

AGENDA

KENT PARTNERSHIP: SAFER AND STRONGER COMMUNITIES GROUP

Thursday, 4th March, 2010, at 9.30 am

Ask for: **Geoff Mills & Andy Ballard**

Darent Room, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone

Telephone **(01622) 694289/694297**

1. Election of Chairman
2. Apologies
3. Notes of the Last Meeting & Matters Arising (Pages 1 - 6)
4. Matters Arising
5. Impact of Offenders Prisons in Kent Presentation (Peter Gilroy)
6. CDRP Strategic Assessments (Russ Nyman/Jim Parris) (Pages 7 - 10)
7. Powers for PCSO's (Matthew Nix) (Pages 11 - 20)
8. Public Confidence Group -Oral Feedback (Clive Bainbridge)
9. Review of County Strategy Group/Safer and Stronger Communities Group Oral Report (Clive Bainbridge)
10. Information Exchange Protocols (Pages 21 - 24)
11. Anti-Social Behaviour Arrangements (Jim Parris) (Pages 25 - 28)
12. Domestic Abuse - KCJB (Pages 29 - 32)
13. SSFC (Pages 33 - 36)
 - 08/09 Underspend
 - 09/10 Indicative Outturn
 - 10/11 Allocation
14. AOB

Contact: Geoff Mills, Secretary, Room 1.95 Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone ME14 1XQ, Tel (01622) 694289 e-mail: geoff.mills@kent.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

KENT COUNTY COUNCIL**KENT PARTNERSHIP: SAFER AND STRONGER COMMUNITIES GROUP**

MINUTES of a meeting of the Kent Partnership: Safer and Stronger Communities Group held in the John Wigan Room, Oakwood House, Maidstone on Thursday, 26 November 2009.

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr P Gilroy (Chief Executive, KCC and Chairman of the Group), Mr C Bainbridge (Director of Community Safety & Regulatory Services, KCC), Mr S Beaumont (County Manager, Community Safety, KCC), Mr G Brown (Kent Agreement 2 Manager), Mr D Coleman (KALC), Mr B Clout (Kent CAN), Mr C Hendry (Chief Executive, Kent Fire and Rescue Service), Ms A Gilmour (K&M Domestic Violence Strat. Group), Mr M Gilbert (Kent DAAT) Mr S Griffiths (Kent Fire and Rescue Service), Mr R Hales (Chief Executive, Sevenoaks District Council), Ms S Latta (Kent Police Authority), Ms C Martin (Head Of Supporting People), Mr O Mills (Managing Director - Adult Social Services), Chief Superintendent M Nix, Chief Inspector R Nyman, Mr J Parris (Assistant Manager, Community Safety), Ms M Peachey (NHS) Ms J Pells (Kent Housing Group), Ms M Royale (Community Development Managers Development Group) Mr T Smith (Kent Police), Mrs G Hopkin (Kent Youth Offending Services, Mr G Thomson (Chief Executive, Gravesham Borough Council) and Mr G Mills (KCC, Democratic Services)

UNRESTRICTED ITEMS**1. Apologies**

(Item 1)

Noted.

2. Notes of the Last Meeting & Matters Arising

(Item 2)

The Minutes of the meeting held on 10 September 2009 were agreed as a true record. Matters arising were noted as appropriate.

3. Kent Agreement 2: Performance Monitoring the eight targets for which SSCG is accountable

(Item 3 -report by Graeme Brown, KCC and Matthew Nix, Kent Police)

(1) This report provided an update on the progress being made in respect of the eight KA2 targets for which the Safer and Stronger Communities Group is responsible. The Group received additional verbal updates from lead partners and noted the positive progress being made against this set of indicators.

(2) The report also suggested that the Group should take responsibility for the delivery NI 47 *(People killed and seriously injured in road traffic incidents)* from the Kent Economic Board and this was agreed.

Action: Graeme Brown

(3) It was also agreed that a letter should be sent to the Home Office asking why the definition of 'serious crime' appears to keep changing without any apparent and meaningful consultation. It was further agreed that some work should be undertaken focusing on the data held by partners relating to the most vulnerable groups, such as young children and for a report to be submitted to a future meeting

Action: Matthew Nix

(4) Subject to the above, the Group noted the Performance Report and agreed to take responsibility for NI 47 - People killed and seriously injured in road traffic incidents

4. Stronger Communities: Presentation giving feedback from the 'Connecting with Communities in Kent' workshop 18 November 2009

(Item 4 -Report by Ms E Hudson (Communities Development Management Group), Ms S Wakeham (Community Development Managers Group) and Ms H Jones, (KCC), attended for this item)

- (i) This was an oral report on some of the work being done by the Community Development Managers Group (CDMG) which supports the Kent Partnership by focusing on working with local communities to increase public participation and volunteering.
- (ii) The report highlighted 3 specific projects the first of which was around helping parish councils, community forums and other community groups to work more effectively with young people. The second project is 'Lend a hand' which is a campaign aimed at promoting and encouraging civic participation opportunities throughout Kent. With the third project the Group is working in collaboration with the Improvement and Development Agency to develop the concept of 'The Community Practice' which aimed at bringing together people so they can share a common area of interest and a variety of expertise and skills or have issues or problems to air, share or solve.
- (iii) During discussion on this item several members of the Group spoke in support of the work being undertaken by the CDMG. As part of this it was said the Group needed to market and promote these projects and in particular with young people by using all the communication tools available through the use of modern technology.
- (iv) Following discussion Peter Gilroy thanked the representatives of the CDMG for attending the meeting.

5. The Development of Sexual Assault Referral Clinics in Kent & Medway

(Item 5 - This report was presented by D.Supt. Paul Fotheringham together with Meradin Peachey)

- (i) In June 2009 the Department of Health National Support Team – ‘Response to Sexual Violence’, carried out a planned review of the policies and procedures implemented around the investigation and prosecution of Rape and Serious Sexual Assault.
- (ii) Although recognising a number of areas of good practice in operational delivery through the existing SARC hosted by Darent Valley Acute Trust, the NST were concerned about the lack of consistency in service across Kent & Medway and the lack strategic ownership & governance including limited involvement of Chief Officers/Executives in promoting a countywide strategy for victims of sexual violence.
- (iii) A multi-agency action plan had been drafted to deliver the NST recommendations, Police & Health have initiated the Kent & Medway Sexual Assault Strategy Group to deliver the action plan and seek governance of the SSCG to support the development of a countywide service for the victims of sexual violence in Kent & Medway.
- (iv) During the course of discussion the Group recognised the importance of this work but the discussion widen as to whether this was the right place for these issues to be debated. The consensus was that it was right for this Group to debate these issues but other bodies such as the County Strategy Group also had a role to play. Therefore in supporting the work being undertaken in this important area it was agreed that there needed to be clarity between the role of this Group and that of the County Strategy Group.

Action: Graeme Brown and Clive Bainbridge

6. Data Sharing Protocol

(Item 6)

- (i) This report was introduced by Graeme Brown and reviewed the current position with the development of an Information Exchange Protocol and made recommendations designed to ensure that the progress made to date was capitalised on and the protocols properly embedded into partnership working across Kent.
- (ii) During the course of discussion it was said that this piece of work needed to be woven into what others are doing so that as far as is feasible there was one protocol embracing the responsibilities and work of the main agencies. Clive Bainbridge said that the whole system needed a refresh and he felt that KCC’s Community Safety Unit was well placed to take a lead in developing training and improving communication. Peter Gilroy endorsed this view and spoke about the

need to look at reducing risks and focusing work around what will give the best returns. It was therefore agreed that there would be some further work done with a report being submitted to the Group's next meeting.

Action : Oliver Mills and Stuart Beaumont

7. Overview & Scrutiny Arrangements

(Item 7 -oral update by Clive Bainbridge)

- (i) During the course of discussion members of the Group spoke about the need to try as far as possible to prevent duplication of effort and to work with those both at County and District level tasked with administering these new arrangements in order to achieve that.
- (ii) The Group noted there would as appropriate be further updates on this matter to future meetings.
- (iii) Building on some of the discussion that took place under item 5 above, Peter Gilroy said this item also prompted the need for there to be greater clarity around the role and responsibilities of the Safer and Stronger Communities Group and that of the County Strategy Group, and the way the two Group's interacted. He asked therefore that a piece of work around these issues be undertaken and a report submitted to the next meeting.

Action: Graeme Brown and Clive Bainbridge to lead in consultation with partners as appropriate.

8. Home Secretary's letter on Confidence TO FOLLOW

(Item 8)

- (i) The Group discussed the content of his letter detailing a package of measures the Government designed to improve the collective response to tackling issues around Anti social behaviour.
- (ii) Following discussion it was agreed that the Chairman of the County Strategy Group would be briefed and asked if he wanted a meeting of the County Strategy Group called to discuss this matter before its next scheduled meeting which was due to take place in February/March 2010 on a date yet to be arranged. Peter Gilroy also said that a briefing letter should be sent to the political leaders in the County as well as the Chairmen and CEOs of the PCT's.

Action: Clive Bainbridge

9. Prevent - Verbal Update

(Item 9 -oral update by Glyn Thomson)

- (i) Glyn Thomson gave an update on the main areas of activity these being training, working in the community, funding, the development of a toolkit (which would be piloted in 3 schools in the Dartford and Gravesham area) , referrals and work being done with the PCT's . He also gave details of a conference being arranged for 5 February 2010.
- (ii) Glyn said he would be contacting his district chief executives colleagues to advise them about the training opportunities that are being developed with the funding provided by GOSE. He also spoke about the on going discussions and meetings with community and local authority representatives.
- (iii) In thanking Glyn for his update the Group placed on record its ongoing support for this important area of work.

10. Meeting Dates for 2010

(Item 10)

These were agreed as follows:

Thursday 4 March - 2.30 - 5.00

Thursday 20 May - 9.30 - 12.30

Thursday 16 Sept - 9.30 - 12.30

Thursday 25 Nov - 9.30 - 12.30

All meetings will be at Oakwood House, Maidstone

AOB

Peter Gilroy said he would be leaving KCC in May 2010 and suggested the Chairmanship of the Group should be taken on by Charlie Hendry. He said he would speak to Charlie with a view to him being confirmed as the Group's Chairman with effect from the March 2010 meeting.

This page is intentionally left blank

By: Clive Bainbridge
Director of Community Safety & Regulatory Services

To: Safer and Stronger Communities Group

Date of Meeting: 4th March 2010

Subject: Kent Community Safety Agreement Priorities: 2010/11 Refresh

Classification: Unrestricted

Summary:

This report indicates the updated CDRP priorities for 2010 /11 as identified via this year's Strategic Assessment procedure.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The priority and target setting process undertaken by CDRPs has been directed by this year's Strategic Assessment procedure.
- 1.2 The Strategic Assessments have been analysed and their individual priorities evidenced and collated to generate the likely priorities to be included in this years Kent County Community Safety Agreement (CSA).
- 1.3 At the time of writing, we have yet to receive Canterbury's Strategic Assessment and so the new priorities can only be listed as provisional.

2.0 PROGRESS ON 09/10 CSA PRIORITIES:

Reducing levels of Domestic Abuse and repeat victimisation

- 2.1 Levels of domestic abuse have continued to rise when comparing Apr-Dec 09 against the same period in the previous year. There has been a net increase of 407 (2.6%) domestic abuse incidents across Kent recorded by Kent Police. The number of repeat victims has remained static over this period, but the percentage of repeat victims has fallen from 25.4% to 24.8%.
- 2.2 CDRPs remain committed to tackling domestic abuse and minimising repeat victimisation and this is again recommended to become a priority in the 2010/11 CSA.

Reducing Alcohol and Drugs Misuse

- 2.3 For the 2009 calendar year, drug offences have increased by 170 (4.4%) when compared to 2008. This is the only increase in any crime type experienced over this period. Hospital admissions for alcohol related harm and other substance misuse show a continuing and increasing trend.
- 2.4 Many CDRPs continue to see reducing alcohol and drugs misuse as a priority and it is recommended to remain a priority in the CSA.

Reducing fear; improving public confidence and perceptions of ASB and crime

- 2.5 Although KCVS reports on the whole that perceptions of ASB and crime have improved when comparing the 2009 calendar year to 2008, there have started to be falls in confidence and increased concerns over the last 2 quarters. Kent performs badly for various BCS perception indicators, either being 6th or 8th out of 8 in its MSG.
- 2.6 There was strong evidence in all of the CDRPs that listed this as a priority in their Strategic Assessments and this is recommended to remain a priority in the CSA.

Reducing Violent Crime

- 2.7 Violent Crime has reduced by 2466 (9.2%) incidents when comparing 2009 to 2008.
- 2.8 Reductions vary across the CDRPs but not many CDRPs have identified this as a priority and of those that did, there was little supporting evidence. As such reducing violent crime is unlikely to remain a priority in the CSA.

Reducing levels of ASB

- 2.9 Reducing ASB remains a high priority for CDRPs and will continue to be included in the CSA.

Reducing levels of Criminal Damage

- 2.10 Kent has seen a large reduction of 6038 (20.7%) criminal damage incidents recorded in 2009 when compared to 2008. This is reflected in the Strategic Assessments as only one CDRP has chosen this as a priority of 2010/2011. As such it is highly unlikely that this will remain a priority in the CSA.

Reducing re-offending of our most prolific offenders

- 2.11 Very few CDRPs consider re-offending rates to be a priority and so this priority will probably not continue in the 2010/11 CSA.

Preventing violent extremism

- 2.12 The Prevent agenda remains a priority as set by central government. However, very few Strategic Assessments mentioned the Prevent agenda and only one CDRP listed it as a priority.

Reducing risk to vulnerable people

- 2.13 Such a priority is not listed within the Strategic Assessments.

3.0 EMERGING PRIORITIES

Reducing levels of Youth Crime

- 3.1 Many CDRPs have listed this as a priority and the evidence provided on the whole is strong. As such it is recommended that this becomes a priority in the CSA.

Environmental Crime

- 3.2 Closely linked to ASB, environmental crime has many wider implications than just affecting the aesthetic appearance of areas. Although data is almost entirely localised, many CDRPs have listed environmental crime as one of their top priorities. It is often tied in with ASB. It should be recommended that the current "Reducing levels of ASB" priority is reworded to include environmental crime.

4.0 2010/11 CSA PRIORITIES (PROVISIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS)

- 4.1 Taking into account the information discussed above, the provisional set of priorities to be placed in the 2010/11 CSA are:

- Reducing levels of Domestic Abuse and repeat victimisation
- Reducing Alcohol and Drugs Misuse
- Reducing fear; improving public confidence and perceptions of ASB and crime
- Reducing levels of ASB including Environmental Crime
- Preventing violent extremism
- [Reducing risk to vulnerable people- this is a current priority but there is no specific data set]
- Reducing levels of Youth Crime

5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

- (i) That the Safer and Stronger Communities Group are asked to note the CDRP priorities indicated above.
- (ii) That the Safer and Stronger Communities Group provisionally recommends these priorities for adoption by the County Strategy Group at its meeting of 20th April 2010.

For further information:

Inspector Russ Nyman, Kent Police
Jim Parris, Assistant Manager, KCC Community Safety

February 2010

This page is intentionally left blank

I have been tasked by the Confidence Delivery Board, chair ACC Beautridge, to consider the issue of PCSO powers, in my capacity as Strategy and Policy lead for PCSOs.

The possibility of extending PCSO powers within Kent could be achieved in two ways:

1. New powers are brought in by the Home Office
2. Kent explores those powers currently at the discretion of the Chief Constable that could be made available for PCSOs but which have not been designated thus far.

Given the timeframes involved Option 2 remains the only one that could be explored at this juncture.

I have attached two appendices to this report.

Appendix A details those standard powers given to all PCSOs in England & Wales.

Appendix B details those powers that are at the discretion of Chief Constables to issue.

The adoption of any, or all, of the additional powers would necessitate a change in all PCSO risk assessments as well as training on the specific issue, as well as altering the PCSO induction course.

As part of the action for the Confidence delivery Board I am working with each of our BCUs (Basic Command Units) to assess which of these optional powers may be considered as a worthwhile addition to the PCSO arsenal. Following this consultation I will submit a further report to ACC Beautridge for consideration, part of which will state that before adopting any new powers, if indeed that is the conclusion, research be done with those forces who currently utilise the power to assess its impact and usage.

I would however, conclude that the decision to adopt any of these powers rests solely, under legislation, with the Chief Constable of each force. These powers were assessed before and were not considered to be complementary with the community engagement, high visibility role that Kent utilises for the deployments of its PCSOs.

Report submitted for information

Barry Spruce

Head of the Extended Policing Family department

This page is intentionally left blank

THE ROLE, POWERS AND DEPLOYMENT OF POLICE COMMUNITY SUPPORT OFFICERS.

PCSOs have very limited powers when compared with Police Officers, and have been trained to deal with specific incidents and tasks only. They have the right to decline to carry out tasks for which they have not been trained and which they assess as too risky or outside their terms of reference. It must be understood that, unlike police officers, there is no positive duty for PCSOs to intervene in an incident – they are civil staff and not police officers. Similarly, there is no expectation that they will engage in activities assessed as 'high risk'.

The Chief Constable has carefully considered the range of powers with which they have been delegated, and PCSOs are not expected to stray beyond the limited core role for which they have been trained, especially into situations where they potentially are in confrontation with members of the public.

PCSOs are equipped with passive personal protective equipment (i.e. body armour). Their training is confined to calming heated situations and defusing hostility. They are not trained in dealing with violence, including arrests. They have been trained to withdraw from such situations and to call for help from police colleagues. This does not mean that they cannot assist in such situations by gathering information such as witness details, assisting with traffic control, and by providing evidence for the prosecution of offenders.

PROPOSED LIST OF STANDARD POWERS FOR POLICE COMMUNITY SUPPORT OFFICERS	
ENVIROMENTAL POWERS	COMMENT
Power to issue fixed penalty notices for littering: Power of an authorised officer of a local authority to give a notice under section 88 of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 (fixed penalty notices in respect of litter).	Already designated to PCSOs in Kent and Medway
Power to issue fixed penalty notices in respect of offences under dog control orders: power of an authorised officer of a primary or secondary authority, within the meaning of section 59 of the Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005, to give a notice under that section (fixed penalty notices in respect of offences under dog control orders.)	EXTENDED POWER This power now includes the issue of FPN for dog fouling, which is already designated to PCSOs in Kent and Medway and adds the additional power to issue a FPN in respect of other dog control orders i.e. the keeping of dogs on leads, the exclusion of dogs from land and the number of dogs that a person may take onto land
Power to remove abandoned vehicles under regulations made under section 99 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.	Already designated to PCSOs in Kent and Medway
TRANSPORT POWERS	
Power to issue fixed penalty notices for cycling on a footpath: Power of a constable in uniform to give a person a fixed penalty notice under section 54 of the Road Traffic Offenders Act 1988 (fixed penalty notices) in respect of an offence under section 72 of the Highway Act 1835 (riding on a footway) committed by cycling.	Already designated to PCSOs in Kent and Medway
Power to stop cycles: Powers of a constable in uniform to stop a cycle under section 163(2) of the Road Traffic Act 1988 when a CSO has reason to believe that a	Already designated to PCSOs in Kent and Medway

person has committed the offence of riding on a footpath.	
Power to control traffic for purposes other than escorting a load of exceptional dimensions: Powers to direct traffic (for purposes other than escorting loads of exceptional dimensions) based on the powers constables have under sections 35 and 37 of the Road Traffic Act 1988 It also gives CSOs the power to direct traffic for the purposes of conducting a traffic survey. CSOs designated under this paragraph must also be designated with powers under paragraph 3A of Schedule 4 to the Police Reform Act.	NEW POWER These powers are intended to enable PCSOs to assist with traffic management at public events, road traffic collisions and other incidents where traffic diversions are necessary.
Power to carry out road checks: Power to carry out a road check, which has been authorised by a Superintendent or above and power to stop vehicles for the purposes of carrying out a road check.	Already designated to PCSOs in Kent and Medway
Power to require name and address for road traffic offences: The Serious Organised Crime and Police Act 2005 allows CSOs to be designated with the power to require the name and address of a driver or pedestrian who fails to follow the directions of a community support officer or police officer under sections 35 or 37 of the RTA 1988.	<i>NEW POWER</i> This power has to be designated to PCSOs that have been given the power to control traffic other than escorting an abnormal load. (See above)
Power to place signs: The Serious Organised Crime and Police Act 2005 enables CSOs to be designated with the power of a constable under section 67 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to place traffic signs.	<i>NEW POWER</i> These powers are intended to enable PCSOs to assist with traffic management at public events, road traffic collisions and other incidents.
Power to seize vehicles used to cause alarm: Power to stop and seize a vehicle which a CSO has reason to believe is being used in a manner which contravenes sections 3 or 34 of the Road Traffic Act 1988 (careless and inconsiderate driving and prohibition of off-road driving) under section 59 of the Police Reform Act 2002.	Already designated to PCSOs in Kent and Medway
ALCOHOL & TOBACCO POWERS	
Power to require persons drinking in designated places to surrender alcohol: Power to require a person whom a CSO reasonably believes is, or has been, consuming alcohol in a designated public place or intends to do so, to not consume that alcohol and to surrender any alcohol or container for alcohol. Power to dispose of alcohol surrendered.	Already designated to PCSOs in Kent and Medway
Power to require persons aged under 18 to surrender alcohol: Power to require a person who he reasonably believes is aged under 18 or is or has been supplying alcohol to a person aged under 18 to surrender any alcohol in his possession and to give their name and address. Power to require such a person to surrender sealed containers of alcohol if the CSO has reason to believe that	Already designated to PCSOs in Kent and Medway

the person is or has been consuming or intends to consume alcohol. Power to dispose of alcohol surrendered.	
Power to seize tobacco from a person aged under 16 and to dispose of that tobacco.	Already designated to PCSOs in Kent and Medway
Power to seize drugs and require name and address for possession of drugs: The Serious Organised Crime and Police Act 2005 allows CSOs to be designated with a power to seize unconcealed drugs or drugs found when searching for alcohol, tobacco or dangerous items. The CSO must retain the drugs until a constable instructs them what to do with it. If a CSO finds drugs in a person's possession or has reason to believe that a person is in possession of drugs then the CSO may require that person's name and address. Only if designated with powers under paragraph 7C may the CSO then detain a person on failure to comply with the requirement.	<i>NEW POWER</i> This power will be restricted to seizing unconcealed drugs and will not enable the PCSO to detain for the purpose of search
POWERS TO TACKLE ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR	
Power to require name and address for anti-social behaviour: Power of a constable in uniform under section 50 of the Police Reform Act 2002 to require a person whom he has reason to believe to have been acting, or to be acting, in an anti-social manner to give his name and address. Paragraph 3(2) of Schedule 4 enables a CSO designated under paragraph 3 of Schedule 4 to detain a person who fails to comply with a requirement to give name and address or who gives an answer which the CSO reasonably suspects to be false or inaccurate in the same way as he or she may under paragraph 2. Paragraph 3(10) of Schedule 8 to the Serious Organised Crime and Police Act 2005 provides that paragraph 3(2) of Schedule 4 to the Police Reform Act 2002 has no effect unless a CSO has been designated with the power of detention under paragraph 2 of Schedule 4.	Already designated to PCSOs in Kent and Medway
ENFORCEMENT POWERS	
Power to require name and address: Power to require the name and address of a person whom a CSO has reason to believe has committed a relevant offence (Relevant offences are defined under subparagraph 2(6) of Schedule 4 of the Police Reform Act 2002 as relevant fixed penalty offences under paragraph 1 of Schedule 4, an offence under section 32(2) of the Anti-Social Behaviour Act 2003 (failure to follow an instruction to disperse) or an offence that causes injury, alarm or distress to another person or loss of or damage to another person's property.)	Already designated to PCSOs in Kent and Medway
Power to photograph persons away from a police station: The Serious Organised Crime and Police Act 2005 enables CSOs to photograph a person who has been	NEW POWER

arrested, detained or given a fixed penalty notice away from the police station.	
SECURITY POWERS	
Power to enter and search any premises for the purposes of saving life and limb or preventing serious damage to property.	Already designated to PCSOs in Kent and Medway
Power to stop and search in authorised areas: Powers under the Terrorism Act 2000 in authorised areas to stop and search vehicles and pedestrians when in the company and under the supervision of a constable.	Already designated to PCSOs in Kent and Medway
Power to enforce cordoned areas: under section 36 of the Terrorism Act 2000	Already designated to PCSOs in Kent and Medway

POWERS NOT INTENDED TO BE INCLUDED IN THE SET OF STANDARD POWERS FOR POLICE COMMUNITY SUPPORT OFFICERS	
ENVIRONMENTAL POWERS	COMMENT
Power to issue fixed penalty notices for graffiti and fly-posting: Power of an authorised officer of a local authority to give a notice under section 43(1) of the Anti-social Behaviour Act 2003 (penalty notices in respect of graffiti or fly-posting).	Already designated to PCSOs in Kent and Medway
TRANSPORT POWERS	
Power to issue PND for throwing fireworks and trespassing on a railway and throwing stones on a railway: Power to give a penalty notice under Chapter 1 of Part 1 of the Criminal Justice and Police Act 2001 in respect of the offences in section 80 of the Explosives Act 1875 and section 55 and 56 of British Transport Commission Act 1949	Not Adopted
ALCOHOL & TOBACCO POWERS	
Limited power to enter licensed premises: The Serious Organised Crime and Police Bill allows CSOs to be designated with a power to enter licensed premises under section 180 of the Licensing Act 2003 for the purposes of investigating relevant licensing offences.	Not Adopted
Power to search for alcohol and tobacco: Where a person has failed to comply with a requirement under paragraph 5 or 6 or has failed to allow a CSO to seize tobacco under paragraph 7 of Schedule 4 to the Police Reform Act 2002 and a CSO reasonably believes that the person is in possession of alcohol or tobacco then a CSO may search them for it and dispose of anything found.	Not Adopted for PCSOs in Kent/Medway
Power to issue PNDs for: sale of alcohol to a person under 18; purchase of alcohol for person under 18; delivery of alcohol to person under 18; drinking in designated area; consumption of alcohol by person under 18 or allowing such consumption; buying or attempting to buy alcohol by a person under 18 and sells or attempts to sell alcohol to a person who is drunk, drunk and disorderly behaviour and drunk in highway.	Not Adopted for PCSOs in Kent/Medway
Power to enforce certain licensing offences: The Serious Organised Crime and Police Act 2005 establishes a set of relevant licensing offences. These offences are sale of alcohol to a person who is drunk, obtaining	Not Adopted for PCSOs in Kent/Medway

alcohol for a person who is drunk, sale of alcohol to children, purchase of alcohol by or on behalf of children, consumption of alcohol by children and sending a child to obtain alcohol.	
POWERS TO TACKLE ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR	
Power to disperse groups and remove persons under 16 to their place of residence: Powers which, by virtue of an authorisation under section 30 of the Anti-social Behaviour Act 2003, are conferred on a constable in uniform by section 30(3) to (6) of that Act (power to disperse groups and remove persons under 16 to their place of residence).	Not Adopted for PCSOs in Kent/Medway
Power to deal with begging: The Serious Organised Crime and Police Act 2005 makes offences under sections 3 and 4 of the Vagrancy Act 1824 into relevant offences. It also gives CSOs a power to detain a person who they have required to stop committing an offence under sections 3 and 4 of the Vagrancy Act and who has failed to comply with the requirement.	Not Adopted for PCSOs in Kent/Medway
Power to issue PND for breach of fireworks curfew; possession of a category 4 firework; possession by a persons under 18 of an adult firework; supply of excessively load firework	Not Adopted for PCSOs in Kent/Medway
ENFORCEMENT POWERS	
Power to issue PND for destroying or damaging property; causing harassment, alarm or distress	Not Adopted for PCSOs in Kent/Medway
Power to issue PND for wasting police time, giving false report, using public network communications in order to cause annoyance; knowingly giving false alarm to a person acting on behalf of a fire and rescue authority	Not Adopted for PCSOs in Kent/Medway
Power to enforce byelaws: The Serious Organised Crime and Police Act 2005 provides that offences committed under relevant byelaws are relevant offences under paragraph 2(6) of Schedule 4 of the Police Reform Act 2002. A relevant byelaw is a byelaw from a list of byelaws that has been agreed between a chief constable and a relevant byelaw-making body.	Not Adopted for PCSOs in Kent/Medway
Power to search detained persons for dangerous items or items that could be used to assist escape: Serious Organised Crime and Police Act 2005 allows CSOs to be designated with the same powers as a constable under section 32 of PACE to search detained persons for anything that could be used to cause physical injury or to assist	Not Adopted for PCSOs in Kent/Medway

escape.	
Power to use reasonable force to prevent a detained person making off: either when waiting for the arrival of a constable or when accompanying a detained person to a police station.	Not Adopted for PCSOs in Kent/Medway
Power to use reasonable force to transfer control of detained persons: Paragraph 2(4A) of Schedule 4 to the Police Reform Act 2002 places a duty on CSOs to remain with a police officer when transferring a detained person to his or her custody until the police officer has the person under control. Paragraph 2(4B) places a CSO accompanying a detained person to a police station under a duty to remain at the police station until the detained person is under control.	Not Adopted for PCSOs in Kent/Medway
Power to remove children in contravention of curfew notices to their place of residence: Power to remove a child to their place of residence if the CSO has reason to believe that the child is in contravention of a curfew notice under sub-sections 15(1), (2) and (3) of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998.	Not Adopted for PCSOs in Kent/Medway
Power to issue FPN for truancy Power of a constable to give a penalty notice under <u>section 444A</u> of the Education Act 1996.	Not Adopted for PCSOs in Kent/Medway
Power to remove truants to a designated place: where a local authority designates premises to which young person or child may be removed under this section, Powers of a constable in uniform to remove a child or young person that they have reasonable cause to believe is absent from school without lawful authority, back to the school or to designated premises.	Not Adopted for PCSOs in Kent/Medway
Power to detain: Power to detain a person whom a CSO has reason to believe has committed a relevant offence who fails to comply with a requirement to give name and address or who gives an answer which the CSO reasonably suspects to be false or inaccurate for up to 30 minutes or until the arrival of a police officer (or to accompany that person to a police station if he or she elects to do so on request).	Not Adopted for PCSOs in Kent/Medway

This page is intentionally left blank

By: Clive Bainbridge,
Director of Community Safety & Regulatory Services

To: Safer and Stronger Communities Group

Date of Meeting: 4th March 2010

Subject: Domestic Abuse Executive Group Update

Classification: Unrestricted

Summary:

This report provides an update on the progress being made with regard to the issues and concerns highlighted at the Safer and Stronger Communities Group on the 26th November 2009, relating to data sharing.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 A report was considered by the Safer and Stronger Communities Group at its meeting on the 26th November 2009, relating to the current status of Data Sharing Protocols. The report highlighted the current position and considered recommendations designed to ensure that the progress made to date was built upon and that the protocols were embedded within partnership working across the county.
- 1.2 The discussions at the meeting identified areas of concern, with the Safer and Stronger Communities Group feeling that there was a need to review and update the protocols and also work towards one protocol, that embraced the work of all the key agencies. A further piece of work was requested that should include a review risk and focus on the maximisation of benefits to all agencies.

2.0 LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK

- 2.1 The principal legislative instruments that control the exchange of information between partners in relation to community safety matters include:
 - The Children’s Act 1989
 - The Crime and Disorder Act 1998
 - The Data Protection Act 1998
 - The Human Rights Act 1998
 - The Common Law Duty of Confidence
 - The Freedom of Information Act 2000.
- 2.2 Numerous other pieces of legislation place on local authorities, a power or duty to share information in specific circumstances. All information sharing must be conducted in accordance with a relevant legal power or duty.
- 2.3 In particular, the Crime and Disorder Regulations 2007, Prescribed Information Regulations 2007, No: 1831, requires statutory partners to share information they hold in relation to a number of broad subject areas.

3.0 BACKGROUND

3.1 The Information Governance Programme Board is a sub-group of the Public Service Board and has recently completed some very helpful work in the area of data sharing protocols and has identified a number of key drivers for change across the county.

3.2 The specific drivers identified include:

- (i) The increased frequency of integrated multi agency teams with co-located staff was necessitating clarification of the information sharing procedures for them to follow.
- (ii) The necessity for protocols and guidance to cover “fast track” sharing of information as opposed to the more lengthy formal procedures to be followed when requesting the information required.
- (iii) Reported informal sharing of information that can lead to inconsistency of practice. This can mean risks in certain instances and can prevent effective protective steps being taken
- (iv) Uncertainty as to how aware staff are of the details and the practice requirements included in protocols relating to their own services. Such uncertainty has been shown by “Enquiries” at the national level as a cause of a failure to protect the vulnerable.
- (v) The publication of national guidance on information sharing which is seen to be of good quality. An example of this is “Information Sharing: Guidance for Practitioners and Managers” published in 2008 by the Department for Children, Schools & Families
- (vi) The success of Children’s Services in delivering a training programme to several thousand staff working with children to support the implementation of the Common Assessment Framework which is dependent on the sharing of personal data between services
- (vii) The training planned by the Safer Kent Delivery Group on information sharing for Community Safety staff in the Districts
- (viii) A review being currently undertaken by Kent Police into the number, which is significant, of protocols which Officers have to be aware of. This is felt to introduce an unhelpful complexity which could mitigate against effective co-operation with other services
- (ix) The work being done by the Kent & Medway Health Information Service in delivering IG training to integrated teams at Medway Council and Medway PCT. It is necessary to ensure the messages given are consistent with those given in similar KCC training for integrated teams.

4.0 PROGRESS TO DATE

4.1 The work of the Information Governance Programme Board (IGPB) and the highlighting of the key issues to the Public Services Board on the 1st February 2010 provides a platform from which a clear work programme can be supported. The (IGPB) work programme will address the identification of best practice, propose revision and simplification of the current Three Tier Protocols, with supporting guidance to ensure understanding across partnerships. Lastly the revised protocols will be supported by a comprehensive training product that will ensure a consistent understanding across partnerships.

4.2 The Public Services Board agreed the following detailed work plan for the Information Governance Programme Board:

- (i) The development of a core set of principles and practice guidance which would be relevant for all information sharing protocols at Tier 3 so:
 - a. facilitating an understanding across the staff in different services of the practice requirements each one is required to follow. Agency specific requirements can “top and tail” the protocols
 - b. reducing the number of protocols which may be required and mitigate against the tendencies for services to develop a range of bi-lateral protocols
- (ii) The establishing of a training specification for information sharing practice supported by practice guidance which can be commonly used by all agencies and services covered by protocols included in the three Tier Model. This should reduce unnecessary duplication of work for trainers in agencies and partnerships while assisting a consistency of message about practice being given to professionals working in the public and third sectors in the county.

4.3 In order to achieve this it was suggested that the Board undertake the following activities:

- (i) The completion of an audit of all existing protocols so that it is clear which are in place and their relevance to current practice enabling recommendations to be made as to changes which can be usefully made. Convey findings and recommendations for change by June 2010 to protocols at Tier 3 to the agencies concerned
- (ii) Complete a review of the current overarching protocol and supporting guidance at Tier 1 and report back on the findings and any proposed revisions to the next meeting of the Public Services Board. This will take account of the work currently being completed on a similar protocol by South East Coast NHS
- (iii) Work with the Safer & Stronger Communities Group, the Kent Children’s Trust Executive Board and the Public Health Board to review the Tier 2 protocols which relate to their partnership responsibilities, “Safer Communities”, “Children & Young People” and “Adult Services”. This will necessitate specific arrangements being made with each of the partnerships and the outcomes from these discussions can be reported to the next meeting of the Public Services Board
- (iv) Establishment of a core training specification which reflects the requirements included in Tier 2 protocols by April 2010, to be shared with all key partnership groupings and services in the third sector for approval. Advantage will be taken of the specifications which are already in place
- (v) The development of guidance on the core requirements of any information sharing protocol at Tier 3 and supporting guidance. The outcomes from this work will be used by members of the IGB to review and revise the protocols which are the responsibilities of their own services

5.0 SUMMARY

5.1 The work of the Information Governance Programme Board dovetails with the concerns expressed by the Safer and Stronger Communities Group on the 26th November 2009.

5.2 The Information Governance Programme Board is an existing group with multi agency membership drawn from a diverse range of services including Adult Social

Care, Children's Services, Health and the Police and it includes representation from Medway Council who will be consulted throughout the proposed work programme. Its overarching purpose has been and remains ensuring the effective implementation of Information Governance into health, social and community services in Kent and Medway. This entails using written protocols and guidance (i.e. the three Tier Model) to enable the duties and powers included in legislation on information sharing to be understood and implemented in practice.

- 5.3 The Managing Director of Kent Adult Social Services has expressed a willingness to take on a lead role with the Information Governance Programme Board and to drive forward the work programme.
- 5.4 The key issues for the Safer and Stronger Communities Group are the volume of work to be completed, together with the associated required resources and the associated timescales. There is some urgency associated with this work as concern is being expressed across community safety partnerships that the current protocols are in need of urgent updating and that there is a need for a common understanding across partnership professionals relating to information sharing.
- 5.5 It is therefore proposed that the work programme of the Information Governance Programme Board should be supported by the Safer and Stronger Communities Group as a key priority and that partners should fully engage with this work programme as the delivery vehicle for updating the current data sharing protocols. Given the high priority associated with this work and the timescales involved consideration may be given to providing resources to support this important activity areas in liaison with the Chair of the Information Governance Programme Board.

6 Recommendations

- (i) That the Safer and Stronger Communities Group supports the work of the Information Governance Programme Board in reviewing and updating the data sharing protocols.
- (ii) That the Safer and Stronger Communities Group considers in consultation with the Chair of the Information Governance Programme Board supporting the work programme with a resource allocation.
- (iii) That the Safer and Stronger Communities Group receives regular updates detailing the progress being made on the work programme.

For further information:

Stuart Beaumont
Head of Community Safety
Kent County Council

Charlie Beaumont
Chair of the Information Governance Programme Board
Effective Practice & Performance Manager
Kent Youth Offending Service

By: Clive Bainbridge
Director of Community Safety & Regulatory Services

To: Safer and Stronger Communities Group – 4th March 2010

Subject: Home Office Anti Social Behaviour Grant Allocation

Summary: This report outlines proposals for the delivery of a number of county wide projects utilising the £64,000 Anti Social Behaviour Grant that has been allocated to Kent by the Home Office.

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The Safer and Stronger Communities Group has received reports previously highlighting the joint letter (19th November 2009) received from John Denham (Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government), John Healy (Minister for Housing) & Alan Johnson (Home Secretary) that highlighted that Kent would receive a grant to assist with the delivery of anti social behaviour (ASB) solutions.
- 1.2 The grant funding was provided in recognition of the local authorities responsibilities for tackling ASB and was paid under s31 of the Local Government Act 2003, without grant conditions. However, progress on tackling ASB in Kent will continue to be monitored through the relevant LAA indicators and using the Kent Police confidence survey.
- 1.3 Ministers made it clear in the original letter, that it was up to partnerships to decide how best to spend the grant. However, all CDRP's have been challenged to set and publicise minimum standards of service in terms of ASB, by March 2010. It is further suggested by Ministers that funding should be targeted towards improving public confidence and in providing better communications.
- 1.4 Since the receipt of the grant in late December 2009, discussions have taken place with a range of partners and with the Government Office, regarding the development of suitable projects.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 Discussions with the Government Office have identified that the Home Office is eager to see the grant funding directed towards tackling ASB and the perceptions of ASB. Suggested themes include:
 - Support to victims and witnesses
 - Minimum standards
 - Communication of minimum standards and work on perceptions
 - Use of tools and powers
 - Training for staff and residents
 - Visible criminal justice payback.
- 2.2 The allocation of the grant in late December 2009 has prompted discussions with Government Office regarding the ability to carry over the funding into the next financial year. GOSE have supported the view that given the limited time left in the current financial year, it would be prudent to develop spending plans that enable spending during 2010/11. However, it should be noted that minimum standards **must** be in place across CDRP's by March 2010.

3. CURRENT SITUATION

- 3.1 Discussions have taken place with key partners regarding the potential projects that could benefit from this grant funding and the requirement to deliver work plans focussed on the key themes outlined by the Home Office.
- 3.2 There is already considerable work being completed relating to communications with ward based news-letters, linked to a communications partnership working group, that is effectively measuring public confidence improvement through mechanisms such as the Kent Crime and Victimization Survey (KCVS). Kent Police already have ASB as a key priority area and “Operation Restore” is being developed and rolled out across all Districts, as a partnership approach to delivering local ASB solutions. Considerable work has already been completed by Community Safety Managers in relation to adopting a government supported best practice minimum ASB standard across the county. It is hoped that all CDRP’s will adopt the minimum standard that will enable the same coordinated standard service to be delivered to all residents of the county.
- 3.3 In addition a training project has already been commenced that involves the KCC/Kent Police Training Unit and CDRP based ASB Officers in developing a standard training product that can support the delivery of minimum standards across the County. The initial funding to develop this pilot training product has already been sourced, but further funding will be required to roll out the product across the county.

4. PROPOSALS FOR GRANT EXPENDITURE

- 4.1 A large number of projects have been considered including:
- Support for the roll out of minimum standards
 - Support for solutions to noise complaints linked to ASB
 - Public Confidence projects
 - Community Payback
 - Repeat Victim support
- 4.2 However, given the planned work already taking place and the recent strategic assessment process that is likely to result in all CDRP’s having some form of ASB Action Plan, it was felt that the funding should be allocated towards front line service delivery, where the grant could contribute directly towards delivering solutions to identified problems. This approach will also contribute towards improving public confidence by linking to the various public reporting processes that are already in place such as ward newsletters and “Blackberry” engagement. The allocation of the funding in this way would also assist the delivery of Operation Restore where small amounts of funding could deliver a better partnership response during the targeted weeks.
- 4.3 The discussion did also identify that in terms of Public Confidence both Swale and Thanet had particular priorities that should be addressed to significantly impact the overall confidence levels across the county and it was felt that they should receive a higher allocation. This view was supported during discussions with the Government Office.
- 4.4 It is therefore proposed that the funding should be allocated as follows:
- | | |
|---|---------|
| • Support for the introduction of county wide minimum standards | £2,000 |
| • Support for Training | £2,000 |
| • Public Confidence work in Thanet | £10,000 |

• Public Confidence work in Swale	£10,000
• Allocation to remaining CDRP's (£4,000 per CDRP)	£40,000
TOTAL	£64,000

4.5 In terms of identifying suitable projects at a local level it was felt that the funding should support at least one or more of the following initiatives:

- Link to Op Restore delivery
- Raising of delivery standards
- Engage community payback
- Safe House initiative
- Public Confidence
- Assist the delivery of solutions to noise complaints
- Assist repeat victims
- Link to the CDRP ASB action plan

4.6 The Community Safety Managers Group have an established Anti Social Behaviour Sub-Group, that is progressing the delivery of minimum standards and it is proposed that this group that already includes representatives from statutory partners, should monitor the spending of the grant funding and report back to the Safer & Stronger Communities Group on progress and outcomes during late 2010.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

- (i) That the Safer and Stronger Communities Group supports the proposed allocation of grant funding as detailed in paragraph 4.
- (ii) That the grant funding wherever possible should be directed towards delivering solutions to issues identified within CDRP ASB Action Plans and key county wide initiatives outlined in paragraph 4.
- (iii) That the Community Safety Managers statutory partner ASB Sub-Group should monitor delivery and report back to the Safer and Stronger Communities Group on outcomes delivered during late 2010.

For further information:

Stuart Beaumont
Head of Community Safety
Kent County Council

This page is intentionally left blank

By: Clive Bainbridge, Director of Community Safety, KCC

To: Safer and Stronger Communities Group.

Date of Meeting: 4th March 2010

Subject: Domestic Abuse Executive Group Update

Classification: Unrestricted

Summary:

This report provides an update regarding the provision of Independent Domestic Violence Advisors (IDVAs) following the meeting of the Domestic Abuse Executive Group on 15th December 2009.

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Following on from the Funding Assessment Report completed by the Kent and Medway Domestic Violence Strategy Group (KMDVSG) in January 2009 that identified a funding shortfall in terms of Domestic Abuse of around £2.4m, The Safer & Stronger Communities Group decided at their July 2009 meeting that the provision of Independent Domestic Violence Advisors (IDVAs) was the key priority with an overall funding requirement estimated at £1.1million.
- 1.2 The SSCG decided to set up The Domestic Abuse Executive Group to take forward this issue.
- 1.3 The Domestic Abuse Executive Group met on the 15th December and was well attended by key statutory partner agencies and discussed a variety of options to sustain and develop IDVA services across Kent and Medway.

2. Summary of Discussion

- 2.1 KCC's Community Safety Unit reported back on their recent audit of domestic abuse service provision; this identified that from the responses they had received £6.4 million was being spent on service provision, of which £5.4 million was financed by Kent Police and KCC Supporting People.

- 2.2 Some CDRPs did not respond to the audit as they felt that their spend was being scrutinised and other areas such as social services and education were unable to split their domestic abuse spend from their general service delivery spend.
- 2.3 Using the Home Office Ready Reckoner Tool to calculate spend on domestic abuse and sexual violence, the estimated actual cost to Kent and Medway is:
- £317m Total
- Of which
- £68m Physical and mental health care costs
 - £43m Criminal justice costs
 - £8m Social services costs
 - £197m Housing, civil legal, employment costs
- 2.4 The Group felt that the way forward was associated with invest to save activity and felt that there was capacity across the various large statutory agencies to identify resources for IDVAs, examples considered included: housing staff, health visitors, schools family liaison officers, community wardens, social workers etc.
- 2.5 All agencies present agreed to consider whether they could provide funds and/or existing staff posts to resource countywide IDVA services and report back at the next meeting.
- 2.6 It was also agreed that Kent Police and Kent Probation, both of whom have experience in the application of lean systems, would brief the next meeting of the Domestic Abuse Executive Group on the Lean process.
- 2.7 If accepted by the agencies represented it is planned to hold a Lean Event to assess whether the processes relating to dealing with domestic abuse are efficient and effective and to identify any cost savings and refocusing of resources to deliver IDVA services across the county.

3. Current IDVA Funding Shortfall for 2010/11

- 3.1 Whilst the medium/long term goal is to secure sustainable funding for enhanced IDVA services across the county, currently 4 existing IDVA posts do not have funding for all of 2010/11:
- 1 post – based at the Maidstone SDVC has a current funding shortfall of **£13,000** for 2010/11.
 - 3 posts – Kent Advocacy Service (covering Shepway, Dover and Ashford) have no funds currently secured for 2010/11 and require **£151,000** to continue their services beyond March 2010.

- 3.2 It is likely that GOSE funding will be received during 2010/11 to support IDVA services within Kent, if awarded at the same level as previous years this will be £40,000, however it is unlikely GOSE will confirm this allocation before mid/late March.
- 3.3 Kent Police, Kent Criminal Justice Board and KCC have agreed to find the remaining funds outstanding to support IDVA services to cover the shortfall for 2010/11.

4 Audit Commission & Comprehensive Area Assessment (CAA)

- 4.1 The Audit Commission is currently engaged in work to consider the inclusion of Domestic Abuse within the CAA. They are now at the stage of collating research on what works to reduce domestic abuse and amongst other areas, they have added Kent to their research base for this work and plan to set up meetings with various stakeholders within Kent to discuss this further.

6 Conclusion

- 6.1 Work is currently underway to identify sustainable funding to maintain and develop IDVA services across Kent and Medway.

7 Recommendations

- 7.1 To support plans for a multi-agency domestic abuse Lean event.
- 7.2 To note the likely inclusion of domestic abuse as a theme within future Comprehensive Area Assessments.

Action or Decisions required: For Information and Decision

As detailed in Recommendations 7.1 – 7.2.

For further information contact:

Alison Gilmour
Kent & Medway Domestic Violence Co-ordinator
Email: alison.gilmour@kent.pnn.police.uk
Tel: 01622 650455

This page is intentionally left blank

To: Safer and Stronger Communities Group – 4th March 2010

From: Graeme Brown; Kent Partnership Manager

Subject: Safer Stronger Communities Fund (SSCF) 08/09; 09/10; 10/11

1. Introduction

This report informs SSCG of issues relating to SSCF for 08/09, 09/10 and 10/11.

SSCF comprises revenue funding and capital funding. The revenue component of the SSCF is part of the three year Area Based Grant (ABG) and has been fixed at the same level for each of the three years 08/09; 09/10 and 10/11. The capital allocation is announced each year.

SSCF is used by Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRPs) to deliver community safety initiatives in the eleven CDRP areas.

The County Strategy Group is the decision making body for SSCG with Kent County Council acting as the Accountable Body.

2. 08/09 UNDERSPENDS

SSCF under spends in excess of the 5% roll forward limit are combined into a single county level fund that can be used to target actions in support of community safety across Kent.

County Strategy Group in October 09 were informed that the 08/09 SSCF under spend available was as follows:

Revenue:	£ 8,632
Capital:	£14,897

CSG agreed to delegate to the Chairman of CSG the use of the 08/09 SSCF under spend and for decisions to be reported back to the next meeting of CSG.

The following use of the SSCF under spend has been approved by the Chairman of CSG:

2.1 Revenue : -

£4k Anti Social Behaviour Awareness Training Programme

Each Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership (CDRP) / Community Safety Partnership (CSP) will be approached on an individual basis and offered a half-day / one day facilitated workshop, run locally, on an identified ASB problem, highlighted by themselves from one of the main Focus Areas in their district.

£4k. contribution to revenue costs of Independent Domestic Abuse Advocates.

2.2 Capital : - Each District Authority and Area Police Command has been contacted inviting bids against the capital underspend of £14k to assist in the set up / equipping local joint community safety units.

3. 09/10

Quarter 3 SSCF claims are still being received from CDRPs. However a provisional and early analysis suggests that there will be a small under spend on SSCF for 09/10. As with 08/09, any under spend in excess of 5% by any individual CDRP will be combined into a single county level fund for determination by CSG.

4. 10/11

Members of SSCG will recall that it had been proposed to review SSCF allocations between CDRPs in time for changes to be made for 10/11. However it was subsequently decided (CSG 20 October 2010) to postpone the review in light of the more fundamental changes that may need to be made from April 2011 should SSCF be drastically reduced as part of the next three year financial settlement.

Revenue Allocation

As previously noted Kent's revenue allocation is part of the ABG and therefore remains the same as in the two preceding years. The sum allocated to each CDRP is in the attached appendix.

Capital Allocation

Capital allocations are made each year by the Home Office. The Home Office wrote to all Local Authority Chief Executives on 20 January 2010 (copied to Chairs of all CDRPs) announcing a reduction in capital allocations for 10/11 by 50%. Consequently Kent's allocation has been reduced from £439k in 09/10 to £219k in 10/11. Allocations to each CDRP for 10/11 therefore need to be halved. The sum allocated to each CDRP is in the attached appendix.

Recommendations

Members are asked to NOTE the contents of this report.

Graeme Brown
Kent Agreement Manager
Kent Partnership
01622 696070

Graeme.brown@kent.gov.uk

SSCF 2010- 11 revenue allocation

	Total
	£
Ashford	98,894
Canterbury	112,644
Dartford	108,341
Dover	98,740
Gravesham	109,093
Maidstone	125,914
Sevenoaks	105,531
Shepway	98,753
Swale	114,731
Thanet	111,504
Tonbridge & Malling	97,350
Tunbridge Wells	96,441
Total	<u>1,277,936</u>

SSCF 2010- 11 capital allocation

	Total
	£
Ashford	16,656
Canterbury	19,145
Dartford	18,689
Dover	16,623
Gravesham	18,851
Maidstone	22,471
Sevenoaks	18,084
Shepway	16,626
Swale	20,064
Thanet	19,369
Tonbridge & Malling	16,324
Tunbridge Wells	16,128
Total	<u>219,030</u>

This page is intentionally left blank