

THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

9 December 2013

Attendance:

Councillors:

Pines (Chairman) (P)

Byrnes (P)
Cook (P)
Evans (P)
Gemmell (P)
Learney (P)

Power (P)
Sanders (P)
Scott (P)
Stallard (P)
Wright (P)

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillors Godfrey (Portfolio Holder for Finance and Organisational Development) and Warwick (Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhoods and Environment) and Councillors Gottlieb and Tait.

1. **DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS**

Councillor Stallard declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in respect of Report OS89 due to her role as a Hampshire County Councillor. However, as there was no material conflict of interest regarding the item, she remained in the room and spoke and voted under the dispensation granted by the Monitoring Officer on behalf of the Standards Committee.

Councillor Byrnes declared a personal but not prejudicial interest in respect of Report OS87 as he was an employee of the Ministry of Justice and he remained in the room and spoke and voted.

2. **CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman advised that the Joint Environmental Services Contract Scrutiny Committee had recently held its first meeting and its minutes and reports would be available on the Council's website in due course.

3. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Committee held on 28 October 2013, be approved and adopted.

4. **COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP – PERFORMANCE UPDATE**
(Report OS87 refers)

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting representatives of the Community Safety Partnership (CSP), including its Chairman - Robert Heathcock (Assistant Director – Neighbourhoods and Environment, Winchester City Council) and also Robin Jarman, Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner (Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner).

Following an introduction by Councillor Warwick, the representatives gave a detailed presentation to the Committee.

In summary, the following points were raised during the presentation.

- As a 'responsible authority', the Council has a statutory duty to have regard to any impact on crime and disorder from the services that it delivers and the Council's Community Safety Team provides support to teams across the Council in discharging this role.
- Mr Heathcock advised that as funding streams continued to change, the Community Safety Partnership (CSP) was likely to receive funding using a commissioning approach for the delivery of its priorities.
- Sgt Richard Holland (Hampshire Constabulary) reiterated the importance of the partnership supporting the police in tackling crime and disorder issues. He provided statistical evidence that indicated continued improvements to this area.
- Robin Jarman explained his role in supporting the work of the Police and Crime Commissioner in delivering a number of priority areas to reduce crime.
- Sandra Tuddenham (Head of Community Safety and Neighbourhood Services), Richard Hein (Head of Parking) and Steve Tong (Housing Options and Support Manager) explained how the Council undertook a joined-up and complementary approach to supporting homeless and rough-sleepers. This included sign posting clients to relevant support services provided by other partners of the CSP and to help target response.
- Chris Mitchell (Offender Management Director, Hampshire Probation Trust) reported on the successes of Integrated Offender Management which was delivered by partners of the CSP.
- Ann Craig detailed the work of the Winchester Domestic Violence and Abuse Forum and Sgt Holland reiterated the Police's zero tolerance approach to instances of domestic violence and that constabulary worked closely with partners to signpost support networks. Mr Jarman was also supportive of this work in providing victims with the confidence to come forward with complaints and trust in the police to have the capacity to deal with the issue. He also advised that further thought would need to be given as to how the police could utilise appropriate measures of statistical

evidence in continuing to successfully tackle this crime and targeting support for victims. Continued partnership working helped deliver a positive approach to the issue.

During subsequent discussion of the presentation, members of the Committee asked a number of detailed questions of the representatives.

- Mr Mitchell explained that the probation service had close links with appropriate agencies to deal with the high percentage of clients in custody with mental health issues; however this remained a challenging issue.
- Mr Tong advised that circumstances surrounding the rehousing by the Council of clients escaping domestic abuse varied depending upon how much was known about the client's circumstances, and so the Council was looking to achieve a consistent approach for the 'flagging up' of such tenants.
- Mrs Tuddenham explained that the CSP's approach to homelessness was based around the individual – for example, enforcement against rough sleeping would not take place without a coordinated approach to sign post necessary support to the client. Sgt Holland also drew attention that regular deployment of officer resources would be necessary should a zero tolerance stance be taken – which was not the best use of police time.
- Mrs Tuddenham explained that intensive training of Street Pastors was delivered by partner agencies. She also reported on the CSP's work undertaken to date with regard to issues of noise complaints associated with the student population in the Stanmore area.
- Various agencies were in place to deal with referrals of offenders with multiple support needs. These included the Health and Wellbeing Board, Anti-Social Behaviour Panel and the Supporting Troubled Families initiative. Proactive work was also undertaken with young people to help stop low level crimes escalating towards more serious crimes.
- Mr Jarman suggested that the police would generally achieve all targets set with regard to the reduction of crime. However, in many cases, increased police activity would not necessarily address the particular causes - for example, domestic violence. Therefore police resources were likely to be better deployed to work with the CSP in delivering preventative and rehabilitative initiatives. With regard to PACT meetings (Police and Communities Together), Mr Jarman recognised the existing fragmented approach to how these were delivered but suggested that they should be utilised consistently in setting police priorities for residents.
- A Member reported that, in the rural area that she represented, PACT meetings were well attended and should receive more publicity so to encourage residents to interact with local police representatives.

- Mr Mitchell explained that the government's new approach towards the commissioning of probation services was intended to open up the market for support and supervision services – including the third sector.
- Mr Heathcock referred to the commissioning approach in general with regard to the CSP and he suggested that for this to be most effective, it should be made as simple as possible with minimal bureaucracy. Grant funding to the CSP had significantly reduced over time and he suggested that some funding should remain as it was necessary to support schemes where a matched funding approach was required. He also asked that the committee consider whether some Winchester City Council core funding to support the work of the partnership was warranted. The Chief Executive drew attention to the Committee that the majority of funding to the CSP had previously been from government. This funding had now been restructured and redirected towards the County Council, the police and the Crime Commissioner, who were collectively responsible to allocate. The Council was able to apportion some support from the General Fund and continued to do so.
- Sgt Holland explained how the police were investigating possible improvements to the 101 service. This may include utilising officers in the call centre to deal with calls. This was likely to be beneficial as the complaints may then not escalate towards requiring a police response.

With permission of the Chairman, Sandie Vining (representing Hampshire Neighbourhood Watch Association), addressed the meeting. She reported that she regularly attended PACT meetings and that Neighbourhood Watch continued to have good partnership working arrangements with the police.

Also with the permission of the Chairman, Paul Williams (Winchester and Community Action – WACA), advised Members that WACA would continue to support the work of the CSP despite no longer receiving direct funding.

At conclusion of discussion, Councillor Warwick advised that the CSP was awaiting official guidance from the government as to how it could maximise the potential of the commissioning approach so it could continue to deliver its work with partner agencies. Councillor Warwick also suggested that the Committee may wish to consider establishing an Informal Scrutiny Group to consider further the effectiveness of the existing multi-agency approach to the homelessness and rough sleepers.

On behalf of the Committee, the Chairman thanked the representatives of the CSP for their presentations and for answering the Committee's questions.

RESOLVED:

That the work of the Community Safety Partnership be noted.

5. **CAPITAL PROGRAMME BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS**

(Report CAB2541 refers)

Councillor Godfrey introduced the Report and explained that it set out a profile of expenditure which would be fully assessed in due course as part of the budget preparation for 2014/15.

During discussion, Councillor Godfrey reiterated that the administration was not proposing disposal of capital assets to allow for expenditure. There was a need instead to maximise revenue from the estate to help support the capital programme. He also stated that the Leader had previously indicated that there would be no capital project at this time to replace City Offices and would instead be looking to consolidate office space in other ways.

Councillor Godfrey also answered questions on specific items with the appendices.

At conclusion of debate it was noted that it was suggested that it would be difficult to make any decisions on the capital programme without seeing further evidence of the revenue implications.

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted

6. **REPORT BACK ON PROGRESS IN IMPLEMENTING THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PROJECT INTEGRA AND RECYCLING INFORMAL SCRUTINY GROUP**

(Report OS88 refers)

Councillor Warwick introduced the Report and drew particular attention to the actions within the Joint Services Waste to Resources Action Plan 2012-15 as included as appendix 2 to the Report. This set out campaigns to improve the District's recycling rates, including initiatives to reduce contamination rates.

The Assistant Director (Neighbourhoods and Environment) explained that although popular with residents in those districts where it had been rolled out, there were no plans for there to be kerbside glass recycling in Winchester. This was because it was prohibitively expensive and there was also already an extensive 'bring site' network across the District. Evidence had shown that it would also generate minimal increases to glass recycling rates overall (around 2%). He also explained that proposals to supplement existing textile recycling initiatives would be publicised across the District.

RESOLVED:

That the progress made in implementing the recommendations of the Project Integra and Recycling Informal Scrutiny Group be noted.

7. **UPDATE ON PROGRESS IN IMPLEMENTING THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE INFORMAL SCRUTINY GROUP ON AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT**
(Report OS89 refers)

The Assistant Director (Neighbourhoods and Environment) advised that it was recognised that the impact on air quality from heavy traffic and congestion in Winchester town centre was exacerbated by lorries unloading in St Georges Street at peak times. The Council would work closely with the Winchester BID to resolve this issue.

RESOLVED:

That progress to date in implementing the recommendations of the Informal Scrutiny Group on Air Quality be noted.

8. **TO NOTE THE SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME (REPORT OS71 REFERS) AND JANUARY 2014 FORWARD PLAN AND COMMENT ON ANY ITEMS FOR FUTURE CONSIDERATIONS**

RESOLVED:

That the Scrutiny Work Programme and Forward Plan for January 2014 be noted

9. **EXEMPT BUSINESS**

RESOLVED:

1. That in all the circumstances, the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

2. That the public be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of the following items of business because it is likely that, if members of the public were present, there would be disclosure to them of 'exempt information' as defined by Section 100I and Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972.

<u>Minute Number</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Description of Exempt Information</u>
##	Estates Restructure) Information relating to the) financial or business affairs of) any particular person (including) the authority holding that) information). (Para 3 to) Schedule 12A refers).

10. **ESTATES RESTRUCTURE**
(Report PER241 refers)

The Committee considered a Report that set out proposals to restructure the Council's Estate's Team (detail in exempt minute).

The meeting commenced at 6.30pm and concluded at 9.15pm.