



Report No  
ES20137

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

---

**Decision Maker:** PUBLIC PROTECTION AND ENFORCEMENT POLICY  
DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

**Date:** Wednesday 10 November 2021

**Decision Type:** Non-Urgent Executive Non-Key

**Title:** THE DRAFT PROTOCOL FOR SCRUTINY OF THE SAFER  
BROMLEY PARTNERSHIP

**Contact Officer:** Joanne Stowell, Assistant Director of Public Protection  
Tel: 020 8313 4332 E-mail: Joanne.Stowell@bromley.gov.uk

**Chief Officer:** Director of Environment and Public Protection

**Ward:** (All Wards);

---

1. Reason for report

- 1.1 Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRPs) were created by the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 to develop and implement strategies to reduce crime and disorder. These partnerships are now generally known as Community Safety Partnerships (CSP); within Bromley, the partnership is known as the Safer Bromley Partnership (SBP). The Safer Bromley Partnership Board (SBPB) provides the governance and the Safer Bromley Partnership Strategy (SBPS) is the strategic framework document that links the partners' aims and outcomes.
- 1.2 Section 19, 20 and 21 of the Police and Justice Act 2006 (the Act) requires every local authority to have a crime and disorder committee (CDC) with the power to review or scrutinise the work of CSPs. In Bromley, the Public Protection and Enforcement Policy Development & Scrutiny Committee (PP&E PDS) has been designated as the CDC for this purpose.
- 1.3 The purpose of this report is to present an agreed protocol to determine how the PP&E PDS will formally scrutinise the SBP and its partners, in accordance with set guidance for scrutiny, and with a view to facilitating good working relationships throughout, and via the scrutiny process

## 2. RECOMMENDATION(S)

**That the Chairman of the PP&E PDS Committee in his role as the Chairman of the relevant Crime and Disorder Committee:**

- 2.1 Agrees the draft protocol attached as Appendix B, the associated workplan and the Police data package (Appendices 1 and 2 within Appendix B).
- 2.2 Agrees that delegated authority be given to the joint Chairmen of the Safer Bromley Partnership Board, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Public Protection and Enforcement, to make minor amendments to the protocol if required.

### Impact on Vulnerable Adults and Children

1. Summary of Impact: There is a statutory requirement for the council to ensure that its overview and scrutiny structures include the ability to scrutinise the work of the SBP and the associated SBP strategy. The 4 priorities within the strategy cover both high-harm crimes and high-volume crimes. A focus on safeguarding and collegiate working is embedded throughout, to protect vulnerable adults and children and to ensure that partner organisations work together, to share the skills, data, powers and resources collectively available to them to maximise beneficial outcomes.
- 

### Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Not Applicable:
  2. BBB Priority: Children and Young People Excellent Council Quality Environment Safe Bromley
  1. Cost of proposal: Estimated Cost No Cost Not Applicable: Further Details
  2. Ongoing costs: Not Applicable:
  3. Budget head/performance centre: Not Applicable
  4. Total current budget for this head: Not Applicable
  5. Source of funding: Not Applicable
- 

### Personnel

1. Number of staff (current and additional): Not Applicable
  2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: Not Applicable
- 

### Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Statutory Requirement Non-Statutory - Government Guidance:
  2. Call-in: Not Applicable:
- 

### Procurement

1. Summary of Procurement Implications: Not Applicable

---

## Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): Borough Wide
- 

## Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Not Applicable
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: Not Applicable

### **3. COMMENTARY**

#### **THE PP&E PDS SCRUTINY ROLES AS A CDC**

- 3.1 Every local authority must have a CDC with the power to review and scrutinise the decisions or actions taken by the SBP. This is to facilitate the discharge, by the responsible authorities, of their crime and disorder functions, however, the CDC does not have decision making powers. The PP&E PDS (in addition to its other responsibilities), is the Council's CDC designated to scrutinise the SBP, and review delivery against the agreed priorities of the Safer Bromley Partnership Strategy (SBPS).
- 3.2 The role of the CDC is to:
  - Meet annually as a minimum (statutory)
  - Act as a critical friend, providing constructive challenge at a strategic level, rather than adversarial fault-finding at an operational/tactical level
  - Focus on the entire partnership, (if issues arise that relate specifically to a particular partner agency, it is more appropriate to refer such issues to the governing body/s of that organisation)
  - Scrutinise partners only "in so far as their activities relate to the partnership itself". For the avoidance of doubt, the CDC should not extend to the separate statutory functions of the partner bodies, nor should it entail scrutiny of individual cases
  - When necessary, to make reports and/or recommendations to the Council, with respect to the SBPs discharge of its crime and disorder functions
  - Consider the Councillor Call for Actions (CCfAs), that arise through the Council's CCfAs process that relate to crime and disorder matters.
- 3.3 Guidance suggests that a protocol be developed to lay down the mutual expectations of partners and scrutiny members, to help make sure that scrutiny is both constructive and effective; currently there is no agreed protocol in place.
- 3.4 Currently, the PP&E PDS exercises its function as the CDC at every committee; Police leadership representatives from the South Borough Command Unit (BCU) attend each committee (5 times a year). In addition to this, they also attend the quarterly SBPB, and various strategic and operational Youth Offending Services (YOS) Board meetings. At each PP&E PDS the Police present a report on crime data; the format and content of this data package has flexed over time, and currently does not fully reflect the required strategic data for consideration by the committee. On occasion, the requests for crime data exceed that which the committee can legitimately scrutinise. In addition, the analysts previously available to the Police locally have again, been moved back to the centre. As a result, the extended data packages are currently provided by operational police personnel. As the data sets can exceed what is required and readily available, the preparation of the data is time consuming and results in operational resources being diverted away from their primary purpose. In comparison, the BCU is scrutinised by Croydon and Sutton once a year, and both boroughs employ their own analysts.

## **TASK AND FINISH GROUP**

- 3.5 On the 21st September 21 the PP&E PDS Chairman required that a cross party Task and Finish group be convened, to be chaired by the Vice Chairman Cllr Colin Hutchins. The aims of the group were to:
- Produce a draft protocol, for approval, that sets out how the SBP will be scrutinised
  - Produce a suggested workplan that invites statutory partners to present their work for scrutiny throughout the year
  - Agree a 'fit for purpose' data package, that replicates the performance report that MOPAC presents for monitoring progress against the Police and Crime Plan, and that reduces the use of Police resources.
- 3.6 In discussion, the members of the Task and Finish Group recognised that the golden thread between the SBPB, the SBPS, the Safer Neighbourhood Boards (SNB) and Ward Panels was not always clearly understood. This has led to operational ward issues being discussed at the PP&E PDS committee, whereas the appropriate forum would have been the SNB. As a result, Appendix A has been produced to provide context as to the links and differences between the SBPB (and the associated strategy) and the SNB. An education piece will be developed and delivered to Members by March 2022 by the Chairman of the SNB, with periodic refreshers provided moving forwards.

## **DRAFT PROTOCOL**

- 3.7 Following consideration of the formal scrutiny role of the PP&E PDS in relation to the SBP, the Task and Finish group agreed upon the draft protocol presented as Appendix B, together with a commitment to develop a workplan to scrutinise partners as a whole (Appendix 1 within Appendix B), and a police data package (Appendix 2 within Appendix B). This draft protocol sets out the arrangements sought to formalise and strengthen the scrutiny process. The draft protocol presents the following:
- The scrutiny arrangements
  - The work programme
  - Attendance from partners
  - The South BCU data package

## **DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRPSED AND CURRENT ARRANGEMENTS**

- 3.8 Should the draft protocol be approved, the CDC would still effectively convene 5 times a year at each committee, however, the future scrutiny arrangements will differ from those currently in place in the following ways:
- A workplan will be developed for partners, that seeks to scrutinise the whole partnership (see Appendix 1 within Appendix B)
  - A fit for purpose data package commensurate with the MOPAC High Harm London Wide Priorities (HHLWP), and High-Volume Local Priorities (HVLP), will be produced as a stand-alone document at each committee (see Appendix 2 within Appendix B)
  - The Police will reduce their attendance to the beginning/end of the year, where they will report on their aims and objectives, achievements and performance, and progress on identified areas for improvement.

3.9 Notwithstanding the above, and although not a formal requirement of the scrutiny process, the PP&E PDS will continue to receive the draft minutes from each SBPB, as well as an end of year report, all of which will contain Police crime data along with partner actions, updates and outcomes.

#### **4. IMPACT ON VULNERABLE ADULTS AND CHILDREN**

4.1 Summary of Impact: There is a statutory requirement for the council to ensure that its overview and scrutiny structures include the ability to scrutinise the work of the Safer Bromley Partnership and the associated SBP strategy. The 4 priorities within the strategy cover both high-harm crimes and high-volume crimes. A focus on safeguarding and collegiate working is embedded throughout, to protect vulnerable adults and children and to ensure that partner organisations work together, to share the skills, data, powers and resources collectively available to maximise beneficial outcomes.

#### **5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

5.1 Section 19, 20 and 21 of the Police and Justice Act 2006 (the Act) requires every local authority to have a Crime and Disorder Committee (CDC) with the power to review and scrutinise the work of CSPs. In Bromley, the Public Protection and Enforcement PDS Scrutiny Committee has been designated as the CDC for this purpose.

5.2 Good practice requires a Protocol for the discharge of the Committee's functions, which in turn clarifies which information is required to be shared, all of which must be compliant with the Data Protection Act 2018 and any data Sharing Protocols.

<b>Non-Applicable Sections:</b>	Policy Implications, Financial Implications, Personnel Implications, Procurement Implications
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	

## **Appendix A – The Links and Differences**

### **1. COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIPS**

1.1 Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRPs) were created by the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 to develop and implement strategies to reduce crime and disorder. These partnerships are now generally known as Community Safety Partnerships (CSP), in Bromley this partnership is known as the Safer Bromley Partnership (SBP).

1.2 This partnership exists to ensure that a number of prescribed ‘responsible authorities’ work together to jointly agree and deliver community safety priorities as agreed by MOPAC. The responsible authorities are:

- 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 Community Safety Partnership.

### **2. THE COUNCIL’S COMMUNITY SAFETY PRIORITIES**

2.1 The work of CSPs in London is determined by MOPAC, via the Police and Crime Plan, and the responsible authorities must have regard to the objectives set out in that plan. The plan contains high harm crime London wide priorities (HHLWP) priorities and high-volume local crime priorities (HVLP).

2.2 All Local Authorities are required to have Anti-social Behaviour (ASB) as a HVLP, the other high volume crime types within this category are as follows:

- Non-domestic abuse violence with injury (NDAVWI)
- Total robbery
- Total burglary
- Total theft person
- Theft taking of a Motor Vehicle (MV)
- Theft taking from a MV

2.3 Of the above, each Local Authority chooses 2 to 4 HVLP as suggested by MOPAC and Met Police data. For Bromley the 4 priorities are:

1. NDAWI
2. Total Burglary
3. Taking of MV (as a locally agreed priority rated as important by the public) and
4. ASB (mandatory)

2.4 In addition to HVLP, there are 3 HHLWP applied to all London Boroughs, these are:

1. Reducing Violence Against Women and Girls
2. Keeping Young People Safe, and
3. Standing Together Against Hate and Extremism

2.5 These MOPAC priorities are reflected within the BCU work streams and direct the work direction of the SBP as a whole. MOPAC does not set specific targets for the above priorities, the only requirements in place are that:

1. Crime is reduced
2. Public perception of the service is good (community confidence)

## **THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE SBP**

3. The SBP as a CDRP is required to do the following:

1. Prepare a local plan and strategy, laying out the approach for addressing those local priorities at a borough level (Safer Bromley Partnership Strategy (SBPS));
2. Produce an annual crime needs strategic assessment
3. Share information among the responsible authorities within the CDRP
4. Track progress against the agreed strategy and plan

3.1 There is no requirement to produce an annual report for scrutiny, however, the SBPB produces an end of year update that effectively demonstrates progress against the strategic aims and plan objectives.

## **4. THE SAFER BROMLEY PARTNERSHIP STRATEGY (SBPS)**

4.1 The SBPS has 4 priorities which are matched to the HHLWP and HVLP within the Police and Crime Plan. These are listed in paragraphs 2.3 and 2.4 above.

## **5. SAFER NEIGHBOURHOOD BOARDS (SNB) AND WARD PANELS**

5.1 SNBs are in place in every London Borough, bringing police and communities together to decide local policing and crime priorities, solve problems collaboratively and make sure that the public are involved in a wide range of community safety decisions.

5.2 MOPAC made £1m available, for Safer Neighbourhood Boards to bid to fund projects that will help cut neighbourhood crimes and boost public confidence. SNBs have driven forward 200 crime reduction projects across the city using this funding.

5.3 The SNB is the primary mechanism for local borough and ward engagement, and as such has 7 specific functions:

1. Establish policing priorities in the borough
2. Monitor crime performance and community confidence
3. Monitor complaints against officers
4. Hear and monitor complaints from victims of crime
5. Provide assurance that a system of independent custody visiting is delivered,
6. Play a significant role in community payback, and
7. Ensure all wards have a panel

5.4 At the SNB the data presented is at borough level to enable strategic priorities to be considered. At the Chair's meeting and panel meetings the data presented is at ward level. At Board level the information and data are currently used to agree funding for relevant projects, however, the SNB structure is under review and the focus is moving to the new engagement panels and to stop and search.

5.5 Ward Panels create a mechanism for local consultation and ensure that the work of each Safer Neighbourhood Team (SNT) maintains focus on resolving local problems by involving local people in the process of prioritising the concerns of the community. Communities also can benefit from an increased understanding of Policing issues within the ward, which should encourage public support and confidence in their local police.

## **6. THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE SBPB AND THE SNB**

6.1 The SBPB is concerned with Community Safety in the broadest sense, whereby it is understood to mean people going about their daily lives in safety. Tackling crime is only one element, as improving Community Safety in its broadest sense is about local partners working together to keep everyone safer. This includes crime prevention; early intervention; enforcement; reducing reoffending; and tackling key drivers of crime such as alcohol/drug misuse and social exclusion. All of these elements are on an equal footing, and the partnership is not crime centric, whereas the SNB is. Moreover, the SBP works strategically, at borough level, whereas the SNB works operationally/tactically at area and ward level.

6.2 The SBPB receives and considers data at a borough level from all statutory partners, whereas the SNB specifically monitors crime performance and community confidence at a local level. Notwithstanding the above, when measuring performance, the SBPB utilises the same data as MOPAC, and as such presents data in a similar way to MOPAC to enable effective comparisons when monitoring progress.



## **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

- The data package below presents monitoring progress against the Police and Crime Plan, whereby the Police have 2 targets:
  - To reduce crime against set high harm and high-volume priorities as set by MOPAC, and
  - Improve satisfaction and perceptions around police performance.
- 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)
- 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.
- 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
MOPAC High Harm London Wide Priorities	Domestic Abuse	3050	2617	-433	-14%	●
	Total Sexual Offences	511	527	16	3%	●
	Knife Crime Offences	264	169	-95	-36%	●
	Gun Crime Offences	56	29	-27	-48%	●
	Race Hate Crime offences	500	582	82	16%	●
	Bromley High Volume Local Priorities	Non -Domestic Abuse with Injury	1368	1327	-41	-3%
Total Burglary Offences		1992	1473	-519	-26%	●
Theft of MV		962	987	25	3%	●
Miscellaneous Data	Total Notifiable Offences	22877	21752	-1125	-5%	●
	ASB Calls	11851	9576	-2275	-19%	●
	Totals	43431	39039	-4392	-10%	●
	Satisfaction and Perception Data					
Feels well informed about Local police Activities over last 12 months	54%	51%		-3%	●	
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%	●	