

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

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.00 pm on 18 January 2017

**Present:**

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

Katie Bacon, Millie Banians, Terry Belcher, Dr Robert  
Hadley and Alf Kennedy

**Also Present:**

Nigel Davies, Laurie Grasty, Kamla Joshi, Trevor Lawry,  
Paul Lehane, Councillor Kate Lymer and Jim McGowan  
Simon Dean, OBE

**STANDARD ITEMS**

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

Apologies were received from the Borough Commander. Detective Superintendent Trevor Lawry attended in his absence. Apologies were also received from Sergeant Trevor Waller from British Transport Police.

**119 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

**120 QUESTIONS TO THE CHAIRMAN FROM COUNCILLORS AND  
MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

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

**121 MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC PROTECTION AND SAFETY PDS  
COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 29th NOVEMBER 2016**

The Committee considered the minutes of the meeting of the Public Protection and Safety PDS Committee held on 29<sup>th</sup> November 2016.

**RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 29<sup>th</sup> November 2016  
be agreed as a correct record.**

## **122        MATTERS ARISING**

### CSD 17008

The Committee noted the Matters Arising report. The Executive Director for Environmental and Community Services informed the Committee that investigations into the number and location of defibrillators in the Borough were ongoing. It was noted that three were sited at various points in the Civic Centre, and one was located at the Central Library. One existed at Biggin Hill Library. Bromley My Time had been contacted and requested to provide data on where defibrillators were located at their leisure centres.

The Executive Director was progressing the investigation with the assistance of Cllr David Cartwright. Information was also being collated around what sort of training was provided in the use of the defibrillators. A revised update would be brought to the next meeting.

**RESOLVED that an update on the location of defibrillators would be brought to the next meeting of the Committee.**

## **123        CHAIRMAN'S UPDATE**

The Chairman informed the Committee that she had recently attended an agenda planning meeting with officers.

## **124        POLICE UPDATE**

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

It was noted that the former Chief Inspector for Neighbourhood Policing was moving on and that two candidates had been interviewed for the post; an offer of employment had been made. The Committee would be updated further in due course.

In terms of performance data, the MOPAC 7 reporting system was still operational. The Police were waiting to hear of any changes to be made subsequent to the new Police and Crime Plan. The performance of Bromley Police against the MOPAC 7 targets was generally considered to be good. Bromley Police was one of only seven forces where the overall crime figures in the rolling twelve month period had decreased.

Challenges still remained with the figures for Violence with Injury (VWI) and Theft from the Person. The number of VWI offences in 2011/12 was 1889, compared with the current figure of 2132—this was an increase in the actual number of offences of 243, or 12.9%. The VWI figure was still lower than the average MPS figure.

In 2011/12, the number of Theft from the Person offences was 305, and it was currently 350, which was an increase of 14.8%.

The Committee heard that the number of ASB offences being reported was increasing across the Metropolitan Police Force. Mr Lawry felt that some of the increase was due to a real increase in offences, but that some of the increase was due to changes in the way that offences were reported. ASB offences seemed to spike on occasions like Halloween and Bonfire Night. The number of arson offences seemed to be on the increase.

Ninety per cent of grade 1 emergency calls were responded to within 15 minutes, but averaged ten minutes. Grade 2 emergency calls were responded to within 60 minutes in 84.5% of instances.

There was an update on Operation Glorious that had been undertaken in the Mottingham area. This had resulted in numerous individuals being convicted of various offences relating to drug possession and drug supply. The Committee was updated concerning Operation Atlas. This was an Operation aimed at dealing with offences connected to gangs, Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE), and other vulnerable children and young people. The Operation had originated as a response to the Ofsted Inspection on Children's Services.

A member asked if the Police were aware of instances when gangs were going around bashing people on the head. The DBC stated that any such incidences had not been reported to the Police as far as he was aware, but he would investigate and report back to the Committee.

A member requested that details of Police operations be disclosed to Councillors at the earliest opportunity so that positive feedback could be given to encourage local residents. A member stated that according to the MPS website, 32% of cases in Bromley were still outstanding, and that in 42% of cases there were no suspects. He asked if these figures were normal.

The DBC responded that the 42% figure relating to lack of suspects was not surprising. In some cases it was connected to either there being no CCTV available, or difficulty in accessing CCTV from various sources. The member commented that the 32% figure equated to 800 open cases. The DBC responded that he was confident that Bromley Police did not have 800 outstanding cases, but he would investigate further.

It was noted that at a Ward Panel meeting recently, the local Ward Officer did not attend. It was queried if it was still usual for Ward Officers to attend. The DBC confirmed that this was still the case.

A member referenced the problem caused in the Borough (especially Orpington) by the dangerous and nuisance use of quad bikes and motor bikes. He asked if Bromley Police were still using off road bikes. The DBC confirmed that this was the case, and that in fact they had been out patrolling on the morning of the meeting. Bromley was the only Borough that still used off road bikes.

A member asked what crime was potentially being committed when motor bikes were being used in town centres in a dangerous and nuisance fashion. The DBC responded that it may be the case that Road Traffic and Public Order offences were being committed in these instances.

It was noted that no charging point existed in West Wickham for body worn cameras. A member asked when this would be rectified. The DBC responded that there was not a specific date set aside for this. The charging point consisted of a special piece of kit that took up a large section of a wall. He promised to look into when the installation may take place.

A member enquired if any progress had been made in identifying the 'cat killer.' The DBC clarified that this was an investigation that was being led by Croydon Police.

A member referenced the number of windows being broken in the vicinity of the Walnuts Shopping Centre in Orpington, particularly windows that had been broken in the Library and Sainsbury's. The DBC explained that breaking a window was a quick and easy crime to commit. It was possible that the Police may try and increase patrols in the area.

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

## **125 PRESENTATION FROM BRITISH TRANSPORT POLICE**

This item was deferred to a future meeting.

## **126 PRESENTATION FROM CHALLENGER TROOP**

The presentation was made by Simon Dean, CEO.

The Committee heard that Challenger Troop (CT) was a not-for-profit organisation--committed to Youth Engagement. CT catered for different needs and age groups, providing structure, guidance and aspiration. CT was a Community Interest Company formed to deliver uniformed youth development and inclusion courses for vulnerable and disengaged young people of school learning age. The aim of CT was to develop personal skills thorough challenging activities in a disciplined learning outdoor environment.

CT had won a variety of awards, and had been recognised as one of the top seven organisations for positive social impact nationally. CT aimed to provide a holistic approach to engagement. It was founded in 2007 in Kent as part of a youth outreach programme. It was estimated that 35,000 6-18 year olds had been helped since inception. CT had been accredited as a Core Education Provider. CT's programmes had been independently evaluated by Brighton University, and found to be very effective.

One of the core aims of the various programmes was to build resilience in young people. Mr Dean informed the Committee that approximately 45% of

young people were destined to fail in education. A core aim of CT was to take young people out of their comfort zone, thus building confidence. It was hoped that young people would take their new behaviours into schools, the home and their environment.

Mr Dean stated that CT was not a boot camp, but was rather a two way partnership; he also commented that CT was not a 'dumping ground' nor was it a last resort option. Neither was it a panacea.

CT aimed to build self-reliance and confidence. This was important as the British Chamber of Commerce had stated that 56% of young people were not employable. CT aimed to be safe, structured, disciplined, inclusive, holistic, challenging, and also rewarding. Many of the employees were former servicemen.

Mr Dean highlighted that CT had managed to achieve a 100% non-reoffending rate which was quite remarkable.

The Chairman asked how it could be ensured that the programmes offered to various age groups were relevant. Mr Dean answered that the courses were scaled according to ability and age groups.

A member asked where CT was based. The response was that CT had a Head Office in Tunbridge Wells, but had various bases in Essex, West London, and town centres in the South East. A member also asked about the ethnic and gender mix of CT groups. It was clarified that CT catered for all ethnicities, and for both sexes.

A member asked if there was any sort of link up with the LIFE courses provided by LFB. He wondered if there could be a cross networking of courses.

A member queried if any of the young people involved in these courses subsequently expressed an interest in a career in the armed forces. Mr Dean responded that many of the young people had subsequently joined the Tri Service Cadets.

A member enquired as to the youngest age a person had to be for entry onto one of the programmes. The answer to this was six years of age.

More information concerning the work of Challenger Troop could be found at the following link:

<http://challengertroop.org/who-we-are/>

The Chairman thanked Mr Dean for his excellent and informative presentation to the Committee.

## **HOLDING THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER TO ACCOUNT**

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

The Portfolio Holder updated the Committee as follows:

The Portfolio Holder had previously allocated funding to Challenger Troop, and agreed that the Emergency Planning section needed some form of resource allocation. A member queried if the Emergency Planning function could be outsourced to LFB.

The Portfolio Holder had recently attended a meeting of the APPG (All Party Parliamentary Group) for London.

APPGs were an informal cross party group who joined together to pursue a particular topic or interest. They were run for and by members of both the Commons and the Lords.

The Portfolio Holder recently attended a meeting of the GLA. The meeting was Chaired by Victoria Borwick. Brian Paddick, Jenny Jones and a group of Lords and Baronesses were also in attendance.

Sophie Linden and Craig Mackey, (Deputy Met Commissioner) gave an update on the Police and Crime Plan that was out for consultation.

Sophie Linden updated the APPG as follows:

#### Priorities:

##### 1. Restoring Neighbourhood Policing:

Ms Linden was assessing ways of increasing the diversity of officers so that the MPS looked and felt like the community it served.

##### 2. Establishing a London Wide Criminal Justice System:

Much good work had been done and Ms Linden was looking to build on this. However, she hoped for the devolvement of this function to the Mayor to complete the programme successfully. The GLA was lobbying the government to this end. Ms Linden commented that the Probation Service in London recently had a poor report.

##### 3. VAWG:

Ms Linden acknowledged that a good strategy was in place from the previous Mayor concerning VAWG and that she wanted to build on this. The GLA had undertaken a needs assessment and were shocked to discover that on average, every week 11 women were seriously assaulted in every Ward in

London. An explanation was being sought to explain the increased levels of reporting.

#### 4. Protecting children and young people:

Work would be undertaken with Local Authorities to ensure the right partnerships were in place to protect young people. MOPAC would be producing a strategy to tackle knife crime, which would include working with communities, retailers, and online sellers of knives.

#### 5. Hate Crime, Extremism and Intolerance.

Even before the EU Referendum, the previous two years had seen an increase in Hate Crime. MOPAC wanted people to feel confident in coming forward to report it. Investigations would take place to determine whether current sentences for perpetrators were appropriate

Across all of these priorities were the themes of: early intervention and prevention; partnership working; and tackling the causes..

#### Craig Mackey

Mr Mackey started by outlining the financial position of the MPS. To date £600m had been saved; however a further £400m in savings was still required.

The MPS felt that the Capital City Grant was £170m short, and they were lobbying the government in an attempt to reduce the shortfall. Next year the MPS had a balanced budget. Years 2, 3 and 4 were not yet balanced.

The MPS was currently in receipt of 25% of the whole policing budget for England and Wales. There were plans to reallocate budgets and there were concerns that the MPS may lose funding as a result.

Mr Mackey gave an overview of the current crime picture of London. Crime overall was up by 3% across London but was higher than this nationally. Burglary and street robbery had seen big drops over the last few years, but rape and sexual assaults had seen large increases. It was important to determine what the underlying factor/s were in causing the change in data.

There had been an increase in dealing with complex issues such as missing people and dealing with people with mental health issues. Also there had been an increased workload related to counter terrorism.

There was a brief mention of BCUs. Mr Mackey expressed the view that doing the same thing in 32 separate Boroughs may not necessarily be the best way forward. He felt that it was important to make the levels of leadership more efficient.

The 101 number had been a success, with 70,000 calls in the last eight months. There was an intent to encourage people to report crimes online and for a better web presence to be created.

Finally he talked about the MPS's technology vision, which was that they wanted everything that Police could do on a PC at a police station to be possible to do on a mobile device in any location. This would free up 10% of time for officers and had been signed off by the Deputy Mayor.

Jenny Jones asked a question about Traffic Policing. She expressed the view that when budgets were cut, the first aspect to be cut was traffic policing. Mr Mackey responded that no plans existed to reduce traffic policing. This could be a debate for the future if there was no option other than to reduce officer numbers, but no current plans for this were being drawn up.

Jenny Jones asked about 'Prevent' and how this was linked to the aim of preventing extremism. Ms Linden answered that 'Prevent' would work hand in hand with MOPAC's plans. However she commented that 'Prevent' was not consistently rolled out across Boroughs and that different Boroughs had different budgets for it. She stated that this might be something that Boroughs chose to co-commission.

Concerning Hate Crime, Ms Linden stated that an online Hate Crime Hub was planned, and that they were tracking to see what happened to offenders following their arrests.

It had been discovered that, worryingly, only 25-30% of knife crime was related to gangs. Therefore there had been an increase in people not in gangs carrying knives. They needed to understand why this was. Mr Mackey commented that it would be interesting to see what Met Officers said in the current survey about officers carrying guns and tasers.

The budget allocated to the Crime Prevention Fund was £72m per annum. Next year there would be no change. Over the last four years, funding had been allocated on the basis of successful bids, not based on needs. MOPAC would be looking at the needs of each Borough based on indicators such as JSA claimants, children on child protection registers, etc.. Where Boroughs did not have the resources to be efficient, they should team up with other boroughs. All of the 30% top slice should come back to the boroughs.

It was noted that Mental Health was about 30% of the Police's workload.

After the meeting, Bob Neill MP introduced the Portfolio Holder to the Deputy Mayor, who said she was coming to Bromley in the near future. In fact, she would be visiting all the London Boroughs.

Ms Linden had planned to meet the Leader, the Portfolio Holder, the Chief Executive and senior Bromley officers on 24<sup>th</sup> February. However this had been cancelled but would be re-scheduled.



The Portfolio Holder had put her name forward to be on a high-level group led by the Lead Member for Crime and Public Protection at London Councils. This was being established to oversee the development of criteria for the London Crime Protection Co-Commissioning Pot. This group would liaise and engage with MOPAC at a pan-London level in relation to the proposals and deployment of the 30% top slice.

The Portfolio Holder would find out in due course if her application had been accepted.

**RESOLVED that the update from the Portfolio Holder be noted.**

**a PPS DRAFT BUDGET 2017/18**

FSD 17011

Members noted the draft budget report written by Claire Martin, Head of Finance.

The purpose of the report was to consider the Portfolio Holder's Draft 2017/18 Budget, which incorporated the full year effect of savings agreed as part of the 2016/17 Council Tax report, and any further savings approved during the year which had resulted in considerable reductions in the Council's medium term "budget gap". Members were requested to consider the initial draft budget savings proposed and also to identify any further action that might be taken to reduce cost pressures facing the Council over the next four years.

Executive were requesting that each PDS Committee consider the proposed initial draft budget savings and cost pressures for their Portfolio and the views of each PDS Committee be reported back to the next meeting of the Executive, prior to the Executive making recommendations to Council on 2017/18 Council Tax levels. It should be pointed out that services such as Environmental Health were already at the lowest legal limit of resources and could not be reduced further.

The PDS Committee considered the update on the financial forecast for 2017/18 to 2020/21, and considered the initial draft 2017/18 Budget as a basis for setting the 2017/18 Budget.

Cllr Richard Williams asked that it be noted in the minutes that he was abstaining from this item.

**RESOLVED that the Draft 2017/18 Budget report be noted.**

**b EXTENSION OF DOGS SERVICES CONTRACT**

ES 170006

The report was presented to the Committee by Mr Jim McGowan, Head of Environmental Protection. There were two reasons why the report was presented to the Committee:

1. Following the report presented to the Public Protection & Safety PDS Committee on September 28th 2016, the Portfolio Holder agreed to re-tender the Stray and Abandoned Dogs Service and Pest Control Service contracts.
2. The final extension on Bromley's contracts for the Stray and Abandoned Dogs and Pest Control Services expired on 30th April 2017. Unfortunately the procurement process for these contracts would not be completed in time for the new contracts to start on the 1st May 2017.

The report recommended that the contracts be extended to provide the requisite time for LBB to complete the European Tender procurement process.

**RESOLVED that**

**(1) The Dog Warden Service contract is extended from 1<sup>st</sup> May 2017 to 31st January 2018**

**(2) The Kennelling Service contract is extended from 1<sup>st</sup> May 2017 to 31st January 2018**

**(3) The Rehoming Service contract is extended from 1<sup>st</sup> May 2017 to 31st January 2018**

**(4) The Pest Control contract is extended from 1<sup>st</sup> May 2017 to 31st January 2018**

**c ANIMAL WELFARE--LICENCE FEES FOR HOME BOARDERS**

ES 17001

The report was presented to the Committee by Mr Paul Lehane (Head of Food Safety, Occupational Safety and Licensing).

The report proposed a new licence fee for Home Boarding of cats and dogs in the light of reduced veterinary inspection costs.

The report noted that the current fees were based on a charge for the Council's appointed veterinary surgeon of £211.00, with additional fees of £4.22 for each cat and dog. The City of London Veterinary Service was revising its fee structure and was proposing a new fee of £74.00 for home boarders from January 1<sup>st</sup> 2017.

LBB was proposing to replace the administration fee based on the number of animals to £72.00. Thus LBB was proposing to charge a new fee for home boarders of £146.00.

**RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder agree the new licence fee of £146.00 for the Home Boarding of cats and dogs under the Animal Boarding Establishments Act 1963 with effect from 1<sup>st</sup> January 2017.**

**d CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING-2nd QUARTER  
2016/17**

FSD 17009

On the 30<sup>th</sup> November 2016, Executive received the second quarterly capital monitoring report for 2016/17, and agreed a revised Capital Programme for the four year period 2016/17 to 2019/20.

**RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder for Public Protection and Safety note and confirm the changes agreed by the Executive on 30<sup>th</sup> November 2016.**

**128 REVIEW OF THE EMERGENCY PLANNING AND BUSINESS  
CONTINUITY SERVICE**

This was a joint presentation by Laurie Grasty and Paul Lehane.

Mr Lehane commenced his presentation by examining the contents of a 'Grab Bag' belonging to an Emergency Planning Officer; in this case the bag was fictional. Out of the bag, Mr Lehane withdrew several items, including 'lucky dice', lucky heather, a four leaf clover and a lucky horse-shoe. There was also a piece of wood that Mr Lehane referred to as 'touch wood'. The common denominator in all of the items was 'luck', and Mr Lehane made the point that LBB could not rely on 'luck' and had to plan for emergencies and serious incidents.

The Committee heard that an Emergency Response Plan existed, but that LBB only had one Emergency Resilience Officer. This did not compare favourably with other Boroughs:

- Croydon 4
- Greenwich 3
- Lewisham 3
- Bexley 2

A You Tube video entitled 'Out of a Clear Blue Sky' was played.

The link for the video is

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EMYnPykeT7o&feature=youtu.be>

This was a video about different types of emergencies, and the response of emergency services.

The Committee heard that LBB had a statutory duty to assist in dealing with any sort of major incident affecting the borough.

The Committee were informed that LBB had a team of trained volunteers that would assist as required. This included individuals who were trained to manage an emergency control centre. There were also staff trained to work as liaison officers and run rest centres. These would act as the interface between the public and the emergency services.

Ms Grasty informed the Committee that emergency plans had been written for most risks. These could include incidences like a flu pandemic, flooding, gas explosions, power outages and terrorism. Overall control would be with a control room in London. Plans needed to be reviewed to make sure they were up to date, and scenarios needed to be practised. With this in mind, a 'snow emergency' scenario was being planned for 9<sup>th</sup> February 2017, which was based on the snow event of 2010.

Another matter that Ms Grasty referenced was the issue of Business Continuity. In the event of a major incident, how would LBB continue to undertake its core functions and services?

It was noted that the last time an emergency response was required was in the summer of 2016, which was a major gas leak in Penge. There was also an incident during Christmas 2016 which was also a gas leak in Penge.

A member stated that in the case of 7/7, the mobile network failed and there were problems with communicating in the London Underground. The member wondered how the Resilience Team would communicate if the same situation was repeated. Ms Grasty responded that the Team did have air way radios but there was no contingency for a mobile network collapsing. A member asked if this had therefore been logged officially as a risk. Another member expressed the view that the mobile network was unlikely to collapse, and that in the case of 7/7 it was more likely that the Police had shut down the network deliberately. It was also noted that the 4G network was a more robust network than the one that was operating during 7/7.

A member stated that the current system that had been set up with regard to volunteers was flawed and dangerous. A more robust and guaranteed plan needed to be set up, with a rota in operation. The member enquired if LBB's resilience and business continuity plans were audited, and by whom. It was noted that a form of auditing was undertaken by London Resilience. A member expressed the view that what was taking place was not a proper audit, like the audits carried out by Ofsted. Ms Grasty responded that it was possible to show the Committee the action plans that had been developed after working in conjunction with London Resilience.

A member stated that it was a very serious weakness that LBB only had one Resilience Officer. He also emphasised the importance of good training for volunteers, which would enable them to respond in an effective and professional manner. The member continued by asking if LBB were fulfilling their legal and statutory obligations. Ms Grasty answered that it was the case that LBB were fulfilling their statutory obligations with respect to Emergency Planning. However, she felt that corporately, business continuity oversight was weak.

A member asked Mr Lehane if the service was under-resourced, and the response was affirmative. Another member asked that if LBB needed to relocate because of an emergency, where would it relocate to? Mr Lehane responded that each team/division had a plan, but there were potential vulnerabilities in this area.

The Chairman asked if a follow-up report would be useful, and the Committee thought that this was a good idea. She also stated that what was required was clarification from the Head of Service as to what was required in terms of budget to plug the resource gap. There was concern across the Committee at what appeared to be a serious resource gap for Emergency Planning and Business Continuity.

The Chairman asked if there was a perception that other Boroughs were more vulnerable. Ms Grasty responded that it depended on the perceptions of individual councils.

The Committee agreed that swift action was required by the Portfolio Holder to provide the requisite funding to adequately support the service.

**RESOLVED that**

**(1) A follow-up report on Emergency Planning and Business Continuity be brought to a future meeting of the Committee**

**(2) The Portfolio Holder for Public Protection and Safety take swift action to provide the budget required to plug the resource gap in the Emergency Planning and Business Continuity Team**

**129 ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION UPDATE**

The update was provided by Mr Jim McGowan, Head of Environmental Services.

The Committee was given a general outline of the scope of the Service, and it was also explained which services were contracted out. It was noted that the Stray and Abandoned Dogs Services, along with Pest Control, were in the process of being re-tendered.

An organisational chart for Environmental Services was tabled. This highlighted the six main sections that Environmental Services was divided into:

- CCTV
- Housing Improvement
- Housing Enforcement
- Public Health, Nuisance and Noise
- Stray Dogs, Drainage and Pest Control
- Coroner and Mortuary Service

There were two sub sections of Public Health, Nuisance and Noise, and these were Scientific Services and Systems Support.

It was noted that the CCTV Room had recently been refurbished and that a visit would be arranged soon for members of the PDS Committee. The CCTV Room was currently located in the St Blaise Building, but would need to be re-sited as the St Blaise Building was going to be demolished.

The Committee heard that 'Housing Enforcement' was primarily associated with the private sector, and a Private Sector Team existed to investigate complaints. Sometimes the complaints related to rogue landlords, and in certain cases the Council would take action and prosecutions. The Team was also responsible for checking hygiene and health conditions in HMOs (Houses of Multiple Occupation).

It was explained that 'public health nuisance' extended to dealing with vermin. The current contract provided a discount for pest control services to those on benefits. The biggest source of complaints the Council had to deal with was noise complaints. These averaged around 4000 complaints annually. Initially, conflict resolution was attempted, but Notices were served when this failed. It was noted that LBB Environmental Services were statutory consultees for licensing issues, and were members of the Biggin Hill Noise and Safety Board.

Members were informed that staff worked out-of-hours to investigate complaints and that 60% of complaints were out-of-hours.

'Scientific Services' were concerned with the following areas:

- Water Quality
- Planning Liaison
- Air Quality
- Contaminated Land

The Coroner and Mortuary Service was a consortium contract between LBB, LB Bexley, LB Sutton and LB Croydon. The Coroner was previously based at St Blaise but was now based at Croydon. The costs of inquests were shared among the consortium.

A Member queried why the CCTV room had to be moved, given the fact that it had recently been refurbished. The Executive Director for Environmental and Community Services explained that the demolition of the St Blaise Building was part of the wider Civic Centre Project. It was noted that although this was the case, the CCTV control room equipment was transferable. A CCTV Options Report would be presented to the next meeting of the Committee.

A Member asked if the Pest Control services extended to squirrels, and the answer to this was affirmative.

**RESOLVED that a CCTV Options report would be presented to the next meeting of the Committee.**

### **130 INTERNAL AUDIT STRAY DOGS REVIEW REPORT**

The Committee noted the follow-up review of the Stray Dogs contract.

The original Internal Audit report, finalised in November 2015, had identified nine priority 1 recommendations.

The follow-up Audit in April 2016 identified that three priority 1 recommendations had been fully implemented, and one was partially implemented, and so it was felt that good progress was being made.

The follow up review noted that out of the five outstanding priority one recommendations, two had been fully implemented and three partially implemented.

No follow-up audits were considered necessary as there were no longer any priority 1 recommendations outstanding.

Members felt that it would be helpful if guidance was provided about the order in which internal audit reports were scrutinised. In other words, should internal audit reports like the Stray Dogs report go to the Audit Sub Committee first, or to the PDS Committee?

**Resolved that the follow-up audit on the Stray Dogs Contract be noted.**

### **131 WORK PROGRAMME AND CONTRACTS REGISTER**

#### CSD 17009

The Committee noted the Work Programme and the Contracts Register for the Public Protection and Safety Portfolio.

The Executive Director for Environmental and Community Services explained that the contracts marked in red related to VAWG. These were currently marked as red as there remained a lack of clarity concerning funding.

**RESOLVED that the Work Programme and Contracts Register report be noted.**

**132 ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

No other business was discussed.

**133 DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING**

The date of the next meeting was confirmed as 1<sup>st</sup> March 2017.

The Meeting ended at 9.35 pm

Chairman