

Meeting	Community Safety Overview & Scrutiny Committee
Date	14 January 2014
Present	Councillors Douglas (Chair), Orrell (Vice-Chair), Fraser, Healey, Hodgson and Warters
In Attendance	Councillor Fitzpatrick
Apologies	Councillor King

27. **Declarations of Interest**

Members were asked to declare at this point in the meeting any personal interests not included on the Register of Interests, or any prejudicial or disclosable pecuniary interests they may have in respect of the business on the agenda. The following interests were declared:

- Councillor Fraser declared a personal, non-prejudicial interest in agenda item 8 (Safer York Partnership Bi-Annual Performance Report) in respect of references to the alley-gating scheme off Scarcroft Road, as a resident of Millfield Road, which one of the streets on the side of the road which was already gated.
- Councillor Hodgson declared a personal, non-prejudicial interest in respect of agenda item 8 (Safer York Partnership Bi-Annual Performance Report) as an employee of the Ministry of Defence, which was referred to in the report.

28. **Minutes**

Resolved: That the minutes of the meeting of 12 November 2013 be confirmed and signed as a correct record subject to minute 23 being amended to read... “The residents of Brockfield Park Drive and Brockfield Road, Huntington had expressed concern that their roads *would not be gritted and queried whether the gritting vehicles would continue to use this route.*”

Referring to minute 26, Councillor Warters queried why the attendance of the Cabinet Member for Environmental Services had not been included as an agenda item for the meeting, as had been agreed. The Chair explained that, as an additional meeting of the committee had been now been scheduled for 10 February 2014, the workplan had been amended to ensure that the items to be considered at the two meetings were distributed accordingly. Therefore the items on the agenda for 14 January 2014 primarily focussed on police, crime and community safety related issues. Other items on the workplan had been moved to the meeting on 10 February 2014. Councillor Warters stated that he was concerned that the decision to defer the attendance of the Cabinet Member for Environmental Services to the meeting in February had been taken without reference back to the Committee and that he wished his concerns to be minuted.

29. Public Participation

It was reported that there were no registrations to speak at the meeting under the Council's Public Participation Scheme.

30. Verbal Update on Community Safety Arrangements Across the North Yorkshire Region

The Assistant Director Housing and Community Safety gave a verbal update on community safety arrangements across the North Yorkshire region.

(i) The Structure

Details were given of proposed changes to the structure. Currently across York and North Yorkshire there were six Community Safety Partnerships in the districts (Richmondshire and Hambleton were already combined) and one Community Safety Partnership for York (The Safer York Partnership). York and North Yorkshire Community Safety Forum was the representative body that brought together the seven community safety partnerships and also included the Local Criminal Justice Board. The aim had been to bring together key decision bodies to ensure that a holistic approach was taken.

The proposal for the future was that there would be two Community Safety Partnerships, one for North Yorkshire and one for York. Although this would not result in any change to

the existing arrangements for York, there were some issues for the districts regarding a loss of autonomy.

It was also proposed that there would be a York and North Yorkshire Community Safety Board to replace the existing Forum. Its purpose would be to bring together the Police and Crime Commissioner, responsible authorities and other relevant organisations to agree and oversee strategic themes and priorities for safer communities across York and North Yorkshire.

The Board would:

- Commission and agree the Joint Strategic Intelligence Assessment (JSIA)
- Based on the JSIA, the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) and other relevant strategic documents, agree the strategic themes and priorities for safer communities across York and North Yorkshire
- Advise the Police and Crime Commissioner on the development of her commissioning plan
- Evaluate progress against the agreed strategic themes and priorities for safer communities across York and North Yorkshire
- Identify and encourage strategic opportunities for collaborative working and commissioning between the Police and Crime Commissioner, responsible authorities and other relevant organisations
- Advise the Police and Crime Commissioner on any potential risks or conflicts to the delivery of the agreed strategic themes and priorities for safer communities across York and North Yorkshire
- Receive regular updates from the North Yorkshire Community Safety Partnership and the Safer York Partnership.

The Safer York Partnership's view of this was that the board would be an additional layer of bureaucracy and was not necessary.

(ii) Funding

Historically the Home Office Grant has been directly allocated to unitary authorities (North Yorkshire has passported this to Districts in part). This funding was now passed to the Police and Crime Commissioner. Although she had passported the

funding for this financial year, in future there would be a commissioning process whereby local authorities and other organisations would have to bid for funds. Currently City of York Council received just under £100k of funding.

Some districts had used the Home Office grant for their core Community Safety Partnership staffing but this would no longer be permitted. In York, the Safer York Partnership staff were core council funded and hence this would not be an issue. In York the Home Office funding had been used to support project interventions through the task groups focused on crime reduction.

Members queried whether the Police and Crime Commissioner would passport the full amount of funding received. They stated that it was important to ensure that appropriate arrangements were in place to ensure that the funding was appropriately managed.

Clarification was sought as to whether the changes to the funding arrangements were as a result of Home Office guidance. Officers stated that different approaches were being taken across the country but that guidelines were in place. It was for the Commissioner to determine how the funding was to be spent. She had set out her priorities and it was anticipated that the allocation of funding would be informed by the outcomes in the plan.

Resolved: That the update on community safety arrangements across the North Yorkshire region be noted.

Reason: To ensure that the Committee is kept informed of the arrangements that are in place.

31. Attendance of City of York Council Representatives on the Police and Crime Panel, and the Police and Crime Panel Support Officer

Councillor Fitzpatrick, one of the City of York Council representatives on the Police and Crime Panel was in attendance. She was accompanied by the Chair of the Police and Crime Panel and the Police and Crime Panel Support Officer.

Details were given of the role of the Police and Crime Panel. The attendees explained that nationally there were some issues in respect of the limitations that the panels had in holding the Police and Crime Commissioners to account. The arrangements had only been in place for a year and hence processes were still developing.

Members were informed that the Police and Crime Commissioner had attended all the Panel meetings, along with the Chief Constable. The data that was provided to the Panel and the information flow was improving and a process was being developed as to how best to evaluate progress on the plan.

Clarification was sought as to the powers of the Panel. These were summarised as:

- The power to veto the precept
- The Panel had to be consulted on the Police and Crime Plan. The Police and Crime Commissioner was obliged to take on board the Panel's recommendations but could disagree with them.
- Confirmation hearings – the Panel had the opportunity to talk to prospective appointees in respect of some of the staff appointed by the Commissioner.
- Consideration of complaints against the Commissioner. The Panel had the power to publish reports if this was in the public interest. Members were informed that two complaints had been considered by the Panel.

Councillor Fitzpatrick stated that, if there were issues that the Committee wished to bring to the attention of the Police and Crime Commissioner, they were welcome to contact either of the City of York Council representatives on the Police and Crime Panel and they would raise these on the committee's behalf.

Resolved: That the verbal update be noted.

Reason: To ensure that the committee is informed of the role of the Panel in holding the Police and Crime Commissioner to account.

32. Further update on recommendations arising from the previously completed Community Resilience Scrutiny Review

Members considered a report that provided an update on the implementation of the recommendations arising from the previously completed Community Resilience Scrutiny Review.

Members expressed their disappointment that more communities had not put in place Community Resilience Emergency Plans.

Councillor Warters, referring to paragraph 4 of the report, queried how the council encouraged residents to notify them when persistent surface water problems occurred. He stated that issues highlighted by the Foss Internal Drainage Board were not being taken into account by the Planning Committee. Councillor Warters informed Members that he was aware of letter being sent to the council in November and for which a response was awaited. He drew attention to issues in respect of flooding in Badger Hill and Osbaldwick. The Director of Communities and Neighbourhoods stated that she would look into this matter¹.

Resolved: That all recommendations from the Community Resilience Review be signed off.

Reason: The committee are satisfied that the recommendations have been implemented.

Action Required

1. Investigate reason for delay in response

SB

33. Update on Tethered Horses Policy

The Assistant Director Housing and Community Safety gave a verbal update on the Tethered Horses Policy. He explained that the report was verbal rather than written, as the final meeting with the contractors had taken place only the previous day.

A tendering process had been carried out to appoint a horse bailiff. Advertisements had been placed on the council's website and in the appropriate trade magazines. Interviews had taken place before Christmas and the contract would commence on 3 February 2014 and was for a three-year period.

Details were given of the processes that would be followed where horses were tethered to council land. The council was also mindful of the need to take a holistic approach to addressing this issue and hence private landlords would be able to access the services of the horse bailiff, although the council would not provide financial support for them to do so. Members queried the process for reporting incidents. They were informed that incidents should be reported through the York Contact Centre who would forward details to the relevant team. Officers would contact the contractor as required. If the issue related to animal welfare, the animal welfare officer would be made aware. A press release would be issued which detailed the arrangements.

Councillor Warters queried why the process of appointing a contractor had taken so long. Officers detailed the process that had been followed and explained that there had been some pressures on the capacity in the procurement team and that one of the contractors had missed the deadline that had been set and it had been agreed that this would be extended. It was important that there was buy in from all parties.

Officers were asked how successful the council had been in working with owners to reduce the number of tethered horses. It was agreed that information regarding this matter would be emailed to Members¹.

The Chair suggested that the committee may wish to review the effectiveness of the policy in about a year's time.

Resolved: That the update on the Tethered Horses Policy be noted.

Reason: To ensure that the Committee is kept updated on the implementation of the policy.

Action Required

1. Forward information

SW

34. Safer York Partnership Bi-Annual Performance Report

Members considered a report from the Safer York Partnership which provided an update on performance.

Members noted that overall levels of recorded crime continued to show signs of reduction, with monthly totals in the first eight months being below target.

Details were given of the cumulative impact area and of the consultation that had taken place on the Alcohol Restriction Zone. Members stressed the importance of ensuring that the signage that would be in place was in keeping with the character of the city and did not add unnecessarily to street clutter. At the request of Members, officers also explained about the Operation Erase Action Plan.

Officers were asked if the revised arrangements in respect of Retailers Against Crime in York (RACY) were working well. Officers confirmed that the partnership had been extended to include all businesses rather than just retail. There had been positive comments from those involved.

Resolved: That the Safer York Partnership Bi-Annual report be noted.

Reason: To ensure that the committee is kept informed of the performance of the Safer York Partnership.

35. Quarter 2 Finance and Performance Update for Environmental Services and Public Protection

Members considered a report which provided an update on financial performance, service plan improvement actions and performance measures for Environmental Services and Public Protection.

Members' attention was drawn to predicted overspends, primarily relating to waste. Officers explained that this was as a result of a combination of factors, including increased landfill costs.

Officers were asked what action was being taken to try to ensure that cost savings were brought in on time. They explained that the two-year budget process had been useful in this respect. Attention was drawn to the redundancy costs in the Communities and Neighbourhoods budget, which had contributed to the overspend.

Resolved: That the financial and performance information provided in the report be noted.

Reason: To ensure that the committee is kept updated on financial and performance issues.

36. Verbal Update on Ongoing Reviews

A verbal update was given on ongoing reviews:

(i) A-Boards

Members were informed that a public consultation event on the A-Boards scrutiny review would be held on 5 February 2014. A presentation had been prepared and the event would enable members of the public to give feedback. Members expressed concern that they had not been consulted on the date of the event and requested that details be forwarded to them.

(ii) Domestic Waste Recycling

Information was tabled which provided an update on the Domestic Waste Recycling Review. It was agreed that Members would email officers with any queries regarding issues in the report.

(iii) Night Time Economy Scrutiny Review

The Chair reminded Members that a remit had not yet been agreed for the Night Time Economy Scrutiny Review, although information had been emailed to Members regarding this issue. Members confirmed that the review should focus on street cleansing and agreed that an informal meeting of the committee should be held as soon as possible in order to progress this matter. As part of the review, Members agreed that it would be useful to invite officers who could comment on the impact on tourism as well as officers who worked on street environment issues.

Resolved: That the update on the ongoing scrutiny reviews be noted.

Reason: To monitor progress on the reviews.

Councillor Douglas, Chair

[The meeting started at 5.30 pm and finished at 7.35 pm].