

## **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 27<sup>th</sup> September 2017.

**RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 27<sup>th</sup> 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 16<sup>th</sup> 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 16<sup>th</sup> October 2017 be noted.**

**43 PRESENTATION FROM 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 12<sup>th</sup> 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 told 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 5<sup>th</sup>, 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 29<sup>th</sup> 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 27<sup>th</sup> 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 29<sup>th</sup> 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 that 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 be fully compliant 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 had 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 14<sup>th</sup> 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 22<sup>nd</sup> January and 29<sup>th</sup> January 2018.

### Post meeting note:

*A response has been received from Victim Support and the date has been confirmed for 22<sup>nd</sup> 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 16<sup>th</sup> January 2018.

The Meeting ended at 9.20 pm

Chairman