

## **PUBLIC PROTECTION AND ENFORCEMENT POLICY DEVELOPMENT & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.00 pm on 1 February 2022

### **Present:**

Councillor Colin Hitchins (Vice Chair in the Chair)

Councillors Julian Benington, Kim Botting FRSA, Mike Botting, Hannah Gray, Alexa Michael, Chris Pierce and Ryan Thomson

Sharon Baldwin (Safer Neighbourhood Board Chairman)

### **Also Present:**

Councillor Angela Page (Portfolio Holder for Public Protection and Enforcement)

Fiona Baker (Met Counter Terrorism Security Advisor)

## **STANDARD ITEMS**

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

Apologies were received from Cllr Kathy Bance and Cllr Ryan Thompson attended as alternate.

Apologies were received from Cllr David Cartwright and Councillor Keith Onslow attended as substitute.

Apologies were received from Alf Kennedy.

Post meeting apologies were received from Jacob Evers.

### **43 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

### **44 MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC PROTECTION AND ENFORCEMENT PDS COMMITTEE HELD ON 10th NOVEMBER 2021**

The Committee considered the minutes of the meeting of Public Protection and Enforcement PDS Committee held on 10<sup>th</sup> November 2021.

**RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 10<sup>th</sup> November 2021 be agreed and signed as a correct record.**

#### **45 QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC AND FROM COUNCILLORS**

One written question from the public was received. The response had been disseminated to Members and to the questioner.

#### **46 PROTECT DUTY-BROMLEY**

Fiona Baker (Met Counter Terrorism Security Advisor) attended and updated the Committee on the new Protect Duty for Bromley.

The Home Office had been consulting on how legislation could be used to enhance the protection of Publicly Accessible Locations (PALS) across the UK from terrorist attacks and to ensure widespread organisational preparedness. There had been 2700 responses to the consultation. At the moment what the Committee was being briefed on was 'proposals'—a Bill was not yet being considered by Parliament. The aim of the briefing was therefore pre-emptive. The consultation had come about as a result of terrorist attacks in the UK and also as a result of the diligent work of Figen Murray. Figen Murray was the mother of Martyn Hett, who at 29 years of age was tragically killed in the terrorist attack at the Manchester Arena in May 2017. She championed 'Martyn's Law'.

The consultation looked at the following areas:

1. Who (or where) should the legislation apply to?
2. What should the requirements be?
3. How should compliance work?
4. How should the Government best support and work with partners?

In terms of who or where the legislation should apply to the following was noted:

- 1) Public venue owners and operators with a capacity of 100 persons or more.
- 2) Large organisations with 250 staff or more who operate within PALS.
- 1) Consideration of responsibilities at Public Spaces

A 'Publicly Accessible Location' (PALS) was defined as any place to which the public or any section of the public had access, on payment or otherwise, as of right or by virtue of express or implied permission. It was noted that these areas could be parks, high streets, hospitals, public transport, beaches, festivals and sporting locations.

Those organisations and businesses affected by the proposed legislation would need to consider terrorist threats and methodologies and assess the potential impact of these to the general public and to their staff. They would also need to consider and take forward reasonably practicable and proportionate protective security and organisational preparedness measures.

In terms of compliance to the legislation, it was not clear at this stage if this would come via the Home Office or self-regulation. It was anticipated that financial sanctions would be imposed for repeated non-compliance.

The Government would provide support and guidance in various ways; one of these would be via an online platform called 'Protect UK' where amongst other things there would be help with undertaking risk assessments. There was also the option to get advice from private sector sources and also via Counter Terrorism Advisors like Ms Baker.

In January of 2022, the consultation process ended and Homeland Security would look at the results of the consultation as they prepared to draw up legislation to put forward to Parliament in a Bill. It was originally anticipated that this work would be completed by July 2022, but it would probably be delayed because of the effects of Covid.

Ms Baker summarised the benefits of the Protect Duty as follows:

- Public Safety & Security
- Site Preparedness
- Accountability
- Enhancing Public Confidence
- Enterprise Value - reducing economic loss to organisations/GDP
- Empower more staff confidence.

Ms Baker highlighted the economic damage caused by terrorism.

A discussion took place regarding the type of targets and locations that terrorists may or may not be more likely to attack and whether or not an enclosed space would be more attractive as a target than an outdoor open space and whether or not multi-level plans may be required for each venue depending on the threat level.

A Member expressed concern regarding the possible cost to organisers in terms of getting staff retrained. She wondered if organisers would get any financial help for this. Ms Baker responded and said that sites would be able to access free training either in person or online from a variety of sources. Organisers would need to be prepared and part of this would be the ability to implement search regimes as required.

A Member expressed concern at the possible creation of a new private industry sector.

Ms Baker said that she would share a document with Members that would outline where the various sources of training could be accessed.

A Member commented on the economic effects suffered by businesses as a result of the London Bridge attack. He recommended that businesses should take out terrorism insurance which in fact had been available for quite some time. He suggested that it would be a good idea if we had a national terrorist insurance base which would help companies operating on tight financial margins and which could be made compulsory. Reference was made to Pool Re who provided terrorism insurance.

Ms Baker said that she was able to share a link with Members that offered terrorism related guidance that was relevant for Councillors.

The SNB (Safer Neighbourhood Board) Chairman said that most businesses would welcome the legislation and that many businesses had already been working on these matters. The Glades and Biggin Hill already had work going on. There was much training on line and in person that was available. She asked about areas in the public/private domain where there was a geographic crossover with no one person having a specific responsibility for the whole of that area. She wondered how this was going to be managed and implemented from the Council's perspective.

Ms Baker responded and said that this was a problem that had been acknowledged in the consultation. However, wherever there was a space, someone would be responsible for that space.

A Member asked if organisations could be liable to be sued or subject to legal action if they had not undertaken the correct preventative measures. This was something that had not yet been finalised.

A Member reflected on who would undertake the associated enforcement and expressed the view that it could not be the police.

The Chairman requested that the Emergency Planning Team look into what places or spaces the Council would need to take responsibility for under the new Protect Duty.

The Chairman expressed his thanks to Ms Baker for her presentation.

**RESOLVED that:**

- 1) Ms Baker would provide Members with the relevant links for generic online guidance with respect to the Protect Duty, as well as more specific guidance that was for Councillors.**
- 2) The Emergency Planning Team should look into what areas the Council would need to consider with respect to the new Protect Duty.**

#### **47           MATTERS OUTSTANDING**

CSD 22008

The Portfolio Holder informed the Committee that there had been no response yet from London Councils with respect to the queries that the Council had made regarding police enforcement of speeding traffic violations. It had been clarified that in actuality this matter lay under the remit of the ECS Portfolio. The Portfolio Holder would update the Committee further when a response was received and the response would be shared across the PP&E and ECS Portfolios.

Members heard that a new Assistant Director for Public Protection and Enforcement had now been appointed and it was hoped that she would take up her position within the next three months.

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

#### **48           POLICE UPDATE**

The police were not required to attend on this occasion but had submitted a data report. The Chairman stated that he was glad to see that overall the figures were coming down but there was some concern expressed with respect to the figures relating to Race/Hate Crime. Also disappointing was the fact that the figures regarding satisfaction with the police had dropped. This seemed to be a national trend currently.

A Member expressed the view that ASB had not in reality decreased by 33%. He said that at the next meeting he would like to ask the police why the number of ASB calls had decreased by 33%. Was it perhaps the case that the public were not bothering to report it?

A Member requested that the police be asked to explain how they were currently treating 'non crime hate incidences'.

A Member noted that burglary offences had decreased by 45% (probably because more people were working from home). She said that if the police were present she would have like to have asked them what number of reported offences resulted in a criminal prosecution. The Chairman requested that the Portfolio Holder prepare the police for this question to be asked at the next meeting.

A Member suggested that the increase in the figures for Race Hate Crime could be because there was a greater confidence in reporting these offences.

**RESOLVED that the police update be noted and that the Portfolio Holder notify the police of questions that Members would like to put to them at the next meeting.**

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

### **49 UPDATE FROM THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER**

The Portfolio Holder for Public Protection and Enforcement updated the Committee as follows:

On November 21st 2021, the Portfolio Holder visited the Bethlem Royal Hospital where the relevant protocols were discussed. Also on November 21st, the Portfolio Holder joined a virtual Mayoral Tackling VAWG Strategy Workshop with London Councillors; this was hosted by the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime, Sophie Linden.

On December 21<sup>st</sup>, the Portfolio Holder had a meeting with Chief Superintendent Dave Stringer. Also on December 21<sup>st</sup>, the Portfolio Holder joined the virtual launch of the draft Police and Crime Plan Consultation meeting with the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime, Sophie Linden.

On January 21st 2022, the Portfolio Holder chaired the Bromley Mentoring Initiative Steering Group.

A Member queried if the Out of Hours Noise Service still existed and it was confirmed that it did exist and was operational.

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

### **50 PPE PERFORMANCE OVERVIEW UPDATE**

Members expressed difficulty in reading the Performance Overview data sheet. They asked if this could be looked into, possibly using a larger font or spreading the data over two pages instead of one.

The Director briefed the Committee that all areas were performing efficiently and effectively, except for one area which was the area relating to food safety inspections. It was noted that some issues existed around recruiting staff and retaining staff.

**RESOLVED that the Public Protection and Enforcement Performance Overview update be noted.**

### **51 FLY TIPPING ACTION PLAN UPDATE**

ES20156

The report was being presented to outline the actions that were being planned to support the Council's Fly Tipping Action Plan.

It was noted that the Portfolio Plan for Public Protection and Enforcement included a commitment to keep Bromley's streets clean and green, to reduce

fly tipping, littering and dog fouling. A target had been set to reduce the number of fly tippings within the borough to less than 3000 per annum. This included a commitment to commence enforcement action against 10% of incidents of fly tipping.

In the first 3/4 of 2021/22 Veolia had attended and removed 2157 fly tipping incidents--226 of these had been subject to enforcement activity. A new project had been initiated by Veolia under the umbrella of 'Your Waste is Your Responsibility'. A campaign had been run by Veolia in Penge and a second campaign was due to be run in Mottingham.

In November 2021, a target hardening scheme was put in place at Mottingham Recreation Ground at a cost of £85,000. During the first quarter of 22/23 it was the aim of the Department to launch a new Action Plan; this was anticipated to be a more robust Action Plan to deter fly tipping within the Borough. The Enforcement Team had recently been subject to restructuring, this meant the team's flexibility had been increased, along with its robustness to deal with fly tipping--as the number of officers that were available to deal with fly tipping had been increased from 1 to 4.

The Chairman was pleased to note the reduction in the number of fly tipping incidents, especially in Penge. A key factor in the reduction in the number of flight tipping incidents was attributed to better education, engagement and general raising of awareness. The Portfolio Holder pointed out that the Street Enforcement Manager had been working closely with Veolia to help their operatives become more successful in finding relevant evidence in fly tipped rubbish which could indicate who had been responsible for the fly tipping incident.

A Member referenced page 23 of the report and noted that out of 226 enforcement referrals, 77 enforcement actions had been undertaken of various types and she asked what had happened with respect to the remaining 149? She also asked if the public took any notice of warning letters and formal notices.

The Street Enforcement Manager answered and said that the remaining 149 had not progressed beyond the investigation stage for various reasons which included the unwillingness of witnesses to come forward and an inability to track down the offenders. He had drafted new notices for the Enforcement Team to work with and he expected this situation to improve. He was looking at new ways to gather information and subsequently enforce. He felt that in the past Bromley had been too insular in its approach and felt that a more intelligence based approach was required and to this end he had made new contacts with other councils and with the Environment Agency. It was hoped that this collaborative approach with other stakeholders would enable the sharing of information and help to make the targeting of individuals more successful. He added that using warning letters did indeed seem to be successful so far. It was noted that at the moment details of fly tipping prosecutions were not being published, but the implementation of a 'wall of

shame' was something that was being considered, but would need to be assessed by the Legal Team first.

The Chairman enquired what support was required from Bromley's internal Communications Team. The Street Enforcement Manager responded and said that a more streamlined corporate message would be helpful. The Council needed to be smart in its use of communications. The Director said that this was something he would look into.

A Member expressed the view that if LBB was only taking action against a third of offenders then this was unsatisfactory. He also pointed out that when officers or Veolia operatives looked through rubbish and found evidence of an address, in most cases this would be the naïve member of the public who had unknowingly used an unregistered dumper. He said that to get to the heart of the matter the Council would need to take enforcement action against the unregistered dumpers.

The Street Enforcement Manager answered and said that more effort was required to make the general public more aware of the issues and that they should look at the licences of anyone that they proposed to use to dump their rubbish. It was the case that there were occasions when the public knew who had taken their rubbish but would not provide a supporting witness statement. It was possible that the Council could invoke powers under the Environment Act 1995 that could force the disclosure of information. It was anticipated that the Council could work with the police and seize vehicles where appropriate.

A Member praised the use of prominent signs that had been used to highlight the level of fines that could be imposed for fly tipping. She said that she had noticed their effectiveness in High Elms and hoped that they could be used more widely. Mr Laws responded and said that a report from the Fly Tipping Working Group was due shortly and after looking at this, officers would be looking at the possible use of signs in fly tipping hotspots, along with the estimated costings.

A discussion took place regarding the different types of fly tipping notices and it was explained that the money from the fines went back into neighbourhood management budget lines. It was noted that the use of cameras and CCTV required authorisation from a Magistrate and that Veolia were being encouraged to pick up more rubbish so that there were not cluster sites of rubbish developing, as 'rubbish bred rubbish'.

**RESOLVED that the Fly Tipping Action Plan update be noted and that the Director would look into how the Communications Team could better support the Fly Tipping Action Plan initiatives.**

**52 PUBLIC PROTECTION AND ENFORCEMENT PORTFOLIO  
DRAFT BUDGET 2022/23**

FSD22013

Members were asked to note the report and to provide comments to the Executive.

**RESOLVED that the Draft Budget report be noted.**

**53 PUBLIC PROTECTION AND ENFORCEMENT RISK REGISTER**

ES20146

The Committee noted that although the 'Out of Hours Noise Service' was still running using volunteers, it was still considered a risk. Consideration was being given to firmer funding and formalising the service. It was suggested that this may be a matter that could be referred back to the Executive for consideration.

The second area of risk that was discussed was with respect to the Coroner's Service, as the Coroner had requested a significant additional financial contribution from the Council. The Director of Environment and Public Protection explained that he had met with the Coroner's Consortium the previous week and disappointedly, there had been no movement concerning the issue of Bromley's contribution in respect of costs to the Consortium since the previous year. The Director was due to attend another meeting with the Chief Coroner the following week. The Coroner had requested a significant increase in the financial contribution from the Council which the Director was querying. This was because no evidence had been provided to support the request for additional funding. The Director held the view that additional funding with respect to the Coroner's Service could largely be met from various COVID grants and not from the councils that were part of the consortium.

At the time of writing there was no impact on the Council's Budget.

The Coroner was also seeking funding for a second Coroner's Court and the Director was challenging the need for this, given that activity had remained static. Members expressed the view that as the Coroner had not as yet provided sufficient justification for the proposed increased costs, the Director should maintain his current position and not agree to additional contributions to the Coroner's Service until evidence was provided to justify the request.

**RESOLVED that the Public Protection and Enforcement Risk Register be noted.**

**54 PUBLIC PROTECTION AND ENFORCEMENT CONTRACTS  
REGISTER**

ES20141

**RESOLVED** that the Public Protection and Enforcement Contracts Register Report be noted and that an update on the Dogs and Pest Control contracts be brought to the March 2022 meeting.

**55 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING OF THE SAFER BROMLEY PARTNERSHIP BOARD**

The Chairman pointed out that LBB had the third best 'Violence Reduction Action Plan' in London and this was something to be proud of.

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the previous meeting of the Safer Bromley Partnership Board be noted.

**56 SBP PARTNER UPDATE--COMMUNITY SAFETY VERBAL UPDATE ON SUPPORTING THE ELDERLY AND VULNERABLE**

It had previously been agreed that different partners from the Safer Bromley Partnership Board would provide updates to the scrutiny committee with respect to the specific priorities of the Safer Bromley Partnership Board. This would mean that going forward, various partners would provide updates and would be scrutinised, whereas before this was just confined to the police. The first of these updates was provided by the Head of Trading Standards and Commercial Regulation.

The specific scrutiny question to be addressed was:

*Crime against the elderly and vulnerable is an area that is tackled under this priority. Can you let us know the action you take, and demonstrate the effectiveness of this, including any return on investment as benefitted by the broader society?*

This question had been drafted on behalf of the Committee in its role under the Police and Justice Act to challenge and scrutinise the work of Trading Standards in its response to the aims and objectives set out in the Safer Bromley Partnership Strategy. It was the first in a series of questions relating to each of the priorities of the SBP, which would be presented at each of the PP&E PDS meetings going forward.

The Head of Trading Standards and Commercial Regulation updated the Committee as follows:

**Response:**

The Bromley Community Safety Partnership Strategy has FOUR priorities, one of which is Safer Neighbourhoods, which sets out ambitions to reduce crimes that are deemed by MOPAC, police and residents to be local priorities.

This includes reducing **crime against the elderly and vulnerable from financial abuse**.

The Strategy states “This will be achieved by working with all stakeholders to protect older or otherwise vulnerable residents from scams and doorstep crime and targeted communications campaigns and enforcement”. By way of a reminder, the average age of a victim of these crimes is 74, and older people are more likely to be targeted, especially those living alone. We also know loneliness is linked with the deterioration of health and the effects of being defrauded in your own home can be life changing, often leading to a loss of confidence and becoming more susceptible to repeat crime. Becoming a victim of fraud can also lead to depression and withdrawal and this can give rise to additional costs on the health sector.

### **So what action do we take?**

We work with our partners to raise awareness of scams and doorstep crime. This is important, as it is believed that these crimes are grossly under reported. We have been raising the profile of our work and these crimes for many years in an effort to increase reporting, allowing early intervention and disruption, but more importantly empowering our residents to recognise a scam and protect themselves.

We work with professional partners like Social Services and the police, and we attend community groups such as Residents’ Associations and Women’s Institutes. We also work closely with the National Trading Standards Scams Teams, adopting their ‘Friends Against Scams’ campaign as our own.

We are re-visiting our colleagues in the Fire Service to help them recognise signs of scams when they visit vulnerable residents to provide fire safety advice.

We monitor the referrals from our partners as it gives us a good indicator about our messaging. These are not one off training sessions. We re-visit banks every year, and we try to get round to all of our contacts at least once every two years.

An increase in the number of referrals from Social Services during the pandemic demonstrated a good working relationship with our colleagues in adult services. Before the pandemic we were delivering up to 100 training and awareness sessions each year. The pandemic has obviously prevented much face to face training but we are picking this up again.

In an effort to maintain contact with residents during lockdown, we launched the TS Alert which you should all receive, and we also have a dedicated page on the Bromley Safeguarding Adults Board web site.

We have strong branding which will be familiar to all our partners and residents.

## **Interventions, investigations, support & advice:**

Case study – this is why our Rapid Response Service is so important:

In July 2021, we received a call to the Rapid Response Service at 8pm on a Friday night. It came from a neighbour of an elderly couple who had earlier that day been cold called by traders offering to clean their drive and gutters. Once on the roof they claimed to find a number of faults which required urgent repairs, and were quoted £12,000. The Trading Standards response was to attend the victims' home that evening and take an initial statement, then to liaise with police for support--having established that the traders were due to return the following morning to start the work. The officer attended the address the next morning and with the aid of the police, intervened to stop any work being carried out. One of the individuals who was detained by the police is the subject of an ongoing investigation by our officers.

Calls to our Rapid Response Service are important indicators of profile and messaging – prior to the pandemic we were receiving nearly 200 calls a year. This has understandably dropped but we hope to pick this up over the next 2 years.

We prosecute when we can. We have to have the right circumstances, as these are often complex investigations, with vulnerable witnesses and perpetrators who are well practiced in the art of avoiding detection.

Case study:

We received a call from a bank concerned about an elderly customer making repeat withdrawals which led to an investigation which identified a woman in her 70s, living alone, who had been cold called by two men offering gardening services, who in total took £18,000 from her for work which was valued at £1600. Both men were prosecuted by the team and convicted of fraud offences in July 2021.

We currently have a number of significant investigations on-going with 3 trials listed for this year.

A big part of our work is around prevention, and also providing advice and support to victims and their families.

Case study:

Tom is 80 and a victim of carbon credit scams. He has capacity but was targeted by scammers for some time. When we got involved he confessed to handing over an “embarrassingly large amount of money” but the true extent of his loss was kept a secret from his family. During the course of his victimisation, he lost his wife; the scammers used this to strengthen their bond with him. He was unknown to social services but his bank account had previously been flagged, police had been involved but for a long time he refused to believe he was the victim of a scam and continued to respond to demands for payment in order to recover his investments.

We fitted a call blocker to his phone and analysis of this device showed he was getting 70 scam calls a week. We also arranged a befriending service through Age UK as he was very lonely, despite having a strong family support network.

After engaging with colleagues from the National Trading Standards Scams Team, we supported the family in writing a letter to his bank to see if they would reimburse his losses. He was eventually refunded a significant sum.

Since April, we have received complaints and enquiries about scams with a consumer detriment of around £1.5million.

### **How do we record impacts and outcomes?**

Outcomes include a number of talks, a number of rapid response calls, and a number of early interventions.

The bigger impact is around the wellbeing of the victim. An elderly woman who lost £12,000 of her life savings to rogue traders who tells us *“It felt as if I had burglars in the house and I was a bit scared of what they would do if I said I wasn’t going to write anymore cheques; they might have turned on me”* and then goes on to say *“After Trading Standards fitted a camera on my front door, I felt a lot safer. I felt as if I could say ‘No more, I’ve got this now’. That’s an impact.*

A victim of a scam told us *“I’m frightened out of my life, I can’t breathe and I don’t know what I’m doing”.*

Another victim told us *“I am finally writing to update you with the good news that my bank have given me a full refund. I am so very relieved. I just wanted to give you a huge thanks for giving me the much needed moral support through that”.*

It is believed that there is a link between victims of scams and rogue traders and their future needs for social care. This can result in additional costs themselves and to local authorities. We don’t fully understand how this works but there are some theories.

One perspective on this focuses on mental health, capacity and confidence of elderly victims and how criminals exploit that. A resident living independently but with cognitive decline, who might be frail and maybe receiving some support will be at greater risk and vulnerable to being targeted by fraudsters. If this goes unchecked they could become chronic targets and this can have an impact on their finances and their health and in some cases make it impossible to continue to live at home.

The work we are doing through early intervention and disruption, for example in providing call-blockers, and advising victims and families in order to prevent or stop victims from responding to scams, can be seen as an alternative to care in some cases, enabling the individual to continue to stay in their home.

This can result in financial savings to the victim, family and the Local Authority.

The National Trading Standards Team has developed a simple model which allows us to give an estimate of the future financial savings as a result of our work in this area. The calculator is based on financial and non-financial losses, using data from a Home Office 'Cost of Crime' Study. The figures are very much an *under estimate*. Locally we have data evidencing £2.5million of savings to residents as result of trading standards interventions since 2006. Using the new calculator, we can estimate that since April 2021, we have created future financial savings to our residents of £250,000 and healthcare & related quality of life savings of £112,170.

The Chairman requested that it be noted in the minutes how much the Council valued the work of the Trading Standards Department.

A discussion took place concerning the trading standards alerts and how wide the circulation of those alerts were. The Head of Trading Standards and Commercial Regulation said he did not have a precise figure on the night for the number of recipients of the alerts, but he would look into that and update Members later. He was seeking to increase the number of recipients for the Trading Standards alerts going forward.

A Member asked how the Council was doing in terms of recruiting Scam Ambassadors. It was noted that the Portfolio Holder was the latest recruit. Mr Vale responded by saying the success of the team was due to the whole team and to the Trading Standards Manager—Graeme Preston.

Members expressed the view that the Trading Standards Department would benefit from more support from the Council's Communications Department.

A discussion took place on how local Bromley businesses could apply to be recognised on the new Trading Standards Approved Trader scheme which was a partnership with Kent County Council Trading Standards. In this regard it was also noted but there was no liability with respect to the Council.

**RESOLVED that the Safer Bromley Partnership scrutiny update from Trading Standards be noted and that the Head of Trading Standards and Commercial Regulation would update the Committee with details of the circulation list for the Trading Standards alerts.**

## **57 WORK PROGRAMME**

CSD 21116

The Chairman requested that for the March agenda, the SBP update from the police with respect to their plan for 2022/23 be added.

The update concerning the Mortuary Contract would come in due course. A Member requested that the Committee consider a visit to the Bethlem Royal Hospital in Beckenham.

**RESOLVED that the Work Programme be noted.**

The meeting ended at 9.20 pm

Chairman

This page is left intentionally blank