

At a meeting of the COMMUNITY AND SAFER CITY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE held in the CIVIC CENTRE on TUESDAY, 11TH JANUARY, 2011 at 5.30 p.m.

Present:-

Councillor Heron in the Chair

Councillors Copeland, Emerson, Maddison, J. Scott, Timmins and J. Walton.

Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were submitted to the meeting on behalf of Councillors Ball, Ellis and Scaplehorn.

Minutes of the Last Meeting held on 7th December, 2010

1. RESOLVED that the minutes of the last meeting of the Committee held on 7th December, 2010 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

Declarations of Interest (including Whipping Declarations)

There were no declarations of interest.

Victim Support Sunderland

The Chief Executive submitted a report and powerpoint presentation (copies circulated) to provide the Committee with information about Victim Support and how they worked with the victims of violent crime.

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

Gillian Thirlwell and Liz Jarvis from Victim Support, presented the report and were on hand to answer Members' queries.

In response to Councillor J. Scott's enquiry, Ms. Thirlwell advised that there was only one Anti Social Behaviour Worker for the Sunderland area.

Stuart Douglass, Safer Communities Manager advised that the Council had received external funding from the Home Office for a specialised worker based within the ASB Team to work with victims and to develop new approaches. Whilst it was only one person, they would liaise with a whole range of Officers to tackle problems together.

The Chairman also advised that the Council had its own Anti Social Behaviour Officers.

Councillor Scott commented that he still felt it was a large workload for just one person.

In response to Councillor J. Walton's query, Ms. Jarvis informed the Committee that they try to advertise the service in a number of ways, namely through attending community events, Universities and Drop-in Centres although this was quite difficult with limited resources.

In response to Councillor Maddison's query, Ms. Thirlwell advised that they had funding to last for the next five months and they would be looking to apply for more at that time.

Councillor Copeland commented that she whole heartedly supported the service as they had always been there when she had needed them and she believed they should not have to apply for funding as it should come out of mainstream funds for the long term.

Ms. Jarvis thanked Members for their support and advised that due to funding cuts, there was a worry on how to sustain the current service. The only way appeared to be to apply for core support from the local authorities in order to keep a local presence.

The Chairman enquired if the service was funded by the Home Office or the Police and if it was still difficult to recruit volunteers.

Ms. Thirlwell advised that the service was funded via the Home Office and that generally the volunteers were university leaders looking to gain experience which resulted in a high turnover of staff, which brought difficulties.

The Chairman enquired if the family members of the perpetrators received support.

Ms. Thirlwell advised that in cases such as domestic violence, they would not send workers out to homes but would arrange to meet elsewhere so that support could still be provided.

Ms. Jarvis commented that they were aware of the risk factors and the need to be careful, not only for the victims, but for the care workers' safety also.

The Chairman commented that the victims were often the silent people in the issue, who needed more support, we had come a long way on this, but was still an issue.

Ms. Jarvis agreed that the service had come a long way and they realised circumstances were not always black and white.

Councillor Copeland commented that a number of services were set up to help the perpetrators and she would like a greater emphasis on services for the victims who, in her opinion, seemed to be at the end of the line when resources were allocated.

The Chairman having thanked the Officers for their report, it was:-

2. RESOLVED that the report be received and noted.

How Northumbria Probation Trust Works with High Risk Drinkers who Commit Violent Offences in Sunderland

The Northumbria Probation Trust submitted a report (copy circulated) to illustrate the work that they carried out with its partners in Sunderland in:-

- (a) identifying violent offenders who were high risk drinkers; and
- (b) addressing their alcohol use and offending behaviours to protect the public from further offending and prevent the creation of new victims of violent crime.

(For copy report – see original minutes).

Kevin Robinson, Head of Offender Management, presented the report and advised that they did not just work with statutory offenders but engaged with people via Police Intelligence and LMAPs.

Councillor Timmins commented that the issue of drugs had not been mentioned, yet on many occasions there was a direct link to violence and there was a need to overcome the problem that young people did not believe they had drink/drug issues.

Mr. Robinson advised that there was a far greater problem with alcohol, which was the cause of most offences rather than drugs, but the service did deal with drug issues also.

Councillor Emerson commented that the alarming figures of individuals consuming 70-100 cans per day was mind boggling with regards to how they funded this, it must be through some form of crime.

Mr. Robinson commented that drug addicts would fund their habits through shop lifting and such like, the same applied to alcoholics with added issues of domestic violence etc. In relation to the consumption of 70-100 cans per day, evidence of these instances were not unusual.

The Chairman advised that he had been involved in the Total Place review in which it was found £385 million was the costs incurred through health issues alone, so with £50,000 going to victim support, £80,000 to Northumbria Probation Trust, these were

small amounts to try and tackle the problems before they became health issues. The Chairman also believed that these services' budgets needed to be increased.

In response to Councillor Copeland's query, Mr. Robinson advised that their service only dealt with people of 18+ ages but there were instances where children aged 12-13 had been addicted to alcohol. It was not just an issue about crime, but health risks also.

Councillor Copeland raised concerns that there would be greater numbers of people suffering from sclerosis of the liver in the future, if action was not taken now.

3. RESOLVED that the report be received and noted.

Drinking Banning Orders

The Deputy Chief Executive submitted a report (copy circulated) to provide the Committee with information about Drink Banning Orders (DBOs) which were introduced via the Violent Crime Reduction Act, 2006.

(For copy report – see original minutes).

Kelly Henderson, Safer Communities Officer/Violent Crime and Leanne Davis, Drug and Alcohol Strategy Manager, presented the report and advised on the two DBOs that had been issued in Sunderland.

Councillor J. Walton referred to paragraph 2.3 of the report which mentioned defined areas and queried that if an individual was banned in a certain area, would they not just move to a non-defined area, which would only shift the problems somewhere else rather than solve them.

Ms. Henderson advised there was a need to be specific and would be based on each individual's circumstances. The issue had not come up under the DBOs issues in Sunderland so far, but she did take Councillor Walton's point on board.

Councillor Copeland enquired if the £500 costs incurred prohibited the Council from issuing further orders.

Ms. Henderson advised that financially, it was a problem in the current economic climate which was why there was a need to work with the Home Office to retrieve the funds back through convictions.

In response to Councillor Copeland's query, Ms. Henderson advised that the two DBOs had been brought to the Authority by the police and it was not just about City Centre issues, so they utilised such services as LMAPs for intel.

The Chairman enquired if the issuing of the DBOs had any effect on the individual's friends, acting as a deterrent almost.

Ms. Henderson commented that there was no information as yet and there may be a need to study the current DBOs that were in place to see what effects they had.

In response to the Chairman's enquiry, Ms. Davis advised that breaches of ASBOs could be taken to criminal court and we now had a real hierarchy to tackle behaviour and problems. DBOs were just one measure in terms of an arsenal of possible routes to take.

Ms. Henderson also advised that they were working with the police to send out joint warning letters to individuals involved in drink related crime and they were working with Pubwatch also.

Councillor Copeland enquired if the person issued with a DBO had to report anywhere, similar to being on parole.

Ms. Henderson advised that this was not necessary as the police would monitor the individual to make sure they were not arrested or involved in further breaches of their order.

4. RESOLVED that the report be received and noted.

Police Reform and Social Responsibility Bill

The Executive Director of City Services submitted a report (copy circulated) to advise Members of the implications of the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Bill with regard to the functions of the Council in licensing and sale of alcohol.

(For copy report – see original minutes).

Tom Terrett, Trading Standards and Licensing Manager presented the report and advised Members that the Bill was currently at Committee stage with a complete report to be submitted by 17th February if they wished to submit any feedback.

Councillor J. Walton commented that he felt these amendments were a long time coming and in particular paragraph 3.4 'Removing the Vicinity Test' although he felt the term 'interested parties **likely** to be affected' was a rather loose term.

Mr. Terrett advised that the Officer's response would be to refer any objectors to the Licensing Sub-Committee so that Members could judge each case on its own merits.

Councillor Walton referred to paragraph 3.6 and questioned how it could be operated when they plan to reduce notification from ten working days to five working days, which would not give much time to organise a Licensing Sub-Committee.

Mr. Terrett advised that a similar approach would be used as the procedures already set up for when the police called for emergency reviews and such like.

In relation to paragraph 3.7, Councillor Walton commented that increasing the maximum fine from £10,000 to £20,000 seemed quite ridiculous when the highest prosecutions we had made were in the region of £1,500 at present.

Mr. Terrett advised that the vast majority of fines issued had been way short of £10,000. This was usually due to the limitations of what people could actually afford to pay, so the increase of possible fines was more symbolic than anything else.

Councillor Emerson raised concerns that the amendments to the Vicinity Test, which needed, could allow frivolous objections and create extra workload for both Officers and Members of the Licensing Sub-Committee.

Mr. Terrett advised that inevitably it would generate more work but they could reject any frivolous objections as they would have to meet the licensing objectives. At this stage, the department suggested an open mind be kept on the issue.

Councillor Copeland enquired if consideration was given over garages selling alcohol in the early mornings.

Mr. Terrett advised that he was not sure it was a major problem with a lot depending on the geographical location of premises and proximity to residential areas. A review had been carried out on one premise which had additional conditions imposed upon it, but the Bill related more to City Centre premises.

Mr. Terrett also advised that any decisions made would need to be appropriate and evidence based.

Councillor J. Scott referred to paragraph 3.9 and enquired how much the Annual Fees would be.

Mr. Terrett advised that depending on the premises the fee could vary from a few hundred pounds to a few thousand pounds.

In relation to the Late Night Levy, Councillor Scott enquired if these would be imposed on Night Clubs and Takeaway establishments.

Mr. Terrett informed the Committee that there was no provision for this at present as it was a new power available to the Council. If the Levy was to be introduced, all establishments would be liable to pay with some eligible for exemptions or discounts. Which establishments were eligible for exemptions etc was unclear at this stage.

In response to Councillor J. Scott's enquiry Mr. Terrett advised that it was not stated at present if the Levy would be rateable similar to the Annual Fees and the Authority was awaiting guidance on the subject.

Councillor J. Scott suggested the remuneration for applying the Levy be based on the popularity of establishments, determined via a headcount for example, so that the more popular venues pay more.

Mr. Terrett commented that it was a valid suggestion worthy of further investigation but was not a decision the Council could make, yet could be put forward to the Government for consideration.

The Chairman referred to paragraph 3.6 and raised concerns of the effects it could have on the locality.

Mr. Terrett advised that if an application was made for a Temporary Event Notice, it would be a useful tool for the Council to be able to amend any set times.

In relation to paragraph 3.7, the Chairman commented that he believed the only way to tackle underage sales was to remove the sellers licence or impose CCTV as an effective method to control the situation.

Mr. Terrett advised that many premises applying for licences volunteered for CCTV, with the Authority suggesting it be installed to those without it, this was requested as CCTV had been used on occasions to examine particular incidents. With regards to the removal of licences, if two instances of underage sales were proven in a premises over a three month period then the licensee could be convicted.

Councillor J. Walton commented that imposing greater fines may be a better deterrent than threatening to remove a licence as a Magistrate may take a different light on such measures that could affect people's livelihoods.

Mr. Terrett advised that the law allows for both approaches to be implemented and the size of fines were a matter for the Courts to decide. Magistrates may overturn the Committee's decision which was why the need for evidence was vital.

The Chairman referred to paragraph 3.11 and suggested the funds generated from the Late Night Levy needed to be used for services such as late night buses servicing greater distances and areas further away from the City Centre, as this would help ease demand in the taxi queues.

Mr. Terrett informed the Committee that 30% of the funds generated by the Levy would be used for 'other services' and that he would investigate if it could be used for transport and report back in due course. As it was a new proposal, we did not know what kind of funds would be generated through the scheme as yet, but as a concept it was certainly worthy of further investigation.

The Chairman raised concerns over the short timescales for deciding on Temporary Event Notices and also referred to paragraph 3.9 of the report to enquire why a licence wasn't removed when a premises had been closed/empty for a period of three months for example.

Mr. Terrett advised that presently, a licence could end in a number of ways, either through suspension, being revoked or the company going into liquidation for example. Sometimes a licence was kept alive during the transferral of a premises but if an individual failed to pay the Annual Fees, under this new Bill, the licence could be suspended (not removed) and they would have to reapply. Mr. Terrett added that this had not been a major problem in Sunderland.

The Chairman commented that if a licence was removed due to premises being empty, it would allow the Authority to update conditions such as noise levels and CCTV, etc.

Mr. Terrett advised that if licensees wished to leave their premises vacant, yet still pay the Annual Fees, that was not a problem, but for the Authority to impose additional conditions there would have to be sufficient evidence of problems occurring.

5. RESOLVED that the report be received and noted with Members comments/suggestions included in future consultations.

Alcohol, Violence and Night Time Economy: Progress Report

The Chief Executive submitted a report (copy circulated) to provide Members with an ongoing progress report in relation to this year's policy review around alcohol, violence and the night time economy.

(For copy report – see original minutes).

Claire Harrison, Acting Scrutiny Officer, presented the report and advised on the City Centre night time visits carried out in December and that further visits would be arranged, possibly in February.

Ms. Harrison also advised that a further Task and Finish Group was to be set up at the end of the month.

In relation to the City Centre visits, the Chairman commented that Members had received a good flavour for the night time atmosphere, with a number of minor incidents occurring but nothing major. Members had also received a good reception from the staff in whichever establishment they visited.

Councillor Copeland commented that she had noted the excellent rapport between the Police and pub landlords who genuinely appeared to take suggestions on board, such as the polycarbonate glass schemes.

Councillor Copeland also commented that she believed the Street Pastors were providing a fantastic service and were well respected.

6. 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).

7. RESOLVED that the report be received and noted.

Forward Plan – Key Decisions for the Period 1 January 2011 – 30 April 2011

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 January 2010 – 30 April 2011 which relate to the Community and Safer City Scrutiny Committee.

(For copy report – see original minutes).

8. RESOLVED that the Committee had considered the Executive's Forward Plan for the period 1 January 2011 – 30 April 2011.

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

(Signed) R. HERON,
Chairman.

COMMUNITY AND SAFER CITY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

8th FEBRUARY 2011

ALCOHOL, VIOLENCE AND THE NIGHT TIME ECONOMY POLICY REVIEW

REPORT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE

STRATEGIC PRIORITIES: SP3: SAFE CITY

CORPORATE PRIORITIES: C101: 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 Northumbria Police responses to alcohol related violence in the City Centre.

2. Background

- 2.1 The key objective in the Northumbria Policing Plan for 2008-2011 is 'to build trust and confidence in the community and reduce crime and disorder'.
- 2.2 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.
- 2.3 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.
- 2.4 Violent Crime in Sunderland is reducing overall, figures for the period April January 2011 show a reduction of 6.5% (a reduction of 235 fewer victims) compared with the same period for 2009.
- 2.5 Within Sunderland Area Command there have been 176 crimes of Most Serious Violence (MSV) for the year to date (April 2010 – January 2011) which represents an increase of 6.7% on last year. This has been reduced from an increase of approximately 30% earlier last year. Most Serious Violence represents 6% of all violent crime.

3.0 Night Time Economy Police Activity

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 intermittently over weekends.

b) Operation Calculate

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

As a result of Operation Barracuda, evidence was gathered with regard to under 18s 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.

c) Operation Jaws

Research has revealed a potentially dangerous interaction between cocaine and alcohol when taken together. The two drugs are converted by the body into a third drug named cocaethylene. Side effects of this drug include an increase in aggressive and risk taking behaviour.

Operation Jaws consists of a Sergeant and Police Constables visiting licensed premises in the City Centre to support door supervisors in preventing use of illicit drugs on licensed premises. The operation also allows Police Inspectors to test for drugs on arrest.

d) Operation Guardian

The key focus of this operation is to provide engagement and reassurance via officers on foot during the main periods of the night time economy at

key identified points. The primary objective is early intervention through a firm, friendly policing style.

4.0 Recommendations

- 4.1 Members are recommended to note the content of this report as evidence on as part of the review.

Background Papers

- **Northumbria Police Strategy for 2008-2011**

**ALCOHOL, VIOLENCE AND THE NIGHT TIME ECONOMY:
PROGRESS REPORT**

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 The purpose of this report is to provide members with ongoing progress in relation to this years policy review: Alcohol, Violence and the Night time Economy

2. Background

- 2.1 An initial scoping document providing several options for detailed focus was presented to the Committee on 6th July 2010. A further report was presented at the 14th September 2010 meeting which added structure to the review and further focus on the subject area
- 2.2 The title of the review was agreed as Alcohol, Violence and the Night time Economy. It was agreed that a task and finish group would be set up to investigate Licensing and enforcement of the city's Licensing Policy.

3. Progress update

Task and Finish Group

- 3.4 The third meeting of the task and finish group was held on the 28th January 2011. Members met with Elaine Griffiths, Manager of Varsity and Chair of Pubwatch, Louise Hardy, City Centre Manager and Tom Terrett, Trading Standards and Licensing Manager.
- 3.5 Information was provided to the group regarding the views of Licensees and feedback was provided regarding a questionnaire completed by Licensees as part of the evidence gathering for the policy review.
- 3.6 The findings of the task and finish group will be incorporated into the final policy review into Alcohol, Violence and the Night Time Economy.

Visits

- 3.7 A visit has been arranged with the Street Pastors for Friday 4th February 2011.
- 3.8 There are two further City Centre visits will the police arranged for the 12th February and 19th February.

4 Recommendation

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

5. Background Papers

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

POLICE REFORM AND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY BILL

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'.

1.0 Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to brief members of the Community and Safer City Scrutiny Committee on the recently published Police and Social Responsibility Bill.

2.0 Background

- 2.1 The Police Reform and Social Responsibility Bill was included in the Queen's Speech on 25th May 2010 and received its first reading on 30th November 2010. The Bill has had its second reading and is currently going through Committee stage. The key points of the Bill are listed below:-

- Abolishes police authorities and replaces them with directly elected Police and Crime Commissioners for each police force outside London, to be introduced from May 2012.
- Replaces the Metropolitan Police Authority with the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime, to be run by the Mayor of London. (The Queen will continue to appoint the Metropolitan Commissioner and the Deputy Metropolitan Commissioner on the advice of the Home Secretary).
- Sets out the basic duties of a Police and Crime Commissioner, including publishing a police and crime plan, setting the local police and crime objectives, and setting the local precept and annual force budget (including contingency reserves) in discussion with the chief constable.
- Provides for Police and Crime Commissioners to appoint and, if necessary, suspend or dismiss the chief constable of their police force. The chief constable will retain control of all other officers of the police force.
- Provides for the establishment of Police and Crime Panels for each police area to advise and scrutinise the work of the Police and Crime Commissioner.
- Restores the right to non-violent protest around Parliament through repealing sections 132-138 of the Serious Organised Crime and Police Act (SOCPA) 2005; also prohibits encampments and other disruptive behaviour in Parliament Square.

- Provides for amendments to the Licensing Act 2003 in order to give the police and local authorities much stronger powers to remove licenses from, or refuse to grant licenses to, any premises that are causing problems.
- Allows local councils to charge more for late-night licenses to pay for additional policing.
- Provides for doubling the maximum fine for premises which persistently sell alcohol to under 18s, and for increasing the period of suspensions which can be imposed on such premises.
- Introduces greater flexibility in relation to the scrutiny and utility of temporary event notices.
- Amends the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971 by introducing a new power for the Secretary of State to temporarily ban new psychoactive substances ('legal highs') for up to one year whilst the health issues are considered by independent experts.
- Amends the constitution of the Advisory Council on the Misuse of Drugs to allow greater flexibility in the membership of the Council.
- Amends the Greater London Authority Act 1999 and the Local Government Act 1972 to enable local authorities to attach powers of seizure and retention of any property in connection with the breach of a byelaw.
- Amends the process for issuing private arrest warrants for universal jurisdiction offences.

2.2 Police and Crime Commissioners

Under the Bill's proposals:-

- Police Authorities will be abolished and replaced with Police and Crime Commissioners for each force outside of London, with the Mayor of London taking the role in the capital. Their salaries will be set by the Home Secretary on the advice of the Senior Salaries Review Body, and many of their functions are broadly similar to those of Police Authorities.
- Elections for commissioners will be every four years from May 2012 and held on the same day as local elections. The elections will be by the supplementary vote system and Commissioners will be limited to serving two terms.
- Commissioners will be required to produce a Police and Crime Plan, consulting local people on its content. Chief Constables will also have to have regard to the Plan.
- Commissioners will have to publish information to allow local people to assess their performance and that of Chief Constables.
- Safer Sunderland Partnership did not support the creation of Commissioners in its response to the consultation preceding the Bill and supported the view of the Local Government Group that the introduction of Commissioners could fragment local partnerships as competing electoral mandates pull the police and councils in different directions.

- Councils will have to jointly establish a Police and Crime Panel to scrutinise the work of their Commissioner.
- These will consist of a minimum of ten councillors and two co-opted members. The Panels will have to represent the political make up of the local area.
- The Panel will review and report on the draft Police and Crime Plan, review the annual report, review or scrutinise decisions taken by the Commissioner, and publish any reports it makes to the Commissioner. scrutinise the work of their Commissioner.
- The Panel will have the power to require the Commissioner and members of their staff to attend Panel meetings and respond in writing to any report it issues. The Panel will be able to suspend the Commissioner if they have been charged with an offence carrying a sentence of two or more years in prison.
- The Commissioner's proposed budget will be presented to the Police and Crime Panel, which will then review it and issue a report on it, with there being a power of veto for the Panel based on a three-quarters majority vote.
- Police and Crime Panels will appoint an acting Commissioner from amongst the Commissioner's staff if the Commissioner is incapacitated or is suspended.

The Northumbria Police Force area covers six local authority areas therefore will potentially have ten councillors and two co-opted members.

The Bill now proposes a power of the Police and Crime Panel to veto a Commissioners proposed budget as opposed to the Pre Bill Consultation proposal of a public referendum which Safer Sunderland Partnership opposed as being costly in its response. The Local Government Group are lobbying to seek that the veto is set at two thirds of the PCC rather than the proposed three quarters.

2.3 The relationship of Commissioners and Community Safety Partnerships

Under the Bill's proposals:

- Commissioners and Community Safety Partnerships will be able to enter into collaboration agreements covering more than one partnership, to produce strategies for reducing crime and disorder. A Commissioner will be able to compel partnerships to produce strategies if they are not doing so – a role currently held by the Home Secretary.
- the Local Government Group have indicated in their response to the Bill that Community Safety Partnerships should not be compelled to come together at Force level but rather should be encouraged to do so voluntarily by Commissioners. It is of note that the Commissioner will not become a responsible authority of the Community Safety Partnership. Additionally the Commissioner is to be empowered to give grants for crime reduction and it is possible that current funds such as the Basic Command Unit Fund could potentially be governed by the Commissioner rather than at local level as is currently the case.

3. Summary and next steps

- 3.1 The Bill is currently in Committee stage where detailed examination of each clause is being carried out. The Safer Communities team will continue to monitor progress of the Bill.

4. Recommendations

- 4.1 That the Community and Safer City Scrutiny Committee note the contents of the report.

COMMUNITY AND SAFER CITY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

8 FEBRUARY 2011

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 11 January 2011 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 8.6.2010	JULY 6.7.10	SEPTEMBER 14.9.10	OCTOBER 12.10.10	NOVEMBER 9.11.10	DECEMBER 7.12.10	JANUARY 11.1.11	FEBRUARY 8.2.11	MARCH 8.3.11	APRIL 05.4.11
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)	Neighbourhood Helpline update (LSL) Best Bar None and Pubwatch (LH) Policy Review update (CH)	Cardiff Model – A&E (KL) SSP Marketing (JS) Street Pastors (DB) Policy review update (CH)	Balance (SR) PCT interventions (NC)	Probation (KR) Victim Support (GT) DBOs (KH) Police Reform and Social Responsibility Bill (TT) Policy Review update (CH)	Northumbria Police (SM) Policy Review Update (CH)	Draft Report	Final Report
Performance			Performance and Value for money assessment			Performance Q2				Performance Q3
Scrutiny	Request to attend conference (CH) Work Programme 2010/11 (SA) Forward Plan	Poverty of Place Visit (SB) Feedback from Conference Work Programme 2010/11 (SA) Forward Plan (SA)	Policing in the 21 st Century Consultation (SD) Feedback from Poverty of Place Visit (CH) Work Programme 2010/11 (SA) Forward Plan	Victims Champion Work Programme 2010/11 (SA) Forward Plan	Work Programme 2010/11 (SA) Forward Plan	Work Programme 2010/11 (SA) Forward Plan	Work Programme 2010/11 (SA) Forward Plan	Police Reform and Social Responsibility Bill update (SD) Work Programme 2010/11 (SA) Forward Plan	Out of hours schools (RB) Work Programme 2010/11 (SA) Forward Plan	Work Programme 2010/11 (SA) Forward Plan
CCFA/Members items/Petitions										

COMMUNITY AND SAFER CITY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

8 FEBRUARY 2011

FORWARD PLAN – KEY DECISIONS FOR THE PERIOD 1 FEBRUARY 2011 – 31 MAY 2011

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 January 2011 – 31 May 2011 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; Food Law Enforcement; 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 Members are asked to note that there are no items in the current Forward Plan relating to the remit of this Committee.

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