

Community Safety Update – (Community Services, Katie Walker)

Synopsis of report:

This report addresses questions raised at previous committee meetings, outlines the process for implementing Public Space Protection Orders (PSPOs) and provides further information about Community Safety.

Recommendation that:

A Member of Community Services Committee be nominated to serve on the Community Safety Partnership for 2022/2023, subject to the outcome of discussions at the Community Safety Partnership and subject to the new provisions for external appointments approved by Corporate Management Committee

1. Context of report

- 1.1 A call in of the decision of Community Services Committee on 17 June 2021, regarding Public Space Protection Orders, was considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Select Committee on 8 July 2021. At the meeting, Members requested a future report to be considered by the Community Services Committee in relation to Community Safety matters.
- 1.2 This report will provide updates to action points raised at previous committee meetings including reporting options for incidents of antisocial behaviour (ASB) and crime, how Members can provide input to the Joint Action Group (JAG), Police ward boundaries and officer delegated powers in regard to Public Space Protection Orders (PSPOs).
- 1.3 This report will introduce Members to the process of implementing a PSPO and provide an insight into some of the Community Safety Partnership (CSP) based meetings.
- 1.4 This report will:
 - identify an opportunity for additional Member representation within the CSP;
 - propose the CSP is utilised to determine deployment of CCTV units; and
 - reiterate the important role Members play within consultation requests.

2. Report

- 2.1 At the meeting of Overview and Scrutiny Select Committee in July 2021, to consider a call in, additional actions were requested and will be addressed here for the benefit of all Members.

Action Point 1

- 2.2 The first action point was to bring a future report to this Committee;

“That investigates the manner in which anti-social behaviour and criminal behaviour is reported to enable it to be better informed when considering the making of Public Spaces Protection Orders (PSPO)s”.

- 2.3 Antisocial behaviour and crime can be reported via multiple routes, with the correct channel being determined by the situation presented at the time. The options, as set out below, are broken down by agency to identify which reporting methods are available.

Surrey Police

- 2.4 When reporting to Surrey Police, all emergency incidents must be reported via phone to 999.
- 2.5 Non-emergency incidents can be reported via phone on 101 or online via the online report form and live chat function on the force website or via direct (private) messaging on social media platforms.
- 2.6 Provisions are also in place for alternative reporting options for those who are deaf or hard of hearing, as well as silent solutions for those in an emergency who are unable to speak through fear of being heard.

CrimeStoppers

- 2.7 When someone wishes to report an incident but would like to remain anonymous, they can report online or via phone to CrimeStoppers. There is also a youth version of this service called Fearless

Runnymede Borough Council

- 2.8 When reporting antisocial behaviour incidents to the Council, it is recommended that this is completed through the Council website where various reporting options are provided. This is due to the responsibility of progressing complaints being shared amongst various departments such as Community Safety, Environmental Health (EH), Housing, Open Spaces and Parking.
- 2.9 For example, a report about littering would be progressed by the Depot, whereas a report about fly-tipping would be progressed by EH despite littering and fly-tipping falling under the category of ASB. Similarly, reports of noise nuisance are progressed by EH unless the source of the noise nuisance relates to a Council tenant when this would be progressed by Housing even though noise is also another category within ASB.
- 2.10 Reports can also be made via the main switchboard which will then be disseminated to the relevant department by Customer Services or via email to the relevant department's team mailbox.

Surrey Fire and Rescue (SFRS)

- 2.11 In some cases reports need to be made to SFRS and must be done via a phone call to 999.

- 2.12 Should someone wish to contact the Fire service regarding preventative initiatives linked to behaviours of ASB (such as a curiosity around fire or unhealthy obsession), this can be done online using forms on their website.

Housing Providers

- 2.13 In some cases reports need to be directed to the Housing Provider (HP). There are multiple HPs within the Borough of Runnymede as well as private landlords and estate agents. Where ASB is being committed by a tenant and this may be a breach of their tenancy conditions, or is linked to a neighbour dispute by social landlord tenants, these must be reported directly to the relevant agency.

Other options

- 2.14 In some cases, members of the public may not utilise the above options and instead relay information to their ward Councillor.
- 2.15 Reports made directly to ward Councillors are not readily available to the agencies unless this is further reported using one of the above options. Therefore, Councillors are encouraged to report matters through the above process so that they can be officially recorded and considered by partner agencies.

Action Point 2

- 2.16 The second action point was to ask Community Safety to “Advise the Chairman whether it is possible for the Joint Action Group to receive evidence from Members of the Council”.
- 2.17 Evidence can be received from Members by the Joint Action Group (JAG) in the same manner that referrals for locations of consideration can be made.
- 2.18 Councillors are not able to be physically present at the JAG meetings due to the sensitive nature of the information discussed. Therefore, referrals for new nominations and evidence to support the nomination should be provided to the Community Safety Co-ordinator who acts as the representative for the Members at the meeting.
- 2.19 In order to highlight the willingness of Runnymede JAG allowing nominations from Members, a duplicate of the referral form was created but titled as Councillor referral to remind Members that they can utilise this.
- 2.20 A copy of this form was shared with Members previously via Democratic Services. Further copies can also be obtained from the Community Safety Co-ordinator.

Action Point 3

- 2.21 A third action point was to “Explore whether it is possible to divide the anti-social behaviour data for the Thorpe and Hythe area into more specific areas”.
- 2.22 A similar question was raised at a previous meeting of this Committee. Officers sought clarification with Police colleagues. Unfortunately, this is not

possible, and it is understood that a response has been provided to the Members of Crime and Disorder Committee by Inspector Wyatt.

Action Point 4

- 2.23 Officers were asked to “Respond to Councillor Burton regarding a query on the use of officer delegated powers to make a PSPO”.
- 2.24 The Council’s Constitution shows the scheme of delegation in regard to PSPOs as the CE/CHES/CHH/CHCD (found on page 81). The former Corporate Head of Community Development, upon recruitment of Katie Walker (Community Safety Coordinator), further authorised via signed letter, for Katie Walker to be able to “apply and issue a Public Spaces Protection Order under The Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014.”
- 2.25 To assist understanding of the process undertaken for PSPOs and how they come to Committee for approval currently, officers have created a flow chart detailing the implementation process (Appendix A).

Introduction to the Public Space Protection Order (PSPO) Process

- 2.26 The process indicated within Appendix A must be followed to ensure that any implementation of a PSPO is the right enforcement action, and that agencies have taken the lowest possible level of enforcement action available.
- 2.27 Any lower level enforcement action and person based interventions taken prior to implementing a PSPO would be evidence towards the justification of, and necessity to, implement a space based solution. This is particularly important as the Council must have due regard under the Human Rights Act and the Equalities Act.
- 2.28 It is also important to note that implementation of any PSPO currently within the Borough of Runnymede will require significant agreement by Surrey Police as the agency tasked with ‘on the ground’ enforcement of the order owing to the Council not having its own patrol officers (Joint Enforcement Team officers), who carry the necessary powers to undertake this role.
- 2.29 Additional considerations must be given to unintended consequences of implementing a PSPO, such as behaviour displacement, and impact on Police resources.
- 2.30 It is vital that any enforcement action implemented is enforceable, otherwise it will devalue the process and create further dissatisfaction amongst our residents. We want to ensure that any actions undertaken are progressable.

3. Overview of Key Meetings and Processes

- 3.1 Within the Community Safety field, there are a number of multi-agency meetings held focusing on specific aspects. However, the three key meetings for Members to be aware of are identified below.

Community Safety Partnership (CSP)

- 3.2 The CSP came about from the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 which made it a statutory requirement for key local agencies to work together to reduce crime and disorder.
- 3.3 The partnership consists of these statutory members:
- Police
 - Local Authority
 - County Council (including Fire),
 - Probation
 - Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG).
- 3.4 Within Runnymede it was identified that Housing Providers were a key agency in the work required to reduce crime and disorder. Therefore, an invitation was extended to one such provider to join the CSP as a representative of the Housing sector.
- 3.5 The group meets quarterly (daytime meeting), to review the ASB and Crime data and review actions being undertaken against the CSP plan.
- 3.6 Within Surrey, it was agreed that local delivery groups would be formed underneath the CSP to support its aims; namely the Community Harm and Risk Management Meeting (CHARMM) and Joint Action Group (JAG). However, these are to complement the work and priorities undertaken by other multi-agency forums such as:
- Chanel Panels (supporting people vulnerable to being drawn into violent extremism)
 - Early Help Hubs (supporting children at any point in their life from the foundation years through to teenage years, as soon as a problem emerges)
 - Multi Agency Risk Assessment Conference (high risk domestic abuse)
 - Multi Agency Public Protection Arrangements (high risk sexual and violent offenders)
 - Family Support Programme
 - Child Exploitation Risk Management Meetings - RMMs (safeguarding children at risk of exploitation either criminal or sexual)
 - Surrey Community Harm Reduction Group (county-wide strategic group)

Community Harm and Risk Management Meeting (CHaRMM)

- 3.7 The CHaRMM focuses on individuals/perpetrators of concern which are impacting on the community, as well as taking a harm centred approach, by supporting vulnerable victims, and meetings are held every 4 weeks.
- 3.8 There is an agreed core membership for meetings, with other professionals invited to attend on a case by case basis, to ensure the correct people are around the table for meaningful discussion, and action plans to be created.
- 3.9 These meetings are the agreed forum for implementing the following tools under the ASB, Crime & Policing Act 2014:
- Civil Injunctions (applicable to perpetrators aged 10 or over)

- Criminal Behaviour Orders (applicable to perpetrators aged 10 or over)
 - Community Protection Notices (applicable to perpetrators aged 16 or over)
- 3.10 Consultation requirements for Closure Orders under the ASB, Crime & Policing Act 2014 can at times be fulfilled during the meeting.

Joint Action Group (JAG)

- 3.11 The JAG meetings discuss hotspot locations of anti-social behaviour and crime which have been identified and referred for consideration.
- 3.12 The meetings also include an examination of crime trend and subjects of high interest by the Surrey Police intelligence department under Serious Organised Crime (SOC) as the offences being committed are location based rather than individual specific.
- 3.13 In Runnymede, the SOC and JAG meetings are combined, and referred to as SOC/JAG meetings, whereas some District and Boroughs hold these meetings separately due to highly volumes of information/locations needing to be discussed.
- 3.14 The group meets every 6 weeks to review actions taken and problem solve areas adopted and is the agreed forum for the implementation of PSPOs under the ASB, Crime & Police Act 2014.

4. Potential Development Within Community Development

- 4.1 It is recognised that the Council has long established ways of working which might be able to change in the future. The amalgamation of Community Development into the Community Services team provides an opportunity to look at any adjustments which could be made.
- 4.2 One such opportunity that is currently being pursued is the potential for Community Services Committee, Member representation on the Runnymede Community Safety Partnership (CSP) which oversees the 2 multi-agency meetings of the Community Harm and Risk Management Meeting (CHaRMM) and Joint Action Group (JAG).
- 4.3 Currently, this partnership has a Member representative on behalf of Surrey County Council (it is noted that the current representative is also a Borough Councillor). Given this, as a way of developing a greater understanding and closer partnership between officers and Members, potentially Borough Councillor representation could be something that is looked to be adopted. If possible, it is proposed that an appointment would be made from within Community Services Committee and represent the Committee and authority at CSP meetings. This approach would also add greater enrichment to discussions at future committee meetings. The appointment as outlined above is due to be discussed at the next meeting of the CSP and subject to their approval of this approach Officers recommend that a member of this Committee is nominated to serve on the CSP.
- 4.4 Members will be aware that a new process for making external appointments was approved by Corporate Management Committee on 20 January, and this

appointment would be treated under the new arrangements whereby prospective representatives would submit their nomination and be appointed by Corporate Management Committee in the new Municipal Year.

CCTV

- 4.5 Safer Runnymede has a supply of deployable CCTV units which Members have previously raised concerns about how they are deployed, as it was felt that they have been monopolised for Policing purposes.
- 4.6 It is suggested that the process for deployment of CCTV units be prioritised during 2022/2023, with consideration made to utilising the CSP as a group to authorise deployment of units.
- 4.7 Currently, one of the units is deployed to a location within a PSPO area at the request of the JAG, and it is requested that this unit remains available for real time quick deployment to problem locations identified by the JAG, where it is possible, with all other unit deployments being agreed by the CSP.

Partnership working and sharing of information

- 4.8 It is recognised that, whilst all of the above information has been available and/or promoted, it may not have been disseminated to all Members. The vastness of functions undertaken within Community Safety makes this area of the Council, as it is with other areas or work, complex.
- 4.9 The field of Community Safety is ever evolving, alongside National Government Policy changes, Countywide frameworks and identified best practice examples, as well as case studies occurring following court cases and high harm outcomes. This not only includes ASB, but other areas of focus such as Domestic Abuse, Child Exploitation, Prevent (Counter Terrorism), County Lines & Serious Violence, Human Trafficking & Modern Slavery, Fraud, Drug related harm, Fire Safety, Water Safety and Road Safety.
- 4.10 The Community Safety Co-ordinator is available to speak with any Member who would like to increase their understanding of Community Safety functions and will be undertaking 'drop in' sessions for Members in the future.
- 4.11 It is requested that Members assist with raising the awareness profile of Community Safety functions by supporting campaigns which encourage residents to participate in responses. These campaigns are provided to obtain, and be reflective of the public's views, and any work undertaken as a result of these views may not be the desired focus if only a small section of the community responds.
- 4.12 An example of this is shown through the annual Community Safety Partnership survey which has previously been discussed by Members as not obtaining enough responses to be reflective of the public opinion. The most recent survey went live for a period of 6 weeks prior to Christmas. It was promoted through targeted contact to residents who had cause to submit an online ASB report throughout 2021, and via email requests to Members and other organisations such as Surrey Police and Royal Holloway university. This enabled the survey to be further shared via resident newsletters and neighbourhood alert emails.

- 4.13 Unfortunately, there was little social media presence for the survey and at its close, only 54 responses had been received. It is really important to obtain the views of the public as these are utilised alongside the agency information when developing the CSP plan and reviewing public opinions to actions taken.
- 4.14 As the response rate was underwhelming, it is suggested that the campaign is run again to bring in further responses and the support of Members sharing is encouraged.

(To resolve)

Background papers

None Stated.

Appendix A

