

**COMMUNITIES POSC (MEETING AS THE CRIME AND
DISORDER COMMITTEE)**

MINUTES of a meeting of the Communities POSC (meeting as the Crime and Disorder Committee) held in the Darent Room, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone on Tuesday, 6 April 2010.

PRESENT: Mrs E M Tweed (Chairman), Mr A R Chell (Vice-Chairman), Mr I S Chittenden, Mr H J Craske, Mr J Ozog, Mr R Tolputt and Mr A Willicombe

ALSO PRESENT: Mr M Gilmartin, Mr P M Hill, OBE and Chief Inspector R Nyman

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr S Beaumont (County Manager, Community Safety), Mr J Parris (Assistant Manager, Community Safety), Ms D Fitch (Assistant Democratic Services Manager (Policy Overview)) and Mr P D Wickenden (Overview, Scrutiny and Localism Manager)

UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

1. Brief induction - setting out the framework for the operation of this Committee
(Item B1)

(1) The Chairman welcomed all partners to the first meeting of this Committee under its Crime and Disorder remit.

(2) Mr Beaumont and Mr Parris gave a brief induction presentation on the background to the work of this Committee and answered questions from Members. The constructive, critical friend role of the Committee and the aim of reviewing the work of the partnership rather than individual partners was emphasised. It was intended that this Committee would look at countywide arrangements and that issues of local or geographical concern would be considered at a District/Borough level.

(3) It was explained that a key document for the Committee would be the Kent County Community Safety Agreement. This would set out the key strategic priorities which could form the basis of issues for the Committee to consider.

(4) When considering issues the Committee would be encouraged to look at how the partners work together, to see whether there were any barriers, and to look for best practise that could be shared across the partnership. The Chairman stated that her aim was to ensure that this Committee added value to the work of the partnership.

(5) The Chairman of the County Strategy Group suggested that the meetings of the Committee should be held after the Group so that the Committee could receive a report on what had been considered at the Group.

(6) RESOLVED that the presentation be noted and that when a copy of the Kent County Community Safety Agreement be circulated to Members of the Committee when it has been agreed by the County Strategy Group.

2. The differing use of powers held by Police Community Support Officer (PCSO's) across the County - with an apparent reluctance by many to enforce the CNEA (Cleaner Neighbourhood and Environment Act)

(Item B2)

(1) The Chairman welcomed Mr Snelling and Chief Inspector Nyman to the meeting.

(2) Mr Snelling had asked for this item to be put on the agenda on behalf of the Dartford and Gravesham Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership. Mr Snelling explained that this issue had been raised at a meeting of Kent Leaders, and related to the views from the public that litter and dog fouling should be dealt with as low level crime and the perception that the PCSO's were reluctant to issue on the spot penalties for these offences, especially dog fouling.

(3) Chief Inspector Nyman provided some background to this issue. He informed the Committee that there were 382 PCSO's in Kent and that the funding for these was not clear after 2011. He explained that there were 20 standard powers that PCSO's could use, which were set out in the papers for the meeting and examples were given. The powers relating to fixed penalties for littering and dog fouling were discretionary and that PCSO's tried to find sustainable solutions to these common problems. All Kent Leaders and Chief Executives were being consulted by the Police on the use of these discretionary powers. Chief Inspector Nyman explained that the decision on which powers should be delegated to PCSO's would rest with the new Chief Constable.

(4) The issue of parking on pavements was raised and the need for the roles of local enforcement and PCSO's to be clarified for the public. Chief Inspector Nyman stated that this would be something that a joined up partnership approach could assist with. Reference was made to the ability of Local Authorities to introduce a bye law to cover this issue.

(5) Mr Gilmartin (Chief Executive of the Police Authority) noted the key issues on PCSO powers raised by Members with a view to using them in the recruitment process for the new Chief Constable.

(6) RESOLVED that it be noted that the PCSO's delegated powers were currently under review and that an update be submitted to the Committee in due course.

3. CCTV Monitoring

(Item B3)

(1) Mr Hill, Chairman of the County Strategy Group, had asked for this item to be considered by the Committee. He explained CCTV monitoring had been raised by a number of District Council leaders, including the Leader of Tunbridge Well Borough Council in relation to the financial burden that this placed upon them. He stated that

a Group was being established with the Police Authority and Kent Police to carry out a joint piece of work. Mr Gilmartin explained that an initial meeting had been held and draft terms of reference had been produced and shared with the Leader of Tunbridge Wells Borough Council. This would be a wide ranging piece of work, which would include options for CCTV across the County and also the possible establishment of a single non-emergency number.

(2) Members referred to a number of options for CCTV in the County including shared monitoring/provision between Districts.

(3) Mr Gilmartin stated that there were a number of possible options that could be explored between the two extremes of each Council running their own service and a single county wide solution, key issues were the importance of CCTV evidence being able to assist the Police in their investigations, even if it was not of the highest standard, and the capital cost of replacement equipment.

(4) Mr Snelling, as Leader of Gravesham Borough Council, stated that his Council had had a debate on this recently. CCTV was popular with the public but the problem for the Council was the limited capacity and the lack of finance to address this. There was an attraction in economies of scale but these need to be established very carefully and the whole range of options explored.

(5) RESOLVED that the establishment of a multi-agency group to look at options for the future of CCTV across the county be noted and that the Committee be kept informed of its progress.

4. Countywide arrangements in place for overview and scrutiny of CDRP's. *(Item B4)*

(1) At the request of the Police Authority the Committee considered a report which set out the current countywide arrangements for the overview and scrutiny of CDRP's. Mr Wickenden emphasised that this was about partnership working and that scrutiny officers from across Kent would be working together to ensure that their Crime and Disorder Committees added value for the residents of Kent and the duplication was avoided. Initial discussion had been held at officer level to produce an agreement on inter-authority co-operation, including engagement with partners, which it was intended would be embedded in authorities constitutions.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

5. Date of next meeting - 11 November 2010 at 2.00pm *(Item B5)*