

At a meeting of the COMMUNITY AND SAFER CITY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE held in the CIVIC CENTRE on TUESDAY, 7TH JUNE, 2011 at 5.30 p.m.

Present:-

Councillor Anderson in the Chair

Councillors Copeland, Curran, Emerson, Essl, Forbes, Scaplehorn, Thompson, D. Trueman and Wiper

Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were submitted to the meeting on behalf of Councillor T. Martin.

Minutes of the Last Meeting held on 5th April, 2011

1. RESOLVED that the minutes of the last meeting of the Committee held on 5th April, 2011 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

Declarations of Interest (including Whipping Declarations)

There were no declarations of interest.

Annual Work Programme and Policy Review 2011-12

The Chief Executive submitted a report (copy circulated) which requested Members to determine the work programme for the year and identify a main theme for a detailed policy review.

(For copy report – see original minutes)

Stuart Douglass, Lead Policy for Community Safety, presented the report and informed Members of the previous policy reviews the Committee had completed which were detailed in paragraph 3.3 of the report; he also advised Members of the proposals for topics for the policy review for 2011-12 which were detailed in the table at paragraph 3.5 of the report. These topics had been identified at the Annual Scrutiny Conference.

Charlotte Burnham, Head of Scrutiny and Area Arrangements, advised that there was normally one policy review topic chosen for discussion throughout the year.

Jim Diamond, Scrutiny Officer, advised that for the past three years the Committee had examined crime related issues for the policy review and advised that the remit of the Committee, which was detailed at paragraph 2.1 of the report, was much broader than that and covered a wide range of issues.

The Chairman commented that the work surrounding Community Cohesion had not received the prominence it should have; the Regeneration Review Committee had looked at the issue of community cohesion in 2002 but made limited progress due to it being a relatively new concept at the time and there being little by way of detailed central guidance. Community Cohesion covered all parts of the communities and saw all agencies working together. There had been a pilot scheme in Southwick to identify how the work could improve the area and reduce poverty. There were Community Cohesion groups which were area based and aimed to bring together the community to combat problems. She was of the opinion that Community Cohesion would be the most suitable topic for the Committee to discuss as its policy review.

Councillor Emerson agreed with this as Community Cohesion sat as an umbrella for all of the topics which had been identified.

Councillor Copeland also agreed that Community Cohesion would be the best choice. Deprivation lead to crime and also left people feeling like they were not a part of the community. The North Area Committee had provided £1,000 to provide a meal for families which had worked well to bring these families back into the community.

Councillor Essl referred to the problems around Eden Vale; there was the issue of younger residents wanting to play football on the open spaces and older residents were not happy with it.

Councillor Forbes stated that all of the proposed topics were interesting; the Changing Drug Scene had jumped out as a possible topic given that it would link into crime and given that there were services to help get people off drugs which help to prevent reoffending.

The Chairman advised that regardless of which topic was chosen the other areas would not be excluded.

Ms Burnham advised that there would be monitoring reports from the previous policy reviews submitted to the Committee throughout the year and these would provide updates on drugs and crime in relation to the previous policy reviews.

Councillor Copeland commented that in Southwick there were a number of clinics which provided methadone and the clients of these clinics had lead to there being a huge increase in crime in the area.

Ms Douglass stated that the previous government had been keen to reduce heroin use by providing methadone for addicts; the new Coalition government had

proposed an abstinence approach to rehabilitation and as such the clinics providing methadone would not be working with as many addicts. There was a population of approximately 900 to 1000 people in Sunderland who were addicted to heroin or methadone. He agreed to bring a scoping report to the Committee to provide an overview of what was happening should Members wish.

The Chairman stated that it would be useful if such a report was provided and queried whether cocaine use was increasing in the city.

Mr Douglass commented that there had always been a small proportion of the drug using population were taking cocaine and while the overall population of drug users was staying approximately the same the proportions were changing. There were proposals for a two day induction for Members on Community Safety which would provide an opportunity to meet with key partners and would provide an overview of the legislation and an opportunity to visit projects within the city.

The Chairman commented that this induction would be a good opportunity to meet with the partnerships and also stated that crime prevention initiatives should be looked into.

Councillors Forbes and Wiper stated that this was a good idea and Councillor Wiper also stated that it was important for Members to be notified of the dates.

Mr Douglass advised that the two days would not necessarily be consecutive.

Councillor Copeland stated that the induction was an excellent idea. She also referred to the XL Youth Villages which had kept young people off the streets and out of trouble; she hoped the funding would continue. She also stated that she had been out on a night with the street pastors and had spoken to the door staff and taxi marshals who were there to reduce crime and fear of crime for people enjoying the evening economy of the city centre.

Mr Douglass advised that there was the desire to prevent young people from wanting to commit offences. A session was to be arranged with the police control centre.

Mr Diamond then stated that following this meeting a report detailing the remit of the policy review would be written.

Councillor Forbes stated that she wanted drugs to be included as an important part of the work programme.

2. RESOLVED that:-

- a. The Annual Work Programme be given consideration
- b. Community Cohesion be selected as the Policy Review topic for the year.

Food Law Enforcement Service Plan 2011/12

The Chief Executive submitted a report (copy circulated) which advised Members of the Food Law Enforcement Service Plan for 2011/12. The report was an Article 4 Plan under the Council's Constitution and was the primary document for promoting food safety and would be considered by Cabinet at its meeting on 22nd June, 2011.

(For copy report – see original minutes)

John Smith, Environmental Health Manager (Commercial), presented the report and advised that the plan had been produced as a requirement of the Food Standards Agency (FSA) which required authorities to produce the service plan on an annual basis.

Mr Smith advised that the primary aim of the department was to protect the health of everyone in the city in relation to food safety matters and also advised that the County Analyst Laboratory in Durham would be closing.

In response to questioning he stated that he believed this closure was due to Durham County Council no longer subsidising the lab. Any samples which required testing would be sent to alternative laboratories elsewhere in the country. It was not anticipated that there would be any significant delay in receiving results and there would not be an increase in the cost of having the analysis carried out. The analysts normally waited until there were a number of similar jobs to be carried out in order to keep the costs down. Where there was a result needed urgently it was possible to request an urgent response.

The Chairman stated that she was not happy about the closure of the Durham lab however she accepted that Sunderland had no control over what Durham County Council does.

Mr Smith then informed Members of initiatives such as the Healthy Homes Award and the Scores on the Doors scheme. There was to be a national scheme implemented by the FSA and it was planned that this would be launched on 28th June. The Scores on the Doors scheme covered all food outlets including takeaways. It was still not known whether the FSA scheme would replace the Council's scores on the doors scheme or whether they would operate alongside each other.

He then referred to the recent E.Coli outbreak and stated that washing vegetables was a sensible precaution and it was important to cook food properly and follow the cooking instructions. He also informed Members that most contamination of foods occurred within the home.

Mr Smith advised that when inspections of food premises were taking place there was no advance warning of the visits. In response to a query from Councillor Curran he advised that the operators needed to co-operate with the inspection staff and there was a good level of co-operation from operators. The service had legal powers for dealing with problem premises however it was very rare that these powers needed to be used.

Mr Smith then informed Members that the department would routinely provide advice when visiting premises and businesses could also request advice; over the last year there had been 35 requests for advice from businesses. He then referred to the sampling exercises which had been carried out. Two of the commercial dishwashers tested had been found to contain E.Coli however this had been traced to faults within the machines and once the machines had been repaired there had not been any issues.

Councillor Copeland commented that it was possible for dishwashers to be dirty inside; it was important to remember to keep cleaning materials clean; it was also important to teach food hygiene and cleanliness to premises operators.

Mr Smith agreed that it was important to ensure that cleaning equipment was kept clean. He also referred to a case of an E.Coli outbreak in Wales which had been traced to cross contamination of a vacuum packing machine. It was important to ensure that raw and cooked foods were kept separate.

Councillor Wiper queried whether the authority had the powers to close down premises and Mr Smith advised that this was the case and the department had closed down premises in the past. It was however a last resort and would only happen if there was a serious, imminent risk of infection. The department preferred to identify problems early and prevent them from escalating.

In response to queries from Councillor Thompson, Mr Smith advised that the standard timetable for inspections was every six months however should there be any issues identified then the visits would be taking place more frequently. The scores were based on the results of the visits and would not change until the next inspection even though it was likely that standards would have improved following the initial inspection. Freedom of Information requests for the inspection reports were difficult to comply with; it would be easier if a direct request for specific information was received.

Following a query from Councillor Copeland Mr Smith advised that the frequency of inspections for shops selling cold cooked meat depended on the rating the premises had been given following its previous inspection.

He advised Members of the financial allocation for the department. Councillor Forbes requested a breakdown of the internal recharges and external costs. Mr Smith stated that he would need to speak to accountancy to get this information and agreed to provide the information to the Scrutiny Officer for circulation to Members.

Mr Smith then went on to advise of the organisation of the department; there was only a small team working on food related work however they did a large amount of work. He also advised of the areas for improvement which were set out in the report and stated that it was difficult to improve given that the department was already performing so well.

The Chairman congratulated Mr Smith and the other officers involved in producing the report which was a fascinating piece of work; she also thanked the officers for working hard to keep the city safe.

3. RESOLVED that the comments of the Committee be referred to Cabinet for consideration.

Forward Plan – Key Decisions for the period 1 June 2011 – 30 September 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 June 2011 – 30 September 2011 which relate to the Community and Safer City Scrutiny Committee.

(For copy report – see original minutes).

4. RESOLVED that the report be received and noted.

Prior to closing the meeting the Chairman expressed concerns over the change in the meeting cycle from a 4 week cycle to a 6 week cycle. She felt that Members should have been consulted regarding this change and also felt that there was no need for the change to have been made.

Charlotte Burnham, Head of Scrutiny and Area Arrangements, advised that the IDeA had carried out a review of the scrutiny arrangements and they had recommended that the authority look at the cycle of meetings and how much work was carried out outside of the meetings. There had been a lot of discussions with the Chairs and Vice-Chairs and it had been agreed that the 6 week cycle would be piloted for a year. The Committee could hold extra meetings should they feel that there was the need to.

The other Members also expressed concerns over the change and the lack of consultation and they asked for a guarantee that they would be consulted at the conclusion of the pilot period.

Ms Burnham confirmed that all Members would be consulted and reiterated that all of the Chairs and Vice-Chairs had been consulted and that this change had been made with the best interests of scrutiny in mind.

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

(Signed) F. ANDERSON,
Chairman.

COMMUNITY AND SAFER CITY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 19 JULY 2011

COMMUNITY COHESION POLICY REVIEW 2010/11: DRAFT SCOPING REPORT

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 The purpose of this report is to put forward proposals and seek agreement from Members in relation to its forthcoming policy review into community cohesion.

2. Background

- 2.1 The Annual Scrutiny Conference was held on 19th May 2011. During the Scrutiny Café sessions a number of viable policy reviews were formulated for discussion by members of the Committee. At the meeting on 7th June 2011, following discussions regarding the work programme, the Committee agreed to focus on issue of community cohesion.
- 2.2 Members chose this area in view of the importance attached by local people to the related issues of improving employment opportunities, tackling poverty, improving educational attainment, securing better housing and improving sport and cultural activities.
- 2.3 Community cohesion is a relatively new term which first came into use widely following the disturbances in Bradford, Oldham and Burnley in 2001. In response to these disturbances, the Government commissioned the Cattle report. This report focused on the importance of developing a dialogue and understanding between members of different racial, cultural and religious communities and ensuring an open debate about issues such as identity, shared values and citizenship.
- 2.4 During the last decade, our understanding of the features of a cohesive community have continued to develop and evolve. This has reflected not only the complexity of the issue but also the fact that there is no one fits all solution to the problems faced regionally or at a local level. Community cohesion has therefore come to encompass broader issues than ethnicity or faith. It has now come to include wider issues such as

tackling poverty and inequalities and developing people's understanding and tolerance of others.

2.5 More recently, the Institute for Community Cohesion has provided a useful definition of an integrated and cohesive community as one where:

- There is a clearly defined and widely shared sense of the contribution of different individuals and different communities to a future vision for a neighbourhood, city, region or country;
- There is a strong sense of an individual's rights and responsibilities when living; in a particular place – people know what everyone expects of them, and what they can expect in turn;
- Those from different backgrounds have similar life opportunities, access to services and treatment;
- There is a strong sense of trust in institutions locally to act fairly in arbitrating between different interests and for their role and justifications to be subject to public scrutiny;
- There is a strong recognition of the contribution of both those who have newly arrived and those who already have deep attachments to a particular place, with a focus on what they have in common;
- There are strong and positive relationships between people from different backgrounds in the workplace, in schools and other institutions within neighbourhoods

2.6 Put simply, community cohesion is about how well people in different neighbourhoods and across the city get on together, how well they support one another and how much they feel they share an interest in what happens in the city. It is about reducing inequalities, crime and levels of deprivation, increasing community engagement and promoting interaction between people.

2.7 In response to the issues facing the city, the Sunderland Partnership produced a Community Cohesion Strategy for the period 2008-2015. The document aimed to ensure that our communities are strong and vibrant and also the opportunities that exist to ensure that the people of Sunderland feel fully able to participate in the life and future of the city.

2.8 The Strategy recognises that while Sunderland has not experienced the kind of instability that has occurred in other North Western cities, there are a number of significant issues that need to be addressed:-

- Young People and intergenerational tensions
- Tackling Deprivation
- Developing a Sense of Belonging
- Developing Links between Communities

3. The Scrutiny Review Process

3.1 Scrutiny reviews will carry out a number of stages in undertaking and completing a review. The stages broadly are:

Stage 1 Scope The initial stage of the review identifies the background, issues, potential outcomes and timetable for the review.

Stage 2 Investigate The Committee gathers evidence using a variety of tools and techniques and arranges visits where appropriate.

Stage 3 Analyse The key trends and issues are highlighted from the evidence gathered by the Committee.

Stage 4 Clarify The Committee discusses and identifies the principal messages of the review from the work undertaken.

Stage 5 Recommend The Committee formulates and agrees realistic recommendations.

Stage 6 Report Draft and final reports are prepared based on the evidence, findings and recommendations.

Stage 7 Monitor The Committee monitors recommendations on a regularly agreed basis.

4. Overall Aim of the Scrutiny Policy Review

4.1 To explore the range of community cohesion issues in the city, such as the relationships between older and younger generations. To identify what the council and partners are doing in relation community cohesion and how national policy will impact on the city.

5. Proposed Terms of Reference for the Scrutiny Policy Review

- 5.1 The draft Terms of Reference for the policy review are proposed:-
- (a) To gain a better understanding of what we mean by the term Community Cohesion;
 - (b) To consider the background and policy context for the development of community cohesion at a national and local level;
 - (c) To review the Sunderland Partnership Community Cohesion Strategy;
 - (d) To explore a range of community cohesion issues affecting the city across a number of themes including young people and

- intergenerational tensions; tackling deprivation, developing a sense of belonging and developing links between communities;
- (e) To consider the policies and programmes of the Council, its partners and the community and voluntary sector which can help bring people together across the city and build bridges between communities;
- (f) To look at the measures being taken to tackle issues causing tensions between older and younger generations within neighbourhoods and communities;
- (g) To consider the action that can be taken to promote “myth busting” and combat misinformation.

6. Potential Areas of Enquiry and Sources of Evidence

6.1 The Scrutiny Committee can invite a variety of people, key stakeholders and interested parties to provide written or oral evidence in order that a balanced and focused range of recommendations can be formulated. A list of potential witnesses, though not exhaustive, is included for Members information:

- (a) Relevant Cabinet Portfolio Holders;
- (b) Representatives of the Local Strategic Partnership;
- (c) Councillor officers;
- (d) Area Committees;
- (e) gentoo
- (f) Local media
- (g) Key Stakeholders and partner organisations (eg. Schools, Health, Police, Nexus);
- (h) Community and Voluntary sector
- (i) Local residents;
- (j) Representatives of minority communities of interest;
- (k) Ward Councillors;
- (l) Local MPs;
- (m) Examples of good practice from other local authorities.

6.2 As well as gathering information and evidence by the methods outlined above the Committee may, if it feels it appropriate, co-opt an additional

member to the Committee for the duration of the policy review in accordance with the provisions of the Crime and Disorder (Overview and Scrutiny) Regulations 2009 and the protocols set out in the Scrutiny Handbook.

- 6.3 Community engagement plays a crucial role in the scrutiny process. Consideration will be given as to how involvement can best be structured in a way that the Committee encourages those views.
- 6.4 In addition, diversity issues have been considered in the background research for this enquiry under the Equality Standards for Local Government. As such the views of local diversity groups will be sought throughout the inquiry where felt appropriate and time allows. Consequently, consideration has been given as to how the views of people from minority communities of interest or heritage (for example, people with disabilities, people with learning disabilities, people with mental health problems, black and minority ethnic people, and Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender people), which may not be gathered through the usual community engagement routes, can be included over the course of the inquiry.

7. Funding from the Dedicated Overview and Scrutiny Budget

- 7.1 Consideration has been given, through the background research for this scoping report of the need to use funding from the Committee's dedicated Overview and Scrutiny budget to aid Members in their enquiry.
- 7.2 At this stage, it is suggested that funding may be necessary to support the following activities:
- (a) Key witnesses;
 - (b) Engagement with voluntary and statutory organisations;
 - (c) Delegates for expert jury, or a public event;
 - (d) General publicity;
 - (e) Visits (as necessary) to deliver effective scrutiny; and
 - (f) Task and Finish activities.

8. Proposed Timetable of the Scrutiny Investigation

- 8.1 The following scheduled meetings will include evidence gathering for the study:

Setting the Scene - September 2011

Evidence Gathering - October 2011 to February 2012

Consideration of Draft Final Report - March 2012

Consideration of Final Report by the Scrutiny Committee - April 2012

Consideration of Final Report by the Cabinet/Council - June 2012

8.2 Additional working group meetings are likely to be necessary to complete the evidence gathering.

9. Recommendations

9.1 Members are recommended to discuss and agree the scope of the Community and Safer City Scrutiny Committee's policy review for 2011/12 as outlined in the report.

10. Background Papers

Sunderland Partnership – Community Cohesion Strategy 2008-2015

Contact Officer : James Diamond 0191 561 1396
james.diamond@sunderland.gov.uk

MEMBERS INDUCTION SESSION

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 report

1.1 To provide details of a proposed induction session(s) for members in relation to their work on the Committee.

2. Background

2.1 At its last meeting, the Committee agreed to undertake an induction session or a number of sessions as part of its work programme for the year. This will allow members an opportunity to meet with key partners, provide an overview of the latest legislation and an opportunity to visit projects within the city.

2.2 The contents of the session could include:-

- The Safer Sunderland Partnership (role and remit, structures and strategic priorities);
- Working Lunch with Representatives from the Safer Partnership Board;
- City Centre Violent Crime Initiatives;
- Visit to the Integrated Offender Management (IOM) Unit;
- Violence Against Women and Girls and Safeguarding Joint Initiatives;
- View the XL Youth Village and Mobile Bus Provision to tackle Anti Social Behaviour

2.3 Following consultation with members, it is proposed that an initial induction session take place on Monday 9 September 2011. If necessary further sessions or visits will be organised. A detailed programme for the session will be circulated to members nearer the date.

2.4 Members views are sought on the contents of the session and whether there are any further visits the Committee may wish to undertake.

3. Recommendation

3.1 Members are invited to consider the report.

4. Background Papers

Contact Officer: Jim Diamond, Scrutiny Officer
0191 561 1396, james.diamond@sunderland.gov.uk

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 update members of the Community and Safer City Scrutiny Committee on the progress of the Police and Social Responsibility Bill.

2.0 Background

2.1 On 8 February 2011, the Scrutiny Committee received a report outlining the proposals set out in the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Bill. The Committee agreed to receive regular updates on the progress during the year ahead.

2.2 The report outlined the key points of the Bill at that time, including:-

- § Abolishes police authorities and replaces them with directly elected Police and Crime Commissioners for each police force outside London.
- § 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.

3. Current Position

- 3.1 Stuart Douglass will provide an update on the current position.

4. Recommendations

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

DRUG MISUSE - UPDATE

REPORT OF CHIEF EXECUTIVE

STRATEGIC PRIORITIES: SP3 SAFE CITY

CORPORATE IMPROVEMENT OBJECTIVES: CI01: Delivering Customer Focussed Services, CI04: Improving partnership working to deliver 'One City'

1. Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 To provide Members of the Community and Safer City Scrutiny Committee with an update of the current national and local frame work to tackle drug misuse, including the current challenges Sunderland faces regarding drug misuse and the interventions in place to reduce drug taking and any drug related harm and crime.

2. Background

- 2.1 At its meeting on 11 June 2011, the Committee agreed to receive further reports during the year on drug strategy with the city.
- 2.2 Leanne Davis leads on the coordination of the Safer Sunderland Partnership's activity in relation to drug misuse and will provide a presentation with an overview of the new national Drug Strategy, the current challenges Sunderland encounters in relation to drug misuse and drug related crime and the initiatives in place to tackle these.

3. Current position

- 3.1 The Government's new Drug Strategy 2010: Reducing Demand, Restricting Supply, Building Recovery. Supporting People to live a drug free life was published in December 2010. This strategy sets out the Government's approach to tackle drug misuse with an emphasis on preventing drug use from occurring and if it does, moving people in to and through drug treatment to ensure that they are able to live drug free lives. This presentation will provide and overview of the strategy and how it is being implemented in Sunderland.
- 3.2 Sunderland's performance in relation to drug treatment has improved in recent years and the presentation will seek to establish the context of drug misuse in Sunderland, providing a summary of the current drug issues and the current performance of drug treatment services.
- 3.3 The Safer Sunderland Partnership has identified tackling drug misuse and the harm caused by it, including drug related crime as a priority for

2010-11. There are numerous schemes in place to achieve this and the presentation will provide an overview of some key initiatives throughout the city to tackle drug misuse and drug related crime.

4. Recommendations

4.1 That the report be noted.

5 Background Papers

No background papers were used in this report.

Contact Officer: Leanne Davis
Assistant Policy Officer for Community Safety
0191 561 7959

COMMUNITY AND SAFER CITY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

19 JULY 2011

WORK PROGRAMME 2011-12

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 2011-12 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 8 February 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 2012-12.

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

COMMUNITY AND SAFER CITY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2011/2012

REASON FOR INCLUSION	JUNE 07.06.11	JULY 19.07.11	SEPTEMBER 06.9.11	OCTOBER 18.10.11	DECEMBER 06.12.11	JANUARY 10.01.12	FEBRUARY 21.02.12	APRIL 03.04.12
Cabinet-Referrals and Responses			Response to the 10/11 Policy Review – Alcohol, Violence and the Night Time Economy (JD)					
Policy Review	Annual Work Programme and Policy Review 2011/2012 (JD)	Policy Review - Scoping Report (JD)	Policy Review – Scene Setting (JD)	Policy Review - Evidence Gathering (JD)	Policy Review – Evidence Gathering (JD)	Policy Review – Evidence Gathering (JD)	Policy Review Progress Report (JD)	Policy Review: Final Report (JD)
Performance			Performance Report (Gillian Robinson) Progress on Past Recommendations (JD)			Performance Q2/ Policy Review Progress ()		Performance Q3/ (Gillian Robinson)
Scrutiny	Food Law Enforcement (Norma Johnston) Forward Plan (SA)	Police Reform and Social Responsibility Bill - Update (Stuart Douglass) Drug Misuse – Update (Leanne Davis) Work Programme (SA) Forward Plan (SA)	Work Programme (SA) Forward Plan (SA)	Emergency Planning (Barry Frost) Neighbourhood Helpline (LSL) Work Programme (SA) Forward Plan (SA)	Work Programme (SA) Forward Plan (SA)	Work Programme (SA) Forward Plan (SA)	Work Programme (SA) Forward Plan (SA)	Work Programme (SA) Forward Plan (SA)
CCFA/Members items/Petitions								

COMMUNITY AND SAFER CITY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

19 JULY 2011

FORWARD PLAN – KEY DECISIONS FOR THE PERIOD 1 JULY 2011 – 31 OCTOBER 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 July 2011 – 31 October 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