

Public Document Pack

NOTICE OF MEETING

www.rbwm.gov.uk



CRIME & DISORDER OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY PANEL

will meet on

TUESDAY, 20TH MARCH, 2018

At 6.30 pm

in the

DESBOROUGH 2 & 3 - TOWN HALL,

TO: MEMBERS OF THE CRIME & DISORDER OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY PANEL

COUNCILLORS DEREK SHARP (CHAIRMAN), HASHIM BHATTI, HARI SHARMA (VICE-CHAIRMAN), JOHN STORY, SIMON WERNER, EILEEN QUICK AND MARION MILLS

SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

COUNCILLORS CLIVE BULLOCK, MOHAMMED ILYAS, GARY MUIR, JULIAN SHARPE, SHAMSUL SHELIM, MALCOLM BEER AND NICOLA PRYER

Karen Shepherd - Democratic Services Manager - Issued: Monday, 12 March 2018

Members of the Press and Public are welcome to attend Part I of this meeting. The agenda is available on the Council's web site at www.rbwm.gov.uk or contact the Panel Administrator **Nabihah Hassan-Farooq** 01628 796345

Fire Alarm - In the event of the fire alarm sounding or other emergency, please leave the building quickly and calmly by the nearest exit. Do not stop to collect personal belongings and do not use the lifts. Congregate in the Town Hall Car Park, Park Street, Maidenhead (immediately adjacent to the Town Hall) and do not re-enter the building until told to do so by a member of staff.

Recording of Meetings – The Council allows the filming, recording and photography of public Council meetings. This may be undertaken by the Council itself, or any person attending the meeting. By entering the meeting room you are acknowledging that you may be audio or video recorded and that this recording will be available for public viewing on the RBWM website. If you have any questions regarding the council's policy, please speak to the Democratic Services or Legal representative at the meeting.

AGENDA

PART I

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>PAGE NO</u>
1.	<u>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</u> To receive any apologies for absence.	-
2.	<u>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</u> To receive declarations of interests from Members of the Panel in respect of any item to be considered at the meeting.	5 - 6
3.	<u>MINUTES</u> To note the Part I minutes of the Crime & Disorder Overview & Scrutiny Panels held on the 7 th February 2018.	7 - 10
4.	<u>COMMUNITY WARDEN ENHANCEMENT</u> To comment on the report being considered by Cabinet on 22 March 2018.	11 - 16
5.	<u>DATE OF FUTURE MEETINGS</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Monday 16 April 2018.	-

This page is intentionally left blank

MEMBERS' GUIDE TO DECLARING INTERESTS IN MEETINGS

Disclosure at Meetings

If a Member has not disclosed an interest in their Register of Interests, they **must make** the declaration of interest at the beginning of the meeting, or as soon as they are aware that they have a DPI or Prejudicial Interest. If a Member has already disclosed the interest in their Register of Interests they are still required to disclose this in the meeting if it relates to the matter being discussed.

A member with a DPI or Prejudicial Interest **may make representations at the start of the item but must not take part in the discussion or vote at a meeting.** The speaking time allocated for Members to make representations is at the discretion of the Chairman of the meeting. In order to avoid any accusations of taking part in the discussion or vote, after speaking, Members should move away from the panel table to a public area or, if they wish, leave the room. If the interest declared has not been entered on to a Members' Register of Interests, they must notify the Monitoring Officer in writing within the next 28 days following the meeting.

Disclosable Pecuniary Interests (DPIs) (relating to the Member or their partner) include:

- Any employment, office, trade, profession or vocation carried on for profit or gain.
- Any payment or provision of any other financial benefit made in respect of any expenses occurred in carrying out member duties or election expenses.
- Any contract under which goods and services are to be provided/works to be executed which has not been fully discharged.
- Any beneficial interest in land within the area of the relevant authority.
- Any licence to occupy land in the area of the relevant authority for a month or longer.
- Any tenancy where the landlord is the relevant authority, and the tenant is a body in which the relevant person has a beneficial interest.
- Any beneficial interest in securities of a body where:
 - a) that body has a piece of business or land in the area of the relevant authority, and
 - b) either (i) the total nominal value of the securities exceeds £25,000 or one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that body **or** (ii) the total nominal value of the shares of any one class belonging to the relevant person exceeds one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that class.

Any Member who is unsure if their interest falls within any of the above legal definitions should seek advice from the Monitoring Officer in advance of the meeting.

A Member with a DPI should state in the meeting: ***'I declare a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in item x because xxx. As soon as we come to that item, I will leave the room/ move to the public area for the entire duration of the discussion and not take part in the vote.'***

Or, if making representations on the item: 'I declare a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in item x because xxx. As soon as we come to that item, I will make representations, then I will leave the room/ move to the public area for the entire duration of the discussion and not take part in the vote.'

Prejudicial Interests

Any interest which a reasonable, fair minded and informed member of the public would reasonably believe is so significant that it harms or impairs the Member's ability to judge the public interest in the item, i.e. a Member's decision making is influenced by their interest so that they are not able to impartially consider relevant issues.

A Member with a Prejudicial interest should state in the meeting: ***'I declare a Prejudicial Interest in item x because xxx. As soon as we come to that item, I will leave the room/ move to the public area for the entire duration of the discussion and not take part in the vote.'***

Or, if making representations in the item: 'I declare a Prejudicial Interest in item x because xxx. As soon as we come to that item, I will make representations, then I will leave the room/ move to the public area for the entire duration of the discussion and not take part in the vote.'

Personal interests

Any other connection or association which a member of the public may reasonably think may influence a Member when making a decision on council matters.

Members with a Personal Interest should state at the meeting: ***'I wish to declare a Personal Interest in item x because xxx'. As this is a Personal Interest only, I will take part in the discussion and vote on the matter.***

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 3

CRIME & DISORDER OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY PANEL

WEDNESDAY, 7 FEBRUARY 2018

PRESENT: Councillors Derek Sharp (Chairman), Hashim Bhatti, Hari Sharma (Vice-Chairman), John Story, Simon Werner, Eileen Quick and Marion Mills

Also in attendance: Councillor Da Costa, Parish Councillor Pat McDonald, Parish Councillor Spike Humphry, Parish Councillor Margaret Lenton and Superintendent Bhupinder Rai.

Officers: Mark Lampard, David Scott and David Cook.

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from the Lead Member for Environmental Services.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

MINUTES

The Part I minutes of the meeting held on the 21 November 2017 were agreed as a correct record.

Cllr Werner mentioned that it was disappointing not to be discussing the Community Wardens paper at this meeting.

BUDGET REPORT 2018-2019

Mark Lampard, Finance Partner - Corporate Services & Operations gave the Panel a presentation on the 2018/19 Budget. The main points of the presentation were as follows:

Key messages:

- Lowest council tax outside of London
- Resident parking remain free in contrast to neighbouring authorities
- Keeping all 14 libraries open, some with increased opening hours
- 86% of schools in the Borough were good or outstanding
- Maintained £330k grant funding to community organisations and increased support for the Citizens Advice Bureau
- Inflation of RPI 3.9%
- Indicative fees and charges increased by up to 3.9% or more where justified market benchmarks were higher
- Increase in core council tax of 1.95%
- Adult social care precept of 3% applied for the final year
- Major Capital investment of £65m – due to the regeneration in Maidenhead
- Ongoing programme of £5.4m savings and additional income
- CCTV upgrade and expansion
- Car Parking charges benchmarked and increased below the benchmark figure. Advantage card holders will not pay any increase.

Annual Capital programme £7m net:

- Replacement parking card equipment £775k
- Commercial and operational estate repairs and maintenance £1.045m
- Replacement equipment at Windsor Leisure Centre £540k
- Dedworth Road £350k
- New London Road roundabout £250k
- Voluntary organisations grants maintained £200k

Capital investment net £65m net:

- Braywick Leisure Centre £15.8m
- Temporary parking facilities £10m
- Schools expansions £4.9m

Cllr Werner informed that he was glad to see CCTV improvements included following the views of this Panel, that projected borrowing levels should be shown leading up to 2025 and that he could not see investment into community wardens. Cllr Werner was disappointed that the warden report was not being considered at this meeting and recommended that a Task and Finish Group be established.

Parish Cllr MacDonald mentioned that it was said that advantage card holders would not be effected by the increased car parking charges yet there was no advantage card discount when parking in the Grove Road car park for over 4 hours. The Panel were informed that advantage card tariffs would be introduced where they were not currently available.

Resolved unanimously: that the Panel unanimously endorsed the recommendations.

STREET DWELLING & ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR STRATEGY

David Scott, Head of Communities, Enforcement and Partnerships introduced the Cabinet report regarding rough sleeping and anti-social behaviour strategy.

The Panel were informed that the report sought to establish a Rough Sleeping Support and Antisocial Behaviour Strategy; to both strengthen the current offer of support afforded to those rough sleeping, and at the same time ensuring there are consequences for those who behave antisocially and or fail to engage with the support offered.

The strategy proposed a multi-agency approach to increase the support available to include outreach workers, housing support officers and a team of enhanced community wardens and a Make Every Adult Matter (MEAM) Coordinator, in addition to external partners including Thames Valley Police (TVP). The strategy being developed so that the benefits for the vulnerable individuals can be realised as soon as possible.

The challenge was that there were a range of individuals with complex needs that needed support as well as an increase in anti-social behaviour. There were also individuals entering the borough to take advantage of footfall in the borough.

An enforcement approach including Community Protection Notices (CPN) and a revised Public Space Protection Order (PSPO) would also be considered to back up the support being provided. The role of community wardens would also be enhanced and the report recommended increasing fixed penalty notices to a maximum of £100.

The issues raised within the report had been discussed with other overview and scrutiny panels, in particular Corporate Services O&S Panel. Over the last five months a framework was put in place to help individuals with 1 to 1 support being provided.

In response to questions the Panel were informed that to introduce a new PSPO there would be a consultation period and that the proposed fixed penalty notices were not just for rough sleepers but for anti-social behaviour.

The Chairman informed that he had met with the chief constable and that he had been informed that aggressive begging would be dealt with.

Cllr Werner raised concern that the report had been circulated late, that there was insufficient evidence and that it lacked detail. There was no evidence of aggressive begging and was a concentration on homelessness. These people often had complex issues so he was pleased to see mental health was being looked at, however it was a concern that they could also be fined.

Cllr Quick mentioned that there had been concern raised about aggressive begging and questioned how we would be defining this and how it would be judged. A lot of residents had contacted her with regards to the issues raised as well as concerns regarding security with bags being left on streets.

Thames Valley Police informed that the Police had no powers to remove belongings left on the street. Items could be removed from train stations as they were on private property. Counter terrorism does deem property left by the homeless to be a security risk. With regards to aggressive begging evidence was required for convictions; we need to show that their actions were active and not just begging.

Cllr Shelim mentioned that the report was a good first step in creating a strategy and provided reassurance to our residents that action was being taken.

Cllr Da Costa said that this was too much an important issue not to get right and it required a more in-depth report. He questioned if 56 days was sufficient to solve complex mental health issues. More detail was required regarding costs and other services being offered. The flexible housing support grant was not mentioned. There also needed to be wider consultation with our stakeholders such as the CCG and mental health teams.

Cllr Story asked Thames Valley Police if there were any lessons that could be learnt from other areas. The Panel were informed that other boroughs had been proactive in the use of PSPOs and had also introduced specific areas to help give to the homeless without giving money. MEAM had been successfully used in West Berkshire.

Cllr Story asked the same question to the Head of Communities, Enforcement and Partnerships and was informed that officers had looked at 26 towns that were using MEAM and were looking to introduce one for the borough. Officers were looking at best practice and how we could use our estate to provide support. We were talking to third sector providers about how we could make an impact. There was a lot to be done and thus important to get a strategic framework in place.

Parish Councillor Cllr McDonald mentioned that as a Maidenhead resident and visitor to Windsor he had never come across aggressive begging and asked if there was any evidence. The Panel were informed that there had been an increase in reported incidents as well as an increase in anti-social behaviour, especially over the last 6 months.

Parish Councillor Cllr M Lenton reported that she was delighted to see that it was acknowledged what a complex issue this was but felt that begging could be dealt separately, she mentioned how she had witnessed two women fitting outside shops in Windsor. She recommended that shops and bus companies be consulted.

Parish Councillor Cllr Humphrey mentioned that rough sleeping support and anti-social behaviour were two separate issues and this report was trying to deal with both together. Current news articles and statements had brought the borough into disrepute. He

recommended that there be a rough sleeper strategy and separate anti-social behaviour strategy. He did not agree with fining rough sleepers if they did not engage.

Cllr Bhatti said he welcomed the report and felt it would be good for the borough, he asked what interim measure were in place at present. The Panel were informed that work was already being undertaken to help the homeless and that a revised role for wardens was being considered. Partner agencies currently worked together on the issues raised.

Cllr Werner recommended that enforcement for the homeless was not the way forward, that the issue of anti-social behaviour and homelessness should be separated and that the report should have an evidence base when considered.

Cllr Ills mentioned that there was no quick fix and that it was important to get our intentions communicated clearly.

Resolved that: the Crime and Disorder O&S Panel considered the Cabinet report in considerable detail and approved the recommendations (Cllr Werner did not support the recommendations and proposed that the Panel should have suggested that enforcement against homelessness should not be recommended, that there should be a distinction between anti-social behaviour and homelessness and that more evidence within the report was required). A number of areas of detail were considered by the Panel.

COMMUNITY WARDENS ROLE AND OPTIONS

Item withdrawn.

FUTURE MEETING DATES

It was noted that the next scheduled meeting of the Panel was 16th April 2018.

The meeting, which began at 7.00 pm, finished at 8.30 pm

CHAIRMAN.....

DATE.....

Report Title:	Community Warden Enhancement
Contains Confidential or Exempt Information?	NO - Part I
Member reporting:	Cllr Grey, Lead Member for Environmental Services (including Parking & Flooding)
Meeting and Date:	Cabinet - 22 March 2018
Responsible Officer(s):	Andy Jeffs, Executive Director David Scott, Head of Communities, Enforcement & Partnerships
Wards affected:	All

REPORT SUMMARY

- 1 This report seeks Members' support for a revised approach to the Community Wardens, which will reflect the current needs of the Royal Borough, and address local residents, businesses and visitors' growing concerns about the increased levels of a range of anti-social behaviours being encountered on our streets, in our car parks and in our open spaces.
- 2 The approach proposed seeks to reuse existing budget to enable a new team of six Community Wardens, along with a new Community Warden Lead to be appointed to work alongside the existing Community Warden team, to increase the capacity of the whole service to focus on reducing anti-social behaviours across the borough, while continuing to increase the highly valued community engagement that the existing community wardens have established.

1 DETAILS OF RECOMMENDATION(S)

RECOMMENDATION: That Cabinet notes the report, and:

- i) **Delegates authority to the Executive Director, together with the Lead Member for Environmental Services (including Parking & Flooding) to undertake the development of detailed plans and the required recruitment and appointment of a team of six additional Community Wardens and a Community Warden Lead.**

2 REASON(S) FOR RECOMMENDATION(S) AND OPTIONS CONSIDERED

Background

- 2.1 A team of 18 Community Wardens operate to provide a range of community engagement, crime prevention, proactive intelligence gathering, community protection and enforcement roles across the Royal Borough. The team includes two senior wardens, who oversee and manage the day to day work of the team within the Community Protection service.
- 2.2 Their work is both at an operational and tactical level, working closely with TVP and other key stakeholders, to provide a high profile borough presence giving residents, businesses and visitors an increased level of reassurance, improved safety and community wellbeing.

2.3 Predominant existing work streams, with an indicative split in the overall proportions of time for the team as a whole can be summarised as follows:

Community Engagement (15% of role):

- Community Hubs / Signposting / Interaction with the community and the vulnerable community
- Litter-picks / removal of small areas of graffiti
- Dispute resolution and de-escalation
- Proactive interaction with the public to prevent and avoid complaints

Crime Prevention (30% of role)

- Liaison with TVP / joint Night Time Economy (NTE) Patrols
- Campaigns (such as the clear car deterrents), advice and events

Proactive Intelligence / Detection (15% of role)

- Evidence gathering for enforcement teams
- Identification of problems on NTE (ASB/noise)

Community Protection (10% of role)

- Police assistance / guard change and anti-terror prevention
- High visibility reassurance patrols in all wards
- Safeguarding visits to children, elderly and the vulnerable

Enforcement (30% of role)

- Issuing of penalty notices (e.g.: dog fouling & littering)
- Environmental Enforcement (e.g.: bonfires, neighbour noise)
- Moving on touts (at events such as Royal Ascot)
- Speed-watch events

2.4 The team has developed and grown since its introduction in 2004, with incremental increases during 2007-11 (increased to 14), and 2011-15 (increased to 18).

2.5 Previous plans to consider increasing the numbers of Community Wardens to 36, have now been revised as a result of a number of other changes in service delivery, including the improvements in preventative and support services such as the new Resilience Service. It is now recommended that it is no longer the best option to seek to double the number of wardens as the requirements in 2018 are quite different to those envisaged previously.

2.6 The Community Wardens receive very positive feedback from residents, businesses and visitors for their work, and are always seeking to work in partnership with internal and external partners. The Parish Councils value their work highly in supporting local issues and helping to mobilise support and action to address emerging concerns at an early stage. TVP value their work highly too and support these proposals.

Emerging Issues

2.7 During the last nine-months there has been a continued increase in the levels of anti-social behaviours being experienced and reported by residents, businesses and visitors. This includes increased incidents linked to the NTE, along with the increasing numbers of persons involved in anti-social activities.

- 2.8 As a result of earlier consideration on how the Community Warden team can increase the effectiveness of their role, further analysis of enforcement areas has been undertaken, such as issuing Fixed Penalty Notices (FPNs) for: cycling on footpaths or in pedestrianised zones, graffiti, unauthorised busking, urination and defecation in public, vehicle compliance (taxis), substance misuse and drug taking.
- 2.9 Additional training to achieve the Community Safety Accreditation Scheme (CSAS) and empower the above enforcement has already been set up, and has commenced for the first cohort of ten wardens at the end of January 2018, with the remaining wardens scheduled for training in April 2018. If approved the new cohort of wardens this report proposes would also undergo this training once appointed.
- 2.10 Members are asked to consider the creation of a new team of six new wardens, a specialist lead warden who could implement the wider town centre enforcement options that CSAS accreditation enables. The expanded team will continue to draw on the community engagement and partnership development skills that have formed the basis of their current reputation, with very good local knowledge to support vulnerable people.
- 2.11 This additional team will provide an increased and targeted ‘support before enforcement’ role, which would complement the current work streams outlined. The new team would also provide additional capacity to address and reduce anti-social behaviour.
- 2.12 The new team would enable the Royal Borough to take a more active enforcement role to wider town centre issues and exploit powers which are not actively used at this time. This will also support and enable more partnership working with TVP to prevent escalation and deter more serious criminal behaviours and actions and promote and support further development of our partnership approach to the management of the town centres.

Table 1: Options considered

Option	Comments
Recruit a new team of six town centre focused Community Wardens, a specialist Community Warden Lead. The recommended option	By recruiting this cohort of new staff a ‘support before enforcement’ model can be effectively applied to address anti-social behaviours, The team will also be equipped to enforce new powers in response to a range of other town centre issues as they arise, such as cycling on pavements, urination, defecation, substance misuse in public places, graffiti, vehicle compliance (taxis) etc.
Do not increase the size of the Community Warden team. This is not recommended	There are increasing numbers of complaints being received in relation to increasing levels of anti-social behaviour which the borough must decide whether to respond to. It is not realistic to do this and sustain the effective work of the community warden team within the current resources.

3 KEY IMPLICATIONS

3.1 Table 2 contains the key implications.

Table 2: Key implications

Outcome	Unmet	Met	Exceeded	Significantly Exceeded	Date of delivery
New expanded Community Warden team delivery	New team not in place by 31/10/18	New team in place by 31/08/18	New team in place by 31/07/18	New team in place by 30/06/18	31/08/18

4 FINANCIAL DETAILS / VALUE FOR MONEY

- 4.1 The total annual cost of the new team is £253,000.
- 4.2 The new team will be funded through the deletion of the vacant 0.65 FTE Community Safety Projects Officer post and the reuse of existing revenue budget including from an amended and modified, Greenredeem scheme keeping the current benefits at a reduced cost.
- 4.3 Equipment and accreditation for the community warden cohort will be funded from existing related capital cost centres.

5 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 Implementation of CSAS accredited powers will require approval from the Chief Constable prior to use. Officers are in discussion currently to ensure this can occur as soon as possible.
- 5.2 Enforcement of powers under the Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014, require community consultation prior to implementation. This consultation could be undertaken once the new team are appointed to ensure the most relevant and effective controls are in place to enable the expanded Community Wardens.

6 RISK MANAGEMENT

- 6.1 An expanded Community Warden team will continue to support and maintain the positive engagement and community support work delivered by the current warden cohort, and which has a very positive reputation with residents, businesses, Parish Councils and TVP, whilst supplementing the capacity and delivery for an enhanced support before enforcement model.
- 6.2 The expansion of the current service as outlined, with an increased capacity in the tasks the team are engaged with, will be perceived as a positive initiative by residents, local businesses and visitors.

6.3 The increased focus on addressing ASB will expose staff to more contact with perpetrators of ASB, and appropriate risk assessment will be completed prior to implementation. This with appropriate training, personal protection equipment (PPE) and mitigations established.

Table 3: Impact of risk and mitigation

Risks	Uncontrolled Risk	Controls	Controlled Risk
Risk of negative public perception if ASB is not tackled.	Without an expanded team, there is insufficient capacity to respond to increased reports of ASB.	Increase current team of community wardens to allow for additional capacity to tackle ASB.	Public and stakeholder confidence achieved and ASB addressed at earliest opportunity
Risk of physical harm to staff.	Physical threat from confrontation by perpetrators.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) CSAS training to cover correct methods of engagement during enforcement. ii) Body worn cameras and protection vests provided to those focused on addressing ASB incidents. 	Risk assessment to confirm appropriate mitigations and PPE; with threat of harm reduced to acceptable level.

7 POTENTIAL IMPACTS

- 7.1 The extended Community Warden team will have a positive impact and enable the Royal Borough to utilise powers which can be granted by the Chief Constable, under the CSAS accreditation scheme. This is positively supported by the Local Police Area senior officers.
- 7.2 A full Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA) will be completed, if following the initial screening, a full EQIA is identified as necessary.

8 CONSULTATION

- 8.1 The comments of the Crime and Disorder Overview and Scrutiny Panel will be sought at the meeting being held on 20 March 2018.
- 8.2 The initial views of the LPA have been obtained to provide in principle support of the partnership approach being adopted through the support before enforcement model to address Anti-Social Behaviour and develop an effective strategy.

9 TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

9.1 Stages for implementing the recommendations as below:

Table 4: Implementation timetable

Date	Details
31 March 2018	Recruitment phase begins (to conclude May 2018)
30 June 2018	CSAS training for new warden staff cohort, ensuring all 25 fully trained
31 July 2018	CSAS Accreditation obtained from chief constable
31 August 2018	New community warden team fully active.

9.2 Implementation date if not called in: Phased implementation from March to September 2018.

10 APPENDICES

None.

11 BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

None

12 CONSULTATION (MANDATORY)

Name of consultee	Post held	Date sent	Commented & returned
Cllr Grey	Lead Member for Environmental Services (including Parking & Flooding)	27/02/18	1/3/18
Alison Alexander	Managing Director	27/02/18	28/02/18
Russell O'Keefe	Executive Director	27/02/18	1/3/18
Andy Jeffs	Executive Director	26/02/18	26/02/18
Rob Stubbs	Section 151 Officer	27/02/18	1/3/18
Terry Baldwin	Head of HR	27/02/18	1/3/18
Louisa Dean	Communications and Marketing Manager	27/02/18	27/02/18

REPORT HISTORY

Decision type: Key decision	Urgency item? No
Report Authors: David Scott, Head of Communities, Enforcement and Partnerships – 01628 796748 Chris Nash, Community Protection Principal - 07976 594501	