

NOTICE
OF
MEETING



CRIME & DISORDER OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY PANEL

will meet on

MONDAY, 14TH NOVEMBER, 2016

At 7.00 pm

in the

COUNCIL CHAMBER - TOWN HALL, MAIDENHEAD

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

COUNCILLORS DEREK SHARP (CHAIRMAN), JOHN BOWDEN (VICE-CHAIRMAN),
HASHIM BHATTI, JESSE GREY, HARI SHARMA, JOHN STORY AND SIMON WERNER

SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

COUNCILLORS MALCOLM ALEXANDER, CLIVE BULLOCK, MOHAMMED ILYAS,
GARY MUIR, SHAMSUL SHELIM, MALCOLM BEER, LYNNE JONES AND
JULIAN SHARPE

Karen Shepherd - Democratic Services Manager - Issued: Friday, 4 November 2016

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 **Tanya Leftwich** 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 15 September 2016 & 6 October 2016.	7 - 20
4.	<u>PRESENTATION - MODERN SLAVERY</u> By Superintendent Rai (Thames Valley Police).	-
5.	<u>DATE OF FUTURE MEETINGS</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Monday 30 January 2017.• Thursday 20 April 2017.	-
	<u>LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 - EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC</u> To consider passing the following resolution:- "That under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting whilst discussion takes place on item 6 on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of part I of Schedule 12A of the Act"	-

PRIVATE MEETING

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>PAGE NO</u>
6.	<p data-bbox="261 443 778 477"><u>DAAT TENDER - AWARD REPORT</u></p> <p data-bbox="261 517 1251 584">To comment on the report to be considered by Cabinet on the 24 November 2016.</p> <p data-bbox="261 622 1267 696"><i>(Not for publication by virtue of Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972)</i></p> <p data-bbox="261 770 1139 844"><u>Details of representations received on reports listed above for discussion in the Private Meeting:</u></p> <p data-bbox="261 916 475 947">None received.</p>	21 – 30
		-

MEMBERS' GUIDANCE NOTE

DECLARING INTERESTS IN MEETINGS

DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS (DPIs)

DPIs 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 license 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.

PREJUDICIAL INTERESTS

This is an interest which a reasonable fair minded and informed member of the public would reasonably believe is so significant that it harms or impairs your ability to judge the public interest. That is, your decision making is influenced by your interest that you are not able to impartially consider only relevant issues.

DECLARING INTERESTS

If you have not disclosed your interest in the register, you **must make** the declaration of interest at the beginning of the meeting, or as soon as you are aware that you have a DPI or Prejudicial Interest. If you have already disclosed the interest in your Register of Interests you 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 discussion or vote at a meeting.** The term 'discussion' has been taken to mean a discussion by the members of the committee or other body determining the issue. You should notify Democratic Services before the meeting of your intention to speak. In order to avoid any accusations of taking part in the discussion or vote, you must move to the public area, having made your representations.

If you have any queries then you should obtain advice from the Legal or Democratic Services Officer before participating in the meeting.

If the interest declared has not been entered on to your Register of Interests, you must notify the Monitoring Officer in writing within the next 28 days following the meeting.

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 3

CRIME & DISORDER OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY PANEL

THURSDAY, 15 SEPTEMBER 2016

PRESENT: Councillors Derek Sharp (Chairman), Hashim Bhatti, Jesse Grey, Hari Sharma, Julian Sharpe (sub for John Bowden) and John Story.

Also in attendance: Superintendent Rai (Thames Valley Police), Parish Councillor Margaret Lenton (Wraysbury Parish Council), Councillor John Lenton and Lisa Lavia (Managing Director - The Noise Abatement Society).

Officers: Tanya Leftwich, Chris Nash and Simon Fletcher.

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor John Bowden (Councillor Julian Sharpe was sub) and Councillor Simon Werner (no sub was available).

Apologies were also received from Parish Councillor Pat McDonald (White Waltham Parish Councillor) and Parish Councillor Spike Humphrey (Sunninghill & Ascot Parish Council).

It was noted that Parish Councillor Margaret Lenton (Wraysbury Parish Council) would arrive shortly.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

MINUTES

The Part I minutes of the meeting held on the 27 June 2016 were agreed as a correct record.

The Chairman announced that the meeting was being recorded and that the audio would be available shortly on the RBWM website.

COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP ANNUAL PLAN

The Team Leader - Environmental Protection, Chris Nash, informed the Panel that he was at the meeting representing himself, the Head of Community Protection & Enforcement, Craig Miller and Members of the Community Partnership. Members were informed that the Community Safety Partnership Plan had been before the Panel under a different Chairmanship and that since then a lot of work had been undertaken to refine the document and incorporate feedback received from Members and stakeholders. It was noted that the Head of Community Protection & Enforcement was seeking feedback to this document with the view to a final sign off late October time.

The Team Leader - Environmental Protection explained that the Community Safety Partnership established its priorities in a number of ways. It was noted that Police data was used to identify crime trends, whilst the borough also conducted an annual survey which highlighted public concerns around community safety; national and regional emerging issues such as child sexual exploitation were taken into account along with issues identified by local neighbourhood action group surveys and police Have Your Say Meetings. The Panel noted that account was taken of related issues and plans including those of the Adults and

Children's Safeguarding Boards. It was noted that the priorities often fell across two or more themes and were delivered within the theme framework.

Members were informed that the five main priority areas for 2015/16 were as follows:

- Violent Crime.
- Sexual Assault.
- Safeguarding (Crime related).
- Burglary.
- Business As Usual.

It was noted that the priorities established in the Annual Strategic Assessment were agreed at the December 2015 Community Safety Partnership Meeting and were categorised under the following three themes:

- Theme 1 – Prevention (Supporting our communities).
- Theme 2 – Protection (Supporting victims of crime & anti-social behaviour).
- Theme 3 – Inclusion (Assisting troubled families and rehabilitating offenders).
- Theme 4 – Maintaining Public Confidence (Resident reassurance & confidence initiatives).

The Team Leader - Environmental Protection ran Members through the aims under each priority.

In the ensuing discussion the following points were noted:

- The Action Plan that sat behind this document was noted to be on-going. Councillor Story suggested that this document gave the appearance that the Council had achieved things it hadn't by showing deadline dates that had since passed. The Team Leader - Environmental Protection agreed to take this suggestion back to the Head of Community Protection & Enforcement.
- That violent crime in general figures with regard to the Night-time Economy had been on the rise. It was noted that assault without injury was in double figures although it was stressed that this included a variety of incidents including harassment. It was requested by Councillor Story that specific figures be supplied at future Panel meetings to help give Members a feel for the numbers involved.
- Superintendent Rai (Thames Valley Police) informed Members that the baseline numbers for repeat domestic abuse victims had been at 32% in April but had since reduced to 26%. The Team Leader - Environmental Protection stated that the figures and targets set would be ironed out before the Community Safety Partnership Annual Plan was signed off.
- Councillor Sharpe requested that more narrative be added against each point so they could be better assessed as to whether target had been met.
- Members requested the age demographic with regard to people being safeguarded. Superintendent Rai (Thames Valley Police) informed Members that age demographic information would take a level of analysis to draw out. It was noted that it was difficult to draw out what was online fraud and what was fraud in general.
- Councillor Grey stated that he found it very difficult to scrutinise, make suggestions and participate in discussions when limited information was being provided without specific numbers involved which the Chairman echoed.
- The Chairman asked whether burglaries were still regarded as a high priority crime. Superintendent Rai explained that burglaries were usually responded to within a four hour period and that this was not likely to change in the future.
- Superintendent Rai informed the Panel that the Thames Valley Police did not have an increase in resources so were not planning to make more police officers more visible in the Royal Borough.
- Superintendent Rai informed the Panel that all burglaries were attended by a member of the Thames Valley Police, whether the offender was still present at the premises or not.
- Superintendent Rai informed the Panel that the Thames Valley Police had a Cross Boarder Offender officer who shared intelligence with other police forces to help catch

cross boarder offenders. It was noted that cross boarder meetings took place on a monthly basis.

- Superintendent Rai informed the Panel that every time the Thames Valley Police made an arrest a message was put out by the media.

The Team Leader - Environmental Protection asked the Panel if they agreed with the key aims for the Royal Borough.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That the Panel agreed that the aims included within the Community Safety Partnership Annual Plan. It was agreed that the Community Safety Partnership Annual Plan be brought back to a future meeting once the additional information was available, ideally to the meeting in November.

The Chairman thanked the Team Leader - Environmental Protection for attending the meeting and addressing the Panel.

PRESENTATION - SOUNDSCAPE MANAGEMENT, A NEW APPROACH TO MANAGING AND REDUCING NOISE FROM ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR AND FACILITATING SAFE MOVEMENT OF PEOPLE AT NIGHT

The Chairman introduced Managing Director from The Noise Abatement Society, Lisa Lavia, to the Panel and invited her to give her presentation on 'Using a scientific soundscape approach to address anti-social behaviour and noise and help facilitate safe movement of people at night'.

Superintendent Rai (Thames Valley Police) informed Members that she had first been made aware of this innovative project when Lisa had done some work in another area. It was noted that this project was one part of a much bigger plan if accepted. The Panel was asked for its feedback.

Members were given a brief presentation which covered the following areas:

- Presentation outline.
- Soundscape: a new International and British standard and an emerging science.
- West Street, Brighton – a police high impact area.
- West Street Story: Interacting with the camera.
- West Street Story: Queue Formation.
- Fast vs Slow Tempo.
- West Street Story night noise intervention results.
- Acknowledgements.
- Project scope and Case for Investment.
- Indicative Intervention Costs.
- Indicative Funding Streams.

In the ensuing discussion the following points were noted:

- The Managing Director from The Noise Abatement Society explained that putting in a semi-permanent installation in the Royal Borough that could be combined with local interventions / measures could be a good tool going forward.
- That the Goswell Hill area in Windsor would be a similar area to that of Brighton.
- That the next step would be to find funding for a three month trial. It was noted that match funding might be an option available to the Council.
- It was noted that sourcing funding was a relatively quick process and could take a couple of months.
- The Panel was informed that if interested this could go live in approximately 4-6 weeks.

The Chairman stated that he liked the sound of this project and that it could be a good way to feedback to the public with regard to outcomes.

The Chairman thanked the Managing Director from The Noise Abatement Society for attending meeting and addressing the Panel.

DATE OF FUTURE MEETINGS

The Chairman informed Members that the dates of the next meetings were as follows:

- Thursday 6th October 2016 – Annual TVP Presentation (6pm start).
- Monday 14 November 2016.
- Monday 30 January 2017.
- Thursday 20 April 2017.

The Chairman requested that all meetings from November onwards started at 19:00.

BUDGET 2017-18 - INITIAL SAVINGS PROPOSALS

The Strategic Director of Operations, Simon Fletcher, referred Members to pages 3-12 of the supplementary agenda and explained that the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) presented to Council in February 2016 identified the need to reduce council expenditure by £5.6m in 2017-18. Members were informed that as the economic climate changed in the UK the Council's expenditure level might need to change. Any significant changes will be weaved into the Medium Term Financial Plan.

The Strategic Director of Operations went onto explain that in March 2016 Cabinet approved a refreshed Transformation Programme 2016- 2018 with the aim to create a leaner and more agile organisation, focused on the customers, services and the communities the Council serves.

Members were informed that guided by the Council's Transformation Programme, work to date had identified how the council's expenditure could be reduced by £5.3m in 2017-18 through a mixture of increasing income and reducing cost. The details were included in the report and further savings proposals would be brought to Cabinet in February 2017.

The Strategic Director of Operations explained that Members should be aware that some of the savings proposed were subject to individual cabinet reports and were therefore only included as draft proposals to be subsequently approved for inclusion in the budget.

Members were informed that the report recommended that managers were authorised to implement the proposals as soon as practicable to secure implementation by 1st April or earlier and that these proposals were included in the Budget for 2017-18 when discussed in February 2017.

Members were informed that the report would be going before Cabinet on the 29 September 2016.

Following the ensuing discussion the following points were noted:

- With regard to the Community Wardens and Parking Enforcement section of Appendix A on page 11 of the report. Members were informed that the Council was currently trialling a small pilot in the Town Centre and had been since the middle of August. It was noted that the pilot was going very well due to the parking wardens heightened presence. Members were informed that the findings of the short-term pilot would be fed into the report.
- The Strategic Director of Operations explained that one of the Councils Manifesto Commitments was to increase the number of Community Wardens but not spend more money and that the Council was therefore looking at creative ways of doing this. It

was noted that the Council was talking to the private sector to see if it could protect the Community Wardens function by enabling them to do more enforcement work.

- That Westminster Marshalls had been introduced recently and that the Strategic Director of Operations was looking forward to taking Members to speak to Westminster Council to find out the pro's and con's. The Chairman stated that the mentality of people at Westminster might not be the same as people in the Royal Borough and that he did not want it to look like a private police force.
- Councillor Story stated that any changes to the Community Wardens role would require clear benefits to be presented to the Panel. The Strategic Director of Operations stated that the procurement process was not at the final stage yet and that he would like a small task and finish group formed to look at the results of the pilot.
- Parish Councillor Margaret Lenton stated that the Council's Community Wardens were so valued by villages in the Royal Borough and that Wraysbury Parish Council was very anxious to see these roles maintained.
- That this report would come back to Cabinet later this year with more data.

The Panel made the following comments to Cabinet:

- The Panel agreed that the report should come back before the Panel.
- The Panel stated that the Community Wardens were very valued by the Council.
- The Panel suggested that the pilot be extended to other areas in the Royal Borough.

The Crime & Disorder Overview & Scrutiny Panel unanimously agreed to recommend to Cabinet the concept of the following:

- (i) **Agree the savings listed in Appendix A for submission to Council in the 2017-18 budgets subject to approval of any subsequent reports on individual schemes.**
- (ii) **Authorises Strategic Directors in agreement with Lead Members to implement savings proposals.**

The meeting, which began at 6.15 pm, finished at 7.50 pm

CHAIRMAN.....

DATE.....

This page is intentionally left blank

CRIME & DISORDER OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY PANEL

THURSDAY, 6 OCTOBER 2016

PRESENT: Councillors Derek Sharp (Chairman), John Bowden (Vice-Chairman), Hari Sharma, John Story and Simon Werner

Also in attendance: Chief Constable Habgood (Thames Valley Police), Superintendent Rai (Thames Valley Police), Councillor Colin Rayner and Parish Councillor Spike Humphrey (Sunninghill & Ascot Parish Council).

Officers: Tanya Leftwich and Craig Miller

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Hashim Bhatti.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

The Chairman announced that the meeting was being recorded and that the audio would be available shortly on the RBWM website.

ANNUAL PRESENTATION BY THE CHIEF CONSTABLE

The Chairman welcomed the new Chief Constable, Francis Habgood, and Superintendent Bhupinder Rai to the meeting and invited the Chief Constable to address the meeting.

The meeting commenced with a presentation to the Panel by the Chief Constable Francis Habgood. The Chief Constable started by showing Members a three minute presentation on what had happened locally over the past few years.

The Chief Constable explained that over the last few months the Thames Valley Police had launched it's commitment which was 'Working together to make our communities safer' by working with partners and the public to build community resilience. Members were informed that the Thames Valley Police would transform and innovate to meet policing needs now and in the future. It was noted that the four strands to the Thames Valley Police's commitment was:

- ❖ An emergency service that keeps people safe and brings offenders to justice.
- ❖ Working together to build stronger, more resilient communities.
- ❖ A modern police force that meets the needs of our communities.
- ❖ A skilled and trusted workforce.

It was noted that the Thames Valley Police's commitment could be found on their website.

The Chief Constable showed Members a graph which showed the crime levels for Violence Against the Person and Burglary Dwelling in comparison to All Other Offences from 01/10/15 to 30/03/16. It was noted that Violence Against the Person

had increased year on year as predicted due to a number of reasons. It was noted that the increase could be due to a recalibration of the lower level crimes that now get put on the Thames Valley Police system, that certain cases of violence that would have originally been disclosed and dealt with at case conferences were now being recorded on the Thames Valley Police system and because the Thames Valley Police had been encouraging people to come forward and report domestic abuse, something that was previously underreported (first time reporting). Members were informed that burglary in the Royal Borough had gone down to a very low base but that there were still cases of cross boarder offenders coming in via the M4 corridor. The Chief Constable explained that it was therefore important that the Thames Valley Police shared information.

The Chief Constable outlined the Priorities for 2016/17 - Operational which were as follows:

- ❖ To cut crimes that were of most concern
 - burglaries, violence, rural crime, serious and organised crime.
- ❖ To protect vulnerable people
 - repeat victimisation of domestic abuse, response to hate crime, CSE, FGM, HBA, FM. It was noted that it was National Hate Crime Awareness Week starting on Saturday.
- ❖ To bring offenders to justice
 - quality of files.
- ❖ To reduce repeat demand.

The Chief Constable informed Members that the Thames Valley Police needed to both support victims and also prosecute offenders. It was noted that the Thames Valley Police had just gone through an assessment process and found that drug issues (dealers) from large cities were setting up homes in local boroughs to sell drugs from. The Chief Constable stated that he believed it was likely that drugs would appear in the next Police Crime Commissioner's plan.

The Chief Constable explained that over the last six months in the Royal Borough the Thames Valley Police had concentrated on twenty DARIM (Domestic Abuse Repeat Incident Management) cases and as a result had seen a big reduction in the numbers of incidents or no incidents at all. It was noted that the high risk cases went through MARAC (Multi Agency Risk Assessment Conferences).

Members were informed that the Fun Food Kitchen, which was a mobile kitchen used to engage with local communities, had been really effective and had been recognised with some National Awards.

It was noted that the High Demand and Chaotic Lifestyle Panel looked at what interventions the Thames Valley Police could put in place to break cycles and reduce demand.

The Chief Constable explained that a safer night-time economy was primarily aimed at Windsor with regard to dealing with night-time violence issues. Members were informed that very intoxicated people were breathalysed and refused entry into clubs if found to be too intoxicated. The Chief Constable explained that this helped change people behaviour and discouraged 'pre-loading'.

(Full copies of the Chief Constable's presentation are available on request – please contact Tanya Leftwich in Democratic Services).

The Chief Constable responded to a number of questions which had been submitted in advance of the meeting from Members:

Councillor Hari Sharma asked the Chief Constable the following question: 'Very recently in the media it's noted that financial scams (Internet, phone and at door) has increased by 50% from last year (January to June 2016). Can I ask the Chief Constable what extra action he is taking to protect residents in the borough? How many residents in the borough have been a victim of this crime?' The Chief Constable responded by answering that some activity had been done across the force and also locally. It was noted that work had been done to help people protect themselves against cyber crime and scams to help raise awareness levels. In terms some of the other types of financial scams there had also been some activity undertaken by the Thames Valley Police including numerous talks and by sending out the Thames Valley Alerts.

Superintendent Rai added that the Thames Valley Police worked well with banks in the Royal Borough to help bust scams. Superintendent Rai thanked Councillor John Bowden for being very engaged in getting the message out at local meetings about preventative measures that can be put in place.

Councillor Hari Sharma asked the Chief Constable a supplementary question which was that although the Chief Constable did not have any figures available regarding victims of crime could he explain how many arrests had been made? The Chief Constable stated that it would depend on what information they could access but that he would see what they could find and arrange for the figures to be brought back to a future meeting. The Chief Constable confirmed that vulnerable people would receive urgent responses from the Thames Valley Police as they were a top priority. The Head of Community Protection & Enforcement added that the Council worked very closely with the Thames Valley Police dealing with anti-social behaviour and crime.

Councillor Simon Werner thanked the Chief Constable for the action taken to deal with the problems with Anti-Social Behaviour in the Thicket. Members were informed that six areas had been identified and that all but one was easily seen by the public. It was noted that the peak period was at lunchtimes when children were using the area. It was requested that action be taken from next July to deal with the problem again. Superintendent Rai responded by answering that she understood the seasonal trend happened every year and explained that the Thames Valley Police had since set up an on-going seasonal calendar to ensure the area was made as safe as possible in future.

Councillor Simon Werner added a supplementary question regarding the websites that advertised the Thicket as being the place to go and asked whether it would be possible for the Thames Valley Police to remove these sites or add a message to say the Thames Valley Police were dealing with the issues already mentioned. Superintendent Rai responded by stating that the websites were not advertising the area so the Thames Valley Police were limited in what they could do but would do some work to make people aware that the Thames Valley Police would be doing seasonal work in the area which would hopefully work as a deterrent.

Councillor Colin Rayner asked the Chief Constable the following questions:

'1. How important is RBWM Council's Community Wardens in fighting crime and reducing incidents of Anti Social Behaviour in the Royal Borough?

2. How important is RBWM Council's CCTV operators and CCTV control room cameras in fighting crime and reducing incidents of Anti Social Behaviour in the Royal Borough?

3. How many arrests have been made after the use of RBWM Council's CCTV footage in the last five years?

4. Is there anything RBWM Council's could do improve our CCTV service to the Thames Valley police that would lead more arrest and fur reduction in crime?'

The Chief Constable responded by answering by explaining that the first question had already been covered earlier in the meeting by way of what was happening on a local level. The Chief Constable stated that in his opinion the RBWM Council's Community Wardens were very important in helping fight crime and in reducing incidents of Anti Social Behaviour in the Royal Borough. Superintendent Rai added that there were certain areas / actions the Community Wardens dealt with that were key to the Thames Valley Police. Councillor Colin Rayner asked whether if the RBWM Council's Community Wardens were no longer available would it result in an increase in crime in the Borough? Superintendent Rai stated that whilst she could not answer that question but that as it stood she felt the Community Wardens dealt with a lot of crime and disorder prevention work which would have to fall elsewhere if they were no longer available.

The Chief Constable responded to Councillor Colin Rayner's second, third and fourth questions by explaining that he felt there were three benefits to having CCTV in place – the environment, community safety and the benefits post the event. Members were informed that one of the challenges of CCTV was that they were set up in a time where in there was quite a lot of money invested by central government but that technology had moved on quite quickly and needed updating to a digital system. It was noted that monitoring could be done in different way by having fewer hubs, that they could be more mobile and by CCTV being made to be more intelligent. The Chief Constable stated that unfortunately the Thames Valley Police did not track the number of arrests made with the direct help of CCTV as it was very difficult to do. The Chief Constable explained that there were a lot of research projects around the country that looked at the value of CCTV. Members were informed that the Chief Constable felt it would be worthwhile looking at the review undertaken that looked at the technical standard and the location of cameras.

Councillor Colin Rayner stated that Newbury had switched off some cameras that the Royal Borough had monitored and questioned what effect that had had on the policing in Newbury? The Chief Constable stated that whilst it was still early days the Thames Valley Police had not noticed seen an increase in violent crime. Members were informed that the CCTV cameras were still in place an could therefore be acting as a deterrent. It was noted that approximately twelve CCTV cameras were to be switched back on but would be monitored going forward by a business community network. The Chief Constable stated that the Thames Valley Police and the Council would collectively to think very carefully before considering switching off all the CCTV camera in the Royal Borough as it would have a significant impact at times on crime. Councillor Colin Rayner asked whether the Thames Valley Police would be happy for the Parish Council to monitor the CCTV cameras for example in Wraysbury if the service / funding was no longer offered by the Council? The Chief Constable stated that he would not object to that type of proposal as it would be the same service being delivered at the end of the day. Councillor John Bowden asked the Chief Constable to confirm that the CCTV would not be removed from outside the Castle in Windsor as it

would have a significant effect / security issue with events such as State Visits, changing of the guard, etc. The Chief Constable answered by stating that this was a clear example of where priorities could be made by ensuring this was a camera that was retained.

Cllr Werner stated his concern about the possibility of splitting the monitoring of car parks and whilst this was more of a Council issue, wondered how Members / officers felt about it. The Head of Community Protection & Enforcement explained that some of the CCTV cameras in the RBWM were already digital, some were still analogue. It was noted that the Council was currently reviewing all options for CCTV monitoring. Members were informed that the Council was looking at how the cameras were configured as the technology had been installed twenty years ago. It was noted that the Head of Community Protection & Enforcement felt there were opportunities to utilise technology as per the needs of the Borough. The Chairman stated that he felt the CCTV cameras were an asset to the Borough but agreed that they did need to be reviewed, but not necessarily reduced.

Councillor Colin Rayner asked whether body worn cameras had seen an affect of the number of arrests made and had encouraged better behaved criminals? The Chief Constable explained that the Thames Valley Police currently had approximately 300 body cameras in use and were looking to roll out more cameras over the next few months so every officer could have access to a body worn camera. It was noted that these cameras were felt to be great in dealing with crime and very helpful in domestic abuse cases as they helped record injuries and provided powerful images. Councillor Hari Sharma questioned whether more body worn cameras would put additional pressure on officers. The Chief Constable stated that he did not believe that to be the case and re-iterated that he felt body worn cameras definitely helped in the fight against crime. Superintendent Rai added that a common complaint from officers was that there were not enough body worn cameras available to use.

Councillor John Story asked the Chief Constable to clarify whether he had heard correctly from the short video at the start of the meeting that 20% of police time was spent on crime. The Chief Constable explained that of the number of incidents reported to the Police 20% related to crime which was also consistent nationally (20-25% across the board).

Councillor John Story asked the Chief Constable whether the public would notice any differences regarding the cost savings the Thames Valley Police were required to make. The Chief Constable explained that the Thames Valley Police would provide the same services but in cheaper, more cost effective ways but that he had been really pleased with the budget settlement from the Government. It was noted that whilst changes would still need to be made he hoped savings could be made in the long-term from investments.

The Chairman read out a question Councillor MJ Saunders who had been unable to attend the meeting had submitted in writing to the Chief Constable which was as follows:

‘Please can you describe the process for assessing the mental health of those taken into custody and, without disclosing any confidential information, please can you summarise how a recent custodian with mental health challenges was most effectively accommodated and how one was least effectively accommodated?’ The Chief Constable responded by answering that when a call was received and mental health concerns were noted people could be detained for their own safety. It was noted that

if there was no place of safety available then people suffering from mental health issues could be detained by the Police. Members were informed that when it was noted that offenders were suffering from mental health issues they would be detained in custody until a place of safety was available and that this did happen not only for the safety of the person in question but also for the general public's safety. It was noted that the 'triage system' in this area was very good.

The Chairman read out a question Councillor David Hilton who had been unable to attend the meeting had submitted in writing to the Chief Constable which was as follows:

'Statistics indicate that crime is falling and I am sure that dwelling burglary for, instance is, however, crime via the internet must be growing. I understand that the National Cyber crime unit deals with these crimes but do not report crime levels by areas. Will this change and when?' The Chief Constable responded by answering that Councillor Hilton was correct that crimes were not recorded locally although he could confirm that the number of cases had increased. It was noted that the term 'cyber crime' covered a wide range of offences. The Chief Constable informed Members that offences were reported into 'action fraud' and collated to see if an originator could be targeted.

Councillor Simon Werner asked what the Thames Valley Police saw the future of NAGs. The Chief Constable responded by explaining that the Thames Valley Police had undertaken a big review of neighbourhood policing and it had come out that a key element was engagement. It was noted that there was no point in running Forums that people did no longer want to attend but that existing structures / Forums might be in place. Members were informed that social media was now used to get community views but that the Royal Borough needed something, not necessarily geographically based that would work for everyone. Superintendent Rai added that locally she felt NAG groups to be very self-sufficient and that the Thames Valley Police worked with them rather than by leading them. It was noted that it was very much about building community resilience from within. Members were informed that Superintendent Rai always encouraged neighbourhood officers to support and give advice to NAGs.

Councillor Colin Rayner explained that there were a number of complaints about motorbikes and quad bike riders using the public highways not wearing crash helmets particularly on Saturday and Sunday afternoons in Wraysbury which he had been asked to raise at this meeting. The Chief Constable responded by stating that this was something the Thames Valley Police could pick up and deal with appropriately.

Councillor Hari Sharma asked the Chief Constable a supplementary question which was whether there was any cause of concern regarding FGM, forced marriage, CSC and honour based abuse in the Royal Borough. Superintendent Rai responded by explaining that she believed there was a level of underreporting not just in the Royal Borough but on a national level. It was noted that the Thames Valley Police were embarking on a partnership plan to better understand these incidents. Superintendent Rai stated that she was satisfied that there was no massive concern around CSC locally but that we should not be complacent. It was noted that Superintendent Rai believed it all started with safeguarding initiatives and then prosecutions at a later stage.

The Chairman thanked the Chief Constable and Superintendent Rai for an excellent presentation, for attending the Panel and answering all the questions asked, which Members echoed.

DATE OF FUTURE MEETINGS

The Chairman informed Members that the dates of the next meetings were as follows (19:00 start):

- Monday 14 November 2016.
- Monday 30 January 2017.
- Thursday 20 April 2017.

The meeting, which began at 6.00 pm, finished at 7.25 pm

CHAIRMAN.....

DATE.....

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 6

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank