

PUBLIC PROTECTION AND ENFORCEMENT POLICY DEVELOPMENT & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the virtual meeting at 6.30 pm on 19 January 2021

Present:

Councillor David Cartwright QFSM (Chairman)
Councillor Chris Pierce (Vice-Chairman)
Councillors Kathy Bance MBE, Julian Benington,
Kim Botting FRSA, Mike Botting, Simon Fawthrop,
Alexa Michael and Harry Stranger

Sharon Baldwin, Alf Kennedy and Oscar Seal

STANDARD ITEMS

87 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Apologies were received from Councillor Suraj Sharma; Councillor Simon Fawthrop attended as his substitute.

The Portfolio Holder had informed the Committee that due to another engagement, she would be joining the meeting at 7.30pm.

The Chairman expressed his thanks for all of the hard work undertaken by officers during the ongoing pandemic and asked that his appreciation be recorded.

88 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

89 MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC PROTECTION AND ENFORCEMENT PDS COMMITTEE HELD ON 8th DECEMBER 2020

The Committee considered the minutes of the meeting of the Public Protection and Enforcement PDS Committee held on 8th December 2020.

The Chairman reminded the Committee and officers that it was important that the Council's involvement with Community payback be revisited and developed.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 8th December 2020 be agreed and signed as a correct record.

90 QUESTIONS FOR THE CHAIRMAN OF THE PUBLIC PROTECTION AND ENFORCEMENT PDS COMMITTEE

No questions for the Chairman or the Committee were received.

91 QUESTIONS FOR THE PUBLIC PROTECTION AND ENFORCEMENT PORTFOLIO HOLDER

One written question from a member of the public was received for the Portfolio Holder.

This is attached as an appendix to the minutes.

92 MATTERS OUTSTANDING

CSD21013

The Committee noted and commented on the Matters Arising report. An update was required concerning the proposed meeting together of Bromley Youth Council (BYC) and Chief Inspector Craig Knight. The Committee was informed that Mr Knight would be meeting with BYC during the following week.

The Chairman of the Safer Neighbourhood Board informed Members that she would be meeting shortly with Bromley police regarding stop and search, and as a result there may be some useful updates that she could feed back to BYC.

It was noted that SLAM (South London and Maudsley NHS Trust) would be attending the Committee meeting in March, and that the Assistant Director for Public Protection and Enforcement had already met with the new Clinical Director of Bethlem.

The Chairman asked the Assistant Director for Public Protection and Enforcement if she could circulate a copy of the current protocol agreement (between the Council and Bethlem) to the Committee.

RESOLVED that the report be noted and that the Assistant Director for Public Protection and Enforcement disseminate the latest version of the protocol agreement with SLAM.

Post Meeting Note

The latest version of the protocol agreement with SLAM was disseminated to Members on January 20th 2021. It was noted that some changes to contact details were required.

93 POLICE UPDATE

Superintendent Andy Brittain and Inspector Stuart Baker attended to provide the update from the police.

A Member asked why it appeared that the figures with respect to the crime of 'harassment' had increased and she requested that in future a more detailed breakdown of this data be provided. Mr Baker agreed that the figure seemed high. He said that he would look into this further and provide more detail to the Member outside of the meeting.

A Member referred to the increase in offensive weapons crimes and in drug trafficking. She asked why the former had increased by 120%, and the latter by 77%. Inspector Baker answered that it was partly a case of small numbers and big percentages. He said that these figures were a reflection of the police's increased presence on the streets dealing with these crime types. He regarded it as a positive that these figures had gone up. He explained the difference between drug trafficking and drug possession. The former was the more serious offence, but sometimes the police had to settle for prosecuting for drug possession as this was easier to prove and to get a conviction in the courts.

The Member asked what plans the police had to reduce these crimes apart from the various MOPAC projects that were planned. Mr Brittain responded that the police were considering various options concerning this to try and improve engagement with young people, and this would include the use of Police Schools Officers when the schools were re-opened after lockdown. The police would also be advertising and promoting more of what they were doing with respect to knife crime.

The Chairman asked why the number of convictions for drug possession and the number of sanctioned detections had decreased. At the same time the number of stop and searches had increased and the Chairman wondered how these factors could be reconciled. Mr Baker said that this was because in many cases there was not enough evidence to prosecute. The police had now set up a Drug Focus Desk which was a small team of experienced detectives, to assist officers in capturing the best evidence to increase prosecutions. This was a relatively new team, and it was hoped that their involvement would lead to an increase in the number of sanctioned detections in the future.

The Chairman asked if going forward the Committee could be supplied with data relating to 'crime hotspots'—this was information that had been supplied in the past. The Chairman felt that it was important that some form of scrutiny with respect to these hotspots was undertaken. Mr Brittain said that he would be happy to meet with the Chairman to discuss this issue and provide any additional information that may be of interest. Going forward, the police were intending to provide a better police performance/data pack.

The Chairman was keen to find out if police times of attendance had been affected by the new low traffic zones. The Chairman expressed the view that

low traffic zones had adversely affected the times of attendance for the London Ambulance Service and the London Fire Brigade.

Mr Brittain was not aware of any evidence to show this but stated that data regarding this could be provided at a future meeting if required.

The police explained why there had been a big increase in ASB calls during the first lockdown. This was largely related to Covid, where neighbours were reporting each other for allegedly breaking lockdown restrictions. The figures had also spiked over the Christmas period.

A Member praised the police for their pro-active work in closing down a 'cannabis farm' in St Mary Cray and other areas like Penge. Other addresses were being looked at. The Member asked that Mr Baker's swift, decisive, and professional actions be noted in the minutes. Mr Baker gave some detail concerning police operations that had been undertaken as part of 'Operation Heat' which covered a variety of areas. There had been an operation undertaken in St Mary Cray where an investigation had recovered cannabis that was worth in the region of £100k.

The police emphasised the importance of the involvement of local communities in assisting the police and providing intelligence that the police could use. Mr Baker highlighted that in recent police raids, individuals had been charged with drug related offences and the police had come across a victim of human slavery.

The police were questioned with respect to the low level of sanctioned detections. The police were aware of the need for these figures to improve.

A discussion took place concerning the theft of dogs, and the police said that although some dogs had been stolen, and there were some 'Traveller' sites where puppies were being bred; on the whole there was not much evidence of this crime taking place in Bromley and the public should not be alarmed concerning this.

A Member, referring back to the matter of sanctioned detections, stated that in his view this could be a misleading figure, as it may not convey the whole picture of what the police were doing on a daily basis on behalf of the public. He felt that the police could be selling themselves short by using this statistic. Although the police were grateful for this comment, Mr Baker maintained that the police did need to improve the level of sanctioned detections.

The Chairman thanked the Member for his comments regarding sanctioned detections but highlighted that anyone undertaking serious scrutiny in this area (including the police themselves) acknowledged that there needed to be a marked increase in the number of sanctioned detections.

A Member asked if individuals were randomly turning up at the Princess Royal University Hospital, in the hope of being vaccinated. The police responded that this did not seem to be a significant issue.

Mr Baker informed Members that the Covid Pandemic had hit the police hard. The first wave had not impacted the police to any significant extent.

However, the police were currently having to cope with around 20 to 25% of their staff either being sick or self-isolating. Fortunately, in many cases, investigative work could still be undertaken from home. There had been a few officers that had ended up in hospital/intensive care but had recovered; the Covid Pandemic was not affecting the response to 999 calls.

A discussion took place concerning the recruitment of new detectives and it was noted that 52% of the new trainees were female and around 30% were from Black, Asian or minority groups (November 2020 figures). The Chairman said he would be interested to receive data concerning how many in the 30% group successfully passed through the training programme.

A Member asked what were the retention rates for new officers. Mr Baker responded that he could provide an update concerning recruitment and retention at the next meeting.

A Member asked if there was a plan to vaccinate the police. The response to this was at the time of the meeting no definitive plans were in place; the Police Commissioner Cressida Dick was lobbying to move this forward.

A Member mentioned that anyone who volunteered in the vaccination process (in terms of actually administering the vaccine to the public) would be offered the vaccine themselves, and perhaps some police officers should consider joining in the volunteer process so that they could get vaccinated. Naturally the downside of this would be that if they were involved in the vaccination process then they would not be undertaking police duties.

The Chairman thanked Mr Brittain and Mr Baker for attending and answering questions and stated that if there were any further questions that committee members would like to ask, they could be submitted in writing.

RESOLVED that

- 1) The police update be noted.**
- 2) Inspector Baker would ascertain whether it was possible to provide a breakdown of the data relating to 'harassment' to Cllr Bance.**
- 3) The police would endeavour to provide data relating to 'crime hotspots' at future meetings.**
- 4) Going forward, the police would endeavour to provide data to the Committee regarding the number of new trainees from Black,**

Asian, or ethnic minorities that had successfully passed through the training programme.

- 5) At the next meeting, the police would endeavour to provide data relating to the recruitment and retention of new police officers.**

HOLDING THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER TO ACCOUNT

94 PUBLIC PROTECTION AND ENFORCEMENT PERFORMANCE OVERVIEW AND PORTFOLIO HOLDER UPDATE

The Senior Performance Officer attended the meeting to provide the update for the Public Protection and Enforcement Performance Overview. She stated that she would be talking through the indicators that had been flagged red.

The first red indicator noted was indicator 2A which was related to the awareness of events and training to groups. The second indicator noted was indicator 2C which related to test purchase operations. Both of these areas had been affected by Covid and Lockdown which had prevented the teams from hitting their targets.

A note was made that indicator 4E had also been affected, and this related to the issuing of licences for HMOs.

Attention was drawn to indicators 4G and 4H which were the new fly tipping performance indicators on the Portfolio Plan. 4G was the total number of open fly-tipping investigations—there were currently 32 cases under investigation. 4H detailed the number of actions undertaken where evidence was available. Fifty-Two cases had to be closed due to lack of evidence.

A Member asked if test purchases could still be undertaken if supermarkets were open. It was noted that a decision had been taken not to do this to safeguard young people from the Covid 19 virus.

A Member commented that HMO's were (in due course) going to fall under the remit of Article 4, he sought clarification concerning what progress had been made regarding this, and whether or not this could make enforcement with respect to HMOs easier. A Member (who was also the Chairman of the Development Control Committee) responded that this area of policy was a work in progress, but she was anticipating that a report concerning this matter would be presented to the Development Control Committee in March.

The Committee noted the Portfolio Holder update that had been submitted to the Committee in writing before the meeting.

The Portfolio Holder update showed that between October and December (and including up to 10th Jan 2021) officers checked 1,863 businesses in the borough. The vast majority of businesses in the borough had been compliant and were seeking to operate within the spirit of the guidelines.

Reference was made to the Approved Trader Scheme. It was noted that LBB had been party to a business agreement with Checkatrade.com, but this partnership was due to end in March 2021. Members were pleased to note that the Council had been in contact with Kent County Council Trading Standards who were delivering their own scheme and had invited LBB to join. Their offer was based on the 'Checkatrade' format and would include free business advice to Bromley members.

Members heard that there would be a one-off upfront cost to LBB which was for web development and content, design, back office set up and testing, but LBB would receive payment for every trader who joined and would break even once Membership got to 158. The Chairman enquired as to its cost. The Portfolio Holder did not wish to disclose the cost at the meeting, but she did provide an assurance that the cost did not have any significant budgetary implications, and in a short while it was expected that the scheme would break even.

Members noted the update from the Portfolio Holder with respect to the Violence Reduction Action Plan (VRAP). On the 6th January, Steve Bending, (Head of Policing & Commissioning from the Violence Reduction Unit at City Hall) had provided feedback on Bromley's VRAP to the Leader and Chief Executive. The summary feedback was:

"This is a commendably comprehensive action plan that demonstrates a strong partnership approach to reduce violence and vulnerability in Bromley. The borough developed an impressive plan last year and it is good to see how this has progressed further, with the inclusion of some innovative activity and a collective sense of leadership demonstrated throughout."

The Portfolio Holder provided an update with respect to VAWG (Violence Against Women and Girls). Bromley had been successful in a joint bid with Croydon, Sutton and the Met Police Service South Basic Command Unit, to bring the 'Drive' perpetrator programme to Bromley.

It was noted that this was MOPAC funded, and initially for 14 months, commencing in February 2021. There would be two launches; a strategic launch across the three boroughs and a local operational launch for Bromley, followed by a Task and Finish Group for the nominated Domestic Abuse Perpetrator Panel members. The Portfolio Holder would be attending the strategic launch on 12th February.

Members were briefed that the Portfolio Holder had approved revisions to HMO Licence fees, and a detailed breakdown of these was provided in the update document that had been disseminated previously.

The Portfolio Holder briefed the Committee that professional dog walkers and residents with multiple dogs now needed a £200 licence to exercise their dogs in a public space or risk a £100 Fixed Penalty Notice. The licences applied to anyone walking five or six dogs at any one time in a public space within the borough of Bromley, including parks. No more than six dogs could be walked

in a public place and a licence was not necessary for anyone walking less than five dogs.

The licence had to be displayed in a fluorescent armband and Public Liability Insurance (£1 million cover minimum) was required before issue. The new licence aimed to encourage responsible dog ownership and adherence to the code of conduct.

A Member asked who would be responsible for any enforcement action that would be required with respect to the multiple dog walker licence. It was noted that this would be undertaken by Ward Security.

RESOLVED that

- 1) The Public Protection Performance Overview report and the update from the Portfolio Holder be noted.**
- 2) Members be updated in due course concerning HMOs falling under the remit of Article 4 directions.**

**95 EXTENSION OF THE PUBLIC SPACE PROTECTION ORDERS
 CONCERNING ALCOHOL**

ES20066

The Head of Community Safety attended the meeting to present the report and to answer any questions.

The Committee noted that in accordance with the recommendations agreed in report ES20033 (presented to the General Purposes and Licensing Committee on the 30th September 2020), the Public Space Protection Orders for Alcohol were reviewed. The response to the associated consultation supported the extension and the PSPO for a further 3 years until January 2024.

The report was being presented as the controls had to be reviewed every three years, otherwise the Council would lose the right to implement them. The Head of Community Safety said that he was pleased with the number of people that had responded to the consultation, and that the controls had been extended to include psychoactive substances.

A Member enquired as to where the three current control zones were located. The Head of Community Safety informed the Committee that the three current control zones were located in the parks at Beckenham, Bromley and Penge. A Member asked if the new control zones would just be located in the parks and the Head of Community Safety responded that the new control zones would be extended to all open public areas which was the more modern approach and which had been adopted by other councils

A Member remarked that it seemed many people were not aware of the current alcohol control zones that existed in the parks, and would it not be an idea for this information to be more fully publicised. The Head of Community Safety acknowledged this point but said that he wanted to be careful not to give the impression that the Council was being a killjoy and that all consumption of alcohol in open spaces was prohibited, which was

not the case. People could still go out for a picnic and have a glass of wine for example.

A Member asked if enforcement could take place anyway under current powers. The Head of Community Safety answered that in these circumstances it would be a police or public order offence--it would have to be more of a breach where someone was drunk and disorderly and where intervention from the police was required.

The Chairman asked how breaches of the control zone would be dealt with, and it was noted that in the first instance this would be dealt with by a fixed penalty notice and not as a criminal activity.

It was **RESOLVED** that the Portfolio Holder for Public Protection and Enforcement approves the amendments and the extension of the PSPO for alcohol for an additional 3 years.

96 PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY OF REPORTS TO THE EXECUTIVE

a MODEL LONDON LETTINGS ENFORCEMENT POLICY

ES20062

This report was presented to the Committee by the Head of Service, Trading Standards & Commercial Regulation. He explained that enforcement guidelines now existed where local authorities may be required to take legal action against property agents who were not looking after their clients' money properly. The aim of the report was to avoid any legal deficiencies in the enforcement action process (if required) in the future. The final decision regarding the report would be made by the Executive.

It was felt that this was a complex area of law for which some expert legal advice may be required and LBB was fortunate to be able to engage with a London wide regional expert to support and test the systems, and also to assess compliance in the borough. The crux of the matter was that property agents were required to join a client protection group and should display signs in their offices to confirm such. If firms failed to join a client protection group then they could be fined as much as £30k. The purpose of the client protection group was to ensure that deposits paid by clients were properly protected. There was a smaller fine of £8k that the agents could be liable for if they failed to display the correct signage. It was also the case that there were certain practices that were prohibited under the new legislation and fees were required to be displayed.

The Chairman enquired who would carry out the relevant checks and if it was going to be complaint led. The Head of Service for Trading Standards and Regulation responded that in the initial stages it was likely that it would be complaint led, as the resources would not be there for a blanket enforcement. The policy applied to letting agents and property management firms. The Head of Service for Trading Standards and Regulation stated that he would check if the same regulations would apply to social housing providers and also to individual private landlords and report back.

The Chairman asked for a report to be presented to the Committee by way of an update later in the year.

It was clarified that the cost of any legal expertise initially would be provided by a London Fund—after that it should be the case that LBB would have gained sufficient expertise so that there would be no need going forward to draw upon external legal expertise. The Head of Service for Trading Standards and Regulation explained that there was a statutory obligation to undertake enforcement in this area, but the policy itself was not a statutory policy—the aim was to have the relevant guidelines in place and agreed by the Council so that if enforcement was required in the future, the Council would have an agreed policy/protocol that could be followed.

RESOLVED that

- 1) The Public Protection and Enforcement PDS Committee approve the Model London Lettings Enforcement Policy for adoption by the Executive on the 10th February 2021**
- 2) An update report on this matter be presented to the Committee later in the year**
- 3) The Head of Service would investigate to see if the same regulations were applicable to social housing providers and also individual private landlords.**

97 PLANNING ENFORCEMENT REPORT

ES 20065

The Head of Planning and Development Support Team attended the meeting to update the Committee regarding the Planning Enforcement report. He stated that since 1st April 2019, 1061 cases had been closed and that between 1st April 2020 and the time of the meeting, 428 cases had been closed. The oldest cases dated back to 2015—two of these cases had gone to Appeal, and one was in abeyance—in this case the Council was working with the resident to resolve an untidy site in West Wickham. Members were informed that the total number of cases that were outstanding was 764.

The Portfolio Holder had drafted a briefing to Cabinet concerning some of the issues that had been facing the planning enforcement section.

The Head of Planning and Development Support Team briefed the Committee that:

- There had been two new starters
- Two planning enforcement officers had Covid symptoms and had been self-isolating
- One officer had retired

- Certain types of work had been prevented by the lockdown restrictions
- The receipt of some planning applications had been delayed
- Some court cases had been delayed

The Head of Planning and Development Support Team reported that despite various difficulties, there had still been some successful prosecutions. There had recently been a successful prosecution at Knockholt Station South Side. A press release would be issued regarding this in due course, and this would involve one of the Committee members and the Portfolio Holder. Knockholt Station had been fined as they were found to be in breach of an enforcement notice.

The Chairman requested that in future, details regarding the number of investigations undertaken, closed and outstanding be reported in the main body of the report.

A Member asked if feedback was provided to the person who reported the cases. The Head of Planning and Development Support Team responded in the affirmative.

Members were informed that the planning enforcement section had no budget for direct action themselves, and that because of this, before enforcement action could be taken, permission had to be obtained from one of the Planning Sub-Committees.

It was noted that this report would be presented to the next meeting of the Development Control Committee.

A Member felt that it would be beneficial if the cases classified as 'general' could be broken down further so that Members had a better understanding of what these cases related to.

A discussion took place with respect to Magistrates' Court costs and what precisely constituted the 'third' reduction in the amount of the fine for a guilty plea.

A discussion took place as to what constituted an 'untidy' site. It was noted that the precise legal definition of an untidy site would be outlined in the Town and Country Planning Act, and there was a right of appeal to the Magistrates Court. No action could be taken regarding an untidy site if Probate proceedings were being undertaken.

The Head of Planning and Development Support Team requested that in any instances where someone wished to make a complaint regarding an untidy site, then photographs should be supplied if possible.

A discussion took place about the possible use of drones for Planning Enforcement.

RESOLVED that the report be noted and that in future, information concerning the number of planning investigations undertaken, closed and outstanding--be reported in the main body of the report.

**98 PUBLIC PROTECTION AND ENFORCEMENT PORTFOLIO
DRAFT BUDGET 2021/22**

The Head of Finance for ECS and Corporate Services attended the meeting to provide an update regarding the Public Protection and Enforcement Portfolio Draft Budget for 2021/22.

Members noted that the report incorporated future cost pressures, planned mitigation measures and savings from transformation and other budget options which were reported to Executive on 13th January 2021.

The Head of Finance for Environment and Corporate Services stated that the report was being presented to the Committee prior to the next meeting of the Executive, so that any comments or suggestions from the Committee could be noted by the Executive before recommendations were made regarding the level of Council Tax for the next financial year.

The Chairman asked if a record of extra costs incurred because of the Covid Pandemic was being kept. It was explained that the Executive received a separate report with respect to costs incurred because of Covid. This had been the practice since April 2019. A particular budgetary issue that related to the Public Protection Portfolio was its contribution into a pan London fund for temporary mortuary provision costs. The contribution from LBB was in the region of £1.4m. The estimated cost for LBB's own local mortuary provision was in the region of £250k. It was also noted that a shortfall in licensing income was projected.

The Chairman asked if there was a backlog of work because of the Pandemic, for example, were there any backlogs of work relating to HMOs or with food licensing. If there were any backlogs, were measures in place to deal with this, and would any new staff be required to deal with any such backlog. The Chairman was concerned that any areas of work that were part of the Council's statutory obligations had a contingency plan in place so that the work could be completed.

The Assistant Director for Public Protection and Enforcement clarified that although there were backlogs—this was something that was being experienced by all councils. As far as food inspections were concerned, the Food Standards Agency understood the impact that Covid had made in affecting targets and these had been modified accordingly. As far as HMO licensing was concerned, the process that was usually carried out by the Council was to inspect premises first, and then grant a licence. However, legislation permitted the granting of a licence as long as the premises was inspected in the first five years, and this was the process that the department was going to adopt for the foreseeable future. The Assistant Director assured

Members that it was likely that most of the backlog of work would be able to be undertaken using overtime rather than having to appoint new staff.

The Committee was pleased to note that all statutory responsibilities were being covered.

A Member referred to an item on Appendix 1 where there was a reference to increased costs without an explanation of what the costs related to. He asked for an explanation of what these costs were, as the text referred to costs increasing by £45k. It was clarified that this referred to an allowance for inflation with respect to both pay and running costs. The Member asked what had happened to the money that had been allocated for Covid Marshals and how long this funding was going to be provided for. The Head of Finance answered that a response was being drafted to the Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government to show how this funding had been utilised, and it was confirmed that the funding would expire at the end of the current financial year.

The Portfolio Holder stated that the money for Covid Marshals would be run through the Environmental Services Division, and not as part of the Public Protection Portfolio.

A Member asked if food safety inspections were taking place with respect to those businesses that were now serving take-away food. She also asked for clarification regarding the current strength of the Food Safety Team, and as there seemed to be a national shortage of food safety officers, would the section consider developing their own officers in house. The Assistant Director for Public Protection and Enforcement replied that the Food Safety Team had endeavoured to carry out some physical inspections initially but were soon instructed by the Food Standards Agency to stop doing this because of the Covid Pandemic. Some remote inspections had been undertaken. The Assistant Director for Public Protection and Enforcement promised to check on the current level of staffing within the Food Safety Team and report back to Members. Members were informed that consideration was being applied to developing strength within the Food Safety Team by training apprentices.

A Member expressed the view that consideration should be applied in the overall Council budget to allocating some resource to help to engage with dis-engaged young people from ethnic minorities to try and reduce levels of serious violence and knife crime.

RESOLVED that

- 1) The financial forecast from 2021/22 to 2024/25 be noted.**
- 2) The initial draft 2021/22 budget be agreed as the basis for setting the 2021/22 budget.**

- 3) The Assistant Director for Public Protection and Enforcement would report back to the Committee concerning the current strength of the Food Safety Team.**

99 COMMUNITY IMPACT DAYS UPDATE

The Community Impact Day Co-ordinator attended to present the Community Impact Days Update Briefing.

The Chairman reiterated what an important service the Community Impact Days provided.

A Member stated that she felt that LBB were still not doing enough to tackle the serious violent crime that was happening in certain wards. She expressed the view that the problem centred around young people who felt disengaged, and that the crime statistics seemed to indicate that many of these were from ethnic minorities. There had been another very serious stabbing the previous week in Crystal Palace. She said that in her ward the Somali community were not engaging and this was because not enough had been done across the board to develop engagement with them.

The Chairman sympathised with the views of the Member and said that this was a subject which would need a significant amount of research and work. The Chairman expressed the view that this would likely be a wide-reaching policy matter that would need to be considered first by the Portfolio Holder and then the Executive.

There was a consensus that the Community Impact days were working well, and once again the importance of the various agencies receiving intelligence to act upon was highlighted.

A Member stated that it was important to use the MOPAC money for these impact days in a focused way, targeting those areas where intervention was most required.

The Chairman thanked the officer for her excellent work.

RESOLVED that the update regarding Community Impact Days be noted.

100 ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC PROTECTION RISK REGISTER

ES20058

There were no red risks concerning the Portfolio that were required to be scrutinised.

RESOLVED that the Public Protection Risk Register be noted.

101 WORK PROGRAMME

CSD 21008

Members noted the Work Programme for the Public Protection and Enforcement PDS Committee.

It was noted that the meeting scheduled for March would be a full one. This was because updates were going to be provided on Business Continuity and Resilience, together with end of year updates from SLAM and Bromley Youth Council. There would also be a MOPAC update report and another report with respect to the Covid Pandemic.

RESOLVED that the Work Programme be noted.

The meeting ended at 8.00 pm

This page is left intentionally blank