

Runnymede Borough Council

CRIME AND DISORDER COMMITTEE

7 July 2016 at 7.30.p.m.

Members of the

Committee present: Councillors H A Butterfield (Chairman), P B Tuley (Vice-Chairman), I A Chaudhri, Miss D Khalique, D J Knight, M J Maddox, A P Tollett and J J Wilson.

Members of the

Committee absent: Councillor Mrs E Gill

133 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Mrs Gill

134 FIRE PRECAUTIONS

The Chairman read out the Fire Precautions.

135 MINUTES AND VERBAL UPDATE BY RUNNYMEDE POLICE INSPECTOR ON POLICING IN RESPECT OF FOXHILLS CLUB AND RESORT

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 12 April 2016 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

At its last meeting, as recorded in the Minutes, the Committee had been informed by the Surrey Police Borough Inspector for Runnymede, Nick Pinkerton, of the action being taken by the police in response to a series of criminal incidents which had taken place at the Foxhills Club and Resort in Ottershaw over the last eighteen months. The Committee had asked for an update at a future meeting and Inspector Pinkerton provided a verbal update to the Committee.

Inspector Pinkerton had spoken several times with Mr Jason Adams, the General Manager of Foxhills Club and Resort, to consider the security of Foxhills and how Foxhills and Surrey Police could work together to deter crime and to tackle anti-social behaviour. They had discussed the possibility of linking Foxhills CCTV system with Safer Runnymede and Inspector Pinkerton had clarified the legitimate business reasons why CCTV security monitoring could be lawful and justified with reference to the Information Commissioner's Office (ICO) Employment Practices Code.

Mr Adams had detailed proposed improvements to Foxhills security including a face recognition entry system and a panic alarm in the spa. If unauthorised persons attempted to force their way into Foxhills premises or threatened staff, then Foxhills had been advised that they should make an immediate 999 call to police. In terms of general and routine communication (i.e. not a request for the police 999 service), then Foxhills would use the Runnymede Safer Neighbourhood Team (SNT) email mailbox as this was centrally monitored. The Committee was pleased to note that a single point of contact had been established for day to day communication between the Police and the Club as this was an action which had been referred to at the Committee's meeting on 12 April 2016. Inspector Pinkerton had also reviewed the dissemination of information for the benefit of local golf clubs. This had included providing timely information about attacks on golf clubs, including any details of perpetrators and vehicles and methods used.

Inspector Pinkerton had also included Foxhills as part of the local police teams' patrol plans and the Police Neighbourhood Specialist Officer and Police Community Support Officers were making discretionary visits. These discretionary patrols were appreciated by Mr Adams' staff who were getting to know members of Inspector Pinkerton's team. Inspector Pinkerton had also offered liaison with Foxhills marketing department to agree forms or words and images to show the partnership between the Club and the Police in action which would be aimed at deterring criminals and reassuring Foxhills clients.

Further work was ongoing with Surrey Police's Community Safety Team and Crime Prevention Officer. Crime prevention survey visits had taken place on 15 and 29 April 2016 and 34 recommendations had been made for discussion. The Committee noted the details of three incidents affecting Foxhills which had been logged on Surrey Police's crime recording system since 12 April, 2016.

An information marker had been added to Foxhills to provide context for calls for police assistance. The police assessed the type of response required to any incident using THRIVE (Threat, Harm, Risk, Investigative, Vulnerability, Engagement) principles and allocated resources to where they were needed most. This meant protecting people made vulnerable due to offences committed against them and the pro-active targeting of serious, harmful and persistent offenders. If the nature of an incident did not meet the immediate police deployment threshold, but there had been unpleasant but not unlawful activity, it was followed up by police. If the position deteriorated, there was a clear escalation process to ensure the appropriate dispatch of police resources.

Inspector Pinkerton had also been in correspondence with Mr Chris Norman, the Surrey County Councillor for Chertsey Town, who had attended the Committee's meeting on 12 April 2016 as a member of the public. County Councillor Norman had queried whether the staff who answered calls from the public were Police or civilian staff. The Committee noted the reply given to County Councillor Norman which was that the initial grading of in-coming calls (101 and 999) was carried out by civilian operators at the Surrey Police Contact Centre at Mount Browne. These operators were trained for this role. They were supported by their civilian supervisors and could consult police officers who could assist in making decisions on more difficult/complex incidents. The grading of incidents could also be amended by the Force Control Room which was managed by an experienced police Inspector and was responsible for the deployment of officers and units.

Partnership work on crime reduction, discretionary patrol visits and the sharing of information would continue. Any incidents occurring at Foxhills would be reviewed as part of the police's wider analysis of crimes and trends. The police would continue to engage confidently with Foxhills, as with all of its partners, to provide an effective policing service. Surrey Police officers and staff were professional, motivated and took responsibility for their actions.

The Committee thanked Inspector Pinkerton for the professional approach which he and his officers had taken in responding to criminal incidents at Foxhills and providing advice on crime prevention. The Chairman reported that Mr Adams was unable to be present at the meeting. However, Mr Adams had asked for his thanks to be conveyed for the police's work.

136 SAFER RUNNYMEDE AND COMMUNITY SAFETY ANNUAL REPORT 2015/16

The Committee noted the Safer Runnymede and Community Safety Annual Report 2015/16. The report documented all aspects of the work performed by the Community Safety Team and the operators in the Safer Runnymede Care and Control Centre and provided information for The Community Safety Partnership (CSP) (the statutory partnership under The Crime and Disorder Act 1997) and the Crime and Disorder

Committee of Runnymede Borough Council which overviewed and scrutinised community safety matters in the borough.

Community Safety

The CSP had four main areas of activity - addressing problems caused by identifiable individuals, {a multi-agency group called the Community Incident Action Group (CIAG) considered these issues}, addressing problems which occurred at identified locations, {a multi-agency group called the Joint Action Group (JAG) dealt with this area of work}, support for ongoing projects/diversionary activities and support for new projects which were likely to benefit community cohesion.

In 2015/16 the CSP had received £3,337 from the Surrey County Council Local Committee for Runnymede (also known as the Local Area Committee) for local community safety work. This funding had been used to produce the Community Safety Plan booklets for the public and had contributed to Domestic Abuse Awareness week in October 2015, the Junior Citizen Scheme (JC) in November 2015, the purchase of 24 hour segment timers (targeting domestic burglary), fly-tipping signs and crime prevention items. It was suggested that there might be an assessment of the effectiveness of the expenditure on the booklets and consideration of whether resources might be deployed on other initiatives. The Police and Crime Commissioner's Office (PCCO) had provided £6,000 towards the Junior Citizen Scheme and £3,000 for a fly-tipping initiative which had allowed six mobile cameras and accessories to be purchased.

The Home Office had allocated £10,000 to each local authority in Surrey to support the Prevent (Counter Terrorism) agenda. In Surrey the local authorities had agreed to 'pool' their Prevent funding and the pooling arrangements had been coordinated by the County Council. This pooled funding had resulted in a Workshop to Raise Awareness of Prevent (WRAP) and information sharing which would benefit over 600 staff across the County, training for 700 frontline Surrey Fire and Rescue staff and for senior management and a part time, fixed term contract, Prevent Officer to coordinate counter terrorism across the county and to establish the public's perception of radicalisation in order to inform future messages to the public on counter terrorism. This funding had also facilitated briefings for local authority Members across Surrey on counter terrorism and had funded the "Channel process" which was a county wide multi-agency panel which aimed to prevent individuals identified as vulnerable from being drawn into violent extremism or terrorist activity. Where an individual was considered to be vulnerable in this way, they were described as a "channel case". There had been no identified "channel cases" in Runnymede for 2015/16.

Three Runnymede Emergency Planning Officers had received 'train the trainer' WRAP training and were now Home Office accredited. 13 schools in Runnymede had had WRAP training from the police for teachers and students. Runnymede Borough Council were currently looking at training packages for staff covering Safeguarding, Prevent and Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE).

Domestic Abuse had been highlighted as a CSP priority for 2015/16 focusing on increasing the number of reports and increasing detection rates and raising awareness. There had been an increase of 65 reported incidents of domestic abuse made to the Police which suggested that the public were becoming more confident in coming forward. However there had been a decrease in detection rates. Domestic Awareness Week had taken place in October 2015, which was a county-wide event. The theme was 'Love shouldn't hurt.' Activities were held throughout the week including outreach work.

Surrey County Council's Children's Safeguarding Board was the lead agency for CSE across the Boroughs. The role of the CSP was to offer a multi-agency response and support the Missing and Exploited Children's Conference (MAECC) /Oversight Group in training professionals and tackling and preventing CSE within Runnymede. The CSP had

highlighted CSE as one of its five key priorities for 2016/17. The other four CSP priorities for 2016/17 were Crime and Anti-Social Behaviour, Domestic Burglary, Domestic Abuse and the Prevent (Counter Terrorism) Strategy.

Annually, Runnymede Borough Council in partnership with Surrey Police invited each school in the borough to take part in the Junior Citizen Scheme which had been held in November 2015 at Thorpe Park, Chertsey, which had been provided free of charge. Over 600 students from 16 schools had attended the scheme and had engaged in simulated real life scenarios, learnt essential life skills about health and safety and how to keep safe online and offline. Awareness of danger had been a key priority, e.g. avoiding online grooming. Positive feedback had been received on the scheme. In February 2016 the annual Crime Summit had been held in Runnymede at Chertsey Hall, which had been organised by the PCCO. Although fewer numbers had attended the Summit this year (the poor weather at the time might have been a factor), positive feedback had been received from residents.

The Committee noted the statistics for 2015/16 in the five priority areas for the CSP in 2015/16 which were domestic burglary, violence with injury, domestic abuse, serious sexual offences, number of deliberate fires and anti-social behaviour. For violence with injury, serious sexual offences and domestic burglary, there had been an increase in reported incidents in 2015/16 when compared to last year's figures. However, it was noted that changes in Home Office counting rules had resulted in increased crime recording. Crimes that formed part of another offence were now separately recorded, crime finalisation rules had changed and more historic crimes were being recorded. Furthermore, Runnymede had had an exceptionally low level of crimes recorded for 2014/15. The total number of incidents for deliberate fires had remained the same as for 2014/15.

The other target priority area for the CSP in 2015/16 was anti-social behaviour (ASB). In Runnymede there was an online reporting system available on the Council website for ASB. Reports were automatically forwarded to the relevant departments or emergency service to be addressed. This system had been reviewed by the Council's Communications Team, streamlining reporting options. This service had also been publicised on the Council webpage and to Neighbourhood Watch residents encouraging use of the system. The local Police in conjunction with Runnymede Borough Council, had held two Facebook panels during 2015/16 which had been well received by residents. This approach offered an alternative platform and reached a larger audience giving them an opportunity to ask questions about crime and ASB. The number of reported ASB incidents to Runnymede Borough Council had dropped over the last year which met the CSP aim. There had been an increase in the percentage of reports received electronically (13.4% in 2015/16 compared to 7.3% in 2014/15) and it was hoped that initiatives such as the Facebook panels referred to above would encourage more people to report incidents online in future.

The Committee considered that it was difficult to assess the CSP's performance in relation to the statistics presented for the SCP's five priority areas for 2015/16, without comparison with other Surrey districts' performance. It was agreed therefore that Officers would circulate to Members of the Committee comparison with other Surrey districts for the CSP statistics and would make such a comparison for future CSP statistical reports. Officers were also asked to consider whether in future there could be a target for reducing online anti-social behaviour.

CIAG had monitored seven individuals during the year. Three Criminal Behaviour Orders, one ASB Injunction obtained by the police, one ASB Injunction obtained by Runnymede's Housing Department and one Community Protection Notice (CPN) Warning Letter had been issued during 2015/16. At the end of the year there were only two areas being monitored by JAG. The JAG members had agreed at the November 2015 meeting that because of decreasing referrals meetings would not take place on a monthly basis and would be held if

necessary. JAG issues would be reviewed by Inspector Nick Pinkerton and the Council's Community Safety Officer on a six weekly basis.

The CSP had identified tackling environmental ASB (and fly tipping in particular) as one of its priorities for 2015/16. The CSP, through a partnership lead by Environmental Health and the Police, sought to tackle the problem of fly tipping on three fronts namely prevention, education and enforcement. Subsequently it had applied for and received grant support of £3,000 from the PCCO for the purchase of 6 mobile CCTV cameras and associated ancillaries to assist in the prevention and enforcement strands of the project. The CSP had contributed approximately £1,700 to cover the costs of the design and purchase of a variety of 'CCTV in operation' signage boards for deployment with the CCTV cameras, and design and purchase of general 'No fly tipping semi-permanent signage' for deployment in public areas (these also publicised the Council's dedicated telephone hot line established as part of this project). These signs made it clear to the public that their vehicle would be confiscated and crushed if they took part in fly tipping.

The reported fly-tipping figures for 2015/16 when compared to 2014/15 showed a small increase of nine incidents for the year. This was a relatively small increase when compared to the reporting period between 2013/14 and 2014/15 where there had been an increase of 150 reported incidents. Surrey County Council had also recognised that fly-tipping was a concern across Surrey and were in the process of formalising a fly-tipping strategy for the county. Once the county document had been completed the CSP would support the strategy through activities conducted within Runnymede.

It was agreed that Officers would circulate to the Committee further details of the extent of the reduction in the increase of fly-tipping incidents and an example fly-tipping public warning sign. Officers were also asked to seek to remove an abandoned caravan on St. Peter's Way. It was noted that the fly-tipping signs were semi-permanent as they moved around with the 6 mobile anti-flytipping CCTV cameras. It was suggested that the PCCO contribution of £3,000 could have helped to fund more than six cameras but it was noted that these six mobile cameras were expensive and were not part of the main Safer Runnymede camera network (i.e. they were stand-alone). It was noted that the trees in the vicinity of the Murray Road car park would be trimmed so that a better view of unauthorised activity, such as fly-tipping, could be obtained.

Safer Runnymede

The Safer Runnymede Control Room and Telecare Service Centre had now been in operation for 19 years. The state-of-the-art CCTV system continued to operate to the high standard envisaged in its original specification, with ongoing technical upgrades incorporated into the running costs. The system design architecture enabled the Council to retain CCTV images from each camera for a period of 31 days. Incidents were reviewed, archived and burnt to disk for Police and Council Officers as required. The quality in picture display, camera operation and picture retrieval was commensurate with industry standards and was employed to the fullest extent allowed.

Safer Runnymede (SR) had received visits from, and assisted with, other local authorities throughout the Country in their plans to follow Runnymede's lead in technology and operational methodology. SR operated in compliance with the National Strategy for Public Space CCTV and had recently been awarded accreditation to the new Surveillance Camera Commissioner's Code of Practice. SR's unique operational environment was shared with the Surrey Police. The co-sharing arrangement had led to continued partnership working. The system architecture provided dual access to both Council and Police cabling networks. This allowed Safer Runnymede access to both Council and Police networks/phones and radios. The team of operators were able to use the Surrey Police incident handling system to quickly access incident information in real-time. Police management had visited the control room and continued to be satisfied with all aspects of its governance.

Dedicated operators monitored cameras in Runnymede, Spelthorne, Elmbridge and Epsom and Ewell at all times. SR now also monitored two ANPR (Automatic Number Plate Recognition) systems for external partners at Esher and Wentworth. The current total of CCTV camera connections stood at 382. The unit had started with just 40 cameras to monitor. All cameras were active – dummy cameras were not used. SR held responsibility for CCTV cameras within Runnymede, in addition to many of those which were owned by Spelthorne Borough Council (39), and all of the cameras owned by Elmbridge Borough Council and Epsom & Ewell Borough Council (71). SR also provided supplementary monitoring and support to Thorpe Park and St. Peter's and Ashford Hospitals during out-of-office hours. The concentration of these CCTV assets within a single working environment had continued to be of considerable operational advantage. Incidents starting in one area were often resolved by observations in another. This wide area network of cameras was unique in Surrey and was of great benefit to local people and Surrey Police.

The cameras had been used in support of activities of the CSP in the gathering of evidence, enforcement of Anti-Social Behaviour Orders and in those areas where Section 30 dispersal powers and Designated Public Place Orders had been put in place. In the first full year of operation 1998, operators had recorded 784 incidents where cameras were used. In 2015/16, Safer Runnymede had recorded a total of 11,069 incidents. The CCTV review area was capable of providing evidential DVDs and still photographs. The centre received numerous visitors throughout the year, mainly from local police officers. On analysis, it was found that each visit might take up a minimum of 15 minutes of SR staff time. Therefore, and in order to minimise the operational impact, a revised CCTV reviewing protocol had been agreed with colleagues at Surrey Police, where Safer Runnymede staff would interrogate CCTV footage over a maximum timeframe of 15 minutes (at rapid speed). This procedure had resulted in a significant reduction of required visits by Surrey Police (and a significant cost saving to Surrey Police).

The Code of Practice permitted use of the Public Space CCTV cameras for a number of different purposes and during the year the variety had been great. There had been many searches for missing people of all ages from the very young, to the elderly or sick. It was often difficult to place a tangible result on these events but as well as possibly preventing a tragedy, and reducing emotional stress for the relatives, there were also considerable known savings to Police resources.

The system was used by a number of sections within the Council in the performance of their duties. It helped by identifying Town Centre Management problems such as rubbish, graffiti or broken street furniture and in consequence these issues were dealt with often before reports were received from the public. SR also helped other agencies, including Customs and Excise and Health and Social Care. The cameras provided evidence of many road traffic collisions and footage and stills were used in investigations. They also provided a safety and wellbeing element to residents and visitors who used Council facilities at halls, leisure centres and parks and open spaces. The Network Management Information Centre (managed by Surrey County Council Highways) continued to receive images of the Elmbridge cameras via fibre links under their original contract with Elmbridge Borough Council.

Use of the CCTV system under the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 was recorded and during the year the legislation had been used on seven occasions. The necessary authorisations were all provided by Surrey Police and authorised by a Police Superintendent. The system continued to be maintained to the highest possible standards with the criteria that the pictures must be always of evidential quality. The CCTV system was operated strictly in accordance with an agreed and published Code of Practice. This complied with the requirements of the Information Commissioner. This required complaints about misuse of cameras or invasion of privacy to be investigated and reported.

Safer Runnymede had received no complaints during 2015/16, one in 2014/15 and none in 2013/14.

The centre continued to look at opportunities to obtain new contracts and develop innovative income streams. To that end, net expenditure had reduced from £385,321 to an actual of £380,443 during 2015/16. Unfortunately, staffing costs had overrun by approximately £51,000 as a result of long-term sickness absence cover during the period with a minimum number of staff being required to monitor the cameras at all times. The level of sickness was expected to reduce during 2016/17, following initiatives taken by the Council's Human Resources Business Centre and the return to work of staff after long term sickness. The Committee commended SR's work but emphasised the need to seek new business continually in order to reduce net expenditure.

A GPS location system which was monitored by SR had been introduced to keep vulnerable people safe by monitoring any movements outside a pre-set area or as an alert from concerned support networks. A Product Service Video (GPS), had been launched which had enabled many external organisations to view SR remotely and had led to a far broader product understanding amongst Healthcare Professionals.

The Safer Runnymede Centre had been featured or was to be featured on BBC television and radio and on Channel Five and ITV television. It was anticipated that the new Police and Crime Commissioner for Surrey, David Munro, would be visiting the Centre in the near future.

Chairman

(The meeting ended at 8.22.p.m.)