

## **Appendix B – Draft Scrutiny Protocol Between the Public Protection & Enforcement Policy Development & Scrutiny Committee (PP&EPDS) and the Safer Bromley Partnership (SBP)**

### **1. Introduction & Purpose of Protocol**

- 1.1 Provisions in the Police and Justice Act 2006 (the Act) introduced Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRPs), however, since 1st March 2010 the Home Office use the term Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) in lieu of CDRPs. In Bromley, the Safer Bromley Partnership (SBP) is the borough's CSP.
- 1.2 Section 19, 20 and 21 of the Act extend the remit of local authorities to scrutinise crime and disorder functions. As a result, the Council is required to designate a Scrutiny Board to act as the Council's 'Crime and Disorder Committee' (CDC). The PP&E PDS has been assigned to fulfil this role.
- 1.3 The SBP has a Board (the Safer Bromley Partnership Board (SBPB)) that meets quarterly. Membership comprises a number of responsible authorities, these being:
- The Local Authority
  - The South Borough Command Unit (BCU)
  - The London Fire Brigade (LFB)
  - The London Ambulance Service (LAS)
  - The Clinical Care Group (CCG)
  - The London Probation Service (LPS)

Other partners can also sit on the SBP however, the above core membership is the same for every partnership.

- 1.3 The purpose of this protocol is to provide guidance and a common understanding on how scrutiny of crime and disorder operates within Bromley. This protocol has been shaped by associated Regulations, Guidance and good working practice. The protocol may be revised by agreement between the joint Chairmen of the SBPB and the Portfolio Holder for Public Protection & Enforcement, in order to continually improve the scrutiny process, however, the core aim is to ensure that Scrutiny remains a positive and challenging process.

### **2. Principles**

- 2.1 Community safety is understood to mean people going about their daily lives in safety. Improving community safety is about tackling crime and disorder, but more widely about local partners working together, with local communities, to keep everyone safer. This includes: crime prevention; early intervention; enforcement; reducing reoffending; and tackling key drivers of crime such as alcohol/drug dependency and misuse, and social exclusion.
- 2.2 In its capacity as a CDC, the PP&E PDS Committee has powers to review and scrutinise decisions made and actions taken, in connection with the discharge by the 'responsible authorities', of their crime and disorder functions, however, it does not have decision making powers.

- 2.3 The role of scrutiny is to act as a critical friend to the SBP providing constructive challenge at a strategic level to the work of SBPB, and there are opportunities for:
- Enhanced dialogue with the partnership
  - Enhanced democratic accountability in respect of the community safety initiatives delivered in partnership
  - Reviewing delivery against the agreed priorities within the Safer Bromley Partnership Strategy (SBPS)
- 2.4 By making recommendations for improvement, the scrutiny contributes to achieving the shared aim of improving community safety in Bromley and may assist in areas such as:
- The integration of community safety with other strategies
  - Policy development
  - Overseeing and reviewing the delivery of joint responses on community safety issues
  - Creating a clearer link between partner agencies and the public on community safety
  - Understanding and increasing community confidence e.g. fear of crime or confidence in policing
- 2.5 Scrutiny is most likely to be successful and lead to outcomes that have a positive impact for local communities, if all parties to the community safety scrutiny process work co-operatively from the basis provided by this protocol, and by treating one another (and any occasional participants) with respect and courtesy. This co-operation involves a willingness to share knowledge, information, data and views, and to develop a shared mutual understanding of community safety in Bromley, as well as to carry out such duties as can reasonably be expected.

### **3. Scrutiny Arrangements**

- 3.1 The PP&E PDS committee has a statutory duty to meet in its capacity as the crime and disorder scrutiny at least once a year, however in practice, scrutiny in this area will take place each time the committee convenes (currently 5 times a year) to:
- Scrutinise the work of the SBP as a whole, insofar as their activities relate to the SBP itself, by acting as a 'critical friend'. For the avoidance of doubt, scrutiny will not extend to the separate statutory functions of the partner bodies, nor will it entail scrutiny of individual cases, and if issues arise that relate specifically to a particular partner agency, such issues should be referred to the governing body/s of the relevant organisation
  - Review or scrutinise progress against the priorities within the SBPS
  - Review or scrutinise referred crime and disorder Councillor Calls for Action (CCFA)
  - Make reports or recommendations to a responsible authority or to a co-operating person or body as appropriate, in so far as they relate to the work of the partnership itself
  - Devise an annual work plan programme at the beginning of each financial year
- 3.2 The Committee will exclude any matters (save those raised via a CCFA) which pertain to local policing and crime priorities, including local data monitoring, as these will be referred to the Safer Neighbourhood Board and Ward Panels, as the primary borough-level mechanism for local engagement and consideration.

3.3 In its capacity as the CDC, the PP&E PDS remains subject to the requirements of the Council's Constitution including the Members' Code of Conduct.

#### **4. The Work Programme**

4.1 The PP&E PDS will undertake work programme planning at the beginning of each financial year. In doing so, Members are encouraged to prioritise for inclusion matters which relate to an identified priority within the SBPS. An example workplan is presented in Appendix 1.

4.2 They are also encouraged to consider the purpose and value of the proposed scrutiny activity, its timing, and whether there is the capacity and resources to undertake it.

4.3 The PP&E PDS as CDC will advise the SBPB in advance of any scrutiny review relating to a crime and disorder issue that they are intending to undertake, as part of its annual work programme, and will have regard to:

- The fit with other review processes such as the work of the South BCU/LFB/LAS/PCT and LPS in holding the respective partners/chief officers to account
- Regulatory and audit activity, and
- Any other ongoing scrutiny undertaken by other scrutiny boards – in particular, information will be sought from the relevant scrutiny boards that cover partner work and be shared with the PP&E PDS in their role as CDC, in order to avoid inappropriate duplication of scrutiny work.

#### **5. Attendance at the PP&E PDS CDC**

5.1 The CDC may require the attendance of an officer of a responsible authority or of a co-operating body to answer questions. Where reasonable notice of the intended date is given, the responsible authority or co-operating body will be obliged to attend. The responsible authority or co-operating body should ensure that officers attending the scrutiny meetings have the seniority and knowledge to answer the board's questions and that they are given appropriate support by their line managers and/or Chief Officers.

5.2 The PP&E PDS as CDC will give at least 4 weeks notice to responsible/cooperating authorities requesting their attendance at a scrutiny and overview meeting. Attendance requests will clearly outline the scope of the scrutiny exercise.

#### **6. Co-opted Members**

6.1 The Home Office guidance for the Scrutiny of Crime and Disorder Matters makes specific reference to the role of police authorities and emphasises the importance of ensuring that community safety scrutiny complement this role. On the occasions that policing items are being discussed, the South BCU will be invited to attend as a co-opted member for those specific items.

## **7. The South BCU Data Package**

7.1 The data shall be presented in such a way that monitoring progress against the Police and Crime Plan can be tracked on a rolling 12-month basis. The data shall juxtapose high volume and high harm priorities against the associated crime categories and compare crime volumes over time, with an associated % change from the previous rolling 12-month period. It will also present data on the perceptions of policing in the same format (see example Appendix 2).

## **8. Making and Responding to Recommendations**

8.1 At the conclusion of any study of a scrutiny item, and on the occasions where the CDC have produced a draft report, the CDC will consult the SBPB on the draft and associated recommendations before the report is published.

8.2 Final reports and recommendations will be sent to the relevant responsible/cooperating authorities affected by the report or recommendations, plus other relevant individuals or organisations that contributed to the study.

8.3 Where a relevant authority or co-operating persons or body has been notified, it must:

- Consider the report and recommendations
- Respond in writing to the CDC within 28 days of the date of the report or recommendations, indicating what (if any) action it proposes to take, and
- Have regard to the report or recommendations in exercising its functions.

## Appendix 1 – An Example Work Programme

Committee Date	Partner	Substantive SBPS Priority	Scrutiny
March 22	Police Community Safety	All Priorities	To present aims for coming year and report on progress from previous year
June 22	Community Safety LFB LAS	Priority One Safer Neighbourhoods	To present work carried out to support priority one
Sept 22	Early Intervention & Family Support Licensing	Priority Two Reducing Violence Against Women and Girls	To present work carried out to support priority Two
Nov 22	Education, Care & Health Services Probation CCG	Priority Three Keeping Young People Safe	To present work carried out to support priority Three
Feb 23	BCU Hate Crime Community Safety	Priority Four Standing Together Against Hate Crime & Extremism	To present work carried out to support priority Four and end of year update from all partners

## Appendix 2 Example Police Data Package

1. The data package below presents monitoring progress against the Police and Crime Plan, whereby the Police have 2 targets:
  1. To reduce crime against set high harm and high-volume priorities as set by MOPAC, and
  2. Improve satisfaction and perceptions around police performance.
2. The data is split into the following categories:
  - High Harm London Wide Priorities (HHLWP yellow cells)
  - Bromley High Volume Local Priorities (HVLP green cells)
  - Local Priority (peach cell)
  - Miscellaneous data including ASB (HVLP) and Total Notifiable Offences (grey cells)
  - Perceptions on policing (blue cells)
3. The HHLWP and HVLP are placed against the MOPAC associated crime categories, and volumes over a 12-month rolling period, the change in volume, and the % change from the previous period are compared and presented. The same is applied to the Police satisfaction and perceptions data.
4. An example package is presented below, and this data is consistent with MOPAC requirements for scrutiny.

REPORTING PERIOD Oct 20 to Sept 21						
	Rolling 12 Months	2020	2021	Difference	% Difference	RAG
			3050	2617	-433	
MOPAC High Harm London Wide Priorities	Domestic Abuse	511	527	16	-14%	●
	Total Sexual Offences	264	169	-95	3%	●
	Knife Crime Offences	56	29	-27	-36%	●
	Gun Crime Offences	500	582	82	-48%	●
	Race Hate Crime offences	1368	1327	-41	16%	●
	Non-Domestic Abuse with Injury	1992	1473	-519	-3%	●
Bromley High Volume Local Priorities	Total Burglary Offences	962	987	25	-26%	●
	Theft of MV				3%	●
Miscellaneous Data	Total Notifiable Offences	22877	21752	-1125	-5%	●
	ASB Calls	11851	9576	-2275	-19%	●
	Totals	43431	39039	-4392	-10%	●
	Feels well informed about Local police Activities over last 12 months	54%	51%		-3%	●
Satisfaction and Perception Data	Agrees Police listen to concerns	73%	71%		-2%	●
	Agree Police can be relied upon to be there when needed	72%	64%		-8%	●
	Agree Police treat all fairly	84%	71%		-13%	●
	Agree Police deal with things that matter to this community	69%	67%		-2%	●
	Knows how to contact Ward Officer	22%	28%		6%	●
	Police do a good job in local area	66%	62%		-4%	●