



## Notice of meeting of

### Decision Session - Cabinet Member for Crime and Community Safety

**To:** Councillor Fraser (Cabinet Member)

**Date:** Tuesday, 4 October 2011

**Time:** 4.30 pm

**Venue:** The Guildhall, York

## AGENDA

---

### Notice to Members - Calling In:

Members are reminded that, should they wish to call in any item on this agenda, notice must be given to Democracy Support Group by:

**10:00 am on Monday 3 October 2011**, if an item is called in *before* a decision is taken, *or*

**4:00 pm on Thursday 6 October 2011**, if an item is called in *after* a decision has been taken.

Items called in will be considered by the Scrutiny Management Committee.

---

Written representations in respect of items on this agenda should be submitted to Democratic Services by **5.00pm** on **Friday 30 September 2011**.

### **1. Declarations of Interest**

At this point Members are asked to declare any personal or prejudicial interests they may have in the business on this agenda.

- 2. Minutes** (Pages 3 - 6)  
To approve and sign the minutes of the last meeting held on 6 September 2011.

**3. Public Participation - Decision Session**

At this point in the meeting, members of the public who have registered their wish to speak at the meeting can do so. The deadline for registering is **5.00pm** on **Monday 3 October 2011**.

Members of the public may register to speak on -:

- An item on the agenda
- An issue within the Cabinet Member's remit
- An item that has been published on the Information Log since the last session. Information reports are listed at the end of the agenda.

Please note that no items have been published on the Information Log since the last Decision Session.

- 4. Target Hardening Fund 2011-2012** (Pages 7 - 18)  
This report presents information on the current years Target Hardening Fund allocations and proposes recommendations on ways to improve the accessibility and awareness of the fund for future years.

- 5. Crime Summit 2011** (Pages 19 - 24)  
This report sets out proposals for the development of a Crime Summit for the City of York to be held on an annual basis from 2012 onwards.

- 6. Urgent Business**  
Any other business which the Chair considers urgent under the Local Government Act 1972.

**Written Representation**

The written representation received since the agenda was first published is included as an annex.

Democracy Officer:

Name: Jill Pickering

Contact Details:

- Telephone – (01904) 552061
- Email – [jill.pickering@york.gov.uk](mailto:jill.pickering@york.gov.uk)

For more information about any of the following please contact the Democracy Officer responsible for servicing this meeting

- Registering to speak
- Written Representations
- Business of the meeting
- Any special arrangements
- Copies of reports

Contact details are set out above

This page is intentionally left blank

## About City of York Council Meetings

### Would you like to speak at this meeting?

If you would, you will need to:

- register by contacting the Democracy Officer (whose name and contact details can be found on the agenda for the meeting) **no later than 5.00 pm** on the last working day before the meeting;
- ensure that what you want to say speak relates to an item of business on the agenda or an issue which the committee has power to consider (speak to the Democracy Officer for advice on this);
- find out about the rules for public speaking from the Democracy Officer.

**A leaflet on public participation is available on the Council's website or from Democratic Services by telephoning York (01904) 551088**

### Further information about what's being discussed at this meeting

All the reports which Members will be considering are available for viewing online on the Council's website. Alternatively, copies of individual reports or the full agenda are available from Democratic Services. Contact the Democracy Officer whose name and contact details are given on the agenda for the meeting. **Please note a small charge may be made for full copies of the agenda requested to cover administration costs.**

### Access Arrangements

We will make every effort to make the meeting accessible to you. The meeting will usually be held in a wheelchair accessible venue with an induction hearing loop. We can provide the agenda or reports in large print, electronically (computer disk or by email), in Braille or on audio tape. Some formats will take longer than others so please give as much notice as possible (at least 48 hours for Braille or audio tape).

If you have any further access requirements such as parking close-by or a sign language interpreter then please let us know. Contact the Democracy Officer whose name and contact details are given on the order of business for the meeting.

Every effort will also be made to make information available in another language, either by providing translated information or an

interpreter providing sufficient advance notice is given. Telephone York (01904) 551550 for this service.

যদি যথেষ্ট আগে থেকে জানানো হয় তাহলে অন্য কোন অর্ধাতে তথ্য জানানোর জন্য সব ধরণের চেষ্টা করা হবে, এর জন্য দরকার হলে তথ্য অনুবাদ করে দেয়া হবে অথবা একজন দোভাষী সরবরাহ করা হবে। টেলিফোন নম্বর (01904) 551 550।

*Yeteri kadar önceden haber verilmesi koşuluyla, bilgilerin terümesini hazırlatmak ya da bir tercüman bulmak için mümkün olan herşey yapılacaktır. Tel: (01904) 551 550*

我們竭力使提供的資訊備有不同語言版本，在有充足時間提前通知的情況下會安排筆譯或口譯服務。電話 (01904) 551 550。

اگر مناسب وقت سے اطلاع دی جاتی ہے تو ہم معلومات کا ترجمہ میا کرنے کی پوری کوشش کریں گے۔ ٹیلی فون (01904) 551 550

*Informacja może być dostępna w tłumaczeniu, jeśli dostaniemy zapotrzebowanie z wystarczającym wyprzedzeniem. Tel: (01904) 551 550*

## **Holding the Cabinet to Account**

The majority of councillors are not appointed to the Cabinet (39 out of 47). Any 3 non-Cabinet councillors can 'call-in' an item of business from a published Cabinet (or Cabinet Member Decision Session) agenda. The Cabinet will still discuss the 'called in' business on the published date and will set out its views for consideration by a specially convened Scrutiny Management Committee (SMC). That SMC meeting will then make its recommendations to the next scheduled Cabinet meeting in the following week, where a final decision on the 'called-in' business will be made.

## **Scrutiny Committees**

The purpose of all scrutiny and ad-hoc scrutiny committees appointed by the Council is to:

- Monitor the performance and effectiveness of services;
- Review existing policies and assist in the development of new ones, as necessary; and
- Monitor best value continuous service improvement plans

## **Who Gets Agenda and Reports for our Meetings?**

- Councillors get copies of all agenda and reports for the committees to which they are appointed by the Council;
- Relevant Council Officers get copies of relevant agenda and reports for the committees which they report to;
- Public libraries get copies of **all** public agenda/reports.

City of York Council

Committee Minutes

---

|         |   |
|---------|---|
| MEETING | DECISION SESSION - CABINET MEMBER FOR<br>CRIME AND COMMUNITY SAFETY |
| DATE    | 6 SEPTEMBER 2011  |
| PRESENT | COUNCILLOR FRASER (CABINET MEMBER)                                  |

---

## 6. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

At this point in the meeting the Cabinet Member was invited to declare any personal or prejudicial interests he might have in the business on the agenda. No interests were declared.

## 7. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the first meeting of the Crime and Community Safety Decision Session held on 5 July 2011 be approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

## 8. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION - DECISION SESSION**

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

## 9. **CONSUMER LANDSCAPE REVIEW CONSULTATION**

Consideration was given to a report which informed the Cabinet Member of the government's proposed changes to the provision of consumer information, advice, education, advocacy and enforcement.

This was a wide-ranging consultation set out in the paper 'Empowering and Protecting Consumers' which aimed to simplify the confusing and overlapping provision of consumer protection.

Officers confirmed that the main issues affecting the authority were:

- Transfer of central government funding for consumer information, advice, advocacy and education to the Citizen's Advice Service (CA).
- As there were no proposals to change the second stage advice, intervention and investigative work currently undertaken by the council's trading standards service it was therefore important to establish good partnerships with CA.
- It was likely that the investigative capacity of the Scambuster Team would be enhanced if the proposals were implemented.

Officers updated that, prior to the end of the consultation period, disaggregation of the functions had already commenced with tenders being invited for particular areas. It was confirmed that the Cabinet Member would be kept updated of developments.

The Cabinet Member queried whether consultation had been undertaken with CA and went onto suggest a minor amendment to the proposed response.

**RESOLVED:** That the Cabinet Member approves Option 1 to support the proposed changes and in particular supporting the value of a specialist Scambuster Team as set out in the consultation response at Annex 1 of the report.  
1.

**REASON:** To support the proposals to strengthen the council's capacity to protect the residents of York and help local businesses prosper in a fair trading environment.

Action Required

1. Forward the consultation response to the Consumer and Competition Policy Directorate. CR

**10. PUBLIC PROTECTION LEGAL ACTIONS**

The Cabinet Member considered the results of legal actions which included, prosecutions, cautions and fixed penalties, undertaken by Environmental Health, Trading Standards and Licensing Services in the Communities and Neighbourhoods Directorate for the period 1 April 2011 to 30 June 2011.



Details of the individual cases had been set out at Annex A of the report and Officers confirmed that, in accordance with the policy each case had been considered on its merits prior to legal proceedings being instituted.

The Cabinet Member questioned details of action taken and congratulated officers on their continued vigilance with these enforcements.

RESOLVED: That the Cabinet Member approves the report and the continuation of the current enforcement policy.

REASON: So that the Cabinet Member reviews formal enforcement activity undertaken by Environmental Health, Trading Standards and Licensing Services.

CLLR S FRASER, Chair

[The meeting started at 4.30 pm and finished at 4.43 pm].

This page is intentionally left blank

|   |                              |
|---|------------------------------|
|  |                              |
| <b>Decision Session – Cabinet Member for<br/>Crime and Community Safety</b>       | 4 <sup>th</sup> October 2011 |
| Report of the Assistant Director – Communities & Culture                          |                              |

## Target Hardening Fund - 2011 -2012

### Summary

1. This report presents information on the current years Target Hardening Fund allocations (Annex 1) and proposes recommendations on ways to improve the accessibility and awareness of the fund for future years.

### Background

2. Applications for money from the Target Hardening fund can be made for capital schemes to deliver physical measures to design out or combat crime and reduce the fear of crime. The fund is open to applications and makes awards on an annual basis. In order to meet the criteria of the fund applications need to have either come from the Safer York Partnership and / or be considered and approved for submission by the relevant ward committee.
3. The current practice was developed in recognition of the strategic role and intelligence from Safer York Partnership and the strategic and local knowledge of ward members. This is to ensure that any bids to the fund are robust, avoid duplication of effort and that any emerging schemes are the most effective measure to combat the highlighted issue based on the intelligence and local knowledge.
4. The fund is not currently advertised wider than the Safer York Partnership, North Yorkshire Police, through the Safer Neighbourhoods teams, and ward committees and through them key stakeholders in wards working with the ward committees.

5. The fund has been managed in this way for a number of years and whilst the process works, in line with the councils wider approach to ensuring that its processes are effective and efficient, it felt that now is a good time to review the process in order to ensure that the maximum impact was achieved through the use of the Target Hardening fund.
6. On review, it was concluded that the process of approving submissions through ward committees and working with Safer York Partnership and North Yorkshire Police is a robust process and requires no change. Options for proposed improvements/changes are therefore focused on raising the awareness and accessibility of the fund at the front end of the process.

### **Consultation**

7. In accordance with policy the decision on the allocation of the Target Hardening Fund 2011-12 is an officer decision following consultation with both the Leader of the Council or his delegated representative, in this case the Cabinet Member for Crime and Community Safety.
8. No formal consultation has taken place on options/recommendation to improve the accessibility and awareness of the Target Hardening Fund; however feedback from applicants and elected members who have made / support applications has been used.

### **Options**

9. **Option 1** - Retain the current level of promotion of the fund which is restricted to ward committees and key stakeholders working with them, Safer York Partnership and North Yorkshire Police. To ensure all of those currently receiving information/ invitation to bid to the fund get regular updates initiate a quarterly e-newsletter. In addition develop and deliver a member briefing session on ward budgets and the Target Hardening Fund as part of the existing member development programme.
10. **Option 2** - As Option 1 and in addition promote the fund internally via the council's intranet to ensure a joined up approach across the authority.

11. **Option 3** - As Option 2 and in addition promote the fund publicly so that residents and organisations active in the wards can make suggestions to the relevant ward committee for funding applications.
12. All options to be implemented alongside the ward committee local improvement scheme participatory budgeting process for the financial year 2013 – 2014 starting in June 2012.

### **Analysis**

13. **Option 1** – The advantage of option 1 is that the suggested e-newsletter and member briefing could be implemented in the current financial year. The disadvantage of Option 1 is that the proposal does not widen the awareness of the fund beyond the existing parameters.
14. **Option 2** – The advantage of option 2 is that as well as the advantage of Option 1 greater connectivity of efforts would be encouraged across the authority.
15. **Option 3** – The advantages of Option 3 is that as well as the advantages of options 1 and 2, it provides opportunities for greater community involvement in identification of potential Target Hardening applications/schemes. This broader approach would also enhance the transparency of the process and allow a focus on specific areas of crime and fear of crime reduction alongside the ward committee local improvement scheme participatory budgeting process. This broadening of the approach may provide an opportunity for vulnerable residents or those not currently engaging through existing routes and protocols to raise concerns and suggest potential solutions. The potential disadvantage of such a broader approach is that there is only a finite funding pot and increased competition is likely to result in the scheme being oversubscribed which may result in residents' aspirations not being met.

### **Corporate Priorities**

16. The options above all relate to the improvement of access to and awareness of the Target Hardening Fund are directly related to the Safer City section of the Corporate Strategy and in particular:
  - We want York to be a safer city with low crime rates and high opinions of the city's safety record

- We will help reduce the number of burglaries and thefts within the city, utilising all available funds such as target hardening.

## Implications

17. The direct implications arising from this report are:

(a) **Financial** - None other than the allocation of the funds to individual Target Hardening schemes

(b) **Human Resources (HR)** - None

**Equalities** - Option 3 offers an opportunity to expand the route for suggestions for potential Target Hardening Schemes to the wider community and ensuring that access to the fund is fair and equitable and in this way improving the quality and diversity of applications to the fund.

(c) **Legal** - None

(d) **Crime and Disorder** – The positive impact of the implementation of the individual Target Hardening schemes contributing to the corporate priority for a Safe City and in particular to reduce burglary and theft.

(e) **Information Technology (IT)** - None

(f) **Property** - None

(g) **Other** – None

## 18. Risks

Risks have been addressed within the main body of the report; additionally the risks associated with the recommendation of this report are assessed at a net level below 16.

## Recommendations

19. The Cabinet Member is asked to:

(a) Note the information on the allocation of the 2011-2012 Target Hardening Fund

Reason: For Information

- (b) Agree option 3, as outlined in Para 11 to publicise the scheme wider to residents and organisations active in the wards so that they can make suggestions to the relevant ward committee for funding applications.

Reason: To ensure that the accessibility and awareness of the target Hardening Fund is improved in a timely fashion for the financial year 2012/2013. Ensuring that access to the fund is fair and equitable and in this way improving the quality and diversity of applications to the fund.

### **Contact Details**

|  |  |            |                      |
|--|--|------------|----------------------|
| <b>Author:</b>   | <b>Chief Officer Responsible for the report:</b>                   |            |                      |
| Mora Scaife<br>Neighbourhood<br>Management Unit<br><i>Tel No. 1834</i>                           | <b>Charlie Croft</b><br>Director Communities and<br>Neighbourhoods |            |                      |
|  | <b>Report<br/>Approved</b>   | √          | <b>Date</b> 20/09/11 |
| <b>Specialist Implications Officer(s)</b> <i>List information for all<br/>Implications: None</i> |  |            |                      |
| <b>Wards Affected:</b> <i>List wards or tick box to indicate all</i>                             |  | <b>All</b> | <i>tick</i>          |
|  |  | √          |                      |
| <b>For further information please contact the author of the report</b>                           |  |            |                      |

### **Background Papers:**

None.

### **Annexes**

**Annex 1 Target Hardening Funding Allocations 2011 – 2012**

**Annex 2 Guidelines 2011-12**

This page is intentionally left blank



| Scheme ref | Ward                       | Title   | Description   | Total cost of scheme | Applied for | Match funding | Provisional Allocation | Status       | ANNEX 1 Progress                         |
|------------|----------------------------|---|---|----------------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|--------------|--|
| TH-11-01   | Westfield                  | Combating environmental crime in Front Street/ Beaconsfield Back Lane | Decoy CCTV cameras, anti-fly tipping signs  | £180.00              | £150.00     | £30.00        | £0.00                  | Not Approved | N/A                                      |
| TH-11-02   | Dringhouses & Woodthorpe   | Planting on Little Hob Moor   | Pyracantha/hawthorn bushes to prevent access to exposed wall and prevent graffiti   | £400.00              | £250.00     | £150.00       | £0.00                  | Not Approved | N/A                                      |
| TH-11-03   | Clifton                    | Greenfields School and Community Garden                               | Fencing, water supply and plants using the field to grow food by local community and combating ASB  | £4,300.00            | £3,300.00   | £1,000.00     | £2,800.00              | Approved     | Scheme commissioned and fencing ordered. |
| TH-11-04   | Heworth                    | New Fence at Fl line Arran Place to White X Gdns Cycle track          | Fencing to prevent stone throwing and tidy up area  | £1,550.00            | £1,400.00   | £150.00       | £1,400.00              | Approved     | Scheme commissioned and fencing ordered. |
| TH-11-05   | Rural West                 | Signs for Esk Drive Play Park   | Signage to reduce the antisocial problems around play park  | £525.00              | £375.00     | £150.00       | £0.00                  | Not Approved | N/A                                      |
| TH-11-06   | Heslington & Fulford       | The Retreat planting  | Planting pyracantha bushes along length of boundary wall to Retreat Home  | £420.00              | £320.00     | £100.00       | £0.00                  | Not Approved | N/A                                      |
| TH-11-07   | Dringhouses and Woodthorpe | Fencing and signage at Chapmans Pond                                  | To fence off private area from public area at Chapman's pond  | £1,900.00            | £1,600.00   | £300.00       | £1,600.00              | Approved     | Scheme Completed                         |
| TH-11-08   | Holgate                    | Lindsey Avenue CCTV   | To combat increased ASB vandalism and theft   | £5,550.00            | £4,500.00   | £3,000.00     | £1,500.00              | Approved     |  |
| TH-11-09   | Holgate                    | Holgate Lighting Scheme   | Increased Street lighting provision including two solar installations and one standard column at 3 locations in Holgate: Railway Terrace, Walworth Terrace North and Bouthwaite Drive | £4,500.00            | £4,000.00   | £500.00       | £4,000.00              | Approved     | Scheme Commissioned                      |
| THH-11-10  |                            | Repeat withdrawn  |   |                      |             |               |                        |              |  |

|          |                            |   |  |            |            |           |           |                 |                     |
|----------|----------------------------|---|--|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------------|---------------------|
| TH-11-11 | Hull Road                  | Hull Road Skate Park  | Install jumps on grass area outside Flaxman Ave  | £0.00      | £0.00      | £0.00     | £0.00     | Not Approved    | N/A ANNEX 1         |
| TH-11-12 | Hull Road                  | Tang Hall Camera  | Re-instate camera at end of Constantine Avenue   | £0.00      | £0.00      | £0.00     | £0.00     | Reserve         | N/A                 |
| TH-11-13 | Strensall                  | Replacement of children's play area fence, Earswick         | Between play area and car park   | £2,150.00  | £1,295.00  | £855.00   | £0.00     | Not Approved    | N/A                 |
| TH-11-14 | Holgate                    | Salisbury Rd and Salisbury Terrace CCTV                     | Install CCTV at junction.  | £6,500.00  | £5,500.00  | £1,000.00 | £0.00     | Reserve         | N/A                 |
| TH-11-15 | Micklegate                 | Bishophill Gating Scheme - Baille Hill Rear Alleyway        | Alleygating the back alley between 1 Baille Hill Terrace and 20 Cromwell Road  | £3,000.00  | £600.00    | £2,400.00 | £600.00   | Approved        | Scheme Commissioned |
| TH-11-16 | Holgate                    | Garnet Terrace Lighting Scheme                              | Improving lighting at Garnet Terrace especially near newly refurbished play area   | £2,000.00  | £1,000.00  | £1,000.00 | £1,000.00 | Approved        | Scheme Commissioned |
| TH-11-17 | Westfield                  | Fencing improvement at Ashbourne Way/Bell House Way snicket | Fencing to both sides of snicket to address ASB experienced by residents   | £6,000.00  | £6,000.00  | £0.00     | £0.00     | Reserve         | N/A                 |
| TH-11-18 | Dringhouses and Woodthorpe | Fencing at Foxton and Carfield Snicket                      | Fencing to snicket to address ASB experienced by residents   | £4,500.00  | £4,500.00  | £0.00     | £0.00     | Reserve         | N/A                 |
| TH-11-19 | Holgate                    | Murray St/Lindley St alleygating scheme                     | Alleygating at four access points to the rear alleyway.  | £4,000.00  | £800.00    | £3,200.00 | £800.00   | Approved        | Scheme Commissioned |
| TH-11-20 | Westfield                  | Bachelor Hill fencing - Askham Lane side                    | Continuation of rolling programme of fencing to enclose whole of Bachelor Hill to address fly-tipping ASB and easy escape route. | £16,745.00 | £16,745.00 | £0.00     | £0.00     | Reserve/Phase d | N/A                 |
| TH-11-21 | Acomb                      | Woodlea Drive/Danebury Drive Junction - Bollards            | Preventing parking on the verge at junction of Woodlea Drive and Danebury Drive  | £3,000.00  | £3,000.00  | £0.00     | £0.00     | Not Approved    | N/A                 |

|          |  |  |   |            |            |       |           |              |                                |
|----------|--|--|---|------------|------------|-------|-----------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| TH-11-22 | Westfield  | CCTV Front St shops/ Beaconsfield Street   | As TH-11-01 except with working CCTV system   | £8,000.00  | £8,000.00  | £0.00 | £8,000.00 | Approved     | ANNEX 1<br>Scheme commissioned |
| TH-11-23 | Rural West   | Copmanthorpe Lighting Scheme               | Enhanced street lighting to address fear of crime/perceived vulnerability in Pike Hill Mount, St Nicholas Rd area   | £4,500.00  | £4,500.00  | £0.00 | £4,500.00 | Approved     | Scheme commissioned            |
| TH-11-24 |  | Repeat Withdrawn                           |   |            |            |       |           |              |                                |
| TH-11-25 | Acomb  | Marking of parking area Boroughbridge Road | Request for signs to be erected and walkway clearly marked for pedestrian safety.   | £850.00    | £850.00    | £0.00 | £0.00     | Not Approved | N/A                            |
| TH-11-26 | Westfield  | Tedder Road Play Area - CCTV               | Installation of CCTV to address antisocial behaviour in and around play area  | £8,000.00  | £8,000.00  | £0.00 | £0.00     | Reserve      | N/A                            |
| TH-11-27 | Westfield  | Tedder Road Play Area - Fencing            | Measure to prevent balls from going onto road and damaging cars and properties opposite.  | £4,800.00  | £4,800.00  | £0.00 | £4,800.00 | Approved     | Scheme completed               |
| TH-11-28 | Westfield  | Tennant Road/Cornlands Fencing             | Fencing of perimeter of play area to address antisocial behaviour, fly-tipping and fear of crime.   | £29,070.00 | £29,070.00 | £0.00 | £0.00     | Reserve      | N/A                            |
| TH-11-29 | Rural West   | Traffic Calming in Rural West              | Enhanced vehicle activated signs in Copmanthorpe and Nether Poppleton   | £5,600.00  | £5,600.00  | £0.00 | £0.00     | Not Approved | N/A                            |
| TH-11-30 | Holgate  | Holgate Allotments - composting toilet     | Installation of a composting toilet at Holgate allotments on Holgate Road   | £0.00      | £0.00      | £0.00 | £0.00     | Not Approved | N/A                            |
| TH-11-31 | Westfield, Acomb Dringhouses and Woodthorpe, Holgate and Micklegate - <b>Recommend amendment to cover whole city</b> | West Wards Safer Neighbourhoods            | Subsidised anti-burglary equipment such as garage locks and shed bars- to be offered in Westfield, Acomb Dringhouses and Woodthorpe, Holgate and Micklegate | £3,500.00  | £3,500.00  | £0.00 | £3,850.00 | Approved     | Equipment ordered              |

|          |                          |   |  |             |             |            |            |              |   |
|----------|--------------------------|---|--|-------------|-------------|------------|------------|--------------|---|
|          |                          | Westfield Close, Poppleton Street Lighting                    | To enhance street lighting in small cul-de-sac to address fear of crime/perceived vulnerability.   | £3,000.00   | £3,000.00   | £0.00      | £0.00      | Reserve      | ANNEX 1<br>N/A                                    |
| TH-11-32 | Rural West               |   |  |             |             |            |            |              |   |
| TH-11-33 | Guildhall                | Pickering House Sheds   | Proposal to demolish sheds and secure area with fencing.   | £3,325.00   | £3,325.00   | £0.00      | £0.00      | Reserve      | N/A   |
| TH-11-34 | Heworth                  | CCTV for Bell Farm Social Hall                                | Purchase and install both internal and external CCTV system which can record through PC in centre to address theft and address fear of crime | £3,800.00   | £1,900.00   | £1,900.00  | £1,900.00  | Approved     | Scheme commissioned                               |
| TH-11-35 | Heworth                  | CCTV for East Parade  | Purchase and installation of a CCTV system   | £9,000.00   | £9,000.00   | £0.00      | £0.00      | Not Approved | N/A   |
| TH-11-36 | Clifton                  | Queen Annes Road Rear Alleyway                                | To alleygate rear alleyway.  | £3,000.00   | £600.00     | £2,400.00  | £600.00    | Approved     | Scheme Commissioned                               |
| TH-11-37 |                          | Repeat withdrawn  |  |             |             |            |            |              |   |
| TH-11-38 | Fishergate               | Alleygating terraced streets at the bottom of Heslington Road | As title to address theft, burglary of houses, sheds and garages.  | £0.00       | £0.00       | £0.00      | £0.00      | Reserve      | N/A   |
| TH-11-39 | Citywide                 | Alleygating pot   | A pot to be used to address the top priority schemes in identified locations which on assessment are suitable for alleygating.               | £6,200.00   | £1,200.00   | £5,000.00  | £1,200.00  | Approved     | Scheme commissioned                               |
| TH-11-40 | Dringhouses & Woodthorpe | St James' Place Streetlighting                                | Enhance lighting on this small cul-de-sac next to the Lidl Supermarket.  | £1,000.00   | £455.00     | £545.00    | £455.00    | Approved     | Scheme commissioned and lighting design received. |
| Totals   |                          |   |  | £160,865.00 | £139,135.00 | £23,680.00 | £39,005.00 |              |   |

## Target Hardening Fund 2011-12 Guidance Notes      Annex 2

|     | Key points  | Detail  | Does my project fulfil the criteria?<br>√/X |
|-----|---|---|---|
| 1a. | Criteria – what is eligible                         | a) community safety projects<br>b) physical improvements which reduce the opportunity for crime or tackle the fear of crime<br>c) schemes which attract revenue funding from external/internal orgs and/or capital funding from internal CYC depts will have an improved chance of success<br>d) only 20% of the total cost of alleygating schemes will be funded with TH money       |   |
| 1b. | Criteria - what is not eligible                     | a) it is not for revenue based activities<br>b) it is not for schemes which benefit one individual<br>c) it is not for schemes on private land  |   |
| 2   | Who can access the funding?                         | Ward Committees, SYP Task Groups  |   |
| 3   | Who manages the budget?                             | Neighbourhood Management  |   |
| 4   | How do Ward Committees/Task Groups access the fund? | a) All suggestions should first be discussed at the relevant Ward Committee meeting or Ward Planning Teams. Applications which are neighbourhood-specific also need to be referred to the relevant ward planning team for their comments.<br><br>b) The Ward Committee/Task Group Project Manager (eg NMO) obtains an application form from the NMU which is submitted to Mora Scaife |   |
| 5   | Who decides if the application is successful?       | Head of NMU in consultation with the Leader of the Council (or in his absence Exec Member for Neighbourhood Services). Prior to this the Shadow Leader is also consulted.   |   |
| 6   | How will the applicant be notified of the outcome?  | Mora Scaife (NMU) will contact the applicant.   |   |
| 7.  | How is the project monitored/evaluated?             | a) The successful project is logged with Mora Scaife and arrangements made with the Project Manager to order the work. Mora Scaife will provide updates to the NS Finance Manager for the quarterly and annual revenue monitoring reports.<br>b) Project updates will be reported to the Ward Committees and Task Groups  |   |

**Target Hardening Fund 2011-12 Guidance Notes    Annex 2**

**Timeline for Target Hardening Projects 2011-12**

**February/March 2011**

Suggestion(s) are discussed at the Ward Planning Team meeting prior to the April ward committee round and a fully completed application form submitted by **31<sup>st</sup> May 2011**



**June 2011**

All bids received are checked for eligibility and a decision is made. Successful bids are commissioned and unsuccessful applicants notified.




**October 2011**

A progress monitoring report submitted to Head of NMU



**March 2012**

A final monitoring report is submitted to Head of NMU

|   |                              |
|---|------------------------------|
|  |                              |
| <b>Cabinet Member for Crime and Community Safety</b>                              | 4 <sup>th</sup> October 2011 |
| Report from the Assistant Director – Housing and Public Protection                |                              |

## **CRIME SUMMIT 2012**

### **Summary**

1. This report sets out proposals for the development of a Crime Summit for the City of York to be held on an annual basis from 2012 onwards.

### **Background**

2. As part of their manifesto commitments the current administration set out a commitment to hosting an annual Crime Summit to provide residents with the opportunity to meet with police and council staff responsible for tackling crime and anti-social behaviour in York.
3. The Police and Justice Act 2006 comprehensively revised the founding legislation (Crime and Disorder Act 1998) placing a new duty on Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) to join together to form a strategy group at top tier local authority level. This group must undertake frequent strategic assessments of levels and patterns of crime and disorder in their area and produce three year rolling community safety plans.
4. Contained within the Statutory Instruments of the Police and Justice Act was a set of minimum standards. One of these standards was to increase community engagement through an annual “face the public session.” Safer York Partnership has met this requirement for the last two years by hosting a community safety market within the city centre.
5. The Government is currently developing a programme of reforms which will impact on the way in which community safety partnerships deliver their programmes of crime and disorder reduction in England

and Wales. This programme is contained within the Police and Social Responsibility Bill which is due to receive Royal ascent in October 2011. Whilst the minimum standards have been repealed within the new Bill as part of a decentralised approach by the Government, there is an expectation that effective practice should be retained and community engagement forms an important part of that process.

## **Consultation**

6. In considering the format of any crime summit, examples of good practice which have seen significant resident engagement have been considered. The main focus of these events have seen the police, residents, council, businesses, charities and voluntary groups come together to identify local community safety problems and jointly develop actions to tackle them.
7. York and North Yorkshire CSPs are currently undertaking their annual Joint Strategic Intelligence Assessments in order to redefine the community safety plans for 2012-13. It would be timely to link this process with a crime summit to ensure that action plans aligned to the Community Safety Plan demonstrate a balance between meeting the priority issues identified directly by communities as well as working toward addressing the high level priorities identified through multi-agency data analysis.
8. In order to maximise the potential for marketing the event as well as gaining commitment within the diaries of the key local stakeholders involved in community safety, it would be timely to hold a crime summit in spring 2012 in line with the planning cycle of Safer York Partnership. This would have the added benefit of having a robust plan in place which both meets the statutory requirements of a CSP and also demonstrates an understanding of localism prior to the appointment of a Police and Crime Commissioner for York and North Yorkshire.
9. The key to a successful community consultation event is to maximise the opportunity for residents to attend. This would best be achieved through a mixture of rigorous marketing, hosting the event in an easily accessible venue within the city and arranging the event at a time that will encourage attendance. Learning from experience of other local authorities, the most successful ones have held their crime summit on a Saturday.



## Options

10. Option 1 - Host a one day market in Parliament Street in the format of previous Face the Public events.
11. Option 2 – Host an event on a Saturday aimed at attracting all age groups and involving a range of stakeholders engaged in work to reduce crime and anti-social behaviour within York.

## Analysis

12. Option 1 is a tried and tested model within York which has achieved a high level on interest from the public. However, the city centre location has meant that the majority of those with whom agencies engaged were not from York. Whilst this has generated some excellent feedback in terms of visitor safety, it does not facilitate the identification and debate around local issues.
13. Option 2 is based on the experience from other local authorities of hosting successful crime summit events. Through organising a range of activities designed to attract all ages and hosting the event on a Saturday, it is likely to be more appealing to York residents to attend and result in a clear picture of local priorities around crime.

## Council Priorities

14. The holding of an annual crime summit support the wider set of priorities set out within the Council Plan. However it would specifically support a number of actions under the 'Build Strong Communities' theme, in particular the community engagement and safer inclusive communities actions. A crime summit would create an opportunity for increased dialogue and debate between key stakeholders engaged in community safety across the city, and local residents.

## Implications

15. The implications arising from this report are:
  - (a) **Financial** There are financial implications attached to hosting a crime summit. However, Safer York Partnership would be engaging with the community as part of the Joint Strategic Intelligence Assessment. Therefore the costs can be met by the partnership.

- (b) **Human Resources (HR)** Staff across a range of Council directorates would be required to be involved in a crime summit to ensure that relevant services are available and able to engage with residents attending. The administration and organisation of the event can be met from resource with the Safer York Partnership team.
- (c) **Equalities** Diversity and social inclusion play a key role within all aspects of community safety. Therefore it is crucial to involve the equalities team within the planning and running of the event to ensure that all communities have equal access.
- (d) **Legal** Not applicable
- (e) **Crime and Disorder** This is a crime and disorder related event and therefore requires substantial input from the SYP team to organise and host.
- (f) **Information Technology (IT)** Not applicable
- (g) **Property** Not applicable
- (h) **Other** Not applicable

## **Risk Management**

16. There are no known risks associated with this proposal.

## **Recommendations**

17. The Cabinet Member is asked to approve:

Option 2, to host an annual Crime Summit in the spring of each year aimed at attracting all age groups and involving a range of stakeholders engaged in work to reduce crime and anti-social behaviour within York.

Reason: To ensure the best opportunity to gain maximum attendance and ensure that resident's priorities and concerns feature within the future delivery plans of the community safety partnership. It also demonstrates recognition of the value of localism in determining community safety service provision.

**Contact Details**

|  |   |   |                      |                                 |                             |             |             |              |              |                |                |
|--|---|---|----------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|
| <b>Author:</b>   | <b>Chief Officer Responsible for the report:</b>                            |   |                      |                                 |                             |             |             |              |              |                |                |
| Jane Mowat<br>Director<br>Safer York Partnership<br><i>Tel No. 01904 669077</i>  | <b>Steve Waddington</b><br>Assistant Director - Housing & Public Protection |   |                      |                                 |                             |             |             |              |              |                |                |
|  | <b>Report Approved</b>  | √ | <b>Date</b> 20/09/11 |                                 |                             |             |             |              |              |                |                |
| <b>Specialist Implications Officer(s)</b> <i>List information for all</i><br><table style="width:100%; border:none;"> <tr> <td style="width:50%;"><i>Implication ie Financial</i></td> <td style="width:50%;"><i>Implication ie Legal</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Name</i></td> <td><i>Name</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Title</i></td> <td><i>Title</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Tel No.</i></td> <td><i>Tel No.</i></td> </tr> </table> |   |   |                      | <i>Implication ie Financial</i> | <i>Implication ie Legal</i> | <i>Name</i> | <i>Name</i> | <i>Title</i> | <i>Title</i> | <i>Tel No.</i> | <i>Tel No.</i> |
| <i>Implication ie Financial</i>  | <i>Implication ie Legal</i>   |   |                      |                                 |                             |             |             |              |              |                |                |
| <i>Name</i>  | <i>Name</i>   |   |                      |                                 |                             |             |             |              |              |                |                |
| <i>Title</i>   | <i>Title</i>  |   |                      |                                 |                             |             |             |              |              |                |                |
| <i>Tel No.</i>   | <i>Tel No.</i>  |   |                      |                                 |                             |             |             |              |              |                |                |
| <b>Wards Affected:</b> <i>List wards or tick box to indicate all</i>   |   |   | <b>All</b> x         |                                 |                             |             |             |              |              |                |                |
| <b>For further information please contact the author of the report</b>   |   |   |                      |                                 |                             |             |             |              |              |                |                |

**Background Papers: None****Annexes: None**

This page is intentionally left blank

DECISION SESSION – CABINET MEMBER FOR CRIME AND COMMUNITY SAFETY

TUESDAY 4 OCTOBER 2011

Annex of additional comments received from Members, Parish Councils and residents since the agenda was published.

| <b>Agenda Item</b> | <b>Report</b>                   | <b>Received from</b>        | <b>Comments</b>  |
|--------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| 4                  | Target Hardening Fund 2011-2012 | Councillor Healey<br>Member | I would agree with Option 3 but would want the funds to be split across the Ward committee's proportional allowing the Police, Safer York Partnership and the Public to bid in the normal fashion. |
| 5                  | Crime Summit 2011               | Councillor Healey<br>Member | I would suggest smaller local events at the major supermarkets where a higher proportion of York citizens tend to go to instead of Parliament Street with its high proportion of tourists.         |

This page is intentionally left blank