

At a meeting of the COMMUNITY AND SAFER CITY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE held in the CIVIC CENTRE on TUESDAY, 6TH JULY, 2010 at 5.30 p.m.

Present:-

Councillor Heron in the Chair

Councillors Ball, Copeland, Ellis, Emerson, Maddison, Scaplehorn, J. Scott, Timmins and J. Walton.

Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were submitted to the meeting on behalf of Councillor O'Connor.

Minutes of the Last Meeting held on 8th June 2010

1. RESOLVED that the minutes of the last meeting of the Committee held on 8th June, 2010 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

Declarations of Interest (including Whipping Declarations)

There were no declarations of interest.

Alcohol, Violence and the Night Time Economy Policy Review 2010/11: Draft Scoping Report

The Chief Executive submitted a report (copy circulated) to put forward proposals and seek agreement from Members in relation to the forthcoming policy review into Alcohol, Violence and the Night Time Economy.

(For copy report – see original minutes).

In relation to the evidence gathering, Councillor Copeland enquired if Members wished for a site visit of the City Centre to look at the Night Time Economy, would it be at the busiest times.

Stuart Douglass, Safer Communities Manager, advised that a Friday or Saturday would be the best days for a site visit. Any possible times could be arranged after

discussions with the Police over the safest options and Members could also view City Centre activity through the CCTV Centre.

Councillor John Scott commented that in order for the Committee to get a true reflection, the visit needed to be at the busiest times to engage with the public that were affected.

Mr. Douglass advised that consideration was needed on how to conduct the visit safely.

The Chairman advised that the Committee needed to be responsible and consider the safety of the public, therefore that judgement should be based on the advice of the Police.

Councillor Scaplehorn commented that during a recent visit in Washington, the Police had advised against the Councillors consulting at the busiest times and they had viewed footage through the CCTV cameras.

Councillor Ellis agreed with Councillor Scott, that to get a true reflection, consultation was required during the busiest times and if it was safe enough for members of the public it should be safe enough for the Councillors.

Councillor J. Walton informed the Committee of a Licensing Committee visit of the City Centre undertaken 2-3 years ago and that it had given a good insight into the situation.

Councillor Emerson acknowledged the benefits of looking into the issue but queried whether members of the public would want to be questioned by Councillors when on a night out.

Councillor J. Walton advised that the engagement from youths was very good during the Licensing visit.

Charlotte Burnham, Head of Overview and Scrutiny, advised that there was a number of possibilities that could be pursued and proposed officers look at all options/dates and bring them back to the Committee for consideration.

Councillor J. Scott raised concerns after a recent visit to Cardiff to see how they worked together around the issue of City Centre violence and how the Council, Police, Fire Brigade met monthly and engaged with the public, yet Sunderland's City Centre Management Team consisted of only one person.

Mr. Douglass advised that whilst there was only one person in the City Centre Management Team, there were a whole range of people who had specific City Centre responsibilities and that looking at other cities was a good idea, of which Cardiff would be visiting Sunderland to view good practice.

In relation to Section 7 of the report and funding from the dedicated Overview and Scrutiny budget, Ms. Burnham advised that the Committee had a revenue stream of £10,000 to fund expert advice, site visits, etc.

In response to Councillor Ball's query, Ms. Burnham advised that the Committee did not spend all of their budget last year and would confirm how much was spent at a future meeting. Ms. Burnham also advised that collectively over all of the Scrutiny Committees, there had been an underspend.

In response to Councillor Ball's query, Tom Terrett, Trading Standards and Licensing Manager, advised that all door supervisors require a license which Police regularly enforce through visits.

In relation to the membership of the Task and Finish Groups, Claire Harrison, Assistant Scrutiny Officer, will contact all members of the Committee when the first Task and Finish Group meeting is arranged.

2. RESOLVED that:-

- i) Members discussed and agreed the scope of the Community and Safer City Scrutiny Committee's policy review for 2010/11 as outlined in the report.
- ii) Members will be informed of the first meeting of the Task and Finish Group and should then contact the Scrutiny Officer if they wish to sit on the membership of the Group, which would focus on licensing policy and enforcement.

Review of the Council's Licensing Policy Statement

The Executive Director of City Services submitted a report (copy circulated) to seek the views of Members upon the Council's draft Licensing Policy Statement under the Licensing Act 2003 in association with their policy review of Alcohol, Violence and the Night Time Economy.

(For copy report – see original minutes).

Councillor J. Walton commented on the section of the Policy 'The Cumulative Impact of a Concentration of Licensed Premises' and suggested the wording be altered to reflect a more anticipatory approach to the issue.

Mr. Terrett advised that he would investigate the matter with Chief Solicitors further and come back to a future meeting of the Committee.

Councillor J. Scott commented that the saturation of venues was causing problems and the Council should have something in place to enable them to say enough is enough.

Councillor Scaplehorn commented that many of the fast food establishments on the industrial estates in Washington were also selling alcohol, which was causing littering. Councillor Scaplehorn urged we move away from calling these areas industrial estates as they were more retail areas and enquired if the Council had any powers to stop people from selling from these premises.

Mr. Terrett advised that all establishments needed a license, once they had this, the Council still carried out inspection visits and if a certain establishment was causing problems it could be called in for review.

Mr. Terrett also advised that if a certain premise was causing a public nuisance etc, conditions could be imposed such as requiring extra signage, waste bins. If the problems were due to specific times, premises hours of business could be curtailed and should Members have any problems with a particular area, they could contact the Licensing Section to investigate further.

In respect of Section 5 of the Policy 'The Need for Licensed Premises', Councillor Timmins commented that as Members could not judge on need, the whole issue needed to be tackled in partnership with Planning as unless the rules were laid out, people could apply anywhere.

Councillor Scaplehorn queried the reporting of issues through the 101 number and how these were not being relayed to the Police.

Mr. Terrett advised that he had regular meetings with the Police and he would speak to them to find out what more could be done. If the 101 complaints related to noise etc. these would get picked up by the Environmental Health Team.

In relation to Section 4.3 of the Policy, Councillor Copeland enquired if the off licences would also be expected to take responsible steps to prevent the occurrence of crime and disorder and public nuisance immediately outside their premises.

Mr. Terrett advised that under normal circumstances the expectation was that alcohol would not be consumed at an off licence but if there was a severe problem at a particular premise, it would be possible for measures to be put in place.

3. RESOLVED that Members' comments on the draft Licensing Policy be taken into consideration.

Tackling Serious Youth Violence

The Chief Executive submitted a report (copy circulated) to provide an overview and presentation on the Serious Youth Violence Crime Programme.

(For copy report and presentation – see original minutes).

Ian Stephenson, Home Office Advisor, presented the report and was on hand to answer Members' queries.

In response to a query from Councillor Ellis, Mr. Stephenson advised that the statistics were gathered from every source available, with crime data being key but also looking at information from authorities in relation to Health, Licensing etc.

Councillor Copeland enquired if they had received records from the hospitals in relation to incidents of GBH.

Mr. Stephenson advised that the Accident and Emergency Department in Cardiff had started collecting assault related data, this was then promoted nationally but was something Sunderland was already doing.

Councillor Maddison enquired how much of the knife crime in Sunderland was gang related.

Mr. Stephenson advised that knife crime in the North East was very low and that most cases tended to be through domestic violence.

The Chairman commented that the likes of London, Birmingham and Manchester had incidents of gang related knife crime, whereas Sunderland did not and queried if it was due to education.

Mr. Stephenson commented that the issues in other areas could be down to the culture of drugs and territories, whilst the culture in the North East of drinking tended to be the main source of violence.

Councillor Ellis commented that the statistics depended on how the Police reported incidents and informed the Committee that a family member had been attacked with a knife, yet it was recorded as affray.

Mr. Stephenson commented that there may have been a number of reasons why that particular incident was recorded as it was, and it may be best that the Police answer that query.

In response to Councillor Scaplehorn's query, Mr. Douglass advised that he was not aware of many racially aggravated assaults but they were very low numbers and suggested specific data could be brought to a future meeting of the Committee.

The Chairman enquired if the education of young people through schools and scouts etc. was having an effect.

Mr. Douglass advised that the Police had carried out a programme through the schools on the prevention of knife crime. Mr. Douglass also commented that it was important this preventative work be carried out so that young people realise what the consequences could be if they carry knives.

The Chairman commented that the statistics on knife crime in the City were low and enquired if the Council was doing something different to other authorities. The Chairman also commented that he would like to see the programme on educating young people be continued.

Mr. Douglass advised that Sunderland had provided a whole range of things to avoid knife crime including offering preventative/diversionary services.

The Chairman commented that the LMAPs was one of the best vehicles the Police had for intelligence sharing in Sunderland and enquired if it was as successful in other areas of the country.

Mr. Stephenson commented that the LMAPs do work well and the Home Office always asks areas to link in LMAPs to the Tackling Knives Action Programme. In relation to education programmes, Sunderland has been ahead of the game and the Home Office also had programmes available.

The Chairman commented that it may be worth looking at the programmes as part of the scoping report to pull together all available resources.

4. RESOLVED that the presentation and report be noted.

Poverty of Place

The Chief Executive submitted a report (copy attached) to highlight to the Committee the current research as regards poverty of place in relation to understanding community safety and the relationship with community cohesion.

(For copy report – see original minutes).

Les Platt, Senior Policy Officer (Diversity) presented the report and requested Members' consideration of site visits.

The Chairman proposed the afternoon of Tuesday, 27th July as a possible date for any site visit.

Ms. Harrison advised that she would email Members with confirmation of dates, times and locations.

5. RESOLVED that the report be noted.

Centre for Public Scrutiny 8th Annual Conference – Feedback

The Chief Executive submitted a report (copy circulated) to provide verbal feedback from the Centre for Public Scrutiny (CfPS) 8th Annual Conference that was held on 30th June and 1st July, 2010.

(For copy report – see original minutes).

Councillor Copeland attended the event and gave the Committee an update on what occurred. Councillor Copeland also felt that Sunderland should have applied for the awards ceremonies as they could have won with a number of projects such as the Polycarbonate Glass Scheme. These ideas needed to be put forward to put Sunderland on the map.

Ms. Burnham advised that she had accompanied Members to the Conference with the message being, for the repositioning of Scrutiny to find ways that don't incur costs in this current economic climate.

Ms. Burnham also commented that Sunderland had made significant strides in its Scrutiny function but the decision was taken not to apply for awards as Scrutiny was on a developmental journey, but Ms. Burnham took on board Councillor Copeland's comments.

6. RESOLVED that the report be received and noted.

Forward Plan – Key Decisions for the Period 1 July 2010 – 31 October 2010

The Chief Executive submitted a report (copy circulated) to provide Members with an opportunity to consider those items on the Executive's Forward Plan for the period 1 July – 31 October 2010 which relate to the Community and Safer City Scrutiny Committee.

(For copy report – see original minutes).

7. RESOLVED that the report be received and noted.

Work Programme 2010-11

The Chief Executive submitted a report (copy circulated) providing for Members' information the current Work Programme for the Committee's work during the 2010-11 Council year.

(For copy report – see original minutes).

Councillor Copeland informed the Committee of a recent operation between the Police and Trading Standards in identifying off licences selling alcohol to the underage and believed if we could tackle this issue, we could cut the incidents of anti social behaviour almost overnight.

The Chairman commented that the legislative process would come under the consideration of the Licensing Committee.

Ms. Burnham advised that the Committee could look at the findings of that particular operation through the Policy Review if Members so wished.

8. RESOLVED that the report be received and noted.

The Chairman thanked everyone for their attendance and closed the meeting.

(Signed) R. HERON,
Chairman.

COMMUNITY AND SAFER CITY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

14 SEPTEMBER 2010

RESPONSE FROM CABINET – 21 JULY 2010

POLICY REVIEW –STUDY INTO ANTI SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR

JOINT REPORT OF DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE AND THE PORTFOLIO
HOLDER FOR SAFER CITY

STRATEGIC PRIORITIES: SP3 SAFE CITY

CORPORATE PRIORITIES: CIO1: Delivering Customer Focused Services,
CIO4: Improving Partnership Working to Deliver 'One City'.

1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide feedback from the Cabinet meeting held on 21 July 2010, which considered the Community and Safer City Scrutiny Committee's Policy report into Anti Social Behaviour.

2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 2.1 The investigation into Anti Social Behaviour conducted by the Community and Safer City Scrutiny Committee falls under the remit of the Office of the Chief Executive and is, within the service area covered by the Safer City Portfolio Holder.
- 2.2 On 21 July 2010, Cabinet considered the Final Report of the Community and Safer City Scrutiny Committee into tackling Anti Social Behaviour. This report provides feedback from the Portfolio Holder following the Cabinet's consideration of, and decisions in relation to this Committee's recommendations.
- 2.3 Following on from this report, progress towards completion of the actions will be monitored through the Action Plan, with standardised six monthly monitoring reports to be presented to the Committee.

3. RESPONSE FROM CABINET TO THE POLICY REVIEW

- 3.1 Following consideration of the Final Report, Cabinet approved the recommendations in their entirety. Details of each recommendation and proposed actions to be taken following approval by Cabinet are provided in the Action Plan attached at **Appendix A**.
- 3.2 Cabinet commended and congratulated the Committee and its officers for their hard work in undertaking the policy review and additional work.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 4.1 That Members note the proposed actions detailed within the Action Plan, appended to this report (**Appendix A**) and seek clarification on its content where felt appropriate.

5. BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 5.1 The following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:-

(i) Cabinet Agenda, 21 July 2010.

Contact Officer: Claire Harrison
Acting Scrutiny Officer
0191 561 1232
Claire.harrison1@sunderland.gov.uk

Appendix A

Community and Safer City Scrutiny Committee Anti-Social Behaviour Policy Review recommendations 09/10

Ref	Recommendation	Action	Owner	Due Date	Progress Commentary
1.	That the comments and recommendations of the Anti Social Behaviour Policy Review be incorporated into the forthcoming SSP Anti Social Behaviour Strategy;	Finalise Delivery Plan to include partner comments and contribution. Seek endorsement from SSP Board at April 2010 meeting.	ASB Delivery Group (ASB Strategy Manager)	01/05/2010	Comments from ASB Policy Review incorporated within Delivery Plan. This was endorsed by SSP Board at meeting on 30 April 2010
2.	That the Safer Sunderland Partnership considers the options for a more unified system of data capture, particularly across the housing sector, in order to improve the response of partners to ASB;	Seek a more unified system of data capture across the partnership to include partner response to ASB. This is to include requirements in relation to victims of ASB, and the Challenge and support ethos.	ASB Delivery Group (ASB Strategy Manager)	01/12/2010	The Home Office have indicated that they are to develop a case management system nationally. Further information is awaited. Gentoo are in the process of developing a unified system which includes requirements in relation to victims of ASB, and the Challenge and support ethos. A presentation has already been provided to the ASB Delivery Group with a view to seeking buy in from partners in the housing sector. The system is also being developed to enable interface with police systems.

3.	That the Safer Sunderland Partnership investigates how it might better identify potential victims of anti social behaviour	Agencies supporting victims of ASB to be asked to provide victim profile data for inclusion in future PSIAa. Police are working with partners to implement a system to protect, reassure and empower vulnerable victims of crime. Use of a case conferencing approach being considered for high risk victims of ASB	ASB Delivery Group (Victims Champion)	01/12/2010	SSP have a Victims Champion who is carrying out an assessment of victim issues in relation to ASB. Gentoo Victim Support service has shown to have a 62 percentage point improvement on improving feelings of safety for victims at the close of the case. Funding has been allocated for an additional Victim Support Worker to be based in the Council's ASB Unit to work with victims of ASB in the private rented and owner occupied sectors.
4.	That the Safer Sunderland Partnership reviews the enforcement measures available to partners and provides staff with guidance on the powers currently available for tackling ASB	Knowledge on use of tools and powers needs to be refreshed and suitable guidance and training for staff to be put in place during 2010-11	ASB Delivery Group (ASB Strategy Manager)	01/12/2010	ASBO protocol updated by Legal Services. New legislation relating to Drink Banning Orders in place and being utilised. Training to be developed.
5.	That the City Council and its partners investigate options for improving the enforcement of environmental ASB and combat issues such as graffiti, litter and fly-tipping;	Service Delivery on priorities to be reviewed pending Street Scene Transformation/ restructure. Greater emphasis to be placed upon responsive local services, to ensure swifter reporting and sorting of issues backed up by feedback to the community on enforcement taken.	Assistant Head of Environmental Services	01/12/2010	Environmental Services representatives are now included as core representatives on all LMAPS. The Council's environmental services staff reporting line is now operational and staff have an enriched role to 'look, report and sort'.

6.	That partners investigate ways of expanding the operation of the Phoenix project in order to help tackle areas experiencing higher levels of ASB fires	YOS and TWFRS to assess if additional referrals could be sourced for the project from those areas experiencing higher levels of ASB fires.	ASB Delivery Group (TWFRS – JW, YOS)	01/12/2010	To be explored
7.	That partners investigate the potential of expanding the operation of the XL Village concept throughout the city	Weekend youth work to be targeted in ASB hotspot areas (via local data and survey findings)	XL Villages Strategy Group (YDG Assistant Manager)	01/12/2010	XL Youth Village is being rolled out across the City. A mobile provision is also being developed to provide additional outreach support to those more inaccessible areas.
8.	That partners investigate the potential of introducing improved security on buses and explore the potential of the youth work pilot working with young people.	Partners investigate the potential of introducing improved security on buses and to examine youth worker engagement with youths in bus shelters to involve them in alternative activities.	ASB Delivery Group (Nexus, YDG Assistant Manager)	01/12/2010	To be explored
9.	That the City Council and its partners consider the extension of the CCTV monitoring system subject to the availability of resources.	Make full use of CCTV technology to tackle ASB in public spaces to deter, aid detection and support prosecutions.	CCTV Steering Group (Security and Emergency Planning Manager)	Ongoing	The SSP are in the process of securing £40,000 of capital funds to support this. Protocol for 3G Camera deployment developed and cascaded to LMAPS. CCTV review and action plan produced

COMMUNITY AND SAFER CITY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

14 SEPTEMBER 2010

ALCOHOL, VIOLENCE AND THE NIGHT TIME ECONOMY POLICY REVIEW 2010/11 SCENE SETTING REPORT

REPORT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE

STRATEGIC PRIORITIES: SP3: SAFE CITY

CORPORATE PRIORITIES: CIO1: Delivering Customer Focussed Services, C102: Being 'One Council', C103: Efficient and Effective Council, C104: Improving partnership working to deliver 'One City'

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To provide an overview to the Scrutiny Committee on current partnership responses to alcohol related violence in the City Centre, as part of their policy review.

2. Background

- 2.1 At its meeting on 8 June 2010, the Scrutiny Committee agreed to pursue a review of alcohol, violence and the night time economy, and at its meeting on 6 July 2010, it agreed a terms of reference for the study, together with a schedule of meetings. It was agreed that the September meeting would be used to set the scene in relation to current responses to alcohol related violence in the City Centre.
- 2.2 This report contributes principally to the following areas within the terms of reference for the study:
 - (a) To gain an understanding of the key issues in relation to violent crime in the City Centre and the relationship between alcohol and violence.
 - (b) To examine the role that partner organisations play in prevention activities in relation to violent crime in the City Centre, with particular focus on situational and social crime prevention.

3. Definition and context

- 3.1 The Home Office defines violent crime as robbery, sexual offences, and a group of Violence against the Person offences ranging from assault without injury, through wounding, to homicide.
- 3.2 The National Crime Strategy highlights that alcohol is a key driver in nearly half of all violent crime and is a cross cutting issue. The National Alcohol Strategy states that up to 70% of A& E admissions at peak times are

alcohol related, 47% of violence victims described the assailant as being drunk and alcohol is a factor in 30% of city centre arrests.

- 3.3 Sunderland City Centre has a vibrant night time economy, with 191 licensed premises consisting of a mix of restaurants, takeaways, pubs and nightclubs. The main nights that have been identified as being problematic for crime and disorder linked to problem premises are Fridays, Saturdays and Mondays.
- 3.4 Violent Crime in Sunderland is reducing, figures for the period 1st April – 15th August 2010 show a reduction of 6.2% compared with the same period for 2009. There has, however, been an increase in relation to most serious violence. Figures show that there were 69 crimes last year compared to 100 for the same period this year. Sunderland is ranked in the top 15% local authorities for harmful drinking and is within the top 5% of highest ranked Local Authorities areas for alcohol specific under 18-year-old hospital admissions.

4. Policy Background

- 4.1 In 2008, the Safer Sunderland Partnership (SSP) produced an annually renewable 15 year strategy called the Safer Sunderland Strategy 2008-2023. It gives a longer term focus to the SSP's activity whilst still including short and medium terms priorities and step changes that need to take place. This is supported by a detailed delivery plan.
- 4.2 The SSP has responsibility for ensuring the Safer Sunderland Strategy is implemented and for reviewing and evaluating progress to ensure that it is achieving what it set out to do.
- 4.3 The overall outcome of the Safer Sunderland Strategy is about everyone being and feeling safe and secure. The strategy has an ambitious aim that:
- “by 2023, Sunderland will be a city where people feel, and are, safe and secure where they can enjoy life without the concerns of being a victim of crime or being harmed”.*
- 4.4 The Safer Sunderland Partnership (SSP) brings together the public, private, community and voluntary sectors to deliver the Safer Sunderland Strategy. There are 6 ‘responsible authorities’ on the SSP and they have the legal duty to work in partnership to tackle crime, disorder and substance misuse and to implement a strategic assessment and partnership plan.

The 6 responsible authorities are:

1. Sunderland City Council
2. Northumbria Police
3. Northumbria Police Authority
4. Tyne and Wear Fire and Rescue Service / Authority
5. Sunderland Teaching Primary Care Trust
6. National Probation Service Northumbria

4.5 Tackling alcohol misuse, including alcohol-related crime and disorder and tackling violent crime are two of the Safer Sunderland Partnership's (SSP) key strategic priorities for 2010/11. There are two themed delivery groups which are relevant to this review:

(a) The Alcohol Delivery Group (ADG) is a thematic delivery group of the Safer Sunderland Partnership. It is responsible for overseeing the implementation of alcohol misuse related outcomes from the Safer Sunderland Strategy and the national alcohol strategy, Safe, Sensible, Social in order to reduce alcohol misuse and the harm it causes including alcohol related crime and disorder.

(b) The Violent Crime Delivery Group is responsible for the preparation and delivery of the Violent Crime Delivery Plan. The work encompasses (i) public space violent crime and (ii) private space violent crime (domestic violence). The group is also supported by the Sunderland Domestic Violence Partnership.

5. Partnership Activity

5.1 There is infrastructure to tackle alcohol and violent crime, and numerous interventions are in place provided either in partnership or by individual services including the following:

5.2 *Sunderland City Council: Safer Communities Team*

5.2.1 The Team consists of both Council and Teaching Primary Care Trust (TPCT) employed staff as well as occasional secondments from partners. The team is part of the Office of the Chief Executive at Sunderland City Council. The core functions of the team are to:

- a) Co-ordinate and support the Safer Sunderland Partnership (SSP) in the development and delivery of the Safer Sunderland Strategy 2008-2023.
- b) Ensure the Council meets its statutory and key delivery responsibilities in relation to Safer Communities, particularly in relation to Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998.
- c) Deal with day-to-day enquiries and concerns regarding safer communities issues.
- d) Maximise the use of external and mainstream resources and commission services to support targeted action on identified crime, anti-social behaviour and substance misuse priorities. The Safer Communities Team co-ordinate Safer Sunderland Partnership action to address crime, disorder, reducing re-offending and substance misuse issues.
- e) The team has is headed by the Safer Communities Manager and includes the posts of Drug and Alcohol Strategy Manager and Safer Communities Officer - Violent Crime Reduction.

5.3 ***Sunderland City Council: Licensing Section and Trading Standards Section***

- 5.3.1 The Licensing Section administers and enforces the Licensing Act. One of the objectives of the Act is the prevention of crime and disorder.
- 5.3.2 The Licensing Section intervenes with licensees where breaches of legislation and licensing conditions are identified e.g. failure to provide CCTV coverage or the exceeding of opening hours.
- 5.3.3 The Trading Standards Section has the responsibility for enforcing the law prohibiting the sale of alcohol to persons under 18. The Trading Standards Section seeks to educate off licensees and their staff about avoiding such sales and, where appropriate, sends child volunteers into premises to attempt test purchases. Illegal sales can lead to prosecutions and reviews of offenders' licences.

5.4 ***Northumbria Police***

- 5.4.1 The key objective in the Northumbria Police Strategy for 2008-2011 is 'to build trust and confidence in the community and reduce crime and disorder'.
- 5.4.2 In a bid to make the City even safer Sunderland Area Command has committed resources to police the City Centre. Key operations to tackle alcohol and violent crime include:

- a) Operation Barracuda

Throughout February and March 2010, a hard hitting police operation focussed on license holders in the city. As well as carrying out additional visits to licensed premises, extra officers were on patrol to stamp down on crime and disorder linked to the night time economy.

The operation resulted in 121 licensed premises visited within Sunderland Area Command, predominantly within the City Centre, Coalfields and Washington areas. Operation Barracuda also involved agencies such as the Border Agency, Trading Standards, and Tyne and Wear Fire and Rescue Service.

The Operation was hailed a success and now runs over intermittently over weekends.

- b) Operation Calculate

Inspections carried out under Operation Barracuda identified premises where under 18's were found within the premises consuming alcohol.

As a result of Operation Barracuda, evidence was gathered with regard to under 18's on licensed premises. An operation was instigated using young persons to undertake test purchases of alcohol. The test purchasing resulted in prosecutions.

All premises identified as selling to the Test Purchase Operatives have attended Gillbridge Police Station to be given guidance and advice on how to make sure it doesn't happen again. Premises concerned were given a formal warning.

5.5 ***Sunderland Teaching Primary Care Trust***

5.5.1 In 2008 Sunderland Teaching Primary Care Trust, as one of the core components on NHS South of Tyne and Wear, invested over £5 million of recurring monies to tackle alcohol related health harms across Sunderland, Gateshead and South Tyneside. As a result £2.6 million is invested annually into services in Sunderland to tackle alcohol health harm, this includes;

- a) A comprehensive alcohol team in Sunderland Royal Hospital, including additional nursing capacity in the Gastroenterology Department, staff to assess individuals who present to the Emergency Department with alcohol related issues and work with individuals in the hospital and in the community and a young people's worker to target those aged 18 and under.
- b) Additional community and in-patient detoxification places
- c) One to one support for hazardous, harmful and dependent drinkers
- d) Nursing capacity for Alcohol Treatment Requirements, an order imposed by the courts
- e) Alcohol Arrest Referral Scheme
- f) Peer support and additional infrastructure for carer services to support families affected by alcohol misuse

5.6 Details of the interventions and powers that are currently used to tackle the issue of alcohol related violent crime are included in **Appendix A**.

6. ***Performance Indicators***

6.1 The Safer Sunderland Partnership have a comprehensive performance framework to monitor performance against a range of national and local indicators relating to alcohol and violence. A copy of this framework can be made available to the Scrutiny Committee upon request. The three most prominent performance measures are currently:

- a) NI 39 - Alcohol Related Hospital Admission Rates (this NI is managed by the Healthy Partnership but a report is also given to the Alcohol Delivery Group)
- b) NI 20 - Assault with injury crime, which is monitored by the Violent Crime Delivery Group and
- c) Most Serious Violent Crime, also managed by this group.

7. **Recommendations**

7.1 Members are recommended to accept this report and to consider which of the current activities being carried out in the city they wish to take evidence on as part of the review.

8. Background Papers

- Safer Sunderland Strategy 2008-2025
- The Home Office: Reducing the risk of violent crime 2008

Contact Officer : Claire Harrison (0191 561 1232)
claire.harrison1@sunderland.gov.uk

Interventions and Powers used for tackling alcohol related violence

Drinking Banning Orders

Drinking Banning Orders (DBOs) were introduced within the Violent Crime Reduction Act, 2006.

They are civil orders that can be sought by various authorities such as the Police, Transport Police and local authorities in England and Wales.

They are a power that can be used to target those who abuse alcohol to the extent that it leads to alcohol related crime or disorder. Orders can be made against individuals aged 16 or over if they have engaged in criminal or disorderly conduct while under the influence of alcohol. Orders can last between 2 months and 2 years.

The aim is to protect the person from further conduct of that kind by prohibiting the individual from doing things prescribed in the order.

The Court can specify an approved course as part of the DBO if the individual consents. Approved courses are taken on a voluntary basis as means to addressing behaviour involving alcohol misuse.

Sunderland City Council and Northumbria Police have worked in partnership to successfully secure 2 DBOs to date.

Cardiff Model

It is recognised that many individuals will attend the Emergency Department for alcohol related violent injuries who never report attacks against them to the police. In order to close this information gap and to identify 'hot spot' areas for alcohol related violence data, Reception Staff at Sunderland Royal Hospital complete a minimum data set on every individual who presents to them with alcohol related violent crime injuries. This initiative is known as the 'Cardiff Model' based on the pilot initiative from the South Wales area.

In Sunderland this information is shared on a fortnightly basis with the Safer Communities and forms part of the intelligence used by the Police as part of their Tasking and Coordinating Group. It is hoped that with more comprehensive information it will also form part of license reviews by Trading Standards and the Licensing Committee. This work is supported by the Regional Director of Public Health Cardiff Model and Government Office North East.

Taxi Marshalling Scheme

This service helps people get home safely from the city centre after a night out. It consists of three fully licensed and trained marshals being on duty at the taxi ranks on Green Terrace and West Street on Friday and Saturday

nights. The SSP are also currently funding a pilot of this scheme on a Monday evening. The Taxi Marshalls job is to help keep the taxi queues moving, resolve any problems that might arise and ensure that all members of the public feel safe in and around the taxi ranks. The scheme is also monitored by the Council's Security and Licensing sections.

Street Pastors

The first Street Pastor scheme started in London in 2003 and there are now over 100 teams across the country. It is an inter-denominational Church response to urban problems (such as crime and anti-social behaviour) where volunteers engage with vulnerable people on the street to care and listen.

Street pastors are ordinary members of the public who help people who get into minor difficulties in the city centre at night. Essentially the scheme supports a safer city centre, but can also impact positively around issues of cohesion and homelessness.

The scheme is overseen by a national umbrella organisation called the 'Ascension Trust' who helps local churches set up new schemes, provide training and ensure consistency of standards. In order for such a scheme to be successful, the Ascension Trust requires 3 key parties to sign up to the scheme namely (a) the Churches, (b) the Police and (c) the Local Authority. In addition, they like pubs, bars and clubs to also come on board to support the scheme as the 4th group/party.

Street Pastors only deal with very minor / low key issues which are of a pastoral nature. They are not there to replace the police. Dealing with very minor issues thereby ensures the police and door staff are not taken away from their duties to deal with minor incidents.

The scheme has been very well received In Sunderland.

Pubwatch

Sunderland Pubwatch was originally set up in 1997 with the aim to improve safety for customers, staff and the local community. By linking all premises together by two-way hand portable radios this offers the premises facilities to share information and bar trouble makers from all pubs and clubs in the city centre and help with constant communications direct to the local Police.

Pubwatch members meet regularly with the Police, City Centre Management, City Council to discuss ways of improving safety and sharing of information.

Polycarbonate Glasses

City Centre Management provided the lead for this 5 month pilot city centre initiative, in partnership with the Safer Sunderland Partnership, Northumbria Police and the City Council's licensing section. The pilot involved the purchase of nearly 20,000 super-strength plastic safety glasses which would be tested in five city centre venues

The polycarbonate drinking vessels provide the modern equivalent to glasses. They are made from the same sort of plastic used in crash helmets and can

take the weight of a small car without breaking and show only a slightly squashed appearance. This greatly reduces the chance of injuries caused by accidents with glass. In busy bars and clubs, glasses can and do get knocked over or chipped so this virtually unbreakable and shatter-proof plastic means the chances of accidental injuries are greatly reduced. The new drink ware also help to keep drinks cool and are 100 per cent recyclable.

It was hoped that the bars and clubs would also make longer term savings by switching to the polycarbonate glasses as it was anticipated that the number of breakages would reduce because the glasses last up to four times longer.

Five premises took part in the pilot: These premises were:

- The Point's Union Bar,
- The Glass Spider,
- Liquid
- Passion and
- Blu Bambu

Best Bar None Scheme

The Best Bar None scheme is a Home Office backed scheme to recognise responsible licensees who operate well run premises and who are genuinely striving to do all they can to reduce alcohol related crime and promote sensible drinking.

The scheme was introduced in Sunderland last year and is a joint partnership including the Safer Sunderland Partnership, Northumbria Police and the City Council.

The scheme is now in its second year and has been expanded this year to cover new categories including best bar restaurant and community pub. This year's winner will be announced in October 2010.

Marketing

The Safer Sunderland Partnership supports key marketing messages to promote personal safety on nights out. Recent marketing campaigns they have supported have included, **Keys, Money, Phone - Plans to get Home**

Marketing Activities include:

- Adshels in key city centre locations, main routes in to the city centre and outside university buildings
- Escalator panels at Park Lane Metro Station
- Washroom Posters in 4 popular bars (Blu Bambu, Chase, Diva, Liquid.)
- Ad van around busy locations on night times
- Digi van around busy locations on night times
- Posters in university residence and buildings
- Beer Mats in city centre bars
- Messages on community TV screens throughout Sunderland
- Bluetooth Messaging on in popular areas on busy nights
- Postcards distributed in student premises

COMMUNITY AND SAFER CITY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

14 SEPTEMBER 2010

PERFORMANCE REPORT 2009/2010

REPORT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE AND DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE

1.0 Purpose of the report

The purpose of this report is to provide Community & Safer City Scrutiny Committee with a performance update relating to the period April 2009 to March 2010. This report includes key achievements during 2009/10, resident's satisfaction with services and progress in relation to the LAA targets and other national indicators.

2.0 Background

- 2.1 Members will recall that a new performance framework was implemented during 2008/2009. This includes 198 new National Indicators which replaces previous national performance frameworks. As part of this new framework 49 national indicators have been identified as key priorities to be included in the Local Area Agreement (LAA). Performance against the priorities identified in the LAA and associated improvement targets have been reported to Scrutiny Committee throughout 2009 as part of the quarterly performance monitoring arrangements. The LAA priorities have been a key consideration in CAA in terms of the extent to which the partnership is improving outcomes for local people. CAA was introduced in April 2009 to provide an independent assessment of how local public services are working in partnership to deliver outcomes for an area. However, the coalition government have abolished CAA with immediate effect. Progress in the LAA will continue to be monitored through 2010/11 (which is the last year of the agreement) through the Council and the Sunderland Partnership's performance management and reporting arrangements. The performance will be reviewed when further national direction is available to ensure that it is fit for purpose
- 2.2 As part of the development of Scrutiny particularly in terms of strengthening performance management arrangements, Policy Review recommendations have been incorporated into the quarterly performance report on a pilot basis. The aim is to identify achievements and outcomes that have been delivered in the context of overall performance management arrangements to enhance and develop Scrutiny's focus on delivering better outcomes and future partnership working. The next progress report will be provided in December 2010.
- 2.3 **Appendix 1** provides an overview of the position for relevant national indicators and also any local performance indicators that have been retained to supplement areas in the performance framework that are not well covered by the national indicator set.

3 Findings

3.1 Key achievements

Sunderland City Council is the sole award holder of a Local Innovation Award from the Idea (Local Government Improvement and Development Agency) for the Policing our communities together theme. This award recognises the fact that Sunderland has displayed strong evidence of a well organised and effective partnership approach to tackling crime and anti-social behaviour. The links that Sunderland has made with the wider criminal justice agenda, its long term vision, neighbourhood level problem solving structures and communication strategy are innovative, well implemented, and should have a significant positive impact on public confidence. Sunderland's elected members, officers and partners are now available to assist Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) across the country with their public confidence and wider community safety work through:

- a Councillors' Call for Action event on community safety and public confidence, 23 June 2010.
- mentoring and coaching
- hosted visits - both to Sunderland City Council and Sunderland representatives visiting CSPs
- the Community Safety College

During 2009, following the success of the pilot XL Youth Village Events, Youth Villages, were rolled out across the city at 10 different venues. 78 events were organised throughout the summer, with 1,230 different young people attending, with between 100 to 200 young people attending each night. Taking a modern approach and offering young people a very different experience from the traditional youth club, the XL Youth Village combines, music, street dance, sport, advice and other services to young people during Friday and Saturday evenings. Designed to offer positive activities to young people, the free mobile village offers a really smart way of being able to move into areas where little or no youth provision exists. Early results show a reduction in youth related anti-social and criminal behaviour and improved community cohesion in the areas where the villages are operating.

A campaign to make the city centre even safer was launched by the Safer Sunderland Partnership – 'The Difference Between Drink and Drunk is U' is a partnership between the Safer Sunderland Partnership and Northumbria Police. It aims to make the city centre a safe place for everyone to enjoy, extra police are on patrol throughout the city centre on Friday, Saturday and Monday nights to reassure the extra people who come into the city centre and action taken against anyone causing trouble.

Not in My Neighbourhood Week, saw police join forces with partner agencies, such as Sunderland City Council, DVLA, and Gentoo, to target crime and disorder in communities across the city. Throughout the week, police increased their patrols with members of the local authority and Gentoo, 'notices seeking possession' were served, Children Services carried out

truancy patrols, and the DVLA carried out stop checks of more than 5000 vehicles. In addition, Trading Standards carried out test purchases at off-licences and retailers selling fireworks were targeted. In parts of the city, offenders carried out tough demanding work to benefit the community as part of community payback initiatives. Community payback gives offenders the chance to 'pay back' to local communities by doing work which helps to improve the environment. The tough punishment forms part of their order supervised by Northumbria Probation.

The Taxi Marshalling Scheme is helping people to get home safely from the city centre after a night out. It consists of three fully licensed and trained marshalls being on duty at the taxi ranks on Friday and Saturday nights. The successful operation of the scheme has meant that additional pilot coverage for a restricted period to cover Monday nights has now been introduced. Following consultation with taxi drivers the marshalling at West Street has now been replaced by marshalling at Park Lane. As a result of the marshalling there has been a noticeable reduction in the number of incidents of disorder and queue jumping.

Best Bar None is a scheme where bars, pubs and clubs can demonstrate their commitment to working in partnership to providing a safe and secure environment for their customers. The scheme allows the people who run pubs, clubs and bars to demonstrate how well they do their job – highlighting the policies they have in place to deal with a whole range of potential problems. It ensures that those who show they work responsibly for the safety of their customers are recognised and rewarded. The Best Bar None 2010 scheme was launched in June 2010 and is city-wide, it is hoped that the number of licensed premises participating in the scheme will increase (there are currently 13 premises participating).

A pilot scheme aimed at reducing the potential dangers of broken glass in nightclubs and bars has been heralded a success. A survey carried out across the city showed that drinkers welcomed the introduction of polycarbonate glasses with the majority overwhelmingly agreeing that the virtually unbreakable glasses made them feel safer. The majority of drinkers said the glasses made them feel safer and that they were an excellent idea. Comments included "It will mean less accidents with glasses" and "It's a great idea, it will make drinking much safer." Many people also thought that it was particularly important that they were used on match days. The majority of those surveyed said it wouldn't bother them to drink out of a polycarbonate glass.

3.2 Customer Focus

Two thirds of residents (67%) agree that local public services are working to make the area safer.

Perceptions of anti social behaviour are improving - fewer residents think that anti social behaviour in their local area 22.2% of residents compared to 23.5% in 2008.

In order to record how serious residents perceive anti-social behaviour to be in their local area, they were asked to indicate how big a problem they believe seven particular issues to be. The percentage of residents that describe each of these issues as a very big problem can be found in the table below.

Type of Anti Social Behaviour	Very Big Problem 2009/10	Very Big Problem (2008/09)	Percentage Change
Noisy neighbours or loud parties	5%	7%	-2%
Teenagers hanging around the streets	18%	22%	-4%
Rubbish or litter lying around	16%	17%	-1%
Vandalism, graffiti and other deliberate damage to property or Vehicles	12%	13%	-1%
People using or dealing drugs	11%	12%	-1%
People being drunk or rowdy in public places	13%	13%	=
Abandoned or burnt out cars	2%	3%	-1%

3.3 Performance

People in Sunderland are feeling safer thanks to the continued success of partnership working in the city to reduce crime, anti-social behaviour and substance misuse. Sunderland's crime rate continues to be below the national average with an 11% reduction for 2009/2010 compared to 2008/2009. This means that in the 7 years since 2002/2003 there have been over 17,000 fewer victims of recorded crime.

The table overleaf shows a summary of performance against the main recorded crime categories for 1 April 2009 to 31 March 2010. It can be seen that there have been reductions in most main recorded crime categories in the last year.

Measure	Volume	% change
Total crime	2665 fewer crimes	11% reduction
House burglary	156 fewer crimes	16% reduction
Criminal damage	985 fewer crimes	16% reduction
Theft from motor vehicle	187 fewer crimes	11% reduction
Theft of motor vehicle/TWOC	179 fewer crimes	26% reduction
Robbery	32 fewer crimes	20% reduction
Violent crime	557 fewer crimes	11% reduction
Assault with less serious injury	384 fewer crimes	16% reduction
Other wounding	372 fewer crimes	14% reduction
Serious acquisitive crime	556 fewer crimes	16% reduction
Most serious violence excl GBH	17 more crimes	9% increase

In relation to Safer Communities six national indicators are priorities identified in the LAA. An overview of available performance can be found in the following table.

Performance Indicator	Performance 2008/09	Performance 2009/10	Trend	Target 2009/10	Target achieved
NI17 Perceptions of anti social behaviour	23.05%	22.2%	▲	20.3%	✘
NI 19 Rate of proven reoffending by young people	96 offences per 100 offenders	81 offences per 100 offenders	▲	110 offences per 100 offenders	✓
NI 20 Assault with injury crime rate	8.84 per 1000 population	7.50 per 1000 population	▲	9.13 per 1000 population	✓
NI 30 Reoffending rate of prolific and priority offenders	-17.6	-33	◀▶	17% reduction	✓
NI32 Percentage reduction in repeat victimisation for those domestic violence cases being managed by a MARAC	n/a	12%	n/a	34%	✓
NI38 The average offending rate by those identified as Class A drug misusers	Not available	Not available	Not available	Not available	Not available

A full overview of performance can be found in appendix 1. The following section contains those performance indicators that are declining and / or haven't achieved the target set for 2009/10.

3.4 Areas for Improvement

NI 15 Serious violent crime rate

There was a slight increase in the number of most serious crimes per 1,000 population, from 0.66 in 2008/09 to 0.72 in 2009/10. The year end figure showed a 9% rise on the previous year representing a rise of 17 crimes. The Police have commissioned a problem profile to examine the rise in most serious violence, however, this has not shown any obvious patterns with regard to location, time characteristics of victims.

NI 17 Perceptions of anti social behaviour

Perceptions of anti social behaviour are improving, 22.2% of residents perceive a range of different types of anti social behaviour to be a problem compared to 23.05% in 2008/09. Performance is not on schedule to achieve the LAA target of 20.3%

During 2009/10 the committee has focused attention on tackling the issue of anti social behaviour by conducting an in-depth review of action being taken by the council and the Safer Sunderland Partnership to combat anti social behaviour and the fear of anti social behaviour. The action plan is currently being developed and implemented to further improve resident's perceptions of anti social behaviour.

NI 18 Re-offending rate for adult offenders

Adult re-offending rates have increased from 3.91% to 4.02% during 2009/10. A target was not set for 2009/10.

The following actions have been identified to address performance issues.

- In Sunderland there is evidence that the availability of bed and breakfast accommodation, albeit poor quality, attracts transient offenders from outside the area. There is ongoing work with the Supporting People Manager, police and probation to determine the extent of the problem and quantify the impact this has on NI 18 performance. The CQC (Care Quality Commission report) has acknowledged this as a problem as part of the Safeguarding agenda.
- There was evidence that offenders on probation caseloads over this period were afforded a degree of leniency in order to meet national compliance targets that consequently led to high levels of acceptable absences when attending for statutory supervision requirements. This has now been addressed and acceptable absences have been limited to 4 for the duration of an order or licence.
- The IOM unit has been established and was launched on 12th May. This will enable probation to work more intensively with high crime causers. Extra resources have been provided by the DOMs unit and an additional probation officer has been deployed to the unit. Work is also underway to analyse the top 200 high crime causers and establish which of those are on statutory supervision but not on DRR, ATR or PPO. An agreement has been reached with Probation to move extra resources into the unit if necessary.
- There is evidence that Young offenders in Sunderland have not been transferring to adult supervision effectively. A transition protocol has been developed in conjunction with the YOS manager.
- There is an agreement with the LDU Manager that in conjunction with the probation performance unit that there will be an audit of sentencing patterns in Sunderland to see if this has an impact on NI 18.
- The Total Place IOM work stream is analysing performance data and governance arrangements across South of Tyne and Wear and this should

support the implementation of IOM in Sunderland and contribute to improvements in the NI 18 target.

- Last year there was an increase in shoplifting in Sunderland and this would have affected the target. Shoplifting has now decreased.
- Work is underway to analyse the re-offending rate of offenders subject to ATRs to contribute to decisions about commissioning and the effectiveness of these requirements.
- A Rapid Process Improvement Workshop was carried out in June. The Rapid Process Improvement Workshop has improved the retention in treatment from drug testing on arrest to start of treatment. This will ensure the drug using offenders are actively engaged in treatment and therefore reduce the risk of re-offending.

NI 41 The percentage of residents who consider drunk or rowdy behaviour to be either a fairly big, or very big problem in the local area

More residents think that drunk and rowdy behaviour is a problem 36.5% compared to 32.7% the previous year. Performance is not on schedule to achieve the LAA target which is 32.7%.

A range of improvement activity is being implemented to improve performance which includes:

- Operation Barracuda (to tackle city centre violent crime) was implemented and this was also backed up by a strong marketing element with outdoor media and press coverage (Drink or Drunk Campaign) including the use of the street projector. 'Lock Em Inn' Leaflets (on the consequences of alcohol related crime and disorder) were developed and delivered in bars, pubs, clubs in the city centre.
- The range of initiatives to help improve safety in the night time economy include (i) Best Bar None which has been re-launched with 22 assessors trained to allow citywide roll out of the scheme (ii) Pubwatch (iii) Introduction of polycarbonate glasses (iv) and taxi marshals.
- The Safer Sunderland Partnership TV film day for June focused on safety initiatives in the night time economy including the taxi marshals, street pastors and personal safety in the night time economy.
- Drink Banning Orders (DBOs) have been introduced with the city's first 2 successful applications in July 2010. These were backed up by strong media coverage.
- The Community and Safer City Scrutiny committee has agreed its work programme topic for the year will be "alcohol, violence and the night time economy" to investigate the issue further .

4 Recommendation

That the committee considers the continued good progress made by the council and the Sunderland Partnership and those areas requiring further development to ensure that performance is actively managed.

Report Key

This is the level of performance at 31st March 2009. A question mark means that information is not available

This is the level of performance at 31st March 2010. A question mark means that information is not available

The target is what we want to achieve. A question mark means that a target has not been set

	2008/09 Outturn	2009/10 Outturn	Are we improving?	Target	Have we achieved the target?	Commentary
Number of most serious violent crimes per 1,000 population (NI015)	0.66	0.72		?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Year end figure showed a 9% rise on the previous year representing a rise of 17 crimes. The Police have commissioned a problem profile to examine the rise in most serious violence, however this has not shown any obvious patterns with regard to location, time, characteristics of the victims etc.
Number of serious acquisitive crimes per 1,000 population (NI016)	12.45	10.46		?		











This is a comparison of the 2008/09 outturn against the 2009/10 outturn. The symbols mean

- performance has improved
- performance is stable
- performance has declined
- Information is not available









This traffic light is a comparison of performance at 31st March 2010 against the target









- The target has been achieved
- Performance is within 10% of the target
- The target has not been achieved
- Not applicable due to no target being set

Community & Safer City







	2008/09 Outturn	2009/10 Outturn	Are we improving?	Target	Have we achieved the target?	Commentary
Number of most serious violent crimes per 1,000 population (NI015)	0.66	0.72		?		• Year end figure showed a 9% rise on the previous year, representing a rise of 17 crimes. The Police have commissioned a problem profile to examine the rise in most serious violence, however this has not shown any obvious patterns with regard to location, time, characteristics of the victims etc.
Number of serious acquisitive crimes per 1,000 population (NI016)	12.45	10.46		?		
The percentage of respondents who consider anti social behaviour to be a fairly big /or very big problem (NI017).	23.50 %	22.20 %		20.30 %		• A force wide summer ASB campaign has been running throughout July and August. This has been driven by the survey findings and the themes are based on the ASB issues of most concern locally eg teenagers hanging around, inconsiderate parking, litter, noise nuisance etc. It is producing pocket sized information cards on positive activities for young people and promoting the success of the XL youth villages. Two mobile buses have also been developed to provide additional outreach support to those more inaccessible areas.
The percentage of adult offenders on the probation caseload who have re-offended within three months of the snapshot taken compared with the predicted re-offending rate (NI018).	3.91 %	4.02 %		?		
Number of young people (aged 10-17) re-offending in the youth justice system (NI019).	0.96	0.81		1.10		
The number of Actual Bodily						

Harm (assault with injury) crimes per 1000 of the population (NI020)	8.84	7.50	✓	9.13	★	• 15% reduction from 2008/09 to 2009/10 from 2477 to 2095
The percentage of respondents who strongly agree/ or tend to agree that the police and local council are dealing with the anti-social behaviour and crime issues that matter in the area (NI021).	27.70 %	29.00 %	✓	27.70 %	★	
The percentage of respondents who agree that the local council and the police understand local concerns about anti social behavior and crime issues (NI027).	28.70	31.80	✓	28.70	★	• There has been a fall from the previous year, where the rate was 0.56 per 1000 population, down to 0.44 per 1000 population.
Number of serious violent offences per 1000 population that involve the use of a knife or other sharp instrument (NI028)	0.56	0.45	✓	?	!	
Number of recorded firearms offences per 1, 000 of the population (NI029)	0.06	0.02	✓	?	!	• This indicator is not available down to a Sunderland level, it is only available to a force level. Data submitted is for the Force
The change in convictions for Prolific and other Priority Offenders (PPOs) over a 12 month period (NI030)	-17.60	-33.00	✓	-17.00	★	• Total offences during baseline year = 154 Total offences during 2009/10 = 103 Reduction of -33% (source: iQuanta Sheet provided by Home Office) • 77 offences for the year to date. -36% reduction.
Percentage reduction in repeat victimisation for those domestic violence cases being managed by a MARAC (NI032)	?	12.00 %	?	34.00 %	★	• There were a total of 212 MARAC cases reviewed in 2009/10. There were 72 repeat cases reviewed by MARAC. The repeat victimisation rate for the year 2009/10 was 34%
						• This is collected at a force level, but the work the Partnership does around NI 32 on the MARACs will

Number of domestic homicide offences per 1,000 population (NI034)	0.00	0.01		?		ultimately help support this measure too as NI 32 works with high risk victims. As far as we are aware there have been no domestic violence murders in Sunderland during 2009/10 therefore this is being set off target by another area within the force.
Assessment of the quality of Preventing Violent Extremism projects (Score is on a 1 to 5 scale) (NI035)	2	3		3		
The change in the number of drug users, being in effective treatment, when compared with the number of drug users being in effective treatment in the baseline year of 2007/08 (NI040).	-59.00	910.00		931.00		
The percentage of residents who consider drunk or rowdy behaviour to be either a fairly big, or very big problem in the local area (NI041)	32.70 %	36.50 %		32.70 %		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are a range of things being done to help address this including: Operation Barracuda (to tackle city centre violent crime) was implemented and this was also backed up by a strong marketing element with outdoor media and press coverage (Drink or Drunk Campaign) including the use of the street projector. Lock Em Inn Leaflets (on the consequences of alcohol related crime and disorder) were developed and delivered in bars, pubs, clubs in the city centre. The range of initiatives to help improve safety in the night time economy include (i) Best Bar None which has been re- launched with 22 assessors trained to allow citywide roll out of the scheme (ii) Pubwatch (iii) Introduction of polycarbonate galses (iv) and taxi marshals. The Safer Sunderland Partnership TV film day for June focused on safety initiatives in the night time economy including the taxi marshals, street pastors and personal safety in the night time economy. Drink Banning Orders (DBOs) have been introduced with the city's first 2 successful applications in July 2010. These were backed up by strong media coverage.

						The Community and Safe City Scrutiny committee has been agreed its work programme topic for the year will be "alcohol, violence and the night time economy".
The percentage of residents who consider drug use or drug dealing to be either a fairly big, or very big problem in the local area (NI042)	30.60 %	30.90 %		30.60 %		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perceptions of drug misuse as a problem are worse in the East of the city. Specific drug treatment agencies have been established in the Sunderland East area, including Lifeline who has a remit to engage with local communities regarding drugs issues. They have linked in with private businesses and regularly search the locality for evidence of drug using, including discarded equipment. There is also a specific family support worker funded through Back on the Map to work with families affected by substance misuse. A poster campaign was developed around drug related litter and who to report this to, with the focus of the campaign being in the East of the city. <p>Work is ongoing to challenge the availability of both legal and illegal drugs and working with colleagues from Northumbria Police and Sunderland University, the Safer Sunderland Partnership is working to challenge the perceptions of and use of legal highs.</p>
The percentage of offenders under probation supervision living in settled and suitable accommodation at the end of their licence order (NI143).	89.30 %	82.00 %		83.00 %		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Probation are looking into this. There had previously been a project looking at accommodation of offenders which is no longer running. It is usually down to individual offender managers to try to organise this. However the figs do fluctuate from quarter to quarter.
The percentage of offenders under probation supervision in employment at the end of their order or licence (NI144).	40.00 %	39.00 %		40.00 %		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Actual outcome for 2009/10 is 39%. Target of 40% narrowly missed. It is worth noting that with the current economic climate and other factors this could affect this target as a rise in unemployment across the country.
% of people who perceive people not treating one another with respect and	39.00 %	39.50 %		39.00 %		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A marketing campaign entitled 'Respect; it's a two way street' has been developed by the Police Corporate Communications department and Supported by the SSP. The campaign ran from 5th July to 29th August. The

consideration to be a problem in their area (NI023)						operational objectives of the campaign was to prevent incidents fo ASB, develop intelligence, picture surrounding ASB and vulnerable persons, improve public confidence and address local ASB priorities.
Number of deliberate primary fires per 10,000 population (NI033i)	15.60	12.80	✓	15.10	★	
Number of deliberate secondary fires per 10,000 population (NI033ii).	77.00	69.90	✓	74.70	★	• Target of 74.7 set for 2009/10, actual of 69.9 achieved. Target has been achieved.
The percentage of residents agreeing that they feel informed, by local agencies, about what they should do in the event of a large scale emergency in their local area (NI037).	15.10	37.90	✓	15.10	★	
Total number of primary fires per 100,000 population (NI049i).	252.60	242.60	✓	245.80	★	• Target of 245.8 set for 2009/10, actual rate of 242.6 achieved. Target has been met.
Total number of fatalities due to primary fires per 100,000 population (NI049ii).	0.71	0.40	✓	0.00	▲	• The fire death Sunderland suffered last year was of an elderly female who suffered burns to her legs following a fire in a waste bin and who was taken to hospital where she died some days after due to peritonitis following a burst ulcer. The coroners decision was the ulcer could be caused by the stress of the fire and it consequently went down as a fire death.
Total number of non-fatal casualties per 100,000 population (NI049iii).	7.50	5.70	✓	7.10	★	
						• Numbers of reported incidents have halved in one year and similarly, the number of vehicles removed has reduced. This tells us that the numbers of vehicles involved in this indicator have dropped significantly which has led to the impact of one vehicle which was not dealt with in time, having a disproportionate impact upon percentages in the analysis of performance. There are often legitimate reasons why there is a delay in investigating reports such as bank holidays, weekends or

<p>% of new reports of abandoned vehicles investigated within 24hrs of notification (BV218a).</p>	<p>95.83 %</p>	<p>96.20 %</p>	<p></p>	<p>90.00 %</p>	<p></p>	<p>misunderstandings in transferring data between departments involved. Overall numbers of reported abandoned vehicles is in decline and this is a good outcome for local environmental quality. The very occasional delay in investigating reports of abandoned vehicles can have an adverse impact on performance due to the continued reductions in reported incidents. There is no evidence to conclude that performance will continue to decline, and so it would not be feasible to suggest any remedial measures at this stage. Monitoring of performance will continue to ensure these levels of performance are maintained.</p>
<p>% of abandoned vehicles removed within 24 hours (BV218b).</p>	<p>94.74 %</p>	<p>93.75 %</p>	<p></p>	<p>95.00 %</p>	<p></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See BVPI215a comments.
<p>Number of days at which graffiti reported to the Council is removed (LPI029)</p>	<p>1.91</p>	<p>0.00</p>	<p></p>	<p>2.00</p>	<p></p>	

COMMUNITY AND SAFER CITY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

14 SEPTEMBER 2010

CONSULTATION: POLICING IN THE 21ST CENTURY: RECONNECTING POLICE AND THE PEOPLE

REPORT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE

STRATEGIC PRIORITIES: SP3 SAFE CITY

CORPORATE PRIORITIES: CIO1: Delivering Customer Focused Services, CIO4: Improving Partnership Working to Deliver 'One City'.

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To provide the Committee with information about the Home Office Consultation: Policing in the 21st Century: Reconnecting police and the people.

2. Background

- 2.1 The Home Office has published a consultation paper called "Policing in the 21st Century: Reconnecting police and the people". A briefing note was circulated to Members of the Committee providing further information about the consultation. Information included in the briefing note forms the basis of this report.
- 2.2 The consultation period is 8 weeks from 26th July until 20th September 2010.
- 2.3 It sets out the Government's new programme of reform to change policing and re-establish the link between the police and the public. It proposes changes in how organised crime is tackled and how our borders are protected by the police service becoming more focused at a national level, as well as providing better value for money.
- 2.4 The consultation contains specific commitments already made in the Coalition Agreement, where the government is **not** consulting on whether they should happen (e.g. directly elected Police and Crime Commissioners), but how best they can be implemented. There are also broader areas where the government is asking for views on whether and how to achieve its aims
- 2.5 Many of the proposals will feature within the forthcoming Police Reform and Social Responsibility Bill. Ahead of the launch of the Bill in autumn 2010, the Government is seeking views on specific aspects of the reform programme.

3.0 Key Proposals

- 3.1 The key proposals are set out in 4 main sections, each with a series of consultation questions (see Appendix A). Commentary and the implications for the Safer Sunderland Partnership are noted, where relevant.

3.2 *Increasing Democratic Accountability*

3.2.1 The proposals to increase democratic accountability are as follows:

- By May 2012, the public will have elected Police and Crime Commissioners and Police and Crime Panels
- The abolition of Police Authorities
- Providing more frequent and more local level information to the public – such as information about crime, ASB and value for money
- A more independent HMIC

3.2.2 Police and Crime Commissioners will be representatives of the public and will hold the police to account. There will be one Commissioner for the Northumbria Force area. The Government wants candidates from a wide range of backgrounds, from political parties and independents.

3.2.3 Their mandate will be to represent and engage with the public, set local policing priorities, agree a local strategic plan, hold the Chief Constable to account, set the force budget and precept, appoint the Chief Constable and where necessary dismiss the Chief Constable. They will ensure that police forces work more efficiently by collaborating with each other across a wider range of policing functions, to strengthen public protection, but also ensure better value for money.

3.2.4 The Government will abolish Police Authorities and will replace them with Police and Crime Panels to provide an overview role at force level for Police and Crime Commissioners on behalf of the public. They will be made up of locally elected councillors from constituent wards and independent and lay members. They will hold confirmation hearings for the post of Chief Constable and be able to hold confirmation hearings for other appointments made by the Commissioner to his staff, but without having the power of veto (but they will have a power to trigger a referendum on the policing precept recommended by the Commissioner).

3.2.5 *Commentary and Implications for the Safer Sunderland Partnership*

- a) A real challenge is how the work of the Commissioners and the Panels will dovetail with our own. It is likely that the latter will be a similar relationship to the one that the Safer Sunderland Partnership has with the police authority at the moment. The Safer Sunderland Partnership will, in some way, also become accountable to the Police and Crime Commissioner for Northumbria. However, Councils already have democratically elected councillors overseeing community safety (through portfolio leads and also scrutiny functions), each of whom are scrutinised and held to account by that authority. As these proposals progress there will need to be real clarity on these roles and responsibilities.
- b) Northumbria Police Authority is currently one of six responsible authorities on Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs). From the information available to date there appears on paper to be little difference in the proposed role of the new Police and Crime Panels and the current Police Authorities. However, the current Police Authority arrangements give local

councils a strong voice in establishing a precept for policing. The new arrangement, whereby a veto on the Commissioner's proposed precept, gives a different relationship of influence. The triggering of a referendum on precept levels would be an expensive exercise in the current financial climate and be potentially damaging to public confidence.

- c) The paper suggests that although police authorities have worked hard to engage with their communities, they remain too invisible to the public, yet the paper provides little evidence to support this statement. The paper does not indicate how the new arrangements will relate to the public at the local level. Northumbria Police Authority has a very strong track record in community engagement (e.g. Police and Community Forums) and in participatory budgeting and has been a valuable local partner for many years. The local safer communities survey indicates that 89% of residents are aware of Northumbria Police Authority and 74% are confident that it spends its money wisely. The latter is a very strong driver of public confidence that the police and local council is dealing with the ASB and crime concerns that matter locally.
- d) The view of the LGA is that in difficult financial circumstances, they have questioned if this is the right time to change structures through additional elections, which could cost the same as 700 police officers. The LGA has developed its own detailed proposals for the reintegration of police oversight into council structures which it sees as the most cost effective solution, with measures that would require minimal legislative changes and would drive out duplicate spending and deliver efficiency savings.

3.3 ***Removing bureaucratic accountability***

3.3.1 The Government will continue to set strategic direction for the police but will take no role in telling the police how to do their job. The Government will also work with the police and the Health and Safety Executive to strengthen guidance on applying a "common sense" approach to health and safety, including scrutinising procedures that act as a barrier to intervening and recognising those officers who put themselves in harms way.

3.3.2 Based on the premise that only 11% of the police are visibly available to the public at any one time, there is an intention to reduce bureaucracy by:

- a) Removing Government targets, centralised performance management and reducing the data burden placed on forces.
- b) Reducing bureaucracy and supporting professional responsibility and cutting red-tape. This includes a number of measures being considered:
 - Cutting down on form filling and paperwork for police officers
 - Reducing the guidance sent from the centre
 - Scrapping the "Stop" Form
 - Reviewing the Regulation of Investigatory Powers (RIPA) and Police Criminal Evidence Act (PACE)
 - Reforming health and safety practices
- c) Ensuring that the leaders of the service take responsibility for keeping bureaucracy to a minimum at force level.

3.3.3 *Commentary and Implications for the Safer Sunderland Partnership*

The removal of the centralised performance management framework will have both positive and negative implications. The previous performance regime has in some ways given CSPs the strength to set and deliver their strategy. The reductions in priority crime have risen from this culture. The Safer Sunderland Partnership is intelligence led with a robust strategic intelligence assessment and performance management framework that includes both national and local measures and targets. This places the partnership in a position where it should be able to adapt relatively easily to setting its own targets, driven by local priorities. The area of concern will be around the impact on being able to benchmark against similar areas.

3.4 ***A National Framework for Efficient Local Policing***

3.4.1 The Government wants forces to find new ways of working together to get the best value from their resources. The paper repeatedly uses the term “golden thread” to describe the link between local and neighbourhood, to protective services, to international policing. The paper proposes that the national framework should be achieved by:

- a) Better value for money for local policing, by ensuring sufficient officers are available at the times when needed most.
- b) Better collaboration between forces. This will include looking at sharing back-office and support functions
- c) The National Policing Improvement Agency (NPIA) will be phased out and clearer roles established for the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) and Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC). ACPO will lose key functions including its role in monitoring domestic extremism and will be established on a more accountable basis involving the new Commissioners.
- d) A new National Crime Agency (NCA) will be created. It is proposed that the NCA will lead the fight against organised crime and the protection of our borders. It will be subject to robust governance arrangements, which will link to the role played by Police and Crime Commissioners. It will use the capabilities of the existing Serious Organised Crime Agency (SOCA) and connect these capabilities to those within the police service, HM Revenue and Customs, the UK Border Agency and a range of other criminal justice partners. The Agency will be led by a senior Chief Constable and encompass a number of ‘commands’, including: organised crime; border policing (working to a national strategy) and; the NCA may also take responsibility for other national policing functions, including some of those presently carried out by the NPIA.

3.4.2 *Commentary and Implications for the Safer Sunderland Partnership*

The implications around these proposals will mainly be felt by the Police. However, there will still be a role for CSPs in helping tackle cross border issues such as organised crime and counter terrorism. In the last section of the paper there is mention of the potential creation of force-level CSPs to assist the directly elected Policing and Crime Commissioners in delivering community safety outcomes. It is possible that these types of issues could be

dealt with more efficiently at a force level but if so then the SSP will need to continue to develop its role around these agendas and ensure it is able to feed into tackling these.

3.5 ***Tackling Crime Together***

3.5.1 The last section of the paper is on partnership working, with a key focus on the role of the public as active citizens as part of the Big Society. There are three main strands around this:

3.5.2 Enabling and encouraging people to get involved and mobilising neighbourhood activists: There are proposals for a range of ways that citizens can get involved and making it easier to access the police and report crime and ASB. A cost effective way of establishing the number '101' as a single national police non-emergency number to report crime and ASB will be looked into. The Government wants to see more special constables and explore new ideas to help unlock the potential of police volunteers in the workforce, for example as police 'reservists' and more volunteers within the wider criminal justice system. The paper proposes people will need to be supported and encouraged to take greater individual responsibility for keeping their neighbourhoods safe such as: attending regular beat meetings; being members of groups such as Neighbourhood Watch or becoming Community Crime Fighters; signing neighbourhood agreements; and holding agencies to account by making crime data and information on how money is spent, more transparent and locally available. Later this year, a new crime strategy will be published, which will set out in greater detail how the approach to preventing and reducing crime will be reshaped in the Big Society.

3.5.3 There is to be a radical reform of the CJS which they perceive as being too remote, lacking in transparency, and not accountable to the public and needs of victims. Proposals include:

- a) A new approach to youth crime, tackling ASB and more active citizenship and voluntary sector involvement
- b) Police reform (as set out earlier)
- c) Sentencing reform
- d) A new approach to the rehabilitation of offenders (e.g. payment by results and opening up the market to private and not-for-profit sectors)
- e) Reviewing the prison estate's contribution to rehabilitation and reducing re-offending

3.5.4 A de-cluttering the partnership landscape by repealing some of the unnecessary bureaucracy and regulations in partnership working but leaving the helpful core duties to give CSPs the flexibility to decide how best to deliver for their communities. There is a clear role for neighbourhood partnerships and they are considering creating enabling powers to bring together CSPs at the force level to deal with force wide community safety issues and giving Commissioners a role in commissioning community safety work.

3.5.5 *Implications for the Safer Sunderland Partnership*

- a) The Government believes that CSPs and other partnerships have played a strong role in preventing crime and want them to continue to do so but

the shifts are not radical in the way that the rest of the paper is around better connecting the police with local people. The Safer Sunderland Partnership is currently 'de-cluttering' by reviewing its partnership functions and structures to ensure it is as efficient and effective as possible.

- b) There is strong focus on neighbourhood partnerships (again, the Big Society in practice) whereby neighbourhood policing teams work with partners, elected members and the local community. Visible and accessible neighbourhood policing teams have been in place in Sunderland to deal specifically with these issues and do this in partnership e.g. via the LMAPS groups and embedded Area Committee arrangements. The Government proposals are to strengthen the 'community' element by helping create an army of community activists giving local people more of a say over what services are provided, stressing local solutions to local problems. The Safer Sunderland Partnership is already identifying existing good practice around the Big Society and opportunities for wider community engagement and involvement. Through its Crime and Justice Programme it already has a number of Community Crime Fighters who are actively engaged with their neighbourhood policing teams. There is however evidence from the 1980s/90s for the need to invest in approaches such as Neighbourhood Watch to make them effective, particularly in more disadvantaged, high crime neighbourhoods.
- c) The proposals around more monthly beat meetings would not pose any significant challenge locally as the police already hold 5 weekly PACT meetings in Sunderland. There is already a desire and a move towards encouraging other ways to encourage people to get involved e.g. "virtual PACT meetings"; and use of Facebook and Twitter etc.
- d) There is a suggestion in the paper that Police and Crime Commissioners will be able to develop force-level CSPs to oversee partnership working throughout the sub-region. Whilst this proposal could help strengthen the links with the Local Criminal Justice Board, there would need to be strong leadership and a real clarity of roles for each CSP at each level. Current legislation places planning and delivery clearly at city level with accountability to scrutiny and the Safer Sunderland Partnership has been successfully delivering at this level for many years.
- e) If a national single non emergency number for the police was to be established then there would be implications for the Council's Neighbourhood Helpline. The latter was established after a pilot of a single non emergency 101 number. This ceased due to a removal of the national funding.

4. Summary

- 4.1 Although the proposals seek to radically shift the worlds of policing, of local democracy and citizen involvement, there is very little altered in the set up of CSPs. We can infer from this that CSPs are operating on the right lines and the basis for their existence is not currently being challenged in any meaningful way, with the only real difference in their operation being the removal of

certain, as yet unspecified, legal expectations. It is likely that these repeals will happen via the introduction of statutory instruments.

- 4.2 The consultation document not only reinforces the notion of "neighbourhood partnerships" as a means of delivery at neighbourhood level, involving elected members and communities, but also suggests at some point in the future the creation of force-level CSPs to assist the directly elected Policing and Crime Commissioners in delivering community safety outcomes.

5. Recommendation

- 5.1 The committee is requested to note the report.
Where appropriate additional comments raised by members of this committee can be fed into the consultation process.

6. Background Papers

Policing in the 21st Century: Reconnecting police and the people

Contact Officer: - Claire Harrison, Acting Scrutiny Officer
0191 561 1232
Claire.harrison1@sunderland.gov.uk

Increasing democratic accountability

1. Will the proposed checks and balances set out in this Chapter provide effective but un-bureaucratic safeguards for the work of Commissioners, and are there further safeguards that should be considered?
2. What could be done to ensure that candidates for Commissioner come from a wide range of backgrounds, including from party political and independent standpoints?
3. How should Commissioners best work with the wider criminal justice and community safety partners who deliver the broad range of services that keep communities safe?
4. How might Commissioners best engage with their communities – individuals, businesses and voluntary organisations - at the neighbourhood level?
5. How can the Commissioner and the greater transparency of local information drive improvements in the most deprived and least safe neighbourhoods in their areas?
6. What information would help the public make judgements about their force and Commissioner, including the level of detail and comparability with other areas?

Removing bureaucratic accountability

7. Locally, what are examples of unnecessary bureaucracy within police forces and how can the service get rid of this?
8. How should forces ensure that information that local people feel is important is made available without creating a burdensome data recording process?
9. What information should HMIC use to support a more proportionate approach to their 'public facing performance role', while reducing burdens and avoiding de-facto targets?
10. How can ACPO change the culture of the police service to move away from compliance with detailed guidance to the use of professional judgement within a clear framework based around outcomes?
11. How can we share knowledge about policing techniques that cut crime without creating endless guidance?

A national framework for efficient local policing

12. What policing functions should be delivered between forces acting collaboratively?
13. What are the principal obstacles to collaboration between forces or with other partners and how they can they be addressed?
14. Are there functions which need greater national co-ordination or which would make sense to organise and run nationally (while still being delivered locally)?

15. How can the police service take advantage of private sector expertise to improve value for money, for example in operational support, or back office functions shared between several forces, or with other public sector providers?
16. Alongside its focus on organised crime and border security, what functions might a new National Crime Agency deliver on behalf of police forces, and how should it be held to account?
17. What arrangements should be in place in future to ensure that there is a sufficient pool of chief officers available, in particular for the most challenging leadership roles in the police service? Is there a role for other providers to provide training?
18. How can we rapidly increase the capability within the police service to become more business-like, with police leaders taking on a more prominent role to help drive necessary cultural change in delivering sustainable business process improvement?

Tackling crime together

19. What more can the Government do to support the public to take a more active role in keeping neighbourhoods safe?
20. How can the Government encourage more people to volunteer (including as special constables) and provide necessary incentives to encourage them to stay?
21. What more can central Government do to make the criminal justice system more efficient?
22. What prescriptions from Government get in the way of effective local partnership working?
23. What else needs to be done to simplify and improve community safety and criminal justice work locally?

Julie Smith, Community Safety Manager
Safer Communities Team
July 2010

POVERTY OF PLACE VISIT

REPORT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE

STRATEGIC PRIORITIES: SP3 SAFE CITY

**CORPORATE PRIORITIES: CIO1: Delivering Customer Focused Services,
CIO4: Improving Partnership Working to Deliver 'One City'.**

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To provide feedback to the Committee on a recent visit undertaken by this Committee and members from the Sustainable Communities Scrutiny Committee and the Environment and Attractive City Scrutiny Committee.

2. Background

- 2.1 At its meeting on 6 July 2010, the Committee agreed to undertake a site visit to areas where poverty of place is evident, following reports that were presented to committee in the October 2009 and July 2010.

3. Feedback from visit

- 3.1 On the 27th July 2010 members undertook the site visit. The purpose of the visit was to consider areas where poverty of place was currently having an adverse impact and an area where environmental work has had a positive impact upon community cohesion.
- 3.2 Members visited the Swan Street Centre, Southwick Health and Community Forum, Waterloo Court Flats and Peat Carr.
- 3.3 The Swan Street Centre is situated in between the areas of Southwick, Marley Potts, Fulwell and Seaburn. Members were informed that a range of community activities are provided by the centre and Staff consult as often as possible with the community to identify residents needs and develop services they want. One of the biggest problems in the area is the level of apathy within the community which makes it difficult to engage. Staff from the centre feel that there is a need to talk to people in the community, to reinvigorate them and help to raise their self-esteem and aspirations.
- 3.4 Members met a group of volunteers from the Southwick Health and Community forum. The forum carries out a number of community based activities such as raising money through fun days and mother and toddler groups. The volunteers feel that the work they do engenders lots of community spirit in an area that they believe is sometimes neglected.

- 3.5 There are a number of shops in Southwick Road that are shuttered, due to being permanently closed or takeaway outlets which are open only at night, which can have a negative impact on the area. The Kwik Save supermarket closed down a number of years ago which residents feel was of great loss to the community. The group of volunteers felt that a supermarket would vastly improve the area.
- 3.6 The group informed Members that residents are proud of where they live and feel that some things (including housing provision) have greatly improved in a number of areas.
- 3.7 Members took a self-guided tour around the Waterloo Court Flats in Sulgrave, Washington. It was observed that the majority of buildings are not well maintained externally, with many of the outer aesthetics in poor condition. Members talked to the occupiers of one of the flats about quality of life in the neighbourhood. There was a communal grassed area in the centre of the courtyard that was slightly untidy and not being used at all. Although the flats are part of a gated community, which often helps to make people feel safer, the gates were considered to be unattractive and depressing.
- 3.8 Members met representatives from Groundwork North East and Gentoo who have been working in partnership on a Community Philosophy project in the Peat Carr area, which aims to address the issue of the non-use of green spaces by local residents through philosophical enquiry. Members visited a large grassed area, rarely used by the community, adjacent to some residential streets.
- 3.9 A representative from Groundwork explained there were problems in engaging people with the project. An event had been organised one weekend to engage with the community however after advertising and door-to-door visits there was still very poor attendance.
- 3.10 Members talked to some local residents and discovered there was also an issue of anti-social behaviour from youths at night and the use of motorbikes across the grass.

4 Recommendation

- 4.1 Members are requested to note the report and those members who were in attendance are invited to share their views.

5. Background Papers

Poverty of Place Scrutiny Report October 2009

Poverty of Place Scrutiny Report July 2010

Contact Officer: - Claire Harrison, Acting Scrutiny Officer
0191 561 1232
Claire.harrison1@sunderland.gov.uk

COMMUNITY AND SAFER CITY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

14 SEPTEMBER 2010

FORWARD PLAN – KEY DECISIONS FOR THE PERIOD 1 SEPTEMBER 2010 – 31 DECEMBER 2010

REPORT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE

1. Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 To provide Members with an opportunity to consider those items on the Executive's Forward Plan for the period 1 September – 31 December 2010 which relate to the Community and Safer City Scrutiny Committee.

2. Background

- 2.1 The Council's Forward Plan contains matters which are likely to be the subject of a key decision to be taken by the Executive. The Plan covers a four month period and is prepared and updated on a monthly basis.
- 2.2 Holding the Executive to account is one of the main functions of Scrutiny. One of the ways that this can be achieved is by considering the forthcoming decisions of the Executive (as outlined in the Forward Plan) and deciding whether Scrutiny can add value in advance of a decision being made. This does not negate Non-Executive Members ability to call-in a decision after it has been made.
- 2.3 Members requested that only those items which are under the remit of the Committee be reported to this Committee. The remit of the Committee covers the following themes:-

Safer Sunderland Strategy; Social Inclusion; Community Safety; Anti Social Behaviour; Domestic Violence; Community Cohesion; Equalities; Licensing Policy and Regulation; Community Associations; Registrars

- 2.4 In the event of Members having any queries that cannot be dealt with directly in the meeting, a response will be sought from the relevant Directorate.

3. Recommendation

- 3.1 It is recommended that the Committee considers the Executive's Forward Plan for the period 1 September – 31 December 2010.

4. Background Papers

4.1 There were no background papers used in the preparation of this report.

Contact Officer: Sarah Abernethy, Acting Assistant Scrutiny Officer
0191 561 1230
sarah.abernethy@sunderland.gov.uk

**Forward Plan –
Key Decisions
for the period
01/Sep/2010 to
31/Dec/2010**



**R.C. Rayner,
Chief Solicitor,
Sunderland City Council.**

13 August 2010

Forward Plan: Key Decisions for the next four months - 01/Sep/2010 to 31/Dec/2010

No.	Description of Decision	Decision Taker	Anticipated Date of Decision	Principal Consultees	Means of Consultation	When and how representations and appropriate Scrutiny Committee	Documents to be considered	Contact Officer	Tel No
01434	To review to Council's Licensing Policy Statement	Cabinet	03/Nov/2010	Scrutiny Committee; Northumbria Police; Tyne and Wear Fire & Rescue Service; Local Businesses & Residents; Reps of the Licensing Trade and Members Clubs	Written requests to principal consultees; internet	Via the contact officer by 20 October 2010 - Community and Safer City Scrutiny Committee	Report	Tom Terrett	5611715

COMMUNITY AND SAFER CITY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

14 SEPTEMBER 2010

WORK PROGRAMME 2010-11

REPORT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE

Strategic Priorities: SP3 – Safer City

Corporate Priorities: CIO1: Delivering Customer Focused Services, CIO4: Improving partnership working to deliver ‘One City’.

1. Purpose of the report

- 1.1 The report attaches, for Members’ information, the current work programme for the Committee’s work during the 2010-11 Council year.
- 1.2 The work of the Committee in delivering its work programme will support the Council in achieving its Strategic Priorities of Safer City, support delivery of the related themes of the Local Area Agreement, and, through monitoring the performance of the Council’s services, help the Council achieve its Corporate Improvement Objectives CIO1 (delivering customer focussed services) and C104 (improving partnership working to deliver ‘One City’).

2. Background

- 2.1 The work programme is a working document which the Committee can develop throughout the year. The work programme allows Members and officers to maintain an overview of work planned and undertaken during the Council year.

3. Current position

- 3.1 The work programme reflects discussions that have taken place at the 6 July 2010 Scrutiny Committee meeting. The current work programme is attached as an appendix to this report.

4. Conclusion

- 4.1 The work programme developed from the meeting will form a flexible mechanism for managing the work of the Committee in 2010-11.

5 Recommendation

- 5.1 That Members note the information contained in the work programme and consider the inclusion of proposals for the Committee into the work programme.

Contact Officer: Sarah Abernethy, Acting Assistant Scrutiny Officer
0191 561 1230, Sarah.Abernethy@sunderland.gov.uk

	JUNE 8.5.2010	JULY 6.7.10	SEPTEMBER 14.9.10	OCTOBER 12.10.10	NOVEMBER 9.11.10	DECEMBER 7.12.10	JANUARY 12.1.11	FEBRUARY 9.2.11	MARCH 9.3.11	APRIL 20.4.11
Cabinet Referrals and Responses			Anti-social Behaviour Feedback from Cabinet							
Policy Review	Proposals for policy review (Claire Harrison)	Scope of review – (CH) Tackling Serious Youth Violence (KH) Review of the Council's Licensing Policy Statement (TT)	Setting the Scene (LD/KH)	Cardiff Model – A&E	Evidence Gathering	Evidence Gathering	Evidence Gathering	Evidence Gathering	Evidence Gathering	Final Report
Performance			Performance and Value for money assessment			Performance Q2				Performance Q3
Scrutiny	Request to attend conference (CH) Work Programme 2010/11 (CH) Forward Plan	Poverty of Place Visit (SB) Feedback from Conference Work Programme 2010/11 (CH) Forward Plan (CH)	Policing in the 21 st Century Consultation (SD) Feedback from Poverty of Place Visit (CH) Work Programme 2010/11 (CH) Forward Plan	101 update (LSL) Work Programme 2010/11 (CH) Forward Plan	Work Programme 2010/11 (CH) Forward Plan	Work Programme 2010/11 (CH) Forward Plan	Out of hours schools (RB) Work Programme 2010/11 (CH) Forward Plan	Work Programme 2010/11 (CH) Forward Plan	Work Programme 2010/11 (CH) Forward Plan	Work Programme 2010/11 (CH) Forward Plan
CCFA/Members items/Petitions										