

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

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.00 pm on 3 November 2015

### **Present:**

Councillor Alexa Michael (Chairman)  
Councillor Chris Pierce (Vice-Chairman)  
Councillors Julian Benington, David Cartwright,  
Will Harmer, Samaris Huntington-Thresher, Kate Lymer,  
Tom Philpott, Michael Tickner and Richard Williams

Precious Adewunmi, Dr Robert Hadley and Alf Kennedy

### **Also Present:**

Nigel Davies, Rob Vale, Jim McGowan, Trevor Lawry, Dr  
Nada Lemic, Councillor Judi Ellis, Councillor Charles  
Rideout CVO, QPM, Councillor Stephen Wells, Councillor  
Pauline Tunncliffe and Susie Clark

### **STANDARD ITEMS**

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

Apologies were received from Mr Terry Belcher and Joanna Davidson from Victim Support.

#### **24 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Cllr David Cartwright declared an interest as a member of the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority.

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

No questions had been received from Councillors or from members of the public.

#### **26 MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC PROTECTION AND SAFETY PDS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 15<sup>th</sup> SEPTEMBER 2015**

The Committee considered the minutes of the meeting of Public Protection and Safety PDS Committee held on 15<sup>th</sup> September 2015.

**RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> September 2015 be agreed.**

## **27 MATTERS ARISING**

Report CSD15124

Rob Vale (Head of Trading Standards and Community Safety) gave a brief update on Community Payback. The Committee were informed that contact had been made with Nicola Walters (the Pan London Operations Manager for Community Payback) and that the LBB contact for Community Payback would be Lisa Whitley. Both would be invited to the next meeting of the Safer Bromley Partnership Strategic Group that was scheduled for December 3<sup>rd</sup> 2015. The Committee heard that Community Payback activities had already been undertaken in the borough in recent months, and that Community Payback work had been undertaken in St Mary's Cray and at Anerley Town Hall. It was hoped that LBB would be able to utilise the programme to assist with public right of way maintenance in the near future.

The Chairman asked how many people had been involved with Community Payback in Bromley to date. Mr Vale was not aware of the data at the meeting, but advised that he would find out. Cllr Michael Tickner asked whom Community Payback were managed by, and Mr Vale answered that the programme was managed by the Community Rehabilitation Company.

The Committee noted that a CCTV update was going to be presented to the Committee later in the meeting, and that the Committee's concerns around the commissioning and tendering for contracts had been fed back to the E&R PDS Committee for action. It was noted that all the matters referred to on the report had been actioned or were in the process of being actioned.

**RESOLVED that the Matters Arising report be noted.**

## **28 POLICE UPDATE**

The Police Update was provided by the Deputy Borough Commander (DBC), Superintendent Trevor Lawry.

The Committee heard that MOPAC (Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime) 7 offences continued to decrease against the financial year baseline of 2011/12. The current performance of Bromley Police was -16.5 %-- this was a further 0.3% fall from the previous update.

This could be broken down as follows:

Burglary	-26.9%
Criminal Damage	-10.2%
Robbery	-48.8%
TFMV	-26.4%
TOMV	4.8%
Theft Person	-8.2%

Violence W/I                      7.0%

(TFMV=theft from motor vehicles; TOMV = theft of motor vehicles; W/I = with injury).

The Committee heard that while overall this was a positive picture—challenges remained. There was currently a rise in TOMV and criminal damage offences. It was noted that a seasonal spike was normally seen at this time of year in these offences, but the police were working hard to target those areas. There had been a rise in the theft of mopeds that had contributed to the increase in the TOMV figures. There had also been a rise in the number of vans being stolen, often with keys left in them by workmen. It was felt that in many cases, the primary motivation for these thefts was not the van itself, but the tools that the van contained. Many people were leaving their vehicles unlocked, and car thieves were now skilled in dealing with digital technology that had previously worked effectively as a deterrent against theft.

Cllr Samaris Huntington Thresher asked if TOMN was more prevalent in certain areas. It was noted that a hotspot for the theft of mopeds was Penge. The theft of high end vehicles tended to be related to burglaries.

Violence with injury offences, although higher than the police would have hoped for, were beginning to fall against a high of 10.8% in May 2015. Bromley was significantly lower than the rest of the metropolitan police area, which had seen over a 17% increase.

Superintendent Lawry informed Members that the number of sex offences reported was increasing. He commented that this was a nationwide phenomenon. He felt that a possible explanation was that the public were more confident in reporting sexual offences, and that this had resulted in increased figures.

Cllr Richard Williams asked about hate crimes against the lesbian and gay community, and queried if the Police employed a designated LGBT officer. Superintendent Lawry clarified that a LGBT officer had been designated. Cllr Williams stated that he would like to have a meeting with the officer concerned.

The Committee were briefed with an update concerning police response times. Immediate grade calls were achieving 90.9% in 15 minutes. The average time to get to an urgent request for service was 8 minutes 48 seconds. Standard grade calls were achieving 92.5% in an hour. This included the Halloween period where there was higher demand and the police were pleased with these statistics.

### **Met Trace**

Met Trace would be rolled out to over 440,000 homes over a three year period. Houses had been identified by the analysis of data over a three year period. In year one, 4300 houses had been identified. Bromley Police had

provided 1200 households with kits. Surprisingly, nearly 300 households refused them.

While engaging with the public concerning “Smart Water”, the police also provided crime prevention advice. The intention was that one in seven households would have “Smart Water” delivered by the end of the programme. It was noted that an individual could purchase “Smart Water” privately for a cost in the region of £70.00. Cllr William Harmer asked if there was a cheaper alternative. Mr Alf Kennedy (Neighbourhood Watch) stated that members of NW could get the product for a discounted rate of £25.00.

The Chairman was surprised to learn that not all households wanted the “Smart Water”, and asked if this was the case, could the packs designated for these households be redistributed. The Deputy Borough Commander confirmed that this could be done.

## **Gangs**

There were 30 identified gang nominals who lived in the borough and a further 12 nominals who had close gang associations. Of the 30 gang nominals, 6 were in custody and 24 lived in the community. Most of these belonged to Bromley’s gangs, but some belonged to other gangs as they had been moved into LBB as part of harm reduction strategies.

The current hotspots for gang activity were :

1. Penge - High Street, McDonalds, Penge Rec, the Groves Estate
2. Anerley - Betts Park, Streetwise.

Tensions existed between the gangs in Penge, and between gangs in Southwark and Lewisham. Cllr David Cartwright referred to previous issues where LBB was not informed of gang nominals being moved in from other boroughs. The Deputy Borough Commander informed the Committee that LBB and the Police were now being informed, and that gang nominals were now more likely to be “imported” from further away.

Cllr Michael Tickner stated that human beings were “tribal” and that we all want to “belong”. He speculated therefore, on what sort of diversionary activities or groups could be set up to create a positive sense of belonging. The DBC informed the Committee that gang members tended to be identified by either the type of criminality that they were involved in, or by their tastes in music. He mentioned that the Police and LBB were looking to employ the services of GAV (Growing Against Violence) and other diversionary activities, but that the issues were not easy to resolve. Any diversionary activities would need to be very targeted.

The Chairman agreed with the concept of “tribality” and noted that many gang members came from dysfunctional families. She believed that gang membership provided such individuals with a substitute “family”.

Superintendent Lawry stated that there was an aspect of that, but the problems were multi-faceted.

### **Early Intervention**

The police were currently bidding for schools early intervention programmes which would involve skilled speakers going to schools and giving presentations and workshops on how to identify gangs and also concerning prevention strategies.

Presentations had been given to staff around Bromley, including colleges and the Children's Trust, to assist staff in identifying vulnerable youths and the reporting of potential gang nominals.

### **Finances**

The financial picture for Bromley Police was not confirmed. The funding was impacted by three predominate parts:

- \* Main grant
- \* How the main grant was split between forces
- \* Specific grants such as the National and International Capital City Grant (NICC)

The Deputy Borough Commander mentioned that the Deputy Mayor for London had written to the Policing Minister, along with 5 other Police and Crime Commissioners regarding how the funding formula was applied. This was before Bromley Police received confirmation of their main grant; it was expected that pressure would be applied to grants such as NICC by other major cities.

The current financial situation meant that the Police were unlikely to know what their financial position would be like until late December / early January 2016. Because of this, no further financial decisions would be made until January 2016 at the earliest. The Chairman thanked Superintendent Lawry for providing a concise and clear police update.

**RESOLVED that the Police update be noted.**

## **29 CHAIRMAN'S UPDATE**

The Chairman updated the Committee as follows:

On 19 September, the Chairman attended the Crime Summit which was held at the Civic Centre. Among other items, the Crime Summit included a presentation from Bromley Youth Council concerning their campaign for Behaviour and Safety on Public Transport. She then attended a Safer Neighbourhood Board meeting which discussed the future of PCSOs, among other issues.

The Chairman held an agenda planning meeting on 12 October 2015 to discuss the agenda for the PP&S PDS on 3<sup>rd</sup> November 2015, specifically the item on drug abuse. This meeting was attended by Dr Nada Lemic, the Director of Public Health in Bromley.

On 23 October 2015, the Chairman attended an extended COE / Cabinet meeting at which proposals for the 2016/17 Council Budget were discussed. It is worth pointing out that the cross-cutting Public Protection & Safety department had already seen very substantial funding reductions and was now operating at the minimum statutory level. It was anticipated that further cuts to the department's budget would be minimal, if any.

The Chairman observed a supervised test purchase exercise on 31 October 2015, where two 16-year-old volunteers were sent into various shops in West Wickham, Hayes and Elmers End to "buy" fireworks, an age-related item which cannot be legally purchased by under-18s. Out of five shop visits observed by the Chairman, two of them sold the fireworks to the volunteers without asking for proof of their ID to ascertain their ages. This exercise highlighted the need for continued education and training for shop staff to ensure that they did not sell age-related goods to those too young to buy them.

**RESOLVED that the Chairman's update be noted.**

**30 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING OF THE SAFER BROMLEY PARTNERSHIP STRATEGIC GROUP**

The minutes of the previous meeting of the Safer Bromley Partnership Strategic Group were noted.

**HOLDING THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER TO ACCOUNT**

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

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

**A) BUDGET MONITORING 2015/16**

Report FSD 15064

The Committee noted the latest Budget Monitoring report for 2015/16, and that the report showed a projected underspend of £20k.

There were no questions on the report.

**RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder endorse the latest budget projection for the Public Protection and Safety Portfolio.**

## **32 DRUG MISUSE IN BROMLEY**

Report ES15082

The report on Drug Misuse in Bromley was presented to the Committee by Dr Nada Lemic, Director of Public Health. The report was drafted to provide members with information on drug misuse in Bromley, and the Committee were asked to note the report, and to consider and comment on the issues that it raised.

Dr Lemic summarised the main points of the report, and the Deputy Borough Commander stated that he had nothing to add. It was noted that most people in Bromley started to take illicit drugs in their early twenties, and that as well as addictions to these substances; individuals also experience addictions to prescription only medicines and over the counter medicines. The Committee heard that Bromley had a lower rate of drug use than England and London in all categories. The main substances that individuals were addicted to were opiates and alcohol. The population receiving treatment for substance misuse were predominantly white males in the 40 to 49 age group. Mortality rates related to drug abuse and drug poisoning had been increasing since 1993, with heroin and morphine as the most commonly implicated drugs.

The Committee heard that drug abuse in Bromley was also the cause of blood borne infections, mental health issues and increased hospital admissions. It was also noted by the Committee that drug misuse had various socioeconomic impacts; these included healthcare costs, crime, homelessness and family breakup. It was also the case that productivity was lost, and unemployment increased in proportion to the severity and misuse of drugs and alcohol.

The Committee were briefed concerning the various intervention programmes provided by Bromley Drug and Alcohol Service. Dr Lemic informed Members that the way in which effective treatment was gauged was by calculating the number of individuals that had been in treatment for three months or more. It was the case that in 2014-2015, 462 individuals effectively engaged in treatment in Bromley-- which equated to 89% of the treatment population. The main measure of successful treatment was the proportion of people that successfully completed treatment and did not return for six months. Bromley had a higher proportion of successful completers than the national value in all categories of substance misuse.

The Chairman drew attention to section 6.1 of the report that was concerned with the main aims of drug treatment, and asked why the main aim of the treatment was not to get people to quit drugs. She also referred the Committee to the bar charts relating to section 6.4 of the report that dealt with treatment outcomes for adults. The bar charts provided data concerning what was regarded as "Successful Treatment Completion" based around the criteria that adults did not refer back for treatment with six months. The

Chairman was interested to know what happened to these individuals in the longer term. The Chairman also pointed out that there was no mention of budgets in the report.

Dr Lemic responded that treatment was concerned with three issues prior to the possibility of abstinence in the future. The first aim was to reduce the level of harm that an individual was doing to him/her self. A secondary aim was to reduce socio economic impact, and a third priority was concerned with “maintenance”. “Maintenance” was the term applied to keeping patients alive and well, and this was regarded as a good outcome. In terms of outcomes, Dr Lemic stated that outcomes were primarily looked at in terms of completion or non-completion of treatment. No budget figures were available on the night, but Dr Lemic estimated that the total spend for drug and alcohol treatment for adults and children was in the region of £1.4m. Dr Lemic agreed to circulate a breakdown of costs post meeting to Members.

*(Post meeting note—this information has now been circulated)*

Councillor William Harmer asked why it was the case that there was a high percentage of drug abuse and misuse in the 44-49 age range. Dr Lemic answered that it was difficult to give a definite answer but she felt that the fact that Bromley was an affluent area was significant. In Bromley the profile of those that engaged in risky behaviour was white middle class men who often had well paid stressful jobs, and could afford their drug habit.

Cllr Benington noted that there was no reference to “skunk” in the report, and asked if any data was available concerning this. Dr Lemic responded that she had confined her report to those that were being treated. Data concerning “skunk” users was not good as they were not engaging in treatment. Cllr Michael Tickner asked how a distinction was made between alcohol use, and alcohol mis-use. Dr Lemic explained that this would be determined by looking at alcohol caused conditions, and alcohol related conditions.

Cllr Cartwright asked how many people were being treated in Bromley annually. Dr Lemic referred the Committee to section 4 of the report where it stated that during 2014-2015, 730 people had made contact with drug and alcohol services, this compared with 863 for the previous year.

Cllr Judi Ellis reminded the Committee of the problems caused by drug dealers in cars. She asked if drug dealers shared information with the police when they were arrested. The Deputy Borough Commander answered that in most cases these individuals did not share information with the police. They may sometimes provide geographical data, but generally not names. Cllr Ellis asked if the drugs were coming from within the borough. She also commented that in various places, needles had been found in alleyways. Dr Lemic stated that a significant proportion of individuals obtained drugs from London, where many of them worked in the City. Cllr Ellis was reassured that drug abuse did not seem to be a significant teenage problem. Dr Lemic highlighted that with younger people, the more serious problem was alcohol abuse rather than drug abuse.



Cllr Charles Rideout wondered why children under the age of 15 would start experimenting with drugs. Dr Lemic stated that it was not clear why this was the case. It has been observed that alcohol and drug mis-use levels had shown significant differences between schools. Cllr Stephen Wells asked how “Looked after Children” were handled. Dr Lemic clarified that LAC children were dealt with in the same way as other children.

Cllr Pauline Tunnicliffe commented that £1.4m was a lot of money for seven hundred people. She asked that in view of the financial pressures facing the Council, would dealing with drug and alcohol abuse still be a priority for the future. She asked if more of these people could be referred to the private sector for treatment, and fund the treatment themselves. Dr Lemic responded as follows:

- Bromley had a low budget spend per head
- The budget was reducing, and had reduced by a third
- Services had been rationalised
- There was a statutory responsibility to treat people

Cllr Judith Ellis expressed concern regarding cases of foetal alcohol syndrome in the babies of mothers who drank alcohol while pregnant. She wondered if there were effective ways of monitoring the children in these family units where the parents were being treated for alcohol abuse. Dr Lemic answered that there was a health visiting service that was operational to provide antenatal support, and that this service worked closely with the midwifery service. It was also the case that the Family Nurse Practitioners Programme could provide nursing support to pregnant mothers if required.

Members noted that a person testing positive for drugs on arrest was obliged to attend a drugs assessment. However, they would have to voluntarily accept treatment for there to be any chance of a successful outcome. Cllr Tickner asked if the police were able to work with housing providers to use disruption tactics by moving people to alternative accommodation if that was appropriate. Dr Lemic stated that this was something that she would need to look into.

Cllr Thresher wondered what more could be done to work pro-actively with schools, and what support services could get involved in this work. Dr Lemic clarified that Dr Jenny Selway was the Lead for Schools. It was the case that in most cases, schools were independent, and were often not keen to engage in rehabilitation programmes as they were concerned about reputational damage. Precious Adewunmi (BYC) felt that teachers should be trained to identify and take appropriate action concerning drug and alcohol mis-use.

Cllr Stephen Wells enquired if young people referred on to recovery programmes by the Youth Justice System were paid for by the YJS. Dr Lemic responded that this was not the case, and that the cost was borne in the normal manner by Public Health.

The Chairman thanked Dr Lemic for answering questions, and for presenting the report, and felt that it would be a good idea for an update report to come to the Committee in the future.

**RESOLVED that the report be noted, and that an update report be brought to a future meeting of the Committee**

**33            PORTFOLIO PLAN UPDATE AND ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITY--  
                 APRIL 2015--SEPTEMBER 2015**

Report ES 15076

This report had been written to advise Members of the activity undertaken by the Public Protection Division during the period commencing 1<sup>st</sup> April 2015, to 30th September 2015, relating to the annual Portfolio Plan and enforcement under delegated powers.

The Committee referred to Appendix A of the report, and the section dealing with Improvement Notices that had been served under the Health and Safety at Work Act 1974. It was noted that this figure was high at 14. The Committee heard that this was as a result of targeted action following complaints.

The Committee wondered why the number of Early Intervention Warning Notices served under the Anti-Social Behaviour Act 2003 was zero. It was explained to the Committee that this was the result of previous proactive and successful work against ASB where 18 notices had been served. It was still the case that 16 Acceptable Behaviour Commitments had been served under the same statutory powers.

Cllr Tickner asked what the public should do if there were problems with loud noise, and the answer to this was that they should still call the noise team. This was still funded by MOPAC. It was the case that at least two complaints from the public had to be received. It was noted that the number for the noise team would be circulated.

The Chairman referred to Outcome 1 of the Portfolio Plan, which was concerned with keeping Bromley Safe. The Committee noted that Operation Crystal was continuing to meet its objectives, and that the Bromley Mentoring Initiative was running well. It was also noted that the targeting of gang nominals had now been added to the remit of Operation Crystal. The Chairman was pleased to note that with respect to this Outcome, all of the RAG statuses were Green.

The Chairman referred the Committee to Outcome 3 which was concerned with supporting and regulating businesses. The Chairman was concerned that the inspection of high risk food businesses had fallen, and that the RAG status was Amber. She was eager to avoid possible outbreaks of food poisoning. It was noted that this was something that Dr Paul Lehane (Head of Food Safety) was working to address. Mr Robert Vale (Head of Trading Standards and Community Safety) agreed with the importance of prevention,

and assured the Committee that the Food Safety Team were on target for Q4. Cllr Samaris Huntington Thresher asked if LBB would be liable if food premises were not properly informing customers about food allergens. Mr Nigel Davies (Executive Director of Environmental and Community Services) reminded the Committee that a full report on Food Safety would be presented to the Committee in March 2016.

*(Post meeting note—the Food Safety report will now be presented in January 2016)*

Cllr Julian Benington drew attention to section 2.1 of Outcome 2 that was concerned with protecting customers. Mr Vale explained that LBB had undertaken much work with local banks to make them more aware of rogue traders who were targeting the elderly or vulnerable. It was now the case that if a bank reported a suspected scam and reported this to the rapid response team, then cars would be dispatched to both the bank and the home of the person concerned. This was a serious matter, as people could lose their life savings; in one recent incident, a 70 year old person lost £48k.

**RESOLVED that:**

**(1) the PPS/PDS Committee receive further reports, every six months, on the activity relating to the Portfolio Plan and enforcement under delegated powers**

**(2) that the Committee be updated concerning food inspections and allergens**

**(3) that the Committee be provided with the out of hours number for the Noise Nuisance Team**

( Post meeting note--resolutions 2 and 3 were completed by 13/11/2015)

**34 CCTV UPDATE**

Report ES15077

This report had been written by Mr Jim McGowan (Head of Environmental Protection) and Mr McGowan attended to brief the Committee on the report, and to answer any questions.

Mr McGowan notified the Committee that the revised completion date for the CCTV refurbishment was now January 2016. He explained to the Committee the reasons for this delay. The Committee heard that a formal appeal had been raised against the tendering process around the contract originally, and that this had to be dealt with by LBB's legal team before matters could be progressed. The appeal was lost, and the refurbishment contract was awarded to Tyco. Subsequent to this, the Government had drafted measures to change the law concerning certain parking enforcement functions, and this meant that a new proposal of works had to be presented to the Secretary of

State which caused additional delay. The current position was that Tyco had been instructed to proceed with works subject to approval, in order to reduce the risk of control room failure.

Mr McGowan explained to the Committee that an eight week factory build of equipment was required prior to installation in January 2016. Following this, there would be a period of testing to ensure that LBB were satisfied that everything was working properly. The monitoring contract had been awarded to OCS, and the maintenance contract had been awarded to Eurovia. The KPI's concerning monitoring had been reported and were on target.

Mr McGowan discussed the matter of charging for CCTV evidential packages. Currently a charge of £50.00 was made for private third party requests, and no charges were made to the Police. It was noted that other boroughs charged the same, but that some boroughs only charged £10.00. The Committee discussed the matter of charging for evidential packages.

Cllr Julian Benington enquired how long it took to provide an evidential package, and stated that the charge should reflect costs. Mr McGowan responded that the time varied. Sometimes it just took two or three minutes, but if the CCTV operators were dealing with a vague police query, then the work could take two hours. An average timescale was in the region of fifteen minutes. Cllr Tickner felt that a £10.00 charge should be made in all cases, and that if an evidential package was subsequently provided, then a £50.00 charge should be levied. He asked for an explanation of the term, "privacy zone software". He wondered if it was prudent to have a CCTV operator employed on a full time basis from 9.00am to 5.00pm, and felt that it may be more beneficial to have an operator working full time from midnight into the early hours of the morning. Mr McGowan explained that the privacy software enabled certain zones that the cameras covered to be blocked out to ensure privacy.

Cllr Samaris Huntington Thresher enquired if other local authorities charged the Police for evidential packages. It was noted that the boroughs that the Committee were aware of did not charge the Police. Mr Nigel Davies (Executive Director of Environmental and Community Services) felt that it would not be a good idea to charge the Police in view of the current severe pressures on their budgets. Cllr Thresher stated that she was opposed to charging the Police. Cllr Thresher asked about the KPI monitoring data, and wondered why some of the areas exceeded a 100% target figure. Mr McGowan answered that in these areas the targets were exceeded. Cllr Thresher expressed the view that in some of the examples on the monitoring data, the percentages were not of any use.

Cllr Thresher stated that it may be a good idea to look at what other councils were charging, and the Executive Director agreed to look into this. Cllr Tickner moved that all applications should be charged at £10.00, and that £50.00 should be charged to third parties when evidential packages could be provided; there would be no charges to the Police; this was seconded by Cllr Richard Williams.

**RESOLVED that**

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

**(2) the following charges for CCTV evidential packages be recommended to the Portfolio Holder:**

- **there would be a flat rate charge of £10.00 for all applications**
- **where evidential packages were provided an additional £50.00 charge would be levied**
- **so where an evidential package was supplied, there would be a total charge of £60.00**
- **there would be no charges raised for providing evidential packages to the Police**

**35 WORK PROGRAMME AND CONTRACTS REGISTER**

Report CSD 15115

The Committee noted the Work Programme for the Public Protection and Safety, Policy Development and Scrutiny Committee.

The Committee also noted the Contracts Register. The Mortuary Contract was tabled separately as it was received subsequent to agenda publication.

**36 CONFIRMATION OF THE NEXT MEETING DATE**

The date of the next meeting was confirmed as 20<sup>th</sup> January 2016.

The Meeting ended at 9.15 pm

Chairman

This page is left intentionally blank