

Recommendations for consideration by the Management Board

Customers & Communities Overview and Scrutiny Panel

- Minute 16 (28.9.09) – Appointment of substitute to the Overview & Scrutiny Management Board:
The panel was advised of the need to appoint a substitute member to attend meetings of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, as per the Management Board's terms of reference. The rationale behind this was to ensure that each scrutiny panel was represented at every meeting of the Management Board. The substitute member must have received the required finance training and be from the same political party as the member for whom they were substituting.

Resolved that Councillor Stephens is asked to be the panel nominated substitute for the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board and a substitute for the Vice Chair is nominated from the Labour Group.

- Minute 17 (28.9.09) – Appointment of Co-opted Representative:
The Chair sought the panel's opinion of co-opting representatives from the third sector.

Recommended to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board that Colin Trend and Chaz Goldie are co-opted to the Customers and Communities Overview and Scrutiny Panel.

- Minute 19 (28.9.09) – Update on tackling anti-social behaviour strategy including the Councillor Call for Action:
The Cabinet Member for Safer and Stronger Communities and the Anti Social Behaviour Manager presented the update report of the Director for Development and Regeneration on the Tackling Anti Social Behaviour Strategy including the Councillor Call for Action request made by Councillor Ball in respect of anti social behaviour problems in Compton Vale.

Members of the panel put forward questions, to which the following responses were provided –

- (i) under the Regulatory Investigatory Powers Act 2000 the local authority was able to deploy covert camera equipment or human intelligence, for the purposes of preventing or detecting crime and disorder, where the subject was not likely to be aware of their presence, although the surveillance had to be necessary and proportionate; it had been reported that some local authorities had used covert techniques to inappropriately ascertain if parents lived in the catchment area for a particular school;
- (ii) Councillors in the neighbouring Ward of Efford had not been involved with the Councillor Call for Action request;
- (iii) Plymouth City Council had successfully used the new Closure Premises Order to 'close down' a flat where persistent anti social behaviour had been problem;
- (iv) there was a clear lack of understanding of the Councillor Call for Action process and procedure;
- (v) a robust service level agreement had been negotiated with Plymouth Community Homes;

- (vi) eviction (and other legal orders) was the last stage in the four step escalation process, if an individual or family were willing to engage with the 'family intervention project' then they would be given a limited tenancy agreement; however, if they did not continue with this support they could be evicted by the local authority who did not have a duty to re-house them; social services would be aware of any pending eviction if there were children involved;
- (vii) the escalation process formed part of the strategy which enabled individuals and families to gain access to services, however problems had been identified with gaining access to the more 'targeted' services;
- (viii) there were a wide range of services available to individuals and families that needed support; there was often an underlying reason why people acted in an anti social manner, such as domestic abuse, alcohol and drug misuse and mental health issues; enforcement was used to underpin the process if people were unwilling to engage with the support process;
- (ix) the Streetwise Project was deployed in areas that were at crisis point and areas identified as hotspots; the team comprised of specialist workers who engaged with young people who could be subject to or at risk of anti social behaviour orders;
- (x) limited funding was available to undertake work on the results of the place survey relating to national indicator 21 which related to how people perceived how well the police and council dealt with anti social behaviour.

The panel noted that the Councillor Call for Action had not been fully implemented as requested by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board reflecting the lack of understanding and strategic approach for dealing with such requests.

Resolved that -

- (1) the Cabinet Member for Safer and Stronger Communities and the Anti Social Behaviour Manager are thanked for their report and the panel welcomes the fall in anti social behaviour incidents but recognised that this masked some variations within the City.
- (2) steps 2 and 3 providing the targeted services of the escalation process are included on the panel's work programme.

Recommended that the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board -

- (1) urgently considers the provision of a 'tool kit' outlining the process and procedures for a Councillor Call for Action request and that it is made available to all Members, departments and interested parties within the next committee cycle;
- (2) request the local strategic partners for resourcing to be made available for –
 - (a) research on national indicators 17 and 21;
 - (b) mapping of intergenerational work within the City and further resources to enhance its delivery.

Support Services Overview and Scrutiny Panel

- Minute No. 18 (1.10.09) - People's Strategy:
Members gave consideration to the People's Strategy 2009 - 2011.

Resolved to recommend the People's Strategy to Cabinet for approval.