 4.1 The 2017/18 Council Tax report reported to Executive in February 2017 identified a significant “budget gap” over the four year financial planning period. Some key changes are summarised below.
- 4.2 There continues to be upward pressure on inflation and the 2018/19 Draft Budget and financial forecast assumes increased costs of 3.5% per annum for 2018/19 and 2019/20 reducing to 2.7% per annum from 2020/21. The inflation mainly relates to contract price increases. The main measure used for contract price increases is RPIX which is currently 4.0%. The Autumn Budget 2017 reported that inflation (RPI) is expected to be 3.1% in 2018/19, 2.8% in 2019/20 and 2.9% in 2020/21 and 2021/22. Currently RPI and RPIX are 3.9% and 4% respectively. A separate provision has also been reflected in the Draft 2018/19 Budget to meet the future increase in costs of the National Living Wage. Action will need to be taken by Chief Officers to fund increasing costs through alternative savings in the event that inflation exceeds the budget assumptions.
- 4.3 Given the scale of savings identified and any inherent risks, the need for longer term financial planning, the significant changes that may follow with a new Government relating to new burdens (there were many changes introduced by the previous coalition Government that resulted in net additional costs for the Council), effect of ongoing population increases and the potential impact of other public agencies identifying savings which impact on the Council’s costs, a prudent approach has been adopted in considering the Central Contingency Sum required to mitigate against these risks. If the monies are not required during the year the policy of using these resources, in general, for investment to generate income/savings and provide a more sustainable financial position should continue.
- 4.4 The latest forecast indicates that despite having a balanced budget in 2018/19 there remains a significant budget gap in future years that will need to be addressed,

particularly from 2020/21.

5. FINANCIAL CONTEXT

5.1 Key issues include;

5.1.1 Two of the Council's main activities which are grant funded are schools and housing benefits. Both of these areas of spend continue to be ring-fenced.

5.1.2 A high proportion of the Council's spend relates to third party payments, mainly contracts, which can limit flexibility to change spend levels as well as providing greater inflationary pressures (e.g. the impact of the National Living Wage).

5.1.3 As reported in previous years, the majority of the Council's spend relates to just a few service areas.

6. LATEST FINANCIAL FORECAST

6.1 A summary of the latest budget projections are summarized in the table below:

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
	£m	£m	£m	£m
Variations Compared with 2017/18 Budget				
Grant Loss	8.5	14.0	18.4	22.2
Cost Pressures				
Inflation (including impact of National Living Wage)	9.1	19.1	27.5	34.4
Welfare Reforms and Impact on Homelessness	2.0	4.3	5.8	7.8
Homelessness Reduction Act	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7
Environmental Services contract & other key contracts	0.0	2.0	4.0	4.0
Full year effect of adult social care spend not funded by IBCF	0.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Children's Social Care	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1
Real Changes (see Appendix 6)	2.0	1.6	2.0	2.5
Total Additional Costs	14.9	29.8	42.1	51.5
Income / Savings				
Savings from Office Accommodation Review	0.0	-0.6	-0.6	-0.6
Acquisition of Residential Properties to Accommodate Homeless (Mears)	-1.0	-1.9	-1.9	-1.9
Additional Income Opportunity (Amey)	-0.5	-0.7	-0.9	-0.9
Additional Income from Business Rate Share	0.0	-0.6	-0.9	-0.9
Impact of London Pilots of Business Rates	-2.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
Interest on balances - additional income	-0.6	-0.2	-0.1	0.0
Release general provision in contingency for significant uncertainty/variables	-2.0	-2.0	-2.0	-2.0
Savings from recommissioning/retendering of various contracts	-1.1	-1.1	-1.2	-1.2
Fall out of Commissioning Programme funding	-0.5	-0.5	-0.5	-0.5
Savings from Childrens Social Care linked to Invest to Save funding	0.0	-0.3	-0.8	-1.0
Total Income / Savings	-8.6	-7.9	-8.9	-9.0
Other Changes (includes use of non-recurring funds)				
New Homes Bonus - Support for Revenue Budget	-1.9	0.8	2.8	3.8
Collection Fund Surplus 2014/15 (set aside to meet funding shortfall in 2018/19)	-4.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
Collection Fund surplus 2015/16 (£6401k carry forward to 2018/19 and 2019/20)	-0.7	-5.7	0.0	0.0
Collection Fund surplus 2016/17	-7.9			
Collection Fund surplus 2016/17 set aside to support the 2019/20 Budget	7.9	-7.9	0.0	0.0
Projection of future year collection fund surplus	0.0	-4.0	-3.0	-2.0
Total Other Changes	-7.5	-16.8	-0.2	1.8
Council Tax				
Increase in Council Tax Base to reflect additional properties and increased collection rates	-1.6	-2.3	-2.9	-3.6
Impact of 3.99% Increase in Council Tax (including Adult Social Care Precept)	-5.7	-11.6	-17.8	-24.2
Total Council Tax	-7.3	-13.9	-20.7	-27.8
Remaining "Budget Gap"	0.0	5.2	30.7	38.7

The above table shows, for illustrative purposes the impact of a council tax increase of 3.99% in 2018/19 (including adult social care precept). Each 1% council tax increase generates on-going annual income of £1.4m. The financial forecast assumes an ongoing increase in the Adult Social Care precept beyond 2019/20. It should be noted that the current legislation only provided powers for this precept until the end of 2019/20.

- 6.2 The table shows that the Council, on a roll forward basis, has a “structural deficit” as the on-going budget has increasing costs relating to inflation and service pressures as well as the on-going loss of Government grants. These changes are not being funded by a corresponding growth in income. The above projection includes savings previously agreed to reduce the “budget gap”.
- 6.3 The above table highlights that, although it has been possible to achieve a potential balanced budget for next year through identifying savings, proactively generating investment income, setting aside non-recurring council tax collection fund surplus and prudent financial management, there remains a “budget gap” of £5.2m in 2019/20 rising to £38.7m per annum in 2021/22. The projections in later years have to be treated with some caution.
- 6.4 It is important to recognize that, given the current ongoing period of austerity for local government, the downside risks remain significant and that the budget gap in future years could widen substantially.
- 6.5 In considering action required to address the medium term “budget gap”, the Council has taken significant action to reduce the cost base while protecting priority front line services and providing sustainable longer term solutions. Significant savings of over £90m have been realised since 2011/12.

7. REAL CHANGES AND SAVINGS

- 7.1 The Public Protection and Safety Portfolio budget includes additional resources as agreed by the Executive in August 2017 as well as savings as a result of the award of the Dog and Pest control contract. The details are summarized in the table below: -

	2018/19 £'000	2019/20 £'000	2020/21 £'000	2021/22 £'000
<u>Additional Resources</u>				
Net additional cost of a temporary Assistant Director of PPS	30	30	-40	-40
Additional Food Safety Officers (2 perm & 3 Temp)	250	100	100	100
Temporary Business Continuity Officer	30	19	0	0
	310	149	60	60
Savings as a result of the award of the Dog and Pest Control contract	-28	-28	-28	-28
Net additional resources	282	121	32	32

- 7.2 Appendix 1 includes the draft estimate summary sheet, budget variations, notes on the budget variations and the subjective analysis.

Comments from the Executive Director of Environment and Community Services

- 7.3 Expenditure pressures and service risks in relation to services in the Public Protection and Safety Portfolio, are detailed in Appendix 2.

8. PROCUREMENT

- 8.1 The Council will continue to identify opportunities for contract savings including the review of inflation provision and repackaging of contracts and re-negotiation to secure the best value for the Council.

9. IMPACT ON VULNERABLE ADULTS WITH CHILDREN

- 9.1 The draft 2018/19 Budget reflects the Council's key priorities which includes, example, supporting vulnerable adults with children and being ambitious for all our children and young people.

10. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

- 10.1 The Council launched the updated "Building a Better Bromley 2016-2018" and the budget proposals reflect the Council's priorities. "Building a Better Bromley 2016-2018" identifies key priorities as follows

- Ensure financial independence and sustainability;
- Invest in our business and our people
- Ambitious for all our children and young people
- Enhance our clean and green Borough.

- 10.2 Ensure financial independence and sustainability priorities include:

- Strict management of our budgets to ensure we live within our means
- Working to achieve the benefits of the integration of health and social care
- Early intervention for our vulnerable residents

11. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 11.1 The financial implications are contained within the overall report.

12. PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

- 12.1 Staff, departmental and trade union representatives will be consulted individually and collectively on any adverse staffing implications arising from the Draft 2018/19 Budget. Managers have also been asked to encourage and facilitate staff involvement in budget and service planning.

13. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 13.1 The adoption of the budget and the setting of the council tax are matters reserved for the Council upon recommendation from the Executive. The Local Government Finance Act 1992 (as amended) requires the Council to set an amount of Council tax for each financial year and provides that it must be set before 11th March in the financial year preceding that for which it is set. Sections 73-79 of the Localism Act 2011 amended the calculations, billing and precepting authorities need to make in determining the basic amount of Council tax. The changes included new sections 31 A and 31 B to the Local Government Finance Act 1992 which has modified the way in which a billing authority calculates its budget requirement and basic amount of Council Tax.

- 13.2 Schedule 5 to the Localism Act 2011 inserted a new section 52ZB in the 1992 Act which sets out the duty on billing authorities, and precepting authorities to each determine whether their relevant basic amount of council tax for a financial year is excessive. If an authority's relevant basic amount of council tax is excessive, the provisions in relation to the duty to hold a referendum will apply.
- 13.3 The making of these budget decisions at full Council is a statutory responsibility for all Members. Members should also have regard to the changes from the Localism Act relating to council tax increases and the recent introduction of the Adult Social Care precept. The Council has a number of statutory duties which it must fulfill by law – although there can be an element of discretion on level of service provision. The Council also discharges a range of discretionary services. The Council is not bound to carry out such activities in the same way as it is for statutory duties – although it may be bound contractually to do so. A decision to case or reduce provision of a discretionary service must be taken in accordance with sound public /administrative law decision making principles. The Council must also comply with the Public Sector Equality Duties in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. In doing so, the council must have due regard to elimination of discrimination, harassment and victimization, advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations with persons who share a protected characteristic.
- 13.4 The Local Government Act 2003 included new requirements to be followed by local authorities, which includes the CIPFA Prudential Code. This includes obligations, which includes ensuring adequacy of future year's reserves in making budget decisions and section 25 of that act requires the Director of Finance to report on the robustness of the estimates made for the purposes of calculating the Council Tax and the adequacy of the reserves. Further details to support these obligations will be reflected in the 2018/19 Council Tax report to be reported to the February meeting of the Executive.

Background documents	Contingency Drawdown Homelessness and Temporary Accommodation Pressures, Executive, 10 th January 2018 Treasury Management – Quarter 2 Performance 2017/18 and Mid-year Review, Resources Portfolio Holder and Council, 29 th November 2017 and 11 th December 2017 Capital Programme Monitoring – 2 nd Quarter 2017/18, Executive, 6 th December 2017 Budget Monitoring 2017/18, Executive, 6 th December 2017 London Business Rate Pilot, Executive, 13 th September 2017 Improved Better Care Fund, Executive, 10 th October 2017 London Business Rate Pilot, Executive 13 th September 2017 Locally Administered Business Rate Relief Scheme, 19 th July 2017 2016/17 Provisional Final Accounts. Executive, 20 th June 2017 Provision of Temporary Accommodation, 14 th March 2017 2017/18 Council Tax, Executive 8th February 2017 Government's Four Year Funding Offer, Executive, 14 th September 2016
Financial Considerations	Covered within overall report

PUBLIC PROTECTION & SAFETY PORTFOLIO**DRAFT REVENUE BUDGET 2018/19 - SUMMARY**

2016/17 Actual	Service Area	2017/18 Budget	Increased costs	Other Changes	2018/19 Draft Budget
£		£	£	£	£
	Public Protection				
108,261	Community Safety	141,400	1,840	0	143,240
77,366	Emergency Planning	83,140	1,530	30,000	114,670
507,888	Mortuary & Coroners Service	402,970	8,050	0	411,020
1,186,564	Public Protection	1,335,340	33,690	251,000	1,620,030
1,880,078		1,962,850	45,110	281,000	2,288,960
1,880,078		1,962,850	45,110	281,000	2,288,960
270,368	TOTAL NON CONTROLLABLE	3,270	20	7,460	10,750
261,500	TOTAL EXCLUDED RECHARGES	374,310	0	34,460	408,770
2,411,946	PORTFOLIO TOTAL	2,340,430	45,130	322,920	2,708,480

PUBLIC PROTECTION AND SAFETY PORTFOLIO**SUMMARY OF BUDGET VARIATIONS 2018/19**

Ref		VARIATION IN 2018/19 £'000	ORIGINAL BUDGET 2017/18 £'000
1	2017/18 BUDGET	2,340	
2	Increased Costs	45	
	Full Year Effect of Allocation of Central Contingency		
3	Additional resources for Public Protection and Safety Portfolio	<u>310</u>	1,418
	Movements Between Portfolios/Departments		
4	Reduction in MOPAC grant funding	109	Cr 402
5	Reduction in MOPAC expenditure recharged from ECHS	Cr 81	
6	Reduction in MOPAC expenditure within PPS	<u>Cr 28</u>	0
	Real Changes		
7	Award of Dogs and Pest Contract	<u>Cr 28</u>	120
8	Variations in Capital Charges	7	
9	Variations in Recharges	35	
10	2018/19 DRAFT BUDGET	<u><u>2,709</u></u>	

PUBLIC PROTECTION AND SAFETY PORTFOLIO**Notes on Budget Variations in 2018/19****Ref Comments****Full Year Effect of Allocation of Central Contingency****3 Additional resources for Public Protection & Safety Portfolio (Dr £310k)**

Executive on 9 Aug 2017, agreed net additional resources of £310k to fund five Food Safety officers, a Business Continuity officer and an Assistant Director post.

Movements Between Portfolios/Departments**4-6 Reduction in MOPAC grant funding and expenditure**

This reflect the reduction on MOPAC grant funding and expenditure in 2018/19. This has no net financial impact on the overall position across the Council.

Real Changes**7 Award of Dog and Pest Contracts (Cr £28k)**

This reflects the financial impact of the award of the new Dog and Pest Control contracts.

8 Variations in Capital Charges (Dr £7k)

The variation in capital charges is due to a combination of the following:

(i) Depreciation – the impact of revaluations or asset disposals in 2016/17 (after the 2017/18 budget was agreed) and in the first half of 2017/18;

(ii) Revenue Expenditure Funded by Capital Under Statute (REFCUS) – mainly due to variations in the value of schemes in our 2018/19 Capital Programme that do not add value to the Council's fixed asset base.

(iii) Government Grants – mainly due to variations in credits for capital grants receivable in respect of 2018/19 Capital Programme schemes, which are used to finance expenditure that is treated as REFCUS.

These charges are required to be made to service revenue accounts, but an adjustment is made below the line to avoid a charge on Council Tax.

9 Variations in Recharges (Dr £35k)

Variations in cross-departmental recharges are offset by corresponding variations elsewhere and therefore have no impact on the overall position.

PUBLIC PROTECTION & SAFETY PORTFOLIO
DRAFT REVENUE BUDGET 2018/19 - SUBJECTIVE SUMMARY

Service area	Employees	Premises	Transport	Supplies and Services	Third Party Payments	Income	Controllable Recharges	Total Controllable	Capital Charges/ Financing	Repairs, Maintenance & Insurance	Not Directly Controllable	Recharges In	Total Cost of Service	Recharges Out	Total Net Budget
	£	£	£	£	£	£		£	£			£	£	£	£
Public Protection															
Community Safety	180,860	0	5,810	17,020	0	Cr 295,280	234,830	143,240	0	300	300	686,610	830,150	Cr 55,720	774,430
Emergency Planning	86,340	0	5,500	22,830	0	0	0	114,670	4,000	80	4,080	69,080	187,830	0	187,830
Mortuary & Coroners Service	0	0	0	0	411,020	0	0	411,020	0	0	0	34,990	446,010	0	446,010
Public Protection	2,178,010	42,570	43,030	161,200	525,910	Cr 388,170	Cr 942,520	1,620,030	3,000	3,370	6,370	860,780	2,487,180	Cr 1,186,970	1,300,210
	2,445,210	42,570	54,340	201,050	936,930	Cr 683,450	Cr 707,690	2,288,960	7,000	3,750	10,750	1,651,460	3,951,170	Cr 1,242,690	2,708,480

Report No.
ES18005

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

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

Date: Tuesday 16 January 2018

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Executive Non-Key

Title: EMERGENCY PLANNING & BUSINESS CONTINUITY SERVICE - UPDATE

Contact Officer: Paul Lehane, Head of Food Safety, Occupational Safety and Licensing
Tel: 020 8313 4216 E-mail: Paul.Lehane@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Executive Director of Environment & Community Services

Ward: (All Wards);

1. Reason for report

To update Members on the Emergency Planning and Business Continuity Service following an earlier report on 18 January 2017, which highlighted the limited resources allocated to the function and the need to review the Council's business continuity arrangements.

2. **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

Members are asked to note the report.

Impact on Vulnerable Adults and Children

1. Summary of Impact: In any emergency situation certain groups of people will be vulnerable. This will be different for each situation. The emergency planning team work closely with blue light services and other partners to ensure that those who may be particularly vulnerable are identified.
-

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy: The Emergency Planning team have plans for a range of situations.
 2. BBB Priority: Excellent Council Safe Bromley:
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: Not Applicable:
 2. Ongoing costs: Not Applicable:
 3. Budget head/performance centre: Emergency Planning
 4. Total current budget for this head: £102k
 5. Source of funding: Existing revenue budget 2017/18
-

Personnel

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 2 fte (Emergency Planning Manager and Business Continuity Officer)
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours:
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Statutory Requirement: The Civil Contingencies Act 2004 requires the Council to assess the risk of emergencies and plan for them and to have business continuity arrangements in place
 2. Call-in: Applicable: Further Details
-

Procurement

1. Summary of Procurement Implications: The Emergency Planning Team procures services and equipment to ensure it is prepared and able to respond.
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): All residents and businesses in the Borough could be affected by emergency situations.
-

Ward Councillor Views

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

3. COMMENTARY

- 3.1 Members received a report on 18 January 2017 (Ref ES17007) on the Emergency Planning and Business Continuity service. That report set out the statutory and strategic background to the service.
- 3.2 This report provides Members with an update on the status of the service and reflects on the impact of five significant events in London this year. These are the Grenfell Tower fire and the terrorist attacks at Westminster Bridge, Borough Market, Finsbury Park Mosque and Parsons Green Tube station

Staffing

- 3.3 In January Members were informed of the resources of the Emergency Planning service compared to the other Boroughs in the South East of London.
- 3.4 Executive on 9 August agreed additional funding for a full time temporary Business Continuity Officer for 2 years. This post was filled on 1st October 2017.
- 3.5 With the exception of Croydon who have increased their Emergency Planning team by 1 officer to 5, the resource in the other Boroughs has remained constant

Borough	Staff Resource
Bromley	2
Croydon	5
Lewisham	4
Greenwich	3
Bexley	2 and currently advertising for a 3 rd person

- 3.6 The Emergency Planning Manager and the Business Continuity Officer have prepared a plan to support managers with their Business Continuity plans. Phase one has been completed, which ranked the importance of each service in the event of significant incident interrupting normal business delivery. Phase two will examine the priority 1 and 2 services and, with corporate oversight, decide which will form the core critical services. A Corporate Business Continuity plan will be prepared to bring together the individual service plans.
- 3.7 Both Officers will be attending the Emergency Planning College in the early part of 2018 to undertake training in the new standards for business continuity.

Partners and Volunteers

- 3.8 The Emergency Planning Manager has continued to recruit volunteers both within the Council and from outside to call upon in the event of a protracted event.
- 3.9 There are now some 80 staff who have volunteered and been trained in roles such as LALO (Local Authority Liaison Officer), Rest Centre Manager, Rest Centre Staff, Borough Emergency Control Centre Managers Borough Emergency Control Centres staff, loggists and On Call Emergency Planning Managers.

3.10 The Council has also entered in to a partnership with local Rotary Clubs. Their Members have volunteered to support the running of rest centres and any other tasks deemed necessary.

Training

3.11 Since January a significant amount of training has been delivered or received to support the Emergency Planning function.

Training Attended

- SSRF training on Mass fatalities & Humanitarian Assistance
- Introduction to Business Continuity
- LALO 2 x2
- Met Office Emergency Responder Course
- Strategic Emergency Planning Course
- UXO (Unexploded Ordinance)
- Train the trainer for Loggists course
- Project Griffin x 4 plus one for Managers.
- Control room training
- Introduction to Emergency Planning

Training provided

- Running Rest Centres x 2 (Red Cross and In-house)
- Rotary Club x 2
- Loggists (In-house)

Exercises

3.12 One of the lessons learnt from the Grenfell Tower fire was that a council's ability to respond is not measured solely by having plans but by its practical capability to implement them. To test the suitability of plans and their application it is essential to exercise them. Since January 2017 the Emergency Planning Team has been involved with the following exercises:

- Exercise Safety City. This was a pan London exercise in March involving all 33 London Boroughs. It tested London's response to a prolonged snow incident. The next one is planned in March 2018 and will focus on the 'Move to Critical' when the threat from terrorism is raised.
- Table top exercise to set up and run a Rest Centre
- Exercise Tandy at Biggin Hill airport. LALO's were deployed to the scene of a plane crash
- Exercise Connects. An annual exercise to test the communication arrangements between London Resilience and the London Boroughs
- Crystal Palace Football Club. Table top exercise to test the response to a marauding terrorist attack in a football stadium
- Project Argus at Crystal Palace National Sports Centre

Incidents

- 3.13 There have been a number of local, regional or national incidents that have had an impact on the Emergency Planning service

Local

- 3.14 In June an unexploded WW2 bomb was found in Penge. Residents were evacuated but a rest centre was not required. The bomb was removed from site and taken to Betts Park where it was subject to a controlled explosion by the Metropolitan Police Bomb Disposal Team.
- 3.15 Also in June a sink hold opened up in Chislehurst. This was dealt with by our Highways Team and TFL but Emergency Planning monitored the situation in case assistance was required.
- 3.16 In July there was a burst water main on the A21 (Bromley Common). 4 homes and 1 business were affected. All were attended to by Thames Water

Regional

- 3.17 In July following the Grenfell Tower fire the Emergency Planning Team and many Bromley staff volunteers gave significant support to RBKC to run the Assistance Centre. Bromley staff also supported Camden council when they evacuated a number of tower blocks following safety concerns. In addition the Emergency Planning Manager was called to provide tactical advice to the Humanitarian Assistance Steering Group and acted as one of the Control Room Managers at Gold Command in Westminster.
- 3.18 Officers also supported the Borough Emergency Control Centre for the Notting Hill Carnival.
- 3.19 There were two terrorist incidents in London (Westminster Bridge and London Bridge). There was no direct EP involvement but the London Prevent Network was mobilised to monitor community tensions

National

- 3.20 Following the Manchester Arena bomb attack the National Terror threat level was raised to 'Critical' for a short time. The Emergency Planning service provided support to the Council's Chief Executive during this period advising on appropriate responses and measures

EP2020 (Emergency Planning for 2020)

- 3.21 The London Boroughs and London Resilience are working together to shape the Emergency Planning services across London in line with the strategic vision set out in EP2020.
- 3.22 This involves groups of Boroughs taking the lead to develop plans and operational procedures on specific topics which are then adopted by all boroughs so we all operate in a consistent way. We are working with our partners in the South East of London to develop plans on recovery, Rest Centres, Mass Shelter, Voluntary Sector Panel, and disruption to water supplies.
- 3.23 As a consequence of work undertaken by other groups a new standardised operating procedure for the Borough Emergency Control Centre, Survivor Reception Centres, Rest Centres and Friends & Family Reception Centres will be adopted. Staff will be trained in these new procedures during 2018.

Minimum Standards for London (MSL)

- 3.24 Each year London Resilience undertake an audit of 8 specific areas of the minimum standards for London expected of an Emergency Planning function.

3.25 This year the specific topics audited were:

1. Business Continuity
2. Notified Animal Disease
3. Flood Response Plan
4. CBRN (Chemical Biological Radiological and Nuclear)
5. Pipeline safety
6. Radiation Emergency Preparedness & Public Information (REPPIR)
7. Structural Collapse
8. Mass Fatalities

Supporting evidence was provided to London Resilience and was accepted.

National Emergency Mortuary Arrangements (NEMA)

- 3.26 Bromley is one of 4 boroughs in London with a nominated NEMA site. In the event of a disaster resulting in a large number of fatalities which would overwhelm the normal capabilities of the local designated disaster mortuary (DDM), Central Government can initiate the NEMA arrangements.
- 3.27 To date these arrangements have not had to be used. The Government contract with the supplier ends soon and it is believed that the central NEMA scheme will be continued.
- 3.28 If the national scheme is abandoned the capacity of the local DDMs will need to be increased. Our local DDM is in Croydon and run by Croydon Council. They are looking at options for the mortuary to ensure it is fit for purpose as a DDM.

Borough Resilience Forum (BRF)

- 3.29 The Borough Resilience Forum (BRF) is a statutory body established by the Civil Contingencies Act 2004 and is responsible for multi-agency emergency planning at the local level as determined by borough risks and needs. We also contribute to emergency planning for London, as directed by the London Local Resilience Forum (LRF). They will facilitate co-operation and information sharing between resilience partners at the local authority level and the London LRF
- 3.30 In future the BRF will be Chaired by the Chief Executive or Executive Director of Environment and Community Services.
- 3.31 The work plan for the Forum has been revised to ensure there is collaborative working with all the key local partners and that there are regular exercises to support work at the local level.

They key objectives for the Forum for 2018/19 are to:

1. Provide assurance to local Councillors and Strategic Leads on local multi-agency emergency preparedness activities.
2. Facilitate the co-operation and sharing of information between member and neighbouring organisations.

3. Assess the risk of emergencies or major incidents to inform local priorities and decision making on emergency preparedness.
4. Develop and maintain multi-agency preparedness to support an effective response to and recovery from emergencies.
5. Publish and communicate information and advice to help residents, businesses and other organisations prepare for emergencies.

4. IMPACT ON VULNERABLE ADULTS AND CHILDREN

- 4.1 In the event of an emergency, people affected may be vulnerable for a wide range of reasons. The emergency services, Council and other statutory partners have procedures to identify those who may be vulnerable based on the nature of the event.

5. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 Emergencies and serious incidents are rare but they do occur. By their very nature they are usually impossible to predict. It is essential that the Council can respond effectively and efficiently.

6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 A major incident or emergency in the Borough or in London could have very significant financial consequences. The Council has to bear these costs but might be able to recoup an element through the Belwin Scheme. This is a discretionary scheme that provides Central Government assistance in exceptional circumstances.
- 6.2 The nature of the emergency will influence the financial implications. These could range from thousands of pounds for short term incidents to millions of pounds for a major disaster.

7. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 The Civil Contingencies Act 2004 imposes a range of duties on the Council as a Category 1 responder. These include: assessing local risks of emergencies; preparing plans to mitigate the effect and deal with the consequences; having business continuity plans in place to provide an appropriate response whilst maintaining essential services.

Non-Applicable Sections:	PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS & PROCUREMENT IMPLICATIONS
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	Report ES 17007 Review of the Emergency Planning & Business Continuity Service. 18 Jan 2017

Report No.
ES18006

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

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

Date: Tuesday 16 January 2018

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Non-Executive Key

Title: MOPAC UPDATE

Contact Officer: Rob Vale, Head of Trading Standards & Community Safety
Tel: 020 8313 4785 E-mail: Rob.Vale@bromley.gov.uk

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

Ward: All

1. Reason for report

- 1.1 This report is presented to update the Public Protection and Safety Policy Development and Scrutiny Committee on the London Crime Prevention Fund (LCPF) granted by the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC), in particular the impact the reduction in the grant will have on each service.
- 1.2 This report provides an update on the report provided to the PDS on November 21st 2017, Report number ES17082.
-

2. **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

- 2.1 Members of the Public Protection and Safety Policy Development and Scrutiny Committee are asked to note and comment on the content of this report.

Impact on Vulnerable Adults and Children

1. Summary of Impact: All of the projects impact on vulnerable adults and children; the mentoring programme targets young people most at risk of developing criminal and antisocial behaviours; the full range of activities within the VAWG programme impact directly on victims of domestic violence and the children in those families who may also be at risk from the perpetrator; the Community Impact Days will look to reduce the fear of crime, especially amongst the elderly.
-

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy:
 2. BBB Priority: Children and Young People Safe Bromley Supporting Independence Vibrant, Thriving Town Centres Healthy Bromley :
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: Not Applicable:
 2. Ongoing costs: Not Applicable:
 3. Budget head/performance centre: Community Safety; Education, Care and Health Services
 4. Total current budget for this head: £643,430 (2017/18 and 2018/19)
 5. Source of funding: Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime, London Crime Prevention Fund
-

Personnel

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 1.16 fte and staff time covering out of hours noise service, 132 hours per week.
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: N/A
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Statutory Requirement: Further Details Noise Service only
 2. Call-in: Not Applicable:
-

Procurement

1. N/A
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): The project areas target specific community groups, as details in the grant agreements. The wider community will benefit from the project outcomes. Details of the full project were provided to this committee on the 29th June 2017. The out of hours noise service covers 310,000 residents in Bromley.
-

Ward Councillor Views

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

3. COMMENTARY

3.1 A report to this committee in November 2017 (ES17082) gave details of the LCPF grant funded projects. The allocation for Bromley is £643,430 with year two receiving much lower funds than year one. This report identifies how this reduction will impact on the various services the fund supports.

3.2 The grant has been apportioned to the following areas across the two years:

	Priority	Year 1 spend (FY 2017/18)	Year 2 spend (FY 2018/19)	total
1.	Violence Against Women and Girls(VAWG)	£199,000	£194,230	£393,230
2.	Wider criminal justice system (IOM)	£7,000	£7,000	£14,000
3.	Children and young people (mentoring)	£58,000	£40,600	£98,600
4.	Neighbourhood Policing (ASB & Noise)	£71,000	£66,600	£137,600
Total proposed spend		£335,000	£308,430	£643,430
			Total allocation	£643,430

Violence Against Women and Girls

3.3 The funding for Violence Against Women and Girls services has been equally split between 2017/18 and 2018/19. This means that for next year all services will continue. Ahead of 2019/20 and 2020/21 allocated LCPF funds are expected to reduce further. A report will be brought back to this group detailing how this will be managed.

3.4 Officers are currently awaiting further information from MOPAC on how these services will be funded for 2019/20 and 2020/21

Wider Criminal Justice System (IOM)

3.5 There will be no impact on this area of work in 2018/19.

Bromley Mentoring Initiative (BMI):

3.6 The Current costs of the scheme for 18/19 are £63,136 with the current predicted income from MOPAC £40,600 and additional funding from social care of £5,000. Therefore the 18/19 funding shortage is £17,536

3.7 BMI are seeking additional avenues for funding from local groups including Rotary clubs and local charity groups.

3.8 BMI are also exploring whether mentoring staff have the capacity to increase their offer by encouraging Academies to purchase peer mentoring training for young people, which would create additional resources, although this will impact on the availability of staff to deliver the mentoring initiative.

3.9 In terms of targets and outcomes, more mentoring relationships are being delivered than were identified as outcomes of the MOPAC funding, so there is an option to reduce the number of

relationships and mentors/mentees supported. However currently the service attempts to offer a mentor to all referrals received, rather than reject referrals.

- 3.10 Consideration will be given to making a small charge for referrals to the service as a way to address the shortfall. All options will be considered by the Mentoring Steering Group at their January meeting and should additional sources of funding not be identified the service offer will need to be reduced.

Neighbourhood Policing (ASB & Noise)

- 3.11 The Neighbourhood Policing allocation is split between delivering the Community Impact Days and the Out of Hours noise service. Community Impact Days (CIDs) are facilitated by the Antisocial Behaviour Coordinator and focus on areas in the borough identified as experiencing increased levels of ASB, crime, envirocrime and arson. CIDs involve multiple agencies working together to make a positive impact on a community.
- 3.12 The coordinator currently has other workstreams delivered alongside CIDs. The work of the CID is established through an LBB intel product presented by an analyst, this product will not be impacted by the reduction in the grant.
- 3.13 The Out of Hours noise service is fully funded by the MOPAC grant and involves a year round response to complaints of noise taking place during evenings, weekends and bank holidays. This includes a seasonal party patrol that runs during summer months. This funding has also previously been used to purchase noise recording equipment.
- 3.14 A total £137.6k funding was allocated from MOPAC for two years for Neighbourhood Policing (ASB & Noise). The split across the two financial years has been revised to £71k in 17/18 and £66.6k in 18/19. £37k will be spent on delivering the community impact days, and £29.6k out of hours service. There will be a shortfall of £5k for the ASB post which will be met within the Community Safety budget for 2018/19.

4 POLICY IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 The project outcomes contribute to the Building a Better Bromley priorities, the Safer Bromley Partnership Strategy and the LBB Violence Against Women and Girls Strategy.

5 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 The table below gives a detailed updated breakdown of how the MOPAC funding for 2017/18 and 2018/19 will be spent across the two Departments: -

Project	2017/18 £	2018/19 £	Total £
Education, Care & Health Department			
1. Violence against women and girls (VAWG)			
Independent domestic & sexual violence	120,000	120,000	240,000
Community domestic abuse	29,000	29,000	58,000
Domestic violence perpetrator programme	30,000	30,000	60,000
VAWG strategic partnership manager	20,000	15,230	35,230
	<u>199,000</u>	<u>194,230</u>	<u>393,230</u>
3. Children & younger people (Mentoring)	58,000	40,600	98,600
Total for Education, Care & Health Department	<u>257,000</u>	<u>234,830</u>	<u>491,830</u>
Environment & Community Services Department			
2. Wider criminal justice system (IOM)	7,000	7,000	14,000
3. Neighbourhood policing (ASN & Noise)	71,000	66,600	137,600
Total for Environment & Community Services Department	<u>78,000</u>	<u>73,600</u>	<u>151,600</u>
Total	<u>335,000</u>	<u>308,430</u>	<u>643,430</u>

5.2 As detailed above, the Mentoring Steering Group will consider all options to address the £17,430 shortfall in funding for 2018/19. This will include looking for additional funding sources as well as the potential introduction of a small charge for referrals.

5.3 The shortfall for neighbourhood policing will be met from within the Community Safety budget for 2018/19, following the revised split of funding between the two years.

5.4 Officers await confirmation of what funding will be available from MOPAC for these projects for 2019/20 and 2020/21.

6. PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

6.1 The ASB coordinator post is dependent on MOPAC funding. Any posts that become at risk of redundancy will be subject to a full consultation in line with the Councils Managing Change procedures. There are no risks to this post in 2018/19, however a further report will be brought to this committee once MOPAC have indicated the levels of funding for 2019/20 and 2021/22.

7. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

7.1 There is a statutory requirement under the Environmental Protection Act 1990 to investigate noise complaints.

Non-Applicable Sections:	None
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	The MOPAC update report November 21 st 2017, Report number ES17082 and 29 th June 2017 ES 17039

This page is left intentionally blank

Report No.
ES18012

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: Public Protection and Safety PDS Committee

Date: 16th January 2018

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

Title: Contract Register

Contact Officer: Dan Jones, Director of Environment

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

Ward: All Wards

1. Reason for report

- 1.1 This report presents an extract from November 2017's Contracts Register for detailed scrutiny by PDS Committee – all PDS committees will receive a similar report each cycle.
- 1.2 This report is based on information covering all Portfolios, which was produced on 21 November 2017 and presented to Contracts Sub-Committee on 30 November 2017.
- 1.3 The Contracts Register contained in 'Part 2' of this agenda includes a commentary on each contract (there is no covering report).

2. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

That PDS Committee:

- 2.1 **Reviews the appended £50k Contracts Register (which also forms part of the Council's commitment to data transparency); and**
- 2.2 **Notes that the Contracts Register in Part 2 contains additional, potentially commercially sensitive, information in its commentary.**

Impact on Vulnerable Adults and Children

1. Summary of Impact: The appended Contracts Register covers services which may be universal or targeted. Addressing the impact of service provision on vulnerable adults and children is a matter for the relevant procurement strategies, contracts award and monitoring reports, and service delivery rather than this report.
-

Corporate Policy

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

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: - N/A
 2. Ongoing costs: - N/A
 3. Budget head/performance centre: PPS Portfolio
 4. Total current budget for this head: £2.039m
 5. Source of funding: - Existing controllable budget 2017/18
-

Personnel

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

Legal

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

Procurement

1. Summary of Procurement Implications: Improves the Council's approach to contract management
-

Customer Impact

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

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? N/A
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: N/A

3. COMMENTARY


Contracts Register Background

- 3.1 The Council has 230 active contracts with a Total Contract Value (TCV) greater than £50k.
- 3.2 The appended Contracts Register details key information concerning the six contracts in the Public Protection & Safety Portfolio (as of 21 November 2017).
- 3.3 The Register is generated from the Council's Contracts Database (CDB) which is administered by Commissioning & Procurement Directorate and populated by the relevant service managers (Contract Owners) and approved by their managers (Contract Approvers).
- 3.4 As a Commissioning Council, this information is vital to facilitate a full understanding of the Council's procurement activity and registers are reviewed by the Commission Board, the Corporate Leadership Team, and Contracts Sub-Committee as appropriate.
- 3.5 New registers will be produced four times a year – though the database itself is always 'live'.
- 3.6 Each PDS committee is expected to undertake detailed scrutiny of its contracts – including scrutinising suppliers – and hold the Portfolio Holder to account on service quality and procurement arrangements.


Contract Register Summary

- 3.7 The table below summarises key data from the 230 contracts contained in November 2017's £50k+ Contracts Register Report (which covers all six Portfolios).

All Portfolios

Issue	Data	September 2017	November 2017
Contracts (>£50k)	All Portfolios	265	230
Flagged as a concern 	All Portfolios	11	14
Contracts by Portfolio	Care Services	106	91
	Environment	20	21
	Education, Children & Families	60	43
	Public Protection & Safety	6	6
	Renewal & Recreation	19	14
	Resources	54	55
TOTALS		265	230
Contracts by Risk Index	Red	19	17
	Amber	95	77
	Yellow	123	103
	Green	28	33
TOTALS		265	230
Contracts by Procurement Status	Red	96	91
	Amber	73	55
	Yellow	29	26
	Green/other	67	58
TOTALS		265	230

- 3.8 There are fewer contracts in the November 2017's combined PDS Register (230) compared with September 2017 (265) because some services have been consolidated into single contracts and some contracts have expired. For information, there are currently 264 expired contracts (all values) in the CDB, which helps to improve the Council's corporate memory.
- 3.9 Key information, for this Portfolio, extracted from November's £50k+ Contracts Register.

Issue	Data	September 2017	November 2017
Contracts	£50k+	6	6
Concern Flag		0	2
Risk Index	Red	0	0
	Amber	2	2
	Yellow	4	4
	Green	0	0
Portfolio Total		6	6
Procurement Status	Red	3	5
	Amber	1	1
	Yellow	1	0
	Green	1	0
Portfolio Total		6	6


PP&S has 6 (2%) of the Council's 230 contracts (valued at greater than £50k)

Since November 2017, Members are advised that the Stray Dogs Collection contract has now been procured and a new contract awarded for commencement on the 1st February 2018.

Contract Register Key

- 3.10 A key to the Contracts Register is set out in the table below.

Register Category	Explanation
Risk Index	Colour-ranking system reflecting eight automatically scored and weighted criteria providing a score (out of 100) / colour reflecting the contract's intrinsic risk
Contract ID	Unique reference used in all related committee reports and authorisations
Owner	Manager/commissioner with day-to-day budgetary / service provision responsibility
Approver	Contract Owner's manager, responsible for approving data quality
Contract Title	Commonly used or formal title
Supplier	Main contractor or supplier responsible for service provision
Portfolio	Relevant Portfolio for receiving procurement, contract monitoring and budget monitoring reports
Total Value	Total Contract Value i.e. the contract's value from commencement to expiry of formally approved period (i.e. exc. any extensions which have yet to be approved)
Original Annual Value	Value of the contract its first year (which may be difference from the value in subsequent years, due to contract start-up costs etc)
Budget	Approved budget for the current financial year. May be blank due to: finances being reported against another contract; costs being grant-funded, complexity in the finance records e.g. capital (also applies to Projection)
Projection	The expected spend by the end of the current financial year
Procurement Status	Automatic ranking system (green, yellow, amber, red) based on value and proximity to expiry designed to alert Owners to take procurement action. Red ragging typically means the contract is nearing expiry and is not a criticism (as all contracts will ultimately become red).
Start & End Dates	Approved contract start date and end date (excluding any extension which has yet to be authorised)
Months duration	Contract term in months

Attention 	Red flag denotes Commissioning & Procurement Directorate concern regarding procurement arrangements (also see C&P Commentary)
Commentary	Contract Owners provide a comment where either the Risk Index or Procurement Status is ragged red or amber. Commissioning & Procurement Directorate may add an additional comment for Members' consideration if appropriate <i>The Commentary only appears in the Part 2 register</i>
Capital	Most of the Council's contracts are revenue-funded but capital contracts are separately identified (and listed at the foot of the Contracts Register) because different reporting / accounting rules apply

Contract Register Order

- 3.11 The Contracts Register is output in Risk Index order. It is then ordered by Procurement Status, Portfolio, and finally Contract Value. Capital contracts appear at the foot of the Register and contracts of concern (to Commissioning & Procurement Directorate) are flagged at the top.

4. IMPACT ON VULNERABLE ADULTS & CHILDREN

- 4.1 The Corporate Contracts Register covers all Council services: both those used universally by residents and those specifically directed towards vulnerable adults and children. Addressing the impact of service provision on the vulnerable is a matter for the relevant procurement strategies, contracts, and delivery of specific services rather than this summary register.

5. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 The Council's renewed ambition for the borough is set out in the 2016-18 update to [Building a Better Bromley](#) and the Contracts Database (and associated Contract Registers) help in delivering all of the aims but especially in delivering the aim of being an 'Excellent Council'. For an 'Excellent Council', this activity specifically helps by 'ensuring good contract management to ensure value-for-money and quality services'.

6. PROCUREMENT IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 Most of the Council's (£50k plus) procurement spend is now captured by the Contracts Database. The database will help in ensuring that procurement activity is undertaken in a timely manner, that Contract Procedure Rules are followed, and that Members are able to scrutinise procurement activity in a regular and systematic manner.

7. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 The Contracts Database and Contract Registers are not primarily financial tools – the Council has other systems and reports for this purpose such as FBM and the Budget Monitoring reports. However, the CDB and registers do contain financial information both in terms of contract dates and values and also budgets and spend for the current year.

8. PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1 There are no direct personnel implications but the Contracts Database is useful in identifying those officers directly involved in managing the Council's contracts.

9. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1 There are no direct legal implications but the Contracts Database does identify those contracts which have a statutory basis and also those laws which should be complied with in delivering the contracted services.
- 9.2 A list of all (irrespective of value) the Council's contracts may be found on Bromley.gov.uk to aid transparency.

Non-Applicable Sections:	None
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	Contracts Register Reports to Contracts Sub-Committee

Contract Register Report +£50k Public Protection and Safety: November 2017

Risk Index	MAIN CONTRACT DATA						FINANCE DATA				Proc. Status	CONTRACT TERMS			Attention	Capital
	Contract ID	Owner	Approver	Contract Title	Supplier Name	Portfolio	Total Value	Original Annual Value	Budget	Projection		Start Date	End Date	Months Duration		
●	47	JIM MCGOWAN	DAN JONES	Mortuary Contract	Princess Royal University Hospital Mortuary via Kings College Hospital NHS Foundation Trust (with LB Bexley)	Public Protection and Safety	384,000	96,000	133,370	98,370	■	01/10/2014	30/09/2018	48	Ⓜ	
●	46	JIM MCGOWAN	DAN JONES	Coroner's Service	London Borough of Croydon	Public Protection and Safety	224,320	224,320	269,600	350,600	■	01/04/1966	31/03/2018	625	Ⓜ	
●	43	JIM MCGOWAN	DAN JONES	CCTV Monitoring	OCS Ltd	Public Protection and Safety	1,515,258	252,652	266,510	266,510	■	01/04/2012	31/03/2018	72		
●	44	JIM MCGOWAN	DAN JONES	Dog Collection & Transportation	SDK Environmental Ltd	Public Protection and Safety	729,300	63,600	63,600	63,600	■	01/04/2006	31/01/2018	142		
●	42	JIM MCGOWAN	DAN JONES	CCTV Repair and Maintenance	Eurovia Infrastructure Ltd	Public Protection and Safety	257,108	42,852	137,450	137,450	■	01/04/2012	31/03/2018	72		
●	299	Victoria Roberts	AILEEN STAMATE	Domestic Abuse - Advocacy Project	Victim Support	Public Protection and Safety	368,692	116,461	20,420	20,420	■	01/04/2014	31/03/2019	60		

This page is left intentionally blank

Report No:
CSD18005

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: PUBLIC PROTECTION AND SAFETY PDS COMMITTEE

Date: 16th January 2018

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

Title: WORK PROGRAMME

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. Members are free to contribute suggestions for future items for the Work Programme.

1.2 Members should note that the Work Programme is fluid and subject to change as required.

2. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

2.1 **That the Committee:**

- (1) **Notes the current Work Programme.**
- (2) **The Committee comments on any matters that it thinks should be incorporated into the Work Programme going forward.**
- (4) **The Committee puts forward suggestions for Member visits.**

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy: Committees normally receive a report on the Work Programme and Contracts Register 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: £343,810
 5. Source of funding: 2017/2018 revenue budget
-

Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 8 posts (6.87fte)
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: Maintaining the Committee's Work Programme normally takes approximately an hour per meeting, but is fluid and may need to be modified as required.
-

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. The Committee is also invited to make suggestions with regard to Member visits.
- 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.

4. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

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

Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	Previous Work Programme Reports and Minutes of the previous meeting.
---	--

PP&S PDS COMMITTEE - FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME

PUBLIC PROTECTION AND SAFETY PDS—27th September 2017
Matters Arising
Chairman's Update
Police Update
Portfolio Holder Update
Presentation from a representative of the Borough Gangs' Team--Acting DCI Charles Clare
Presentation from Sarah Armstrong (Say No 2 Knives) on Knife Crime and Stop and Search.
Discussion around the London Assembly Police and Crime Commission Report
Food Safety Service Plan—2017-2018
Capital Programme Monitoring Report-1 st Quarter—2017-2018
Trading Standards Service Plan
Dogs and Pest Control Contracts
Expenditure on Consultants
Work Programme, Contracts Register, and Risk Register
PUBLIC PROTECTION AND SAFETY PDS—21st November 2017
Matters Arising
Chairman's Update
Police Update
Budget Monitoring
Portfolio Holder Update
Guidance for Noise Control on Construction Sites Controlled Under the Control of Pollution Act
MOPAC Update
Counter Terrorism/Prevent Update
Presentation from London Fire Brigade—including Impact Factor and Tower Blocks
Report on CCTV Procurement Strategy
Report on Domestic Violence and VAWG Services
Report on Gate Review for Mortuary Service
Work Programme, Contracts Register and Risk Register
PUBLIC PROTECTION AND SAFETY PDS—16th January 2018
Matters Arising
Chairman's Update
Police Update
Portfolio Holder Update
Contracts Register Report
Capital Programme Monitoring Report
Draft Budget Report
Update report on Emergency Planning and Business Continuity Service
Crime and Disorder in the night time economy (Verbal Update)
Presentation on Town Centre Policing and Public Safety, including the Night Time Economy
MOPAC update report

Presentation from London Probation Services
Work Programme
PUBLIC PROTECTION AND SAFETY PDS—6th March 2018
Matters Arising
Chairman's Update
Police Update
Budget Monitoring
Portfolio Holder Update
Update Report on Drug and Alcohol Abuse
LAS Presentation
Presentation from Bromley Youth Council
Trading Standards update on under age sales
SLaM Update
Contract Register Report
Work Programme
POSSIBLE FUTURE PRESENTATIONS and AGENDA ITEMS
Enforcement Activity Report—June 2018
Portfolio Plan and Environmental Protection Update—June 2018
Presentation on the RSA's New Futures Network
Ministry of Justice's New Employment Programme
Prison Reform
Housing Enforcement
Trading Standards work around estate and letting agencies
POSSIBLE FUTURE VISITS
Victim Support-Confirmed for January 22 nd .

This page is left intentionally blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 7a of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is left intentionally blank