

# AGENDA

## PARTNERSHIP AND WELL BEING OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE MEETING

(ACTING AS THE CRIME AND DISORDER OVERVIEW AND  
SCRUTINY COMMITTEE)



Overview and Scrutiny

Date: Monday 14 March 2011

Time: 6.30 pm

Venue: Town Hall, High Street,  
Maidstone

Membership:

Councillors: Butler, Ms Griffin, Miss Langley,  
D Mortimer, Mrs Parvin, Paterson  
(Vice-Chairman) and Mrs Stockell  
(Chairman)

---

Page No.

1. **The Committee to consider whether all items on the agenda should be web-cast**
2. **Apologies**

**Continued Over/:**

---

**Issued on 04 March 2011**

The reports included in Part I of this agenda can be made available in **alternative formats**. For further information about this service, or to arrange for special facilities to be provided at the meeting, **please contact Orla Sweeney on 01622 602524.**

To find out more about the work of the Overview and Scrutiny Committees, please visit [www.maidstone.gov.uk/osc](http://www.maidstone.gov.uk/osc)

*Alison Broom*

**Alison Broom, Chief Executive, Maidstone Borough Council,  
Maidstone House, King Street, Maidstone Kent ME15 6JQ**

<b>3. Notification of Substitute Members</b>	
<b>4. Notification of Visiting Members</b>	
<b>5. Disclosures by Members and Officers:</b>	
a) Disclosures of interest	
b) Disclosures of lobbying	
c) Disclosures of whipping	
<b>6. To consider whether any items should be taken in private because of the possible disclosure of exempt information</b>	
<b>7. Minutes of the Meeting Held on 8 February 2011</b>	<b>1 - 9</b>
<b>8. Update from the Safer Maidstone Partnership</b>	<b>10 - 25</b>
<b>Interviews with:</b>	
• Martin Adams, Chairman of the Safer Maidstone Partnership;	
• David Coleman, Independent Chair of the Kent Police Authority Standards Committee;	
• Robbie Graham, Chief Inspector Kent Police; and	
• Zena Cook, Director of Regeneration and Communities.	
<b>9. Update from Kent Police</b>	<b>26 - 28</b>
Interview with Matthew Nix, Chief Superintendent Kent Police	
<b>10. INFORMATION: Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership Scrutiny Protocols</b>	<b>29 - 33</b>

## MAIDSTONE BOROUGH COUNCIL

### MINUTES OF THE PARTNERSHIP AND WELL BEING OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY 8 FEBRUARY 2011

**PRESENT:** Councillor Mrs Stockell (Chairman)  
Councillors Butler, D Mortimer and Paterson

**83. The Committee to consider whether all items on the agenda should be web-cast**

**Resolved:** That all items be web-cast.

**84. Apologies**

Councillor Daphne Parvin, Councillor Heather Langley and Councillor Jane Griffin sent their apologies.

**85. Notification of Substitute Members**

There were no Substitute Members.

**86. Notification of Visiting Members**

It was noted that Councillor David Pickett attended as a Visiting Member interested in item 9.

**87. Disclosures by Members and Officers:**

Councillor Butler disclosed a personal interest in Item 8, tackling Obesity, by virtue of his mobility business which catered for obese persons.

**88. To consider whether any items should be taken in private because of the possible disclosure of exempt information**

**Resolved:** That all items be taken in public as proposed.

**89. Minutes of the Meeting Held on 11 January 2011**

**Resolved:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 11 January 2011 be agreed as a correct record of the meeting and duly signed by the Chairman.

## **90. Tackling Obesity**

The Chairman welcomed Jim Boot, Community Development Manager and Jane Coombes, Healthy Lifestyles Coordinator. The Chairman also welcomed the representatives from local Weight Management Programmes; Jill Maynard from Zeroth Active Zone and Donna Kavanagh and Sara Matthews from Maidstone Leisure Centre.

Jim Boot began by explaining his new role managing the community development team, the team was focussed on enabling local communities with the purpose of improving the lives of residents and included the Sports and Play function. The Officer made reference to Maidstone's Health Profile for 2010 and the few red indicator results which showed Maidstone as significantly worse than the England average on a small number of health issues. Those that were showing as red were physically active children and obese adults. The Officer made reference to the forthcoming Olympics in 2012 as an opportune time to tackle these inequalities. Mr Boot explained that the 2 year Service Agreement with the Primary Care Trust (PCT) to develop health programmes was coming to an end but that it would be 2 years before the new health structures were in place which would involve GP Commissioners. The Officer explained that they would know at the end of March whether the Health Prevention funding would continue. The Committee expressed their hope that funding would be continued.

Jane Coombes, Healthy Lifestyle Coordinator explained that the funding for her post came from the PCT and that through their Health Needs Assessment they had identified the number of people that needed to be reached through the Health Programmes. As a result of this 60% of the budget was targeted towards Health Programmes. They had also engaged a nutritionist to go out to rural areas where people couldn't be reached through the weekly programmes devised. She explained that it was a 2 year programme run according to evidence based practices. The success was in the holistic approach, recognising that from the evidence in the Health Needs Assessment, it was not just diet that was important; behaviour change and motivation were involved. The Officer felt that Body Mass Index (BMI) was not always the best measurement. At the beginning and end of each 10-12 week programme weight and measurement was taken; following the programme 6 monthly contact was maintained with participants. Ms Coombes told the Committee that overall the programmes were a success and they were on course to meet the targets set by the PCT in the Service Level Agreement.

Members questioned the BMI criteria and the referral process. The Committee were told that patients could self refer or were referred by GP's, practice nurses, dieticians, school nurses and through advertising and leaflets distributed widely to doctor's surgeries and libraries. Members questioned the BMI level and why it was set at 28. It was explained that it was set at that level so intervention could take place before a patient became obese. Members questioned the use of the

internet to promote the programmes. Mr Boot responded by explaining that there was a definite link between behaviour change and social change and with social networking sites such as Facebook and Twitter there was an opportunity to exploit this. The Officer cited the success of the Facebook campaign in 2010 which had secured the Red Bull 'Back Yard Digger' BMX track for Mote Park.

Members referred again to the Health Profile for Maidstone and the discrepancies showing physical activity significantly worse than the England average and questioned whether this would lead to obesity. Ms Coombes explained that National Child Measurements were taken during a child's first year at school and this information would feed into the Health Profile which put Obese Children as not significantly worse than the rest of England but could not offer further explanation. Mr Boot explained that some communities would be performing worse than others in Maidstone and this would have an impact on the overall figure for Maidstone.

Members questioned whether the Healthy Lifestyles Programmes were taking a holistic approach and addressing other problems such as smoking and alcohol as part of the process. It was confirmed that this was the approach taken and alcohol units were checked; patients were asked if they would like a smoking referral and portion sizes were looked at. Ms Coombes highlighted other groups such as 'Little Stirrers' which she explained was based on the Change for Life programme and was a preventative measure; a cooking programme for parents and young children. The Officer explained that the Change for Life campaign was used widely in terms of its ethos and the colour schemes for marketing purposes. Ms Coombes explained that all programmes were funded by West Kent PCT with 60% of the programmes focused on Obesity and the other 40% tackling Mental Health and general Well-Being. It was discussed that the impact self esteem and mental health has should be incorporated into the programmes.

Members asked if Central Government had done enough in this area. Ms Coombes explained that £72 million had been invested in the Change for Life Campaign which had involved national television advertisements, local authorities and PCTs. The Committee were also told that Maidstone and West Kent had won a bid for a community chest and would be working with Change for Life on this. The Officer also explained that Change for Life would be issuing a 'passport' with incentives such as collecting points which would be met with rewards and that the Change for Life materials were continued to be used widely. Mr Boot summarised the programmes and said that they were trying to foster change, such as with breast feeding initiatives. He explained that it was about tapping into groups of people who already got together such as new mothers and encouraging people to motivate themselves.

The Chairman introduced Jill Maynard who ran two of the Healthy Living programmes at Zeroth Active Zone. Mrs Maynard explained that Zeroth particularly focused on patients with MS and medical conditions who would benefit from exercise.

The "Go For It" programme run at Zeroth was originally set up in 2007 for children. Due to the funding allocations being on an annual basis Mrs Maynard said it was difficult to plan ahead and referrals were restricted. One of the aims of Zeroth in particular was to reduce inappropriate referrals to the paediatric team. Mrs Maynard explained the "Go For It" programme in more detail to the Committee; it ran for 12 weeks and included 6 parent workshops (as with children under 11 parents also needed to be re-educated about food.) Mrs Maynard told the Committee that children were very often aware of healthy eating and what constituted this but were not very informed about physical activity and their own physicality. Pre and post measurements were taken including weight, height, waist, peak flow and fitness. For children under 11 it was not about weight loss and more about maintaining weight and patients were discouraged from weighing obsessively. The aim was to improve fitness levels and self esteem. The current "Go For It" programme had two age groups 5-11 & 12-16 with the criteria being a BMI over the 85th percentile. Mrs Maynard told the Committee that School nurses could no longer make referrals or contact the family and that the onus was now on the parents. Ms Coombes explained that to combat this change local authorities were advertising in the Primary Times so parents could contact their LA who would then make the referral. Mrs Maynard interjected to explain she had only had one referral as a result of this. Mrs Maynard explained the work done with teenagers involved workshops and that there were one to one sessions for more vulnerable children.

The "Weight for Life" Programme was described as an adult programme for those of a BMI of over 28; involving 2 gym sessions a week as well as nutrition and healthy lifestyle talks. Mrs Maynard felt that the weaknesses of the programme were the referral process; the information reaching the GP's, the understanding of different programmes available, the data collection and the possibility of a 2<sup>nd</sup> referral. The issue with data collection was explained as being the forms and assessment criteria required for the programmes by the PCT being left to individual interpretation. With reference to the 2<sup>nd</sup> referral Mrs Maynard felt that this had not been considered and should be down to the programme manager's discretion as 12 weeks is often not enough time to work with someone who was severely obese. Mrs Maynard outlined Zeroth's strengths as being a safe environment with the ability to cater for less mobile people and with a focus of those with medical conditions. She explained that it was value for money and that the £1 charged was to give participants ownership of what they were doing. Councillor Paterson who visited the centre was able to share with other Members the enthusiasm and commitment of those on the programme. Councillor Paterson also highlighted an aspect of the set up at Zeroth that was praised by those participating in the scheme which was the privacy that they did not feel they would have at a public gym.

Jim Boot explained that the process now was for schemes like Zeroth to become accredited in preparation for the role of Commissioners. He explained that there would be a period of transition from the PCT to the future GP commissioning body and therefore an opportunity to

demonstrate the importance of a local body. Members asked if there was a capacity for growth with Zeroth. Mrs Maynard explained that there was capacity in the afternoons for another 400 people. Members also raised the idea of advertising with local businesses.

The Chairman invited Sara Matthews and Donna Kavanagh to the discussion representing the schemes run by the Leisure Centre. Miss Matthews began by making reference to the 'old schemes' and 'exercise referrals' which targeted people with medical conditions that were often fit before their illness and were already motivated to return to their old self. Miss Matthews explained that under the old schemes patients were only seen every 5 weeks during a 20 week programme which was subsidised costing £2.95. Under the old scheme the Leisure Centre had 115 referrals a year from GPs, Hospitals and for Physiotherapy. The old scheme had a 32% drop out rate. The new Weight Management Programme, - ran for 12 weeks and at 10 weeks there was a trip to the supermarket to help re-educate participants on food. Members were told the programme also involved food analysis and motivational talks. The gym programmes were set individually and included weekly nutrient talks. Miss Matthews informed Members of a 'passport' through which weekly goals were set and small changes identified each week. Also incorporated in the programme were food diaries and weekly seminars on a broad range of topics.

Miss Matthews explained that the new 12 week programme had 53 referrals from GP's, it was being run at a reduced cost to participants of £2.00 and had a 41% drop out rate. Miss Matthews explored reasons for the high drop out rate with Members and other witnesses such as emotional and mental health issues which Ms Coombes explained they were exploring with counselling offered by -another West Kent NHS funded programme in collaboration with Age Concern, MIND, Brighter Futures and MBC.. Miss Matthews told the Committee that they had considered dropping their rate to £1 per session, explaining that it was important that participants took some onus by making a payment. Miss Matthews also agreed with Mrs Maynard on the 2<sup>nd</sup> referral scheme being made at the discretion of the programme manager.

The common denominator for obesity was said to be a sedentary lifestyle. Miss Matthews explained that often those that are overweight would stop eating and slow down their metabolism; when they were told to eat more often they found it hard to grasp. Members highlighted the myth often that ready meals which were high in fat and salt were cheaper to buy than fresh foods. Witnesses confirmed that in the long term it was cheaper to cook from scratch but that it did involve planning. Members discussed the issue that Home Economics was no longer a part of the curriculum in schools. Ms Coombes explained that there was a drive to have kitchens put back into schools and the witnesses confirmed that issues surrounding food were incorporated into their programmes. Also discussed was the emphasis on cooking in the media which should have a positive effect.

Members moved onto the Healthy Schools Programme and Maidstone reaching 100% Healthy Schools Status. The Committee were told that the

Healthy Schools toolkit was changing and would become a local arrangement.

Members discussed what could be done to raise the profile of the Healthy Lifestyles programmes examined. Ms Coombes explained that it was about engaging GP's and that what had let the programmes down despite leaflet drops, advertising and all the other aspects discussed was informing GP's directly about the Programmes that were available. Members were also keen to see Maidstone Borough Council's Website making explicit links to appropriate organisations and websites.

The Chairman concluded by thanking all for attending.

**It was Resolved:**

- a) That GPs should be engaged though a conference or seminar setting and given the opportunity to get involved in schemes that tackled obesity in light of GP consortiums. This would give those involved in programmes and referral schemes the opportunity to raise the profile of schemes; and
- b) That methods of promoting the programmes and services available via the Internet should be explored with IT and Communications.

**91. CCTV Update**

The Chairman invited John Littlemore, Head of Community Services and Housing and Councillor David Pickett, Visiting Member to the meeting.

Members had been invited to the recent stakeholder events on CCTV including a visit to the Medway CCTV Centre and a Questions and Answers session. Mr Littlemore explained that there would also be a neighbourhood forum that the Committee could be involved in as part of the consultation process. The Officer informed the Committee that the report to the Cabinet Member was likely to be delayed until March 2011. The outcome from the Stakeholder Question and Answer session was discussed and the Committee were supportive of this: there would be a stakeholder steering group who would be involved in the specification for the CCTV monitoring service. Members highlighted a concern that there would be a loss of local knowledge if CCTV was moved to Medway. Shops in Maidstone were said to have built up a partnership involving CCTV which had nothing but praise for the current system. Some members felt that this provided the local, on the ground knowledge that was vital. It was also highlighted by some Members that as County Town of Kent a move to Medway may result in a loss of control.

The Chairman told members that the partnership between Maidstone and Medway meant that only the 'remote' control of the cameras were going to Medway and referred Members to the Health and Safety issues of the



current set up that are a factor in the decision. Mr Littlemore explained that the long term usage of current facilities was not viable and would not comply with minimum Health and Safety requirements. He also explained that there were technical issues to consider and the current set up meant the Town Hall were still using VHS recording. The Officer explained that an alternative would have to be considered so if it was not Medway another solution would be sought. Members referred to the recent visit to Medway and told the Officer how impressed they were with the facilities. Members felt that the issues were centred around the 'ownership' of the service. Mr Littlemore explained that stakeholders had been listened to and that staff would be transferred across to Medway with the authority going above and beyond to ensure local knowledge remains. The Officer also confirmed that regular meetings with the 'town centre partnership' had been included in the specification and the Officer believed this to be achievable. The Chairman emphasised that local knowledge was about maintaining local people's relationships with Police and the Fire Service predominantly. Members felt that there was also an issue to consider in reducing the 'fear of crime' which CCTV in Maidstone currently offered. Mr Littlemore reemphasised that if it was not Medway and the Partnership arrangement then a tendering process would take place which would look more widely at possible service providers.

Mr Littlemore informed the Committee that with regard to response times, technical and digital links would be better at Medway and that images could be downloaded into police vehicles, for instance, with the type of technology available. Members questioned an earlier proposal for CCTV provision with other Mid Kent Partners. Mr Littlemore explained that this had been explored in 2009 with Swale but that bid had failed and Swale were now with Medway. With regard to other options Mr Littlemore explained that the cost of crating a new set up for CCTV in Maidstone did not offer a viable incentive as the Medway option would be cheaper. The Officer explained the transfer from Swale to Medway had included only 4 hours of downtime in terms of service disruption, and that Maidstone had the benefit of learning from their experience. Members explored crime statistics associated with CCTV in Swale and Maidstone and mitigating factors such as Maidstone's night time economy. The Chairman deduced that Maidstone was now in a position where something needed to be done and that the service currently in operation was past its sell by date.

Members discussed with the Officer possible negative consequences of the service being provided at Medway if, for example, the operator from Maidstone was called away because of an incident in another area. Mr Littlemore explained that there were discussions on hours but that they did not have the equipment yet to understand when quiet and busy times were. He told the Committee that there would be a minimum of 2 operators at any one time and the specification draft would safeguard against situations like the example given by Members.

In response to Members questioning the Officer explained that the Police did not pay towards CCTV and there was no statutory duty to provide the service. Members questioned the savings that would be achieved by the partnership with Medway asking whether they would form part of the

savings required to be made by the authority as a whole. The officer explained that they were at present factored into current savings but in the future when other partners became involved more savings may be available. The Committee asked what provisions were in place should the entire service be knocked out at Medway. The Officer explained that Police HQ provided a back up service and the Chairman suggested a visit to Force Control HQ for the Committee to view the service.

Members queried the timescale for the service going to Medway; a date of December 2011, early 2012 was given. The Officer reiterated to the Committee that if the service was to stay it would inevitably go out to tender via Procurement within the next 12 months. He explained that with the partnership it was not governed in the same way as a contract (as with a tender) and they could have a notice period or a review date set every 12 months or 2 years which would give a degree of flexibility to arrangements. The Officers confirmed to Members that the legalities had been explored.

Members observed that with digital links the service could go anywhere in the country and an example was discussed involving Bexley Council and the company Siemens. The Officer explained that by going out to tender this type of arrangement could not be restricted.

The Chairman thanked the Officer for the update.

**It was resolved:**

- a) That a statement on behalf of the Committee should be sent to the Cabinet Member for Community Services in support of the stakeholder steering group developing the specification for the CCTV monitoring service; and
- b) That a visit to Force Control HQ to view a similar arrangement to CCTV to be organised by Councillor Stockell.

## **92. Future Work Programme**

The Committee discussed their future work programme focusing on their next meeting as the Crime and Disorder Committee.

**It was resolved:**

- a) That Ian Learmouth, Chief Constable of Kent Police should be invited to provide and update on his priorities for Kent and Maidstone; and
- b) The Local Strategic Partnership delivery group, Safer Maidstone Partnership, should be invited to update the Committee on their current priorities and issues and provide and update on Domestic Violence as discussed at their last meeting.

**93. Duration of the Meeting**

6.30 pm to 9.20 pm

# Agenda Item 8

## Maidstone Borough Council

### Partnership and Well Being Overview & Scrutiny Committee meeting as the Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Committee

Monday 14 March 2011

#### Update from Safer Maidstone Partnership

**Report of:** Overview & Scrutiny Officer

#### 1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Partnerships and Well Being Overview and Scrutiny Committee has a statutory role to act as the Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Committee and scrutinise the Safer Maidstone Partnership, one of four delivery groups in the Local Strategic Partnership.

#### 2. Recommendation

- 2.1 The Committee is recommended to interview the Chairman of the Safer Maidstone Partnership Martin Adams, Area Manager of Kent Fire and Rescue Service, Robbie Graham, Chief Inspector at Kent Police and David Coleman, Independent Chair of the Kent Police Authority Standards Committee to provide an update on the Safer Maidstone Partnership and its priorities, Stakeholder events such as Domestic Violence and their view on the proposed changes to CCTV.

Areas of questioning could include but are not limited to:

- On what basis were the original 9 priorities formed and what statistical information was used to support this;
- When will the revised Priorities of the SMP be confirmed;
- How will the priorities of the SMP be communicated to the wider community to ensure engagement;
- What will happen to the organisations that were supported by the SMP under their wider set of priorities;
- Will the SMP seek to engage widely with organisations despite the narrowing in priorities;
- How will they achieve this;
- How have the outcomes of the Stakeholder events held been taken forward;
- What involvement do the SMP have with regard to CCTV;
- What is the SMP's stance on CCTV and the proposed relocation of the monitoring to Medway;
- How are the SMP articulating their voice on CCTV in the local community;
- Has CCTV caused divisions in the group;
- What have the outcomes and successes been of the Stakeholder events so far;
- How have these been taken forward; and

- How does the structuring of the issues around 4 central themes Prevention, Education, Intervention and Enforcement assist in taking outcomes forward.

### **3. Safer Maidstone Partnership**

- 3.1 The Safer Maidstone Partnership currently has 9 Priorities which they are proposing to reduce to 4: anti social behaviour; domestic abuse; road safety; and drug and substance misuse. At their meeting on 25 November the group appointed a task and finish group, established with key partners, to review existing priorities and ascertain whether data is available to support these as priority issues. The 4 priorities have broader links with other types of crime, for example drug and substance misuse which can often be linked with burglary crimes. The assessment completion date is March 2011 when it can be confirmed whether the data and analysis is correct in terms of the 4 proposed priorities.
- 3.2 The Sustainable Community Strategy is overarching to the work of the Local Strategic Partnership and the Safer Maidstone Partnership and at the SMP's meeting in November 2010 (Appendix A) they agreed to a:

**'refresh exercise of the Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS) on behalf of the LSP. This involves working with each delivery group to set priorities, actions, targets and performance measures. The SMP delivery group's current terms of reference include the following objectives:**

- **Continue the decrease in overall rates of crime;**
- **Take a preventative approach to tackle and reduce anti-social behaviour;**
- **Promote Maidstone as a safe place to live;**
- **Reduce violent crime and reduce serious crime in the wards where the trend is higher than the borough average;**
- **Reduce alcohol related crime in the town centre;**
- **Reduce drug offences; and**
- **Improve road safety.**

- 3.3 It was suggested at the meeting that it was sensible to align the group with the SCS terms of reference and strategic assessment priorities. It was proposed at the meeting that the SCS should reflect the priorities currently being set through the strategic assessment to ensure consistency across the partnership. It was confirmed that the strategic assessment task and finish group would incorporate discussions on the SCS refresh, including performance data availability and action setting.

### **4 CCTV**

- 4.1 The decision (Appendix B) on CCTV was made on 20 December 2010. Subsequent to the decision there has been much negative media coverage in the local press. Maidstone Borough Council have held Stakeholder events which have included a visit to the CCTV Control Centre at Medway and a Question and Answers Session. The final report will be published on 17 March with a decision from the Cabinet Member will be made on 25 March 2011.

The decision proposed:

- That a partnership arrangement with Medway Council to provide CCTV services through a service level agreement be investigated; and
  - That the Director of Regeneration and Community Services reports back to the Cabinet Member for a decision as to the way forward in the procurement of CCTV services, following consideration of stakeholders' views, such report to include an analysis as to whether the issues listed in paragraph 1.5.6 of the Report of the Director of Regeneration and Communities have been satisfactorily resolved.
- 4.2 The decision was made 'as part of the medium term service and financial planning process, the current CCTV service and the cost of provision were reviewed and a range of options identified.' The review confirmed that in its current location, the cost of the service could only be significantly reduced by reducing the level of service provision i.e. reducing the number of days the CCTV cameras are observed'
- 4.3 One of the options was to consider a proposal from Medway Council which already provides the CCTV service for Swale Borough Council. This option would require Maidstone to join a shared CCTV control centre based in Medway, through the transfer of the operation, maintenance and management of the service to Medway Council.

## **5. Stakeholder Events**

### *Domestic Violence*

- 5.1 Prevention, Education, Intervention and Enforcement are the issues that were highlighted at the stakeholder event on Domestic Abuse held on 12 November 2010. The event's afternoon workshop identified a wide range of priorities, best practice and a wide range of gaps/barriers in the service. Initial feedback which is documented in the group's minutes from their meeting on 25 November (Appendix A) has identified a number of recurring themes including the need for:
- A co-ordinated agency approach for tackling Domestic Abuse (DA) in the borough;

- Better early intervention;
- Provision of a one stop shop; and
- Better information and training for practitioners and victims.

On 7 March 2011 there will be a 2<sup>nd</sup> stakeholder event on Road Safety. The event will focus on the same issues: Prevention, Education, Intervention and Enforcement.

- 5.2 The SMP report progress against priorities/targets to the LSP board on a quarterly basis and produce an annual report. They also present emerging issues to the Board and identify actions required, as the need arises.

## **6. Impact on Corporate Objectives**

- 6.1 The remit of LSP Safer Maidstone Partnership has relevance to many of the Council's Priorities but relates specifically to the priority a place that has strong, healthy and safe communities which covers the majority of the delivery group's work and the MBC objective to make people feel safe where they live relates to the key priorities of the group.
- 6.2 There are no risks involved in considering the priorities and progress of the Safer Maidstone Partnership.



**MINUTES OF THE  
LOCAL STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP  
Safer Maidstone Partnership Meeting  
25 November 2010 11.00 – 12.30, ROOM 6D, MAIDSTONE HOUSE**

<b>Present:</b>	Martin Adams David Hewetson Zena Cooke John Littlemore Lisa Smith John A Wilson (Cllr) Tracey Kadir Sarah Robson	Chair, Borough Commander, KFRS LSP Lead Officer, Community Safety Coordinator, MBS Director, Regeneration & Communities, MBC Chief Housing Officer, MBC Community Safety Manager, Golding Homes Cabinet Member for Community Services, MBC Asst. Chief Officer, Courts & Mid Kent Probation Services Community Partnerships Manager, MBC
<b>Apologies:</b>	Nick Silvester Robbie Graham Paul Shallcross Juliet Knott Jackie Bradley Annette Hinton Andy Hudson	Partnership Manager South Division, KFRS Inspector, Kent Police Preventative Services Manager, Kent Children's Services Golding Homes Sergeant, Kent Police Maidstone Mediation Governor, Maidstone Prison

	<b>MINUTES</b>	<b>ACTION</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>
<b>1.</b>	<b>Minutes of the Last Meeting on the 2<sup>nd</sup> September 2010</b>  Page 5 - <b>TK</b> requested clarification on the item <b>AH</b> raised with regard to sex offenders, stating partners do not address the issue. The reference was acknowledged as incorrect. <b>AH</b> had acknowledged partners do address sex offenders' needs, but raised concern regarding continued service provision for sex offenders. <b>MA</b> proposed to amend the minutes. Partners agreed the change.	<b>SR</b>	<b>By next meeting</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Actions/Matters Arising</b>  Item on membership of the partnership is Item 3 on the agenda.  Page 4 - <b>NS</b> to circulate KFRS quarterly reports - in the absence of NS, <b>MA</b> agreed to follow up with NS.	<b>MA</b>	<b>By next meeting</b>



	<b>MINUTES</b>	<b>ACTION</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>
	<p>Page 5 – No information was received from partners with regard to inappropriate images/messages on Facebook. <b>ZC</b> will follow up with partners to ascertain whether they have seen an increase in this area.</p> <p>Page 6 –SMP sub-groups is an item on the agenda.</p> <p>Page 6 –November’s Domestic Abuse Stakeholder event update is item on the agenda.</p> <p>Page 7 – <b>MA</b> asked whether any partners had attended the flood defence event at Teapot Lane September. No partners present had attended.</p>	<b>ZC</b>	<b>By next meeting</b>
<b>3.</b>	<p><b>Proposed Membership of the SMP</b></p> <p><b>MA</b> circulated copies of the proposed membership of the SMP delivery group for comment.</p> <p><b>LS</b> will check and confirm the most appropriate representative from Golding Homes.</p> <p><b>ZC</b> queried whether it was appropriate to have two members from Kent County Council (KCC) Children’s Services. The group agreed that Paul Shallcross should be the lead KCC member, with the opportunity for other KCC representatives to attend as non-members.</p> <p><b>SR</b> proposed two additional candidates who had expressed their interest in membership of the group; Lesleigh Bounds from KDAAT (who attends all other partnership meetings in the county) and Paul Alcock, Manager of The Mall shopping centre. The group agreed for invitations to be extended to both as they met the agreed criteria for membership.</p> <p>Members present approved the final membership. MA will present the proposals to the LSP Board on 15 December for their formal approval.</p>	<p><b>LS</b></p> <p><b>SR</b></p> <p><b>MA</b></p>	<p><b>By Dec 2010</b></p> <p><b>By Dec 2010</b></p> <p><b>15 Dec 2010</b></p>
<b>4.</b>	<p><b>Update from LSP Board</b></p> <p><b>MA</b> confirmed his membership and attendance at the LSP Board, which meets every quarter (the next meeting is scheduled for 15 December) and is attended by all delivery group chairs across the Maidstone LSP. <b>MA</b> will provide the Board with a Chair’s update based on today’s meeting and will disseminate information from the Board to the next delivery group meeting in February 2011.</p> <p><b>ZC</b> reported the proposals for the SMP to be part of the Maidstone</p>	<b>MA</b>	<b>Feb 2011</b>

	<b>MINUTES</b>	<b>ACTION</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>
	LSP had been well received by the Board. The proposals advised the Board that the SMP would have fewer priorities based on the strategic assessment being co-ordinated by <b>JL</b> and <b>DH</b> . <b>MA</b> advised that tackling domestic abuse is a Board priority. <b>DH</b> confirmed that domestic abuse has been proposed as a priority issue within the Strategic Assessment refresh.		
<b>5.</b>	<p><b>Review of the SMP sub-groups</b></p> <p><b>JL</b> presented a paper on the SMP’s existing sub-groups. All groups had originally been set up to tackle a strategic priority, however many still existed beyond the timeframe of their original remit. <b>JL</b> had assessed the sub-groups for their purpose and relevance against the SMP’s current priorities. The circulated paper proposed a series of recommendations for each sub-group.</p> <p><b>MA</b> asked if partners had any views or comments.</p> <p><b>TK</b> suggested the sub-groups should naturally come from those priorities identified from the strategic assessment.</p> <p><b>ZC</b> suggested that all sub-groups/individuals should be reassured that this exercise is about formalising the SMP’s structure and responsibility for its priorities. The exercise aims to strengthen and modify the sub-groups, rather than putting at risk the good work already done.</p> <p><b>MA</b> suggested the delivery group should communicate this to the existing sub-groups. <b>MA</b> offered to meet with the sub-groups once the assessment was complete to explain what the SMP is trying to achieve. <b>MA</b> is keen for the SMP to have a role in supporting the process of helping to evolve and support the sub-groups. <b>JL</b> will ensure <b>MA</b> is invited to attend these meetings, once organised, with the relevant sub-groups.</p> <p>The report was agreed on the basis that the final set of sub-groups would be based on the SMP’s agreed priorities arising from the Strategic Assessment Process. <b>JL</b> to produce a further report for the next SMP meeting.</p>	<p><b>JL</b></p> <p><b>JL</b></p>	<p><b>By next meeting</b></p> <p><b>By next meeting</b></p>
<b>6.</b>	<p><b>Strategic Assessment update</b></p> <p><b>JL</b> updated the group on the strategic assessment, a key piece of work setting the SMP’s future priorities. Following the recommendation of the September delivery group meeting, a task and finish group has been established with key partners to review existing priorities and ascertain whether data is available to support these as priority issues. Initial discussions had proposed reducing the 9 priorities to 4; anti-social behaviour, domestic</p>		

	<b>MINUTES</b>	<b>ACTION</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>
	<p>abuse, road safety and drug and substance misuse.</p> <p>The 4 priorities had been chosen as they had broader links with other types of crime, e.g. drug and substance misuse is often linked with burglary crimes.</p> <p>The task and finish group had met prior to the SMP meeting to discuss future actions. <b>JL</b> and <b>DH</b> will take the lead, collating and analysing the crime data statistics and will report back at the next task and finish group meeting in December. The task and finish group will meet on a monthly basis until the assessment's completion in March 2011.</p> <p><b>JL</b> will circulate the draft strategic assessment by the next delivery group meeting. <b>JL</b> advised that the task and finish group is a temporary working group, which will cease to exist once the strategic assessment is complete.</p> <p><b>ZC</b> asked if the data is correct in terms of the four proposed priorities. <b>JL</b> advised that this could not be confirmed until the data has been analysed.</p> <p><b>JAW</b> asked if data had been collated yet. <b>DH</b> confirmed that some data had been received, although it should be noted that probation data is likely to change. <b>DH</b> confirmed that the strategic assessment tackles crime as an inclusive perspective rather than just through the police.</p> <p><b>JAW</b> asked for clarification on how the assessment's priorities had been established. <b>ZC</b> confirmed that the strategic assessment is updated on an annual basis. Priorities are set against data gathered in the borough, which ensures the assessment's priorities are set based on the borough's identified and evidenced needs.</p> <p><b>JL</b> confirmed that the task and finish group meeting notes can be circulated to the delivery group. Members agreed this would be helpful. <b>MA</b> requested the task and finish meetings be extended to two hours as an hour had not been sufficient time for consideration of the data..</p>	<p><b>JL</b></p> <p><b>JL/SR</b></p>	<p><b>By next meeting</b></p> <p><b>By next meeting</b></p>
<p><b>7.</b></p> <p><b>7.1</b></p>	<p><b>Performance Management</b></p> <p><b>Performance exceptions report</b></p> <p><b>DH</b> advised the group that he had spoken with <b>RG</b> regarding the performance exceptions report circulated to the delivery group. Unfortunately, <b>RG</b> and <b>JB</b> were unable to attend today's meeting. As Kent Police representatives, they are in the best position to</p>	<p><b>RG/JB</b></p>	<p><b>At next meeting</b></p>

	<b>MINUTES</b>	<b>ACTION</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>
	<p>disseminate the information to the group. <b>MA</b> confirmed he would request <b>RG/JB</b> provide an update at the next meeting.</p> <p><b>DH</b> was able to confirm that burglary (dwellings) had seen substantial increases, but these are still low against overall county figures.</p> <p>Sex offences have increased with the distribution of indecent images through the web/mobile technology contributing to the increase. Theft, drug offences and fraud have all seen increases. Domestic abuse has decreased, although figures for repeat victims are not available. <b>TK</b> mentioned she had seen data regarding repeats. <b>ZC</b> requested <b>DH</b> liaise with <b>RG</b> to obtain this information.</p> <p>With regard to abandoned vehicles, <b>MA</b> suggested the target for the fluctuations in the figures depends on scrap metal value going up and down.</p> <p><b>ZC</b> questioned whether a condensed problem profile or an analysis of the key areas outlined could be made available to complement the performance exceptions report. <b>DH</b> confirmed he had made a request to <b>RG</b> to explain any changes in data. The group agreed it would be useful to consider these at the next meeting.</p>	<p><b>DH</b></p> <p><b>DH</b></p>	<p><b>By end Dec 2010</b></p> <p><b>By end Dec 2010</b></p>
<b>7.2</b>	<p><b>Sustainable Community Strategy</b></p> <p><b>SR</b> is undertaking a refresh exercise of the Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS) on behalf of the LSP. This involves working with each delivery group to set priorities, actions, targets and performance measures. The SMP delivery group's current terms of reference include the following objectives:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continue the decrease in overall rates of crime</li> <li>• Take a preventative approach to tackle and reduce anti-social behaviour</li> <li>• Promote Maidstone as a safe place to live</li> <li>• Reduce violent crime and reduce serious crime in the wards where the trend is higher than the borough average</li> <li>• Reduce alcohol related crime in the town centre</li> <li>• Reduce drug offences</li> <li>• Improve road safety</li> </ul> <p><b>MA</b> suggested that it is sensible to align the SCS, terms of reference and strategic assessment priorities. <b>SR</b> proposed that the SCS should reflect the priorities currently being set through the strategic assessment to ensure consistency across the partnership. This was supported by the group.</p> <p><b>JL</b> confirmed that the strategic assessment task and finish group</p>		

	<b>MINUTES</b>	<b>ACTION</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>
	<p>will incorporate discussions on the SCS refresh, including performance data availability and action setting.</p> <p><b>SR</b> raised the need for community engagement to be integrated as a priority across all delivery groups. <b>ZC</b> will request Roger Adley from the Borough Council's Communications team to review the LSP's planned Communication and Engagement Strategy, with a view to incorporating the requirements of the SMP.</p> <p><b>ZC</b> proposed the LSP Away Day held annually in February is a good time to present the SCS refresh to LSP partners, including the SMP's priorities.</p>	<b>ZC</b>	<b>By end Dec 2010</b>
<b>8.</b>	<b>Any other business</b>		
<b>8.1</b>	<p><b>SMP Funding requests</b></p> <p><b>JL</b> advised the group of a funding request for Porchlight services for street homelessness. Maidstone Borough Council's Housing Service, Canterbury Housing Service and Porchlight have previously been successful in a bid to support two outreach workers. However, the funding is time limited, only 1 year. <b>JL</b> advised SMP partners that the request was for £5,000 from the SMP's current under-spend.</p> <p><b>ZC</b> asked how much uncommitted funding the SMP currently has. <b>DH</b> confirmed this was approximately £18,000.</p> <p><b>DH</b> also advised the group of requested funding for the Community Safety Unit's "<i>Stay Safe this Christmas</i>" campaign- i.e. chains for purses, SmartWater etc. The unit are requesting £5,000 funding to support crime prevention issues.</p> <p><b>ZC</b> confirmed that the SMP has not had a protocol for approving funding requests, but in the absence of such a protocol felt both requests should be brought to this meeting for discussion.</p> <p><b>MA</b> proposed that the SMP should support both initiatives. All partners present agreed. MA suggested the remainder of unallocated funding (£8,000) for this year could be transferred into next year's budget if this was possible, given the anticipated funding reductions. <b>DH</b> will clarify with KCC, as it is their funding and will inform partners of the decision.</p> <p><b>SR</b> suggested the LSP's criteria for awarding and monitoring its performance reward grants could be updated for administering SMP funding. <b>MA</b> asked the group for views and all agreed this would be useful. The group agreed to fund both requests and <b>JL</b> and the <b>CSU</b> would be asked to complete a form retrospectively for funding.</p>	<p><b>DH</b></p> <p><b>SR/JL/DH</b></p>	<p><b>By 31 Dec 2010</b></p> <p><b>By 31 Dec 2010</b></p>

	<b>MINUTES</b>	<b>ACTION</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>
<b>8.2</b>	<p>The group agreed that a protocol for managing SMP funding was needed. <b>JL</b> to provide a report with proposals for consideration at the next SMP meeting.</p> <p><b>DV Stakeholder event update</b></p> <p><b>SR</b> updated the group on the Domestic Abuse stakeholder event held on 12 November at Lenham Community Centre. The event was commissioned by the LSP SMP delivery group and delivered in partnership with the Maidstone Domestic Violence Forum. Over 90 people attended the event, including Helen Grant MP. The day included presentations from practitioners and agencies and a workshop session explored prevention, intervention, education and enforcement, identifying the priorities for Maidstone, best practice and gaps/barriers in the service. Initial feedback has identified a number of recurring themes including the need for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A co-ordinated agency approach for tackling DA in the borough</li> <li>• Better early intervention</li> <li>• Provision of a one stop shop</li> <li>• Better information and training for practitioners and victims</li> </ul> <p><b>SR</b> noted that the SMP's strategic assessment has proposed domestic abuse as a priority, suggesting a working group with a lead agency is the next step forward.</p> <p><b>ZC</b> asked whether the delivery group would consider supporting a virtual social networking approach as part of the very positive response to the DV event. <b>TK</b> advised that Swale Borough Council had created a similar network. <b>SR</b> to research the options and update the group at the next meeting.</p> <p><b>MA</b> thanked <b>SR</b> and the Community Partnership support officers for their efforts to ensure the day's success.</p>	<b>JL</b>	<b>By next meeting</b>
<b>8.3</b>	<p><b>National accredited training for health trainers</b></p> <p><b>ZC</b> circulated information regarding the NHS' free training programme for potential Health Trainers. The sessions tackle life style choices, e.g. drug and alcohol misuse, weight management and smoking cessation. <b>ZC</b> agreed to forward the information and asked partners to confirm if they wished to participate.</p>	<b>SR</b>	<b>By next meeting</b>
<b>8.4</b>	<p><b>JAW</b> observed that there were very few partners attending today's meeting. <b>ZC</b> confirmed that three were not here due to meeting clashes – one on holiday. It was noted that the previous SMP Strategy group meeting dates were potentially still in people's diaries and had caused some confusion. <b>MA</b> asked <b>SR</b> to</p>	<b>ZC/ALL</b>	<b>By Dec 2010</b>
		<b>SR</b>	<b>By Dec</b>

	<b>MINUTES</b>	<b>ACTION</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>
	confirm to partners all 2011 meeting dates and times, to avoid future diary clashes.		<b>2010</b>
<b>9.</b>	<p><b>Dates of Future Meetings</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <b>Safer Maidstone Partnership Delivery Group</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 24 February 2011</li> <li>• 16 June 2011</li> <li>• 6 September 2011</li> </ul> </li>   <li>➤ <b>LSP Board (for info for reporting purposes)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 15 December 2010</li> <li>• 23 March 2011</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

## **MAIDSTONE BOROUGH COUNCIL**

### **RECORD OF DECISION OF THE CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY SERVICES**

Decision Made: 20 December 2010

#### **PROVISION OF CCTV**

##### **Issue for Decision**

To consider a partnership arrangement with Medway Council for the council's CCTV service including staffing, maintenance and management to be operated as part of Medway Council's shared CCTV control centre.

##### **Decision Made**

1. That a partnership arrangement with Medway Council to provide CCTV services through a service level agreement be investigated.
2. That the Director of Regeneration and Community Services reports back to the Cabinet Member for a decision as to the way forward in the procurement of CCTV services, following consideration of stakeholders' views, such report to include an analysis as to whether the issues listed in paragraph 1.5.6 of the Report of the Director of Regeneration and Communities have been satisfactorily resolved.

##### **Reasons for Decision**

As part of the medium term service and financial planning process, the current CCTV service and the cost of provision were reviewed and a range of options identified. The review confirmed that in its current location, the cost of the service could only be significantly reduced by reducing the level of service provision i.e. reducing the number of days the CCTV cameras are observed. However, one of the options was to consider a proposal from Medway Council which already provides the CCTV service for Swale Borough Council. This option would require Maidstone to join a shared CCTV control centre based in Medway, through the transfer of the operation, maintenance and management of the service to Medway Council.

In agreeing to the shared service, Medway Council would look to operate the service as part of their wider operation, providing for economies of scale and more flexible staffing options. Medway would accept the risk of the ageing camera stock in providing a fully serviced proposal which includes the repair and replacement of all cameras and other equipment within the fixed price offered.

In accepting such a proposal the council would benefit from an immediate capital and revenue saving, improve resilience in terms of staffing, technology and disaster recovery arrangements and place the service in a



more sustainable position for the longer term. It would also offer the opportunity to develop income streams for the CCTV service and other services provided by Medway's control centre.

The proposal would also result in the release of the space occupied by the current service within the Town Hall, widening the options available regarding the future use of the building.

A "soft-market test" has been undertaken to provide confidence that the Medway Council proposal offers good value for money. The information received from a third party confirms that the Medway Council figures for providing a shared service are comparable.

Advice from the procurement section and legal services is that the partnership offer from Medway Council can be entered into without tendering the service so long as further clarification is obtained from Medway Council to ensure:

- the service level agreement properly reflects the shared nature of the partnership arrangement;
- Medway Council's procurement process complies with European Procurement Directives and our own contract procedure rules;
- Maidstone Council officers fully participate in future contract negotiations and appointments;
- Maidstone Council is able to fulfil its partnership role within the governance arrangements of the CCTV Service

In the scenario that Medway Council is unable to satisfy the assurances being sought listed above, paragraph 2 of the Decision Made enables the council to move the process forward by way of tendering the service in accordance with European Procurement Directives and Maidstone Council's contract procedure rules.

The Decision Made in this document differs from the recommendations made in the Report of the Director of Regeneration and Communities, with the Cabinet Member for Community Services retaining responsibility for the decision, to ensure complete transparency in the decision making process relating to the future of the CCTV service.

### **Alternatives considered and why rejected**

The council could continue with the current capital scheme to provide a basic upgrade to the basement area within the Town Hall and elements of the equipment at a cost of £247,000. It is not thought appropriate that the council takes this action as it will incur significant cost and does not offer the opportunity to improve resilience or deliver savings.

Whilst the council does not have a "do nothing" option due to the health and safety implications for part of the work, the council could look to address only those essential health and safety issues and not upgrade any of the equipment. This would leave the service vulnerable in terms of failure, with increased revenue costs attached to repair. Capital investment would also be required in the short term as equipment

becomes beyond reasonable repair or the frequency and cost of repairs becomes unmanageable.

If the council decided to keep the service at the Town Hall and either complete the current scheme or simply address the immediate health and safety issues, it could reduce its ongoing revenue costs by reducing the hours over which the service operates. It is not thought appropriate that the council takes this action due to the negative impact it will have on the contribution the service makes to reduce crime, increase public safety and maintain public confidence.

### **Background Papers**

None

Should you be concerned about this decision and wish to call it in, please submit a call in form signed by any two Non-Executive Members to the Head of Change and Scrutiny by: <b>30 December 2010</b>
---



# Agenda Item 9

## Maidstone Borough Council

### Partnership and Well Being Overview & Scrutiny Committee meeting as the Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Committee

Monday 14 March 2011

#### Update from Kent Police

Report of: Overview & Scrutiny Officer

#### 1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Partnerships and Well Being Overview and Scrutiny Committee have a statutory role to act as the Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Committee. In light of the recent appointment of Ian Learmouth, Chief Constable of Kent Police, the Committee wish to establish what the Chief Constable's priorities are for Maidstone and remain informed on the services being provided.

#### 2. Recommendation

- 2.1 The Committee is recommended to interview Matthew Nix, Mid Kent Commander, Kent Police to establish the direction the new Chief Constable has given and to be updated on the performance of the Basic Command Unit (BSU) and Police Community Support Officers (PCSO's) neighbourhood policing.
- 2.2 Areas of questioning could include but are not limited to:
- What are the current police priorities for Maidstone;
  - On what basis are the priorities set and refreshed;
  - What influence has Ian Learmouth's appointment had on the Police priorities for Kent;
  - What methods are in place for PCSO's to engage with the community;
  - How are the successes of Neighbourhood Policing measured;
  - What long term ambitions are there for Neighbourhood Policing in Maidstone;
  - What is the 'best practice' in Neighbourhood Policing that is observed;
  - What impact does CCTV monitoring have on crime in Maidstone;
  - What information sharing takes place between the Police and with organisations such as the SMP and to what benefit; and
  - What is the (Multi Agency Public Protection Arrangement) MAPPA process.

### **3 Chief Constable, Ian Learmouth**

- 3.1 In his role as Strathclyde Police's Assistant Chief Constable (Operational Support) had responsibility for Support Services, Roads Policing, Emergencies Planning and most of the major projects that impact on operational policing.  
Mr Learmouth joined Norfolk Constabulary in August 2007 as Deputy Chief Constable with responsibility for Human Resources, Legal Services, Professional Standards and the Business Performance Unit. Mr Learmouth joined Kent Police on 5 July 2010 as Chief Constable and is a member of the association of Chief Police.

### **4 The Basic Command Unit**

- 4.1 A Basic Command Unit (BCU) is a Police area within a Police Force. In April 2006, Kent Police had a major re-organisation and consolidated the work force from nine BCUs to six BCU areas. These are North Kent, West Kent, Medway, Mid Kent, South Kent and East Kent.
- 4.2 Within each of these areas, teams of Public Protection Officers work in the Special Investigation Unit (SIU). Each area will have a Detective Inspector, Detective Sergeant, constables and administration support. Their duties are varied from keeping records of the Registered Sex Offenders (RSOs) to collating and profiling person subject to the MAPPA process.
- 4.3 The Detective Inspector has overall strategic responsibility for the effective running of the unit whilst the Detective Sergeant and Constables carry out the day-to-day business. This includes managing information using VISOR (Violent and Sex Offender Register) carrying out visits to RSOs homes and ensuring the correct policing response is given to events of concern, raised by the general public.
- 4.4 The BSU works with other multi-agencies involved in the day-to-day management of MAPPA subjects. Public Protection Officers are skilled in the sharing of information ensuring law on disclosure is upheld, however the protection of the public is paramount.
- 4.5 The role of the Public Protection Officer on the BCU continues to develop and the safety of the public remains a priority.
- 4.6 The BSU in Mid Kent, serving Maidstone, is said to be the best performing in the county.

### **5. Police Community Support Officers Neighbourhood Policing**

- 5.1 Neighbourhood policing is an approach to increase contact between the police and the public, giving the opportunity for the police to be more responsive to the needs of local people. Neighbourhood Policing is about tackling local priorities in partnership with public and partner agencies, increasing public confidence in the police and reducing the types of crime and anti-social by the public behaviour prioritised by the public. The primary aim is to improve the public's perceptions and safety. This can be achieved through foot patrols, by holding meetings, proactive engagement methods to find out residents thoughts, range of enforcement and prevention techniques to reduce crime and disorder problems in the local area
- 5.2 The crime figures for Mid Kent shown on the Kent Police Website show that the level of crime in Mid Kent is average in comparison to the rest of Kent and that the average number of crimes in this area has **decreased from 1645.7 to 1556 (5.4%)** (compared to the same three month period last year) as shown below:

	Sep	Oct	Nov	Average
<b>2009</b>	1656	1637	1644	<b>1645.7</b>
<b>2010</b>	1499	1579	1590	<b>1556</b>

## **6. Impact on Corporate Objectives**

- 6.1 Understanding and engaging with Kent Police relates specifically to the Council's priority of a place that has strong, healthy and safe communities and the MBC objective to make people feel safe where they live.
- 6.2 There are no risks involved in considering an update from Kent Police.

## **MAIDSTONE PROTOCOLS FOR CRIME AND DISORDER REDUCTION PARTNERSHIP OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY**

- 1.** These protocols assume:
  - The continued operation of the Police and Justice Act 2006;
  - The continued existence of a Crime and Disorder Committee within the Overview and Scrutiny Function at Maidstone Borough Council (currently the External Overview and Scrutiny Committee);
  - The existence of a Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership for the Borough of Maidstone (currently the Safer Maidstone Partnership);
  - A partnership approach, working with responsible authorities within the Borough (and, where appropriate, beyond) as a "critical friend".
  
- 2.** The purpose of this protocol is to ensure effective interaction between the Safer Maidstone Partnership and the Crime and Disorder Committee to:
  - Enhance the public accountability of the Safer Maidstone Partnership;
  - Establish acceptable and appropriate ways of working between the two bodies; and
  - Develop and maintain a positive working relationship for the benefit of the residents of the Borough of Maidstone.
  
- 3.** The protocols are based on the following principles:
  - Overview and Scrutiny of the Safer Maidstone Partnership should focus on supporting the reduction of crime and anti-social behaviour and reducing fear of crime and anti-social behaviour in the Borough of Maidstone.
  - Safer Maidstone Partnership Overview and Scrutiny should seek to minimise any unnecessary additional administrative burdens on responsible authorities.
  - Crime and Disorder Committee agendas need to be developed in conjunction with the Safer Maidstone Partnership.
  - It is the intention of the Crime and Disorder Committee to require the Safer Maidstone Partnership to demonstrate added value in the work it does.
  
- 4.** The Crime and Disorder Committee has the statutory power to:
  - Consider Councillor Calls for Action made in relation to community safety matters;
  - Review or scrutinise decisions made, or other action taken, in connection with the discharge by the responsible authorities of their crime and disorder functions; and
  - Make reports or recommendations to the local authority with respect to the discharge of those functions.
  - "The responsible authorities" means the bodies and persons who are responsible authorities within the meaning given by section 5 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 (c.37) (authorities responsible for

crime and disorder strategies) in relation to the local authority's area.

5. Maidstone Borough Council has a responsibility to work with Kent County Council and other district councils on the scrutiny of community safety issues where this is possible, for example through joint development of work programmes. The Overview and Scrutiny Team will seek to identify opportunities for joint working through the Kent and Medway Overview and Scrutiny Officer Network and present proposals to the Crime and Disorder Committee and the Safer Maidstone Partnership as these develop.

## **6. Communication**

- 6.1 The Crime and Disorder Committee and the Safer Maidstone Partnership will each nominate a named officer to be the main point of contact. That officer will direct all correspondence to the appropriate person.
- 6.2 The Overview and Scrutiny function will inform the Safer Maidstone Partnership of all Overview and Scrutiny Committee work programmes on a six monthly basis to give Partners the opportunity to comment on any items that they feel appropriate to their own work. The Safer Maidstone Partnership will also be invited to propose future work items for the Crime and Disorder Committee where it wishes to do so, though the Committee is under no obligation to take these on.
- 6.3 The Safer Maidstone Partnership will inform the Crime and Disorder Committee of its forthcoming work on a six monthly basis and consult the Committee on its work where appropriate. In particular, the Safer Maidstone Partnership should consult the Crime and Disorder Committee on its Partnership Plan.
- 6.4 Both parties will inform the other of structure changes and significant changes to priorities or future plans to ensure accuracy of information.

## **7. Information Sharing**

- 7.1 The Safer Maidstone Partnership will distribute public minutes of full Partnership, Policy group and Strategy group meetings to members of the Crime and Disorder Committee as soon as these are agreed.
- 7.2 The Crime and Disorder Committee may also request informal notes of delivery group meetings where this is relevant to work being carried out by the Committee.
- 7.3 The Safer Maidstone Partnership is required to respond to requests for information by the Crime and Disorder Committee "as soon as reasonably possible". These requests from councillors should be well focussed and thought through.
- 7.4 Information provided to the Crime and Disorder Committee by responsible authorities should be depersonalised and should not include any



information that would be reasonably likely to prejudice legal proceedings or current or future operations of the responsible authority. These requirements cannot be bypassed by Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 i.e. by putting an item onto Part II of a committee agenda.

## **8. Meeting Protocols**

- 8.1 The Committee has a duty to meet at least once a year and is recommended to meet at 6 monthly intervals to ensure the ongoing building and maintenance of knowledge. Review task and finish groups may meet outside of these formal meetings with the requirement to report findings in full at a Crime and Disorder designated meeting.
- 8.2 Officers or employees of responsible authorities or of co-operating persons or bodies are required to attend meetings of the Crime and Disorder Committee to answer questions or provide information. The Committee will endeavour to give at least one month's notice to persons requested to attend. The person required must attend on the specified date unless they have a reasonable excuse not too.
- 8.3 Prior to meetings between the Crime and Disorder Committee and the Safer Maidstone Partnership, the Overview and Scrutiny function will:
- Agree meeting dates as far in advance as possible;
  - Provide meeting paperwork at least 5 working days prior to the meeting;
  - Provide the Safer Maidstone Partnership with a list of proposed questions or key areas of inquiry.
- 8.4 When representatives of the Safer Maidstone Partnership are invited to attend meetings of the Crime and Disorder Committee, the following protocols will apply:
- Committee Members should endeavour not to request detailed information from representatives of the Safer Maidstone partnership at meetings of the Committee, unless they have given prior notice through the appropriate officer. If, in the course of question and answer at a meeting of the Committee, it becomes apparent that further information would be useful, the representative being questioned may be required to submit it in writing to members of the Committee through the appropriate officer.
  - In the course of questioning at meetings, representatives of the Safer Maidstone Partnership may decline to give information or respond to questions on the ground that it is more appropriate that the question be directed to a more senior representative.
  - Representatives of the Safer Maidstone Partnership may decline to answer questions in an open session of the Committee on the grounds that the answer might disclose information which would be exempt or confidential as defined in the Access to Information Act 1985. In that event, the Committee may resolve to exclude the

media and public in order that the question may be answered in private sessions.

- Committee members may not criticise or adversely comment on any individual representative of the Safer Maidstone Partnership by name.
- The Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules, as published in the Maidstone Borough Council Constitution, will apply to all meetings.

8.5 A record will be made of the main statements of witnesses appearing before the Committee and agreed with the witness prior to publication or use by the Committee. Committee meetings may be electronically recorded and web-cast.

## **9. Reporting and Recommendations**

9.1 Section 19(2) of the Police and Justice Act 2006 states that where the Crime and Disorder Committee makes a report or recommendations, a copy shall be provided to each of the responsible authorities.

9.2 In accordance with Section 19(8) of the Police and Justice Act, the authority, person or body to which a copy of the report or recommendations is passed shall:

- a) Consider the report or recommendations;
- b) Respond to the Crime and Disorder Committee indicating what (if any) action it proposes to take; and
- c) Have regard to the report or recommendations in exercising its functions.

9.3 The relevant partner (or partners, including the full Safer Maidstone Partnership) will have 28 days to formally respond to any recommendations made by the Committee, or if this is not possible as soon as reasonably possible thereafter. The relevant partner(s) will inform the Crime and Disorder Committee Chairman if delays are expected.

9.4 The Overview and Scrutiny function will ensure that drafts of Committee reports are made available for comment by the Safer Maidstone Partnership Strategy Group and any adverse comments or concerns reported to the Committee before the final report is published.

9.5 The Chairmen of the Safer Maidstone Partnership will be given advance notice of the date of publication of the report and consulted on the text of any accompanying press release.

## **10. Co-option**

10.1 The Crime and Disorder Committee may co-opt additional members as it sees appropriate. These co-optees:

- Have the same entitlement to vote as any other member;

- May not be co-opted where the committee is considering a decision or action for which that person was wholly or partly responsible, or otherwise directly involved;
- May not out-number the permanent committee members;
- Must be an employee or officer of a responsible authority or co-operating person or body; and
- Cannot be a member of the Executive.

The relevant responsible authority will be consulted as to the most suitable person prior to co-option, and the membership of the co-optee can be withdrawn at any time.

- 10.2 Home Office guidance for the scrutiny of crime and disorder matters, states that "local authorities should, in all instances, presume that the police authority should play an active part at committee when community safety matters are being discussed – and particularly when the police are to be present". In light of this guidance, Kent Police Authority will be invited to propose a member for co-option onto the committee when community safety matters are being considered.
- 11.** These protocols will be reviewed after every third meeting of the Crime and Disorder Committee by the Committee Chairman and the Safer Maidstone Partnership Chairmen to ensure that they remain fit for purpose.