

**STRONG AND SUPPORTIVE COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY
COMMITTEE**

**WEDNESDAY 9 NOVEMBER 2011
7.00 PM**

Bourges/Viersen Room - Town Hall

AGENDA

Page No

1. Apologies for Absence

2. Declarations of Interest and Whipping Declarations

At this point Members must declare whether they have an interest, whether personal or prejudicial, in any of the items on the agenda. Members must also declare if they are subject to their party group whip in relation to any items under consideration.

3. Minutes of Meeting Held on 14 September 2011

1 - 8

4. Call In of any Cabinet, Cabinet Member or Key Officer Decisions

The decision notice for each decision will bear the date on which it is published and will specify that the decision may then be implemented on the expiry of 3 working days after the publication of the decision (not including the date of publication), unless a request for call-in of the decision is received from any two Members of a Scrutiny Committee or Scrutiny Commissions. If a request for call-in of a decision is received, implementation of the decision remains suspended for consideration by the relevant Scrutiny Committee or Commission.

5. Commercial Operations

9 - 14

CRIME AND DISORDER SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

For items 6 and 7 only the Strong and Supportive Communities Scrutiny Committee will be acting as the Council's designated Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Committee.

6. Dog Control Orders

15 - 28

7. Integrated Offender Management

29 - 48

8. Establishment of the Citizens Power Scrutiny Task and Finish Group

49 - 50

9. Forward Plan of Key Decisions

51 - 66

10. Work Programme

67 - 72

11. Date of Next Meeting

Thursday 5 January 2011

Joint Meeting of Scrutiny Committees and Commissions to scrutinise the Budget 2011/12 and Medium Financial Strategy to 2015/16.

Wednesday 18 January 2012

Strong and Supportive Communities Scrutiny Committee



There is an induction hearing loop system available in all meeting rooms. Some of the systems are infra-red operated, if you wish to use this system then please contact Paulina Ford on 01733 452508 as soon as possible.

Emergency Evacuation Procedure – Outside Normal Office Hours

In the event of the fire alarm sounding all persons should vacate the building by way of the nearest escape route and proceed directly to the assembly point in front of the Cathedral. The duty Beadle will assume overall control during any evacuation, however in the unlikely event the Beadle is unavailable, this responsibility will be assumed by the Committee Chair.

Committee Members:

Councillors: M Todd (Chairman), S Day (Vice Chairman), G Casey, C Burton, G Simons, J R Fox and M Jamil

Substitutes: Councillors: D Over, B Saltmarsh and S Martin

Co-opted member when Committee Acting as Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Committee:
Ansar Ali – Police Authority Representative

Further information about this meeting can be obtained from Paulina Ford on telephone 01733 452508 or by email – paulina.ford@peterborough.gov.uk

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
STRONG AND SUPPORTIVE COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
HELD IN THE
BOURGES & VIERSEN ROOMS, TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH
ON
14 SEPTEMBER 2011**

Present: Councillors Todd (Chairman), S Day, G Casey, C Burton, JR Fox, and M Jamil

Also Present Ansar Ali Police Authority Representative
 Councillor Sandford Leader of the Liberal Democrat Party
 Peter Godley Youth Council Representative
 Niamh Kingsley Youth Council Representative

Officers in Attendance: Paul Phillipson Executive Director of Operations
 Karen Kibblewhite Safer Peterborough Manager - Cutting Crime
 Katy Softley Anti Social Behaviour Co-ordinator
 Graeme Clark Project Manager
 Andrew Edwards Head of Growth & Regeneration
 Andrew Mackintosh Director of Communications
 Paulina Ford Senior Governance Officer, Scrutiny
 David O'Connor Long Lawyer

1. Apologies

Apologies had been received from Councillor Simons.

2. Declarations of Interest and Whipping Declarations

Item 7 – Review of Citizen Power Peterborough Programme

As the report had made reference to the Peterborough Environment City Trust Councillor Sandford declared a personal interest in that he was a member of the Board of the Peterborough Environment City Trust.

3. Minutes of the meeting held on 20 July 2011

The minutes of the Strong and Supportive Communities Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 20 July 2011 were approved as an accurate record.

4. Call In of any Cabinet, Cabinet Member or Key Officer Decisions

There were no requests for Call-in to consider.

5. Trees in Bridge Street

The report was presented to the Committee at the request of Councillor Sandford who had raised concerns regarding the proposal to remove approximately one third of the existing trees in Bridge Street. The report explained the reasoning behind the proposal and the outcome of the public consultation on the plans to improve Bridge Street and Long Causeway which had included a question on the removal of the trees in Bridge Street. Councillor Sandford was concerned that the consultation questionnaire had been misleading and had

been bias towards the removal of trees. The Director of Communications and Head of Growth and Regeneration were in attendance to present the report and answer any questions. The Director for Communications advised Members that after consulting with Councillor Sandford he had agreed to reword the question regarding the removal of trees. This would then be opened up for public consultation again allowing the public to have another opportunity to give their views.

Observations and questions were raised around the following areas:

- Members felt that question three in the consultation survey regarding trees had given a misleading statement prior to the optional choices. The statement read:

Q3 Trees - We have been advised by specialists that there are too many trees on both Long Causeway and Bridge Street. If we do not remove some of the trees there is a danger that they all could die, or at least be harmed over time. We are proposing to remove the minimum number, which will also have the benefit of opening up the street scene, allowing in more natural daylight.

- Removal of the minimum number of trees will ensure the long term sustainability of the remainder
 - The opportunity should be taken now to remove all of the trees to reduce maintenance issues in the future.
 - The trees should be left untouched even though there could be issues in the future regarding maintenance
 - I don't have any opinion on this
- Councillor Sandford had read a copy of the Tree Condition Survey and Management Recommendations report used as a base for the proposal for the removal of trees. The report had stated that there was no recommendation for tree removal but had also suggested a need for selective tree removal to ensure longevity of the tree stock. The report had also reported that most of the trees assessed had an estimated remaining contribution of 40 plus years with only three trees of 20 to 40 years and they were in good health.
 - Members wanted to know why one of the options included in the survey was to remove all of the trees. *Members were informed that there had been several enquiries from members of the public asking if there would be an option to remove all of the trees. Officers therefore felt that this option should also be included in the consultation to take into account those views.*
 - Members noted that the response to the survey had been very low with only 100 people responding.
 - How was question three going to be rephrased to ensure a fair and equitable consultation? *The Director for Communications advised that the question would be rephrased as follows:*

Another chance to have your say on proposals to potentially remove some trees in the area.

We have been advised by specialists, The Urban Forestry Organisation Limited, that there are too many trees on Long Causeway and Bridge Street, which has a potential impact on the future health of the trees. We are proposing to remove around a third of these trees in order to prolong the life of the others, open up the street and allow more natural daylight.

Do you think we should?

- *Leave the trees untouched*
 - *Remove around one-third of the trees*
 - *Remove all of the trees*
 - *I don't have any opinion on this*
- Councillor Sanford pointed out that any removal of trees must be inline with the Councils Trees and Woodlands Policy and must have sound arboriculture reasons.
 - Some Members felt that the economical cost of maintaining the trees should also be taken into consideration.
 - Had the businesses along Bridge Street and Long Causeway been approached for their views on the trees? *Members were advised that as part of the consultation there had been a letter drop to all businesses advising them of the consultation and how to access it. Informal discussions had also taken place with businesses along Bridge Street concerning removal of some trees. Businesses had been mainly concerned with the disruption of business if any work were to take place in Bridge Street rather than a strong opinion of retaining the trees.*

RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends that:

1. The Director of Communications rephrases question three of the consultation on Improving Bridge Street and Long Causeway to read:

We have been advised by specialists, The Urban Forestry Organisation Limited, that there are too many trees on Long Causeway and Bridge Street, which has a potential impact on the future health of the trees. We are proposing to remove around a third of these trees in order to prolong the life of the others, open up the street and allow more natural daylight.

Do you think we should?

- *Leave the trees untouched*
 - *Remove around one-third of the trees*
 - *Remove all of the trees*
 - *I don't have any opinion on this*
2. Question three to be published for a further month to allow the public to have another chance to have their say on proposals to potentially remove some trees in Long Causeway and Bridge Street.
 3. The Director of Communications to report back to the Committee with the results of the additional consultation.

6. Designated Public Places Order (DPPO)

The report informed the Committee of a proposal to extend the existing city centre Designated Public Places Order (DPPO) into the New England area. The proposal had been at the request of the local Neighbourhood Policing Team Inspector and the Neighbourhood Manager for the areas as well as by a local resident. The DPPO would mean that to consume alcohol in public when asked to stop by a police officer would become an offence. The proposed area was an extension to an existing designated area in the city centre and was bounded by the following roads: St Pauls Road, Fulbridge Road, A47 Soke Parkway, Bourges Boulevard.

Observations and questions were raised around the following areas:

- Members were concerned that the boundaries put in place would cause further displacement of anti-social drinking. *Members were informed that a DPPO was a reactive tool and not the only solution. There were a range of other tools in place to tackle anti social drinking. The natural boundary along Bourges Boulevard would help prevent further displacement.*
- Members were concerned at the amount of alcohol licences that were being given out and that there was no joined up strategy to tackle anti social drinking across Peterborough. *Members were informed that the Alcohol Strategy was being reviewed with partners from Health and the Safer Peterborough Partnership. Specific areas looked at had been licensing and street drinking. Part of the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment had looked at what the issues were across the city and they would be taken into account as part of the review. The outcome of the review would be brought back to the Committee at a future meeting.*
- Why did the DPPO stop at Bourges Boulevard and not extend to the railway tracks as a natural boundary. *The boundary was set on the basis of evidence and on the recommendation of the Neighbourhood Manager and the local Neighbourhood Policing Team Inspector. The boundary would only be extended if evidence was provided to show a further displacement of alcohol related anti social behaviour. The legislation used to put in place a DPPO required evidence based information.*
- A member of the Youth Council commented that young people would probably cross over to the railway tracks to drink to avoid the DPPO area and wanted to know when the DPPO would come into force. *The DPPO would go to Council in November and if agreed would come into force early November. The DPPO was not an outright ban on drinking it was a tool to tackle anti social drinking.*

RECOMMENDATION

The Committee:

- (i) Endorsed the proposed Designated Public Places Order extending the existing designated area in the city centre which is bounded by St Pauls Road, Fulbridge Road, A47 Soke Parkway, Bourges Boulevard; and
- (ii) Recommended the adoption of the Designated Public Places Order to Full Council.

7. Review of Citizen Power Peterborough Programme

The report informed the Committee of the findings of the formal review of the Citizen Power Peterborough programme. The review had been brought about after the meeting of the Committee on 19 January 2011 at which it had recommended that the Citizens Power Programme be disbanded. Following the recommendation an in depth review of the programme had taken place. The Executive Director presented the report outlining the outcomes of the review to the Committee supplemented by a slide presentation which highlighted the six projects within the programme detailing future planned activities. The six projects within the programme were:

- Project 1: Peterborough Curriculum
- Project 2: Sustainable Citizenship
- Project 3: Recovery Capital
- Project 4: ChangeMakers
- Project 5: Arts & Social Change
- Project 6: Civic Commons

The Committee were asked to:

- a. Identify any additional recommendations or actions to ensure the Citizen Power Programme continued effectively to make a real and lasting difference to Peterborough.
- b. To establish a scrutiny task and finish group to work with officers to ensure that all recommendations and actions from the review were implemented.
- c. To endorse and support the development of an All Party Policy session early in 2012 at where the outcomes from the Single Delivery Plan and relationship to the Citizen's Power Programme would be discussed.

Observations and questions were raised around the following areas:

- The report states that the total investment in the city as a result of the Citizens Power Programme will be £1,170,775. Could the Committee have a breakdown of where this money has and will be spent? *The Executive Director of Operations advised that this could be provided.*
- Was the Council's contribution of £250,000 to the programme a cash contribution and did this include officers salaries. *The £250,000 had been a cash contribution and officer's salaries had not been included in that figure. Officer's time on the programme was part of their core work and had not been considered to be over and above what they normally did.*
- Members had concerns regarding value for money for projects 4 ChangeMakers, 5 Arts & Social Change and 6 Civic Commons. The expenditure against the benefits did not appear to give value for money. *The programme had been difficult to quantify however the fact had been that it had generated a large amount of inward investment into the city which would benefit the city in the long term. Some of the Citizens Power work had been challenging but indications were that it was making a difference.*
- Members congratulated Officers on the quality of the review.
- Members pointed out that when the Citizens Power Programme had first started each member of the Committee had agreed to Champion one of the strands. Since that time there had been little or no contact from officers with the member Champions. This had made it difficult for the Members to engage with the programme and sell it to the public.
- The Recovery Capital project dealt with problems associated with drug and alcohol use. The Council already provide funding to Bridgegate so why could they not fund the work of the Citizens Power Programme. *The funding to Bridgegate from the Council had been to provide specific services. The work that had been done through the Citizens Power Programme was over and above those services therefore additional funding was required.*
- A member of the Youth Council asked if officers were engaging with young people in particular with regard to the Arts. *Officers had engaged with young people and this was continuing to happen. The Executive Director of Operations invited the representatives of the Youth Council to get involved in the programme.*
- Peterborough had a diverse community. How are you engaging and encouraging those young people from the most deprived areas of the city who would not normally get involved in the Arts? It would be useful to see a map of the city indicating where engagement had taken place with young people and what activities they had taken part in. *Members were advised that connecting with diverse communities had been challenging and more work was being done around this.*
- Do you have an exit strategy for the programme and how are you going to maintain sustainability of the programme. *Members were informed that discussions had already taken place about the sustainability of the programme and how the 27,000 Fellows of the Royal Society of the Arts could be used going forward to draw in ongoing interest and funding for the continuation of the programme.*
- Members were concerned that experts were being brought into the city from other cities and that experts within the City were not being used and developed to ensure continuity of the programme. *The Officer advised that people who had been brought in were leading thinkers or experts in their field. This had been about capacity building and they*

had helped people to understand how they could do things better by looking at best practice from elsewhere.

- When the funding for the programme stopped how would people continue with the projects. Would advice be given on how to raise money and access funding? *Members were informed that the Arts Council saw Peterborough as a cold spot in terms of Arts engagement and were therefore committed to encouraging growth of the Arts in Peterborough. A strand of work within the Arts and Social Change project was about giving people the skills to access Arts Council funding. The Arts Council had put some money into a grant scheme and people from Peterborough would be encouraged to apply.*
- Was there a vision of how the city would be perceived from an Arts perspective in the future? *One of the statements in the Arts and Social Change project was to have an improved much more visible cultural offering across the city and to build a Creative Hub which would be a unique asset to enable the cultural offering in the city to flourish.*

The Chair thanked the Executive Director of Operations and Project Manager - Citizens Power Programme for giving an informative and excellent presentation.

ACTIONS

1. The Committee requested that the Executive Director of Operations and the Project Manager for the Citizens Power Programme:
 - I. Provide a detailed breakdown of expenditure for the £1,170,775 funding received as a result of the Citizens Power Programme.
 - II. Contact the representatives of the Youth Council to discuss how they could become involved in the Citizens Power Programme.
 - III. Produce a map of the city showing where and how young people were being engaged with the Citizens Power Programme.
2. That members of the Committee continue to be champions of each of the six Citizen's Power strands and that those members who were no longer on the Committee are replaced with current members of the Committee as Champions.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends:

The establishment of a cross-party task and finish group to oversee and monitor the implementation of the recommendations and actions from the Citizens Power review.

8. Neighbourhood Council Scrutiny Review Group

The report provided the Committee with an update on the Neighbourhood Council Scrutiny Review Group. At its meeting on 10 November 2010 the Strong and Supportive Communities Scrutiny Committee agreed to establish a Task and Finish group to conduct a review of Neighbourhood Councils. The review had been completed in March 2011 and one of the recommendations agreed by Cabinet on 21 March 2011 was that the Neighbourhood Committee implementation plan should be overseen by the Neighbourhood Council Scrutiny Review Group. The Review Group met on 31 August 2011 to discuss the purpose of the group going forward, the membership of the group and the terms of reference.

The Committee were asked to agree the new terms of reference and name of the group as the Neighbourhood Committee Implementation Scrutiny Group.

Councillor Burton thanked all the Members and officers who took part in the Neighbourhood Council Scrutiny Review for their contribution and ongoing commitment to the development of Neighbourhood Committees.

RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends that:

- I. The review group continue under the new name of Neighbourhood Committee Implementation Scrutiny Group
- II. That the new terms of reference be accepted.
- III. That the membership of the group is agreed.

9. Forward Plan of Key Decisions

The Committee received the latest version of the Council's Forward Plan, containing key decisions that the Leader of the Council anticipated the Cabinet or individual Cabinet Members would make during the course of the following four months. Members were invited to comment on the Plan and, where appropriate, identify any relevant areas for inclusion in the Committee's work programme.

ACTION AGREED

The Committee noted the Forward Plan and agreed that there were no items for further consideration.

10. Work Programme

Members considered the Committee's Work Programme for 2011/12 and discussed possible items for inclusion.

ACTION AGREED

To confirm the work programme for 2011/12.

11. Date of Next Meeting

Wednesday 9 November 2011

The meeting began at 7.00 and ended at 9.06pm

CHAIRMAN

This page is intentionally left blank

STRONG AND SUPPORTIVE COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE	Agenda Item No. 5
9 NOVEMBER 2011	Public Report

Report of the Executive Director of Operations

Contact Officer – Annette Joyce, Head of Commercial Operations
Contact Details - 01733 452280

COMMERCIAL OPERATIONS

1. PURPOSE

1.1 To provide members with an overview of Commercial Operations.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 The Committee is recommended to note and comment on the work of Commercial Operations and propose further scrutiny in relation to its business fields.

3. LINKS TO THE SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY STRATEGY

3.1 Peterborough's Sustainable Community Strategy is the plan for the future of our city and the surrounding villages. It sets the direction for the overall strategic development of Peterborough. Commercial Operations remit directly links to the council's strategic priorities;

- Creating Opportunities – Tackling inequality.
- Creating strong and supportive communities.
- Delivering substantial and truly sustainable growth.
- Creating the UK's Environment Capital.

4. BACKGROUND

4.1 Commercial Operations provides a framework for the day to day operations of the city and to focus strategic efforts to enhance the city in the long term. The department's vision is to provide a high quality, safe and easily accessible environment that underpins commercial and social success. The following areas of business make up Commercial Operations:

4.2 The Enterprise Centre

The Enterprise Centre has been designed to provide an overarching structure to support the Social Enterprise Sector in Peterborough. Its specific aim is to increase the number, sustainability and growth of new and existing social enterprises in Peterborough. The centre is located within St Peters Arcade.

Intensive business planning courses, introductory workshops and Barclays sponsored events continue to run at the centre. Since April 1st client engagement was exceptionally strong with 202 pre-start clients and 26 existing businesses supported. Compared to target figures, this equates to 153% over performance of unemployed and economically inactive individuals being engaged by the centre.

4.3 Parking Services

Commercial Operations are responsible for ensuring that the parking provision in Peterborough is used correctly, responsibly and that the best use is made of on and off street car parking space to the maximum benefit of the local community. We also ensure that the Council's car

parks are maintained to an appropriate standard within the constraints of the available budget.

There are 12 car parks currently containing 3094 parking spaces and 473 Pay & Display spaces, managed by Commercial Operations.

On-street charging went up by 10% in 2010 to £1.10, the first price increase in 5 years.

Off-street charging went up by an average of 12% from 2008 to 2010, and an average of 10.6% (from May 2011). Off-street season tickets increased in each of those changes on average 3%.

4.4 **CCTV**

CCTV Improves the safety and security of residents, visitors and the business community.

Peterborough's CCTV service is managed by Commercial Operations and comprises 144 cameras, with surveillance 24 hours a day.

Additional cameras have been added in recent years and further cameras are to be installed at Stanground. We also upgraded existing cameras (x11) to newer technology this current financial year, financed from capital budgets

4.5 **General Market**

The General Market supports local business and creates significant employment in the city. Managed by Commercial Operations, it is an integral part of the local community, providing an assortment of goods, from furniture and clothing to fresh fruit and vegetables.

There are 55 individual traders occupying 112 market stalls on the Market which is open Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday and Saturday from 8.30am to 4pm.

4.6 **City Centre Management and Tourism**

Commercial Operations via its Visitor Destination Centre promote Peterborough as a place to visit and enjoy and manages Tourism in the city.

The Visitor Destination Centre and Bus Station located service are both open Monday to Saturday 9.30 – 5.00pm. Both sites sell a combination of the following.

- PCard
- Local event ticket sales
- Key Theatre tickets
- Bus Station tickets
- National Express tickets
- Railcards
- Bus Passes
- Holidays
- Shaws Holidays
- Maps
- Gifts

City centre management host a business forum for local businesses each month, at which 60 to 80 businesses and or city centre stakeholders attend to discuss issues, including marketing plans and overall performance of the city.

Resilience Services

Providing Emergency Planning and Business Continuity support.

Passenger Transport

Providing members of the public with travel information for nationwide bus, coach and train services, as well as walking and cycling options in Peterborough. Peterborough City Council was highlighted by the House of Commons' transport select committee as an example of good practice in protecting and maintaining its subsidised bus services in the face of challenging funding cuts. The transport select committee was investigating 'Bus Services after the Spending Review'.

Concessionary Fares: 2,694,943 concessionary journeys made in Peterborough authority area in 2010/11 using concessionary passes.

Public Transport: 11,728,783 passenger journeys made on public transport in Peterborough in 2010/11, an increase of 2.67% on the previous year. This is against the national trend of declining bus passenger journeys nationally (places like London, Brighton, Cambridge and ourselves etc are bucking the national trend).

The above equates to around 68 trips per head of Peterborough's population. The trips per head of population are also increasing, so the increase in passenger journeys is not just down to Peterborough's increasing population.

School Transport: Arrange transport for 1450 mainstream students

Arrange transport for 601 SEN students

Number of students on public transport – 478

On average arrange 2307 journeys per month for children in the care of the authority (on average 25% transported by employed drivers, 17% with taxis and 58% with volunteers).

Community Transport: 268 Community Link members

474 Community Link journeys made in October 2011

1152 passenger journeys made on WRVS, which PCC supports by a small grant

2611 passenger journeys made on Octane rural dial a ride, which PCC supports by a small grant.

Park and Ride: For 2011 the service is operating free of charge. It will operate for 15 days (9 Saturdays and 6 Sundays: Saturday from 29 October to 24 December and Sunday from 13 November to 18 December), from 2 sites (Lynch Wood Park and Perkins), with buses operating every 12 minutes.

Awards: Winner of National Transport Awards 2011 – Improvements to Bus Services
Shortlisted for UK Bus Awards 2011 – Transport Authority of the Year – Winner announced 29 November 2011.

Events

Creating high quality events, creating a vibrant atmosphere, as well as a memorable and positive visitor experience. As well as organise small scale events, such as Jazz on the Square, Classical music recitals and street markets.

2010 Christmas Lights Switch On: Once again the Christmas Lights switch on proved a very popular event, with Westgate House staging an afternoon fashion parade before the lights switch on. This was the first to be held in the revamped Cathedral Square, which allowed more people to safely view the event. At its peak we estimate that over 5,000 people were either in the square or the surrounding streets to witness the switch on. This was a completely trouble free event.

2010 New Years Eve Party: The first NYE party since 2001 was held in Cathedral Square with an ABBA tribute band and an 80s Experience Band providing the entertainment. As this was the first event for 9 years, it was difficult to forecast how many we could expect to turn up, but we were not disappointed, as around 5,000 people witnessed the count down to the turning of the year at midnight.

Halford Cycle Tour: This was the third time this event had been staged in Peterborough and once again it was very well supported by the public with around 12,000 people taking part in the pre race activities and watching the race itself.

Italian Festival: The third Italian Festival was held in September and each year this festival increases in size and was again very well supported throughout the day into the early evening. The flag throwers attracted a very large crowd, as did celebrity chef Antonio Carluccio. Over the whole day, the estimate is that around 7,500 people enjoyed the day.

Perkins Great Eastern Run: The 2011 Perkins Great Eastern Run was the sixth race since its relaunch in 2006. Record numbers in both the Half Marathon and Fun Run were achieved. In the Half Marathon 4106 entered and in the Fun Run 1347 entered. It is estimated that over 50,000 people turned up to watch the event, at either the start, finish or on the course.

Key Strategic Objectives

Objective 1 - Promoting the city

- Broadening the visitor offer of the city by extending the events diary and marketing existing attractions more extensively.

Objective 2 - Managing the City

- To communicate and co-ordinate the work of all city stakeholders and monitor outputs.
- To communicate and engage effectively with businesses.

Objective 3 - Improving the Environment and the public spaces

- To encourage and facilitate improvements to the environment and public spaces that is inviting, clean, and is safe environment to be enjoyed.

Objective 4 - A Prosperous City

- Diversifying and strengthening the economic base. The city should be the catalyst for encouraging the growth of both new and existing business within the city.

5. KEY ISSUES

5.1 This is not an exhaustive list of Commercial Operations activity but areas that will be of interest to this Committee.

Redevelopment

Urban design determines the very shape of the streets and public spaces which make up our city. It influences how easy and pleasant it can be to move from area to area. During 2012, both Bridge Street and Cowgate will undergo redevelopment.

The proposed works provide an opportunity to emphasise the historic character of Cowgate and help revitalise Bridge Street. Both areas are viewed as main commercial parts of the city centre. Commercial Operations will work closely throughout with the Cowgate Traders Association and City Centre Business Forum to keep disruption to a minimum. It is envisaged that we will help to bring some of the open space element of the scheme alive by expanding the events, street market and trading offers to both schemes.

Olympic Torch 2012

An iconic moment for Peterborough has been confirmed. Peterborough will be the first stop in the region for the Olympic Flame, when it makes its journey around the UK as part of the London 2012 Olympic Torch Relay. The last few months has seen this department developing a route, programming entertainment throughout the route and planning the logistics for the arrival and exiting of this event.

The flame is due to arrive in the city at approximately 7.20pm on 3 July 2012, as it makes its way around the country over the course of 70 days. A welcome event will be held on the Embankment that evening, to celebrate the arrival of the flame, which will feature a range of

entertainment, showcasing Peterborough's cultural and heritage offerings.

Hosting the Olympic Torch is an incredible platform to showcase our city. Peterborough has managed to secure the BBC regional televised hour special. It is imperative that we maximise every promotional opportunity. We are therefore currently producing a marketing strategy that capitalises on tourism to Peterborough.

Street Activity Strategy

With the redevelopment of the city and its public spaces, it is envisaged that we will look to formulate a Street Activity Strategy early next year. The aim is to assist all individuals and organisations involved with street activity within the city centre to reach a vision for creating a dynamic city centre environment, which is diverse and vibrant, adding value to the economic, social and cultural fabric of Peterborough. This includes a review of tables and chairs licensing, street trading and visiting markets and commercial activity.

The Enterprise Centre

We plan to redesign the course content at The Centre to offer more generic courses, whilst seeking long term funding to ensure sustainability. Also looking for a tenant mix, such as a recruitment agency and café operator.

6. IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 Securing sponsorship for projects and events during the current economic climate could prove challenging.

7. CONSULTATION

- 7.1 Cowgate and Bridge Street redevelopment schemes have undergone public consultation.

8. NEXT STEPS

- 8.1 Any recommendations from the Committee for changes should be referred to the Cabinet Member Tourism, Business and International links.

9. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Used to prepare this report, in accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

None

10. APPENDICES

- 10.1 None

This page is intentionally left blank

STRONG AND SUPPORTIVE COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE	Agenda Item No. 6
9 NOVEMBER 2011	Public Report

Report of the Senior Neighbourhood Enforcement Officer, Regulatory Services

Contact Officer(s) – David Marshall, tel 863740

DOG CONTROL ORDERS

1. PURPOSE

- 1.1 This document sets out information regarding what is involved in instigating Dog Control Orders including the legal process, evidence base and staffing requirements, and potential costs. The Scrutiny Committee is asked to debate the subject to provide a recommendation on the way forward.

Information will also be supplied regarding the newly contracted Dog Warden Service with Midland Environmental Services Ltd aside from this report.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 The Departments recommendations are that we continue to use current powers to tackle the problems faced in dealing with Dog Fouling.
- 2.2 Legislative changes are a potential. May 2011 saw a consultation period end regarding Anti Social Behaviour. Dog Control Orders are one of the areas that may change should the changes be implemented. It is recommended that we wait until a decision is reached on this subject before moving forward. Further information is supplied further in the document.

3. BACKGROUND

At the September 2010 Peterborough North Area Committee meeting it was agreed by the group that information would be required to inform a debate around whether or not Dog Control Orders are what is required in the Werrington area. Since then it has developed into whether it is appropriate city wide. Concerns were raised regarding the behaviour of dogs that were allowed by their owners to run around off the lead and that some owners were not picking up the fouling left by their dog.

3.1 LEGISLATION

Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005

The relevant legislation is the Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005.

Section 55 of the CNEA 2005 gives Local Authorities and Parish Councils the ability to install Dog Control Orders (DCO) to control a) fouling of land from dogs b) keeping dogs on leads c) the exclusion of dogs from land and d) the number of dogs a person can take onto land.

The order must clearly state what land is to be affected by the order and the times or periods during which an offence is to apply. The land that this Act applies to is any land which is open to the air and to which the public have access through payment or otherwise.

The Act under section 59 states that an authorised officer from the Local Authority can, when satisfied that an offence has taken place, issue a Fixed Penalty Notice. Section 60 of the Act states that the default amount of the FPN is £75 although there is the ability to charge what we wish (within reason).

Police Community Support Officers will also have the ability to issue FPNs for offences as per section 59 CNEA 2005.

Dogs (Fouling of Land) Act 1996

Peterborough is already covered under the Dogs (Fouling of Land) Act 1996. Any order installed prior to 2005 is still valid. When the CNEA 2005 came into operation it states that the Dogs (Fouling of Land) Act 1996 would cease to have effect. That means from 2005 onwards no further orders could be installed using Dogs (Fouling of Land) Act 1996. Peterborough's order was installed in 1998 and covers the entire city and communities within its boundaries. It was written in such a way that any expansion to the city or its boundaries would be covered, alternatively any reduction in boundaries would mean the land removed from Peterborough's boundaries would cease to be covered.

Other Considerations

The Home Office have recently released a document for public consultation regarding a potentially new piece of legislation to reform the way Anti-Social Behaviour is dealt with by the Police and Local Authorities.

It is suggested in the document that Dog Control Orders under the CNEA 2005 would be replaced by this new 'Community Protection Order'.

Consultation on this document closed on 3 May 2011 and can be seen at <http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/publications/consultations/cons-2010-antisocial-behaviour/asb-consultation-document>

3.2 THE STATISTICS

Below is a break down of the calls for service received through the Environmental Enforcement Team and the Dog Warden Service in relation to those that would be impacted upon with a DCO.

2010/11*	Number of calls received
Flytipping	1586
Accumulations	732
Duty of Care	246
Littering	200
Flyposting	161
Verge Parking	97
Section 46/47	62
Graffiti Enforcement	28
Dog Fouling Enforcement	12
Dog Warden Service	532

*dates 1/4/2010 – 31/03/2011

2011/12**	Number of calls received
Flytipping	1167
Accumulations	551
Abandoned Vehicles *	219
Littering	139
Duty of Care	115
Section 46/47	115
Flyposting	90
Verge Parking	22
Graffiti Enforcement	10
Dog Fouling Enforcement	8
Dog Warden Service	327

* began March 2011

**dates 1/4/2011 – 14/10/2011

3.3 POLICE STATISTICS

These statistics relate to Owner or person in charge allowing dog to be dangerously out of control in a public place injuring any person OR Owner or person in charge allowing dog to enter a non-public place and injure any person.

15 Incidents for Financial year 2010/2011

9 Incidents for this financial year to 1st October 2011

3.4 LEGAL PROCESS

As part of the research we have approached PCC Legal Services to request information on what process they would ask we follow in order to introduce a DCO. The process is described briefly below;

A. - A proposal has to be compiled setting out: 1) what offences are to be controlled by the order. There are 4 possible offences and each of these requires a specified form of words in order to be valid. The penalty and exemptions and defences should also be described; 2) The land to be covered must be accurately described. Generally all land open to the air to which the public has access can be included but there are some minor exemptions. A map can be used.

B. – it is not part of the legal process but at this stage it would probably be best to refer the matter to members for initial thoughts/ guidance on the proposal.

C. – [Subject to B] we must then begin consultation: i) with other possible DCO makers in the proposed area. This includes town or parish councils; ii) with the public by way of advertising in a local paper and also display/inspection of documents/maps. 28 days should be allowed as a minimum for responses to be received by us.

D. – the members must consider the proposal and all representations made and make a decision. The test is this: is the DCO a necessary and proportionate response to problems caused by activities of dogs and owners? There must be a balance between the interests of the public e.g. children and dog owners. The proposal can be approved [and the DCO made] or not approved. It can also be changed but if so then the consultation process has to be done again in full.

E. – members must decide when the DCO will come into effect and this will be a minimum of 14 days. At least 7 days before it comes into effect the DCO must be advertised in a local paper and be displayed for inspection and put on our website

F. – Notices warning of the DCO and offences must also be placed on or near to the land and at regular intervals within it [depending on the size of the land]

As you can see the process may take several months overall and will incur officer time in the preparation. Expenditure on advertising and notices will be incurred.

3.5 STAFFING INFORMATION

Neighbourhood Officers are responsible for:

1. Flytipping – under section 33 of the Environmental Protection Act 1990, Officers must conduct investigations into reports made by partner agencies and residents relating to the illegal disposal of controlled waste. Investigations require officers to gather evidence from many different sources which includes the conducting of PACE interviews.
2. Accumulations – under section 4 of the Prevention of Damage by Pests Act 1949 Officers have a duty to investigate and arrange the removal of accumulations of waste that is likely to harbour or attract rodents. They also have a duty to serve abatement notices on private land open to public access where Flytipping accumulates to ensure the waste clearance and to stop its re-occurrence.
3. Littering – Officers are tasked with patrolling the streets of Peterborough, mainly the centres and the City Centre to tackle the increasing problem of Littering. This offence is dealt with by way of Fixed Penalty Notice. They are also responsible for the serving of Litter Control notices to businesses who neglect their duty to clear litter from the shop fronts.
4. Flyposting – Officers deal with reports regarding advertisements of all different shapes, sizes and locations that are thought to be in place without advertising consent. Officers are responsible for collating evidence and from multi-national companies to sole traders regarding their illegal advertising activities. They can issue FPNs for minor offences or take legal action against those repeat offenders or where offences are deemed too serious for a FPN.
5. Graffiti – Officers are tasked with investigating reports of Graffiti. Their involvement in this mostly relates to working with those who have graffiti on their properties to encourage its removal. Failing to work with PCC to improve the amenity of the area can result in the service of a graffiti removal notice.
6. Duty of Care (Commercial premises) – Officers must carry out annual inspections of businesses in Peterborough and investigate those that come to their attention for various reasons (referrals from other PCC departments such as Food Hygiene, Trading Standards for example). We request the production of Waste Transfer Notes that prove legal disposal of trade waste. Failing to provide this results in £300 FPN or Court action.
7. Duty of Care (Waste Carriers) – Officers, in co-operation with Cambs Police, are tasked with conducting stop checks on vehicles transporting waste. The purpose of these are to request the production of a Waste Carriers Licence. Failing to produce results in a £300 FPN or Court.
8. Verge Parking – Although in most areas of Peterborough there are no powers to deal with this behaviour, Neighbourhood Officers are tasked with being PCCs lead team to investigate and encourage those responsible to stop damaging the verges. This requires a site visit to gather evidence and discuss with residents. Where possible, cases are referred to Highways for repair or where traffic orders are in place, to parking services to patrol and issue PCNs.
9. Section 46 Investigations – This is the domestic misuse of bins. Neighbourhood Officers must deal with those who do not comply with Enterprises' polite requests to use the service correctly. Intervention is required where bins are not removed from public property after bin collection day, where bins are continually contaminated with incorrect materials in recycling bin or where excess waste is placed out with the bin. A legal notice is served on the occupants, visits are made to ensure compliance and FPNs of £100 are issued to those who breach the terms of the notice.
10. Section 47 Investigations – This is the commercial misuse of bins. Same offences and procedure as above.
11. Abandoned Vehicles – Investigate and arrange removal of abandoned and untaxed vehicles. Enterprise are our contractor for vehicle removal.

12. Dog Fouling – Neighbourhood Officers were given the authority to issue FPNs under the Dogs (Fouling of Land) Act 1996 when PCC stopped the Pest and Dog Control service. Given the level of involvement in the above tasks it is not often officers are able to pro-actively patrol parks and open spaces. Officers will respond to reports of Fouling as and when they are received. Offences are dealt with by way of £50 FPN.

4. KEY ISSUES

4.1 i) Whilst CNEA gives local authorities the power to introduce dog control orders, Defra's guidance on the Act states that:

"It is important for any authority considering a dog control order to be able to show that this is a necessary and proportionate response to problems caused by the activities of dogs and those in charge of them and; any authority needs to balance the interest of those in charge of dogs against the interests of those affected by the activities of dogs and that a failure to give consideration to these factors could make any subsequent dog control order vulnerable in the Courts."

This means if the council cannot point to specific problems to answer questions raised by constituents to justify each order, this could be challenged in Court. If members are receiving these complaints they would need to record them and forward them on, its not enough to state we are receiving them; they need to be recorded in a durable and retrievable form. We would need to go through a long period of evidence gathering to find out whether there is an issue or not. We would also need to carry out events and activities to promote responsible dog ownership.

In summary the Council must produce evidence on request as to why dog control orders are considered necessary and proportionate e.g. what problems occur, how those with a responsibility for dogs have been accounted for.

ii) The need to consult with other Local Authorities. We have carried this out with neighbouring authorities, mainly in Cambridgeshire.

South Cambs District Council hasn't installed any themselves and left it to Parish Councils to install the DCOs. It therefore didn't cost them any money to install the order but are responsible for handling complaints and issuing the FPNs.

South Kesteven spoke of the process being very resource intensive in producing the documents; they also spoke of having limited resources available to 'police' orders. South Kesteven in the end went only for orders covering fenced off children's play areas and banning dogs from within them.

iii) The DCOs must be compatible with legislation released in 2006 called the Animal Welfare Act 2006. This legislation means that dog owners have a legal responsibility to allow their dogs to exhibit normal behaviour and patterns i.e. walk/run freely, provide a suitable diet etc. Larger dogs that require more exercise for example would not be able to gain the required exercise if the owner can not release it from its lead we would therefore be forcing this person to breach the AWA 2006.

iv) Consideration must be given to those who may struggle to comply e.g. elderly people. Census information may potentially be used as a method of gaining a population break down from the local area where DCO is to be installed. We'd have a duty to reach those dog owners who would be affected to provide advice and information. This is also the group less likely to be involved in any consultation process.

v) Informing the General public on how to comply. This will require the production and release of literature, perhaps in the form of a leaflet to households in the area most likely to be affected by the order.

Signage will also need to be produced. Every entrance of the area of land affected needs to be signed to inform the public of the orders in place. Signs then need to be placed at regular intervals within the area covered by the orders.

vi) The promotion of different management approaches to educate dog owners and make provisions for dog owners and non dog owners without the need to extensive DCOs. An alternative for example would be to set aside a fenced area to allow dogs to be walked off the lead and exercised. It would also be a need to consider events that could be held in parks and open spaces to educate dog owners regarding responsible dog ownership.

vii) The environmental impact caused by greater numbers of dog owners using their cars if they lose access to suitable places to walk dogs nearby. The Council has a Climate Change Department whose purpose is to promote initiatives to reduce Peterborough and its residents carbon footprint. Installing an Order could be seen as going against the good work they are doing.

4.2 POTENTIAL COSTS

i) Its impossible to give accurate costs that may be involved; the costs of venues to display maps and documents for consultation, the production of maps and documents for consultation, media advertising (posters, newspaper adverts, production of web page etc), Officer time.

Given information regarding the authority needing to prove all reasonable steps have been explored prior to installing DCO, the costs of holding events to promote responsible dog ownership, which hasn't ever happened, also can't easily be determined.

ii) Stationary/Signage (approx costs).

Quotes obtained from PCCs printing supplier Danwood;

1. The re-design costs involved in updating the Fixed Penalty Notice pads to add an additional offence code - **£90**
2. The printing costs for Fixed Penalty Notice pads (50 Pads) - **£300**
3. The re-designing costs for the No Dog Fouling signs to reflect new legislation - **£45**
4. The printing costs for 'No fouling' on sticker format (50 signs) - **£100**
5. The costs involved in producing metal versions of the no fouling signs. (to include the metal brackets for affixing to street furniture). These would be displayed at all entrances to the area covered by DCO. (10 signs) - **£330**
6. The design of a new sign for 'dogs must be kept on leads' - **£90**
7. The cost of printing 'dogs must be kept on leads' on sticker format (50 signs) - **£100**
8. The cost of printing 'dogs must be kept on leads' on metal (to include metal brackets for affixing to street furniture). This would be displayed at the entrance to the area covered by DCO. - **£330**
9. The printing costs of a leaflet which would be written and designed by PCC Officer and passed to Danwood for printing (100 leaflets)- **£200**

iii) In view of the information I believe this is a full time job for someone similar to that of an Animal Welfare Officer. They can co-ordinate PCCs efforts in holding events and if then required installing and co-ordinating the installation of DCOs.

The new staff member could also have the delegated authority similar to that of a Neighbourhood Officer to ensure effective policing of the orders. Staff of this nature are on a minimum of Grade 9 on the Councils pay scale (**£24k-27k** per annum). Inclusive of On Costs this amount will increase to somewhere in the region of **£31,748**.

This also does not cover any other associated costs such as equipment and uniform purchase.

Funding for this post would need to be found.

5. CONSULTATION

5.1 This has been discussed and presented to the Peterborough North Area committee. They have asked that it be presented to the Strong and Supportive Scrutiny Committee.

6. NEXT STEPS

6.1 After scrutiny committee debate we will consider changes in Service Delivery.

6.2 Report back to Peterborough North Area Committee

6.3 Discuss with the Cabinet Member

7. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Used to prepare this report, in accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

7.1 None

8. APPENDICES

8.1 Appendix A: Kennel Club response to media article regarding PCCs consideration of DCOs. Includes information from a Freedom of Information request they submitted.

8.2 Appendix B: Dogs trust response to media article regarding PCCs consideration of DCOs.

This page is intentionally left blank

Marshall David

From: Fern Howard [Fern.Howard@thekennelclub.org.uk]
Sent: 19 October 2010 17:12
To: Marshall David
Cc: Emily Jeffrey
Subject: Dog Control Order Information
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed
Attachments: KC DCO briefing paper - Jul 10.doc; Schemes to promote responsible dog ownership.doc; FOI stats 19.10.10.doc

Dear David,

Further to our telephone conversation, please find attached:

1. Kennel Club briefing on Dog Control Orders
2. Examples of positive alternatives to Dog Control Orders implemented by a selection of local councils
3. Indicative statistics of costs/income associated with Dog Control Orders (19.10.10)

Based on our experience, the Kennel Club advocates that developing schemes to promote responsible dog ownership is largely more successful and cost effective than introducing Dog Control Orders. Research shows that irresponsible dog walking often arises simply due to lack of information, as dog owners are not always clear about where or how they should dispose of dog mess or how to deal with behavioural problems. Successful initiatives run by a number of councils across the UK show that **EDUCATING** and **ENGAGING** local dog walkers can significantly reduce irresponsible behaviour and create a welcoming environment for both dog owners and non-dog owners without resorting to Dog Control Orders. Positive, simple and relatively low cost actions that you can take may include:

- Distributing waste bags
- Liaising with local dog walkers to ensure that dog waste bins are conveniently located, sufficiently monitored and emptied regularly
- Developing a code of conduct or community dog initiative/event

The Kennel Club's KC Dog campaign strives to work with local councils to discuss problems and develop possible solutions before turning to restrictions. To find out more about this campaign please visit: www.thekennelclub.org.uk/kcdog. In order to help us monitor the situation in Peterborough, it would be great if you could let me know if/when there are any developments in relation to Dog Control Order proposals.

If you require any further information or advice on this matter, please do get in touch.

Warm regards,

Fern

Fern Howard
 External Affairs Assistant
 The Kennel Club, 1-5 Clarges St, Piccadilly, London, W1J 8AB
 Tel: 020 7518 1020
 Fax: 020 7518 1028
 Email: fern.howard@thekennelclub.org.uk
 Web: <http://www.thekennelclub.org.uk/kccampaigns>



THE KENNEL CLUB
Making a difference for dogs

DOG CONTROL ORDERS FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST

Please note that the statistics given below are indicative and reflect the data entered up to and including today's date (19/10/10).

Of the FOI responses processed so far, **87 local authorities have run consultations/implemented dog control orders.**

Expenditure*

- Over **50% (44)** of these **87 respondents have not calculated any costs in relation to control orders** (consultation expenses/signage/officer enforcement etc.).
- Average spend = **£10,894.564** per local authority (based on calculations from 43 local authorities). However, the detail of costings varied significantly between councils:
 - A significant number indicated that there were extra costs in addition to those given
 - A significant number indicated that the figure given was only an estimation
- Most amount spent = **£58,318.44**

N.B. The attached document shows how Hampshire Council spent under £1,000 on a successful scheme promoting responsible dog ownership.

Income*

- Average income = **£2,156.68**
- 26 local authorities have made **£0** from dog control orders between April 2006-2010
- 6 councils have not recorded income accrued from dog control orders

* April 2006 - April 2010

Case Study: Schemes to promote responsible dog ownership

Falkirk Council - Green Dog Walkers

Green Dog Walkers (GDW) is a non-confrontational, friendly way to change attitudes about dog fouling in the Falkirk Council area. Volunteers wear a GDW armband which signifies that they have "Taken the Pledge" to always:

- clean up after their dog
- carry extra dog waste bags
- be happy to be approached to 'lend' a dog waste bag to those without
- be a friendly reminder to other dog walkers to clean up after their dogs

The scheme has been rolled out throughout the Falkirk Council area and has over 400 individual volunteers wearing the GDW armbands and 9 community group partners who are managing their own schemes within their neighborhoods.

New volunteers are invited to sign the GDW pledge in order to receive the armband.

The scheme has cost the Council approximately £8000 - covering set-up costs and the GDW Starter Packs sent to community group partners which include armbands, leaflets, posters, poop scoops and doggy bags.

For further information go to:

http://www.falkirk.gov.uk/services/corporate_neighbourhood/estates_management/litterzone/community/green_dog_walkers.aspx

Brighton and Hove Council – Raising the standard of professional dog walking

Brighton and Hove Council was the first council in the UK to establish an inspection and accreditation scheme for dog walking businesses. Launched in November 2009 the scheme invites dog walking businesses to be inspected and sign a Code of Conduct, allowing the Council to regulate the industry and giving the public a benchmark to help find reputable businesses.

The scheme came about after members of the public raised concerns with the council's Animal Welfare officers about these businesses being able to act responsibly.

As part of the scheme dog walkers undergo an inspection of vehicles used to transport the dogs, provide evidence of their insurance and sign a Code of Conduct. Companies which sign the code and pass the inspection are then given a listing on the council's website.



DogsTrust



Dear Sir or Madam,

05/11/2010

Dogs Trust is interested to hear that Peterborough Authority is considering the introduction of a Dog Control Order under the Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005. We strongly support the concept of responsible dog ownership and undertake a significant effort to encourage dog owners to be responsible. Issues such as dog fouling and keeping proper control of a dog in public places are frequently the focus of our campaigns.

We draw to your attention new animal welfare legislation, the Animal Welfare Act 2006, which imposes a duty of care on all persons who have contact with animals. One of the requirements of the Act is to allow the animal "*to be able to exhibit normal behaviour patterns*". For dogs this will clearly include the ability to exercise the dog off the lead in an appropriate place.

There is a significant body of scientific research that shows that dogs are a benefit to society. Keeping dogs encourages responsibility, particularly for juveniles, and there are significant health benefits to dog owners. While there may also be some disadvantages, responsible ownership, including such procedures as regular worming, are effective in minimising them. Dogs Trust therefore considers it important that responsible owners should not be discouraged from keeping a dog by draconian Dog Control Orders.

Please feel free to contact us at any stage of your research process.

Kind regards,

Chris Moore
Campaigns Officer

chris.moore@dogstruct.org.uk
020 7833 7686

This page is intentionally left blank

STRONG AND SUPPORTIVE COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE	Agenda Item No. 7
9 NOVEMBER 2011	Public Report

Report of the Head of Neighbourhoods

Contact Officer(s) – Adrian Chapman/Gary Goose
Contact Details – 863887

UPDATE ON THE INTEGRATED OFFENDER MANAGEMENT (IOM) PROGRAMME

1. PURPOSE

- 1.1 This report provides an update to the Committee on the progress of developing an integrated approach to offender management and its effect upon reoffending within the City.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 For the Scrutiny Committee to endorse and support the continued development of an integrated approach to offender management (IOM) within the City and to suggest additions or further opportunities to the approach that will further enhance it.

3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1 Inspired by the success of the Prolific and other Priority Offender programme (30%+ reduction in reoffending nationally), the Drug Intervention Programme (DIP; £7.12 saved for every £1 spent), Multi-Agency Assessment Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPA) and other partnership work, our Integrated Offender Management programme targets offenders in the community (both those on statutory supervision and those who are not; youth and adult) who present the highest risks of reoffending within our City. The scheme in Peterborough is supplemented by the Social Impact Bond, under its operating name of The One Service, who work specifically with those short sentence offenders released from prison under no statutory supervision.

The IOM scheme within Peterborough is developed in accordance with joint Home Office/Ministry of Justice guidance published in 'Integrated Offender Management, Government Policy Statement', June 2009.

The IOM approach complements Peterborough's preventative agenda by looking to change behaviour and prevent reoffending whilst relentlessly pursuing those who continue to break the law and present high levels of risk.

- 3.2 The IOM scheme has the following key aims:

- **Preventing re-offending, reducing local crime and making communities safer; tackling social exclusion** of offenders and their families and **driving up operational delivery performance**
- Creating multi-agency partnerships thereby providing a **single, coherent structure** for the management of repeat and other problem offenders, by **addressing potential overlaps between existing approaches** and programmes to manage offenders and **address gaps**

- **Align the work of local criminal justice agencies**, expanding and improving on **partnerships** that already exist to work with **targeted groups** of offenders, builds upon existing offender management partnerships, such as PPO and DIP programmes

3.3 IOM is based upon the widely accepted principle that a relatively small number of offenders are responsible for majority of crime. There is a general consensus that:

0.5% of offenders = 10% volume crime

10% of offenders = 50% volume crime

Once in prison:

- 33% have at some point been in care
- 90% have at some point been excluded from school
- 54% have education level of 11year old
- 50% long-term unemployed
- 40% hard-drug issue of more £100 a day
- 70% closest friendship group multi-convictions
- 10% diagnosed mental illness

76% of those sentenced to less than 12 months will re-offend and be back within 2 years

But, this is not a soft option. Support is there for those offenders who want to stop offending; our targeted programme ensures that those who do not stop are relentlessly pursued by the police and captured should they err.

4. IOM in Peterborough

4.1 Victim based crime in Peterborough continues to be at its lowest recorded levels for years.

4.2 A major reason for the progress in reducing crime is the partnership-led integrated offender management initiative.

4.3 Since last presented to the Committee developments include:

- Joined up the police led burglary initiative (Op Alert), with our existing PPO Scheme and our Keys Project to create a single scheme.
- We now manage a single cohort (since April 2011)
- The police developed an IMPACT Team (started April 2011) to target those offenders failing to comply
- Multi-agency selection – any partner can propose someone to be included
- Multi-agency case management and review of current cases
- Information sharing daily, weekly & monthly

4.4 The scheme now manages regularly around 100 offenders. At any one time about half are in custody and half are in the community.

4.5 As mentioned earlier, the scheme is supplemented by the national pilot of ‘payments by results’ in the criminal justice system: The Social Impact Bond, known as The One Service. The Peterborough pilot is funded by investment raised through a social impact bond. A number of organisations deliver intervention work under the [One Service](#) brand to 3,000 short sentenced men released from [HMP Peterborough](#).

This approach offers released prisoners the opportunity to change their lives by focussing on the causes of their offending behaviour across a range of tried and tested pathways to reduce re-offending.

Integrated offender management links up with other areas of work within the city to make longer-term change a realistic prospect. These include the family recovery project, safer schools, the drugs intervention programme and the development of a city-wide approach to anti-social behaviour.

4.6 Our approach and our partners.

The IOM scheme is based upon tried and tested pathways to reduce reoffending. Those pathways are delivered by a range of partners, co-ordinated by a local authority employed IOM Co-ordinator. A brief summary of pathways and partners (not an exhaustive list) is detailed below:

1. **Enforcement** – Police, probation, prisons, YOS
2. **Accommodation** – PCC, NACRO, Cross Keys
3. **ETE** – Nacro, Job Deal, JobCentre Plus, Probation
4. **Health** – CPFT, Links with NHS Peterborough/Cambridgeshire being developed
5. **Substance Misuse** – SaferPeterborough Team, DIP
6. **Finance** – JobCentre Plus
7. **Children & Families** –Links to Family Recovery Project; to Ormiston via One Service
8. **Attitudes & Thinking** – Probation, YOS
9. **Women** – Dawn Project. Domestic abuse links to Women’s Aid and HMP Peterborough

4.7 Governance for the scheme is provided by the Safer Peterborough Partnership Board and the Peterborough scheme has been developed under the guidance of the Criminal Justice Board in order to achieve as much cross-county consistency as possible. This provides for greater organisational effectiveness and is particularly noteworthy given the introduction of The Policing and Crime Commissioner during 2012.

As mentioned, the scheme is co-ordinated by a local authority employed co-ordinator and further staffed under partnership arrangements with dedicated local authority, police and probation staff engaged with offenders on a day to day basis. This partnership arrangement is cost neutral and demonstrates the commitment and belief in the approach, cross-agency.

Local development of the scheme is managed via a bi-monthly multi-agency Reducing Reoffending Group, chaired by the Safer Peterborough Manager (Cutting Crime), Karen Kibblewhite. The group has devised an IOM development plan which is attached at appendix ‘A’. The three key priorities for the schemes development for the forthcoming year are:

- Co-location of all dedicated IOM staff;
- Development of a single case management system across all agencies;
- Development of a clear performance framework across the geographic county.

Offenders are managed by a Red, Amber, Green rating, they are assessed according to their compliance with the scheme and a joint professional view of the risk they present of reoffending.

The Home Office and Ministry of Justice are currently developing a single reducing reoffending measure which will assist in comparing the effectiveness of schemes across the country; it is hoped that this will be available for use during the latter part of 2011.

5 Does the scheme work?

5.1 Yes, and an example of how it has actually worked for one individual is detailed below. This is a genuine example of an individual who has had a long history of criminal behaviour together with other activity that has adversely affected the lives of many of Peterborough’s law abiding citizens. The scheme has prompted the following:

He was:	He has:
A prolific burglar and thief	Committed no offences for months
Engaged in anti-social behaviour	Behaving
Unsettled in various and numerous accommodation	Has his own settled accommodation
High level of drug abuse (heroin and cocaine)	Is engaging with drugs services and reducing his use
Low literacy levels	Is learning to read and write
High and disruptive alcohol use	Has requested alcohol detox
Unwilling to engage with support and displayed aggressive behaviour	Is training to become a peer support worker.

6. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Used to prepare this report, in accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

Integrated Offender Management; A government policy statement 2010

Safer Peterborough Partnership Plan 2010 -2013

7. APPENDICES

7.1 Appendix A: Peterborough Reducing Reoffending Action Plan
Appendix B: Integrated Offender Management – Key Principles



Home Office



Ministry of
JUSTICE

INTEGRATED OFFENDER MANAGEMENT KEY PRINCIPLES

CONTENTS

Introduction

Overview of Integrated Offender Management (IOM)

Principles of IOM

PPO refresh and ‘traffic light’ assessments

DIP review

Hallmarks of effective partnership working

Principle 1 – All partners tackling offenders together

Principle 2 – Delivering a local response to local problems

Principle 3 – Offenders facing their responsibility or facing the consequences

Principle 4 – Making better use of existing programmes and governance

Principle 5 – All offenders at high risk of causing serious harm and/or re-offending are ‘in scope’

INTRODUCTION

This document provides an overview of Integrated Offender Management (IOM) and sets out questions for partnerships about key elements of joint working to enable effective development and delivery of IOM, following on from the Government's IOM policy statement published in June 2009¹.

OVERVIEW OF INTEGRATED OFFENDER MANAGEMENT (IOM)

IOM is an overarching framework for bringing together agencies in local areas to prioritise interventions with offenders who cause crime in their locality. Local IOM arrangements will work best if they are not restricted to statutory or local criminal justice agencies, but involve a wide range of social agencies, including the voluntary sector, who have a role to play in tackling risk factors associated with crime and offending.

IOM provides areas with the opportunity to target those offenders of most concern in a more structured and co-ordinated way. Building on an analysis of the crime and offending problems in an area, IOM will help to ensure coherent joint working across partnership agencies to make the best use of local resources, to ensure that targeted offenders do not fall through the gaps between existing programmes and approaches, and that identified problems are addressed. The IOM policy statement recognised the significant contribution that both the Prolific and other Priority Offender (PPO) and Drug Interventions Programmes (DIP) will make to local IOM arrangements, and these successful approaches should be firmly embedded within local IOM arrangements.

¹ www.crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/iom

IOM places a strong focus on four key actions:

- Reduce crime, reduce re-offending and improve public confidence in the criminal justice system.
- Address potential overlaps between existing approaches and programmes to manage offenders and address gaps.
- Align the work of local criminal justice agencies, expanding and improving on partnerships that already exist at the local, area and regional level with wider social agendas.
- Simplify and strengthen governance, to provide greater clarity around respective roles and responsibilities - including leadership, operational decision making and allocation of resources.

PRINCIPLES OF IOM

The IOM policy statement set out five key principles which should underpin local IOM arrangements. These are:

- **All partners tackling offenders together** - local partners, both criminal justice and non- criminal justice agencies, encourage the development of a multi-agency problem-solving approach by focussing on offenders, not offences.
- **Delivering a local response to local problems** - all relevant local partners are involved in strategic planning, decision-making and funding choices.
- **Offenders facing their responsibility or facing the consequences** - offenders are provided with a clear understanding of what is expected of them.
- **Making better use of existing programmes and governance** - this involves gaining further benefits from programmes such as the PPO programme, DIP and Community Justice to increase the benefits for communities. This will also enable partners to provide greater clarity around roles and responsibilities.
- **All offenders at high risk of causing serious harm and/or re-offending are 'in scope'** - intensity of management relates directly to severity of risk, irrespective of position within the criminal justice system or whether statutory or non-statutory.

The questions set out later in this document build outwards from these overarching principles. They are for partnerships to work through, to help provide an understanding of the strength of local arrangements and areas for further development. The underlying objective is to ensure that local IOM arrangements across England and Wales are as robust as they can be.

PPO REFRESH AND 'TRAFFIC LIGHT' ASSESSMENTS

In June 2009, the PPO refresh guidance, "*PPO 5 years on: maximising the impact*" was published. This recognised the impact that the PPO programme continues to have on the crime and re-offending of a group of damaging offenders, and set out a number of challenges for local areas to address, to ensure that their local PPO schemes are having the maximum impact on local crime rates.²

Both the PPO refresh guidance, and the IOM policy statement, recognised the important contribution that PPO schemes would continue to make as part of broader IOM arrangements, with the IOM strategic umbrella providing the framework for reviewing and refreshing local PPO arrangements.

The questions set out in this document are intended to complement the existing PPO traffic light assessment tool, which is used in partnership with Government Offices to assess key elements of local PPO schemes. The PPO criteria were revised in 2008 to reflect the Community Safety Partnerships Hallmarks of Effective Partnership working. The criteria describe the three broadest enablers of effective performance management: people & relationships, data & analysis and structures & processes.

The PPO traffic light assessment tool remains valid, as a tool for ensuring that PPO schemes make maximum impact on crime and re-offending as part of local IOM arrangements.

DIP REVIEW

The findings of the review of the DIP Delivery Model were published in May 2009. The review recognised the significant improvements in capability and services that the Programme has brought about and included recommendations to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of DIP. A programme was put in place to implement the findings of the review and achieve a step-change improvement in delivery effectiveness. In February 2010 the *DIP Operational Handbook* was published which, supported by a new DIP funding model, set out a new framework defined through three core functions:

- the successful **IDENTIFICATION** of specified Class A drug misusing offenders;
- a comprehensive and standard **ASSESSMENT** of their treatment and other support needs;

² www.crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/ppo/ppominisite095years.pdf

- effective, consistent **CASE MANAGEMENT** to help break the cycle of drugs and offending.

The DIP Operational Handbook will be implemented from April 2010.

The DIP review also identified IOM as the local infrastructure for sustaining DIP in the long-term, and implementing the elements within the DIP Operational Handbook will be taken forward under the IOM strategic umbrella, to ensure that DIP continues to operate as a key component of local IOM arrangements.

HALLMARKS OF EFFECTIVE PARTNERSHIP WORKING

The principles of IOM focus on desired outcomes for integrated offender management. There is a much greater chance that these outcomes can be achieved when partnerships embed the six hallmarks of effective partnership working, set out below, which underpin effective delivery of all outcomes.

During the time that partnership working on crime and community safety issues has been in place, we, and our delivery partners, have learnt what characterises effective partnerships by appraising the way in which high-performing partnerships conduct their business. It is the desire to improve performance across all partnerships to a higher level that lies at the root of the Hallmarks of Effective Partnerships³.

The Hallmarks of Effective Partnerships are intended to summarise the core elements of effective partnership working and they provide a way for partnerships to check if they are delivering effectively or if there are areas where they should target improvements. The six Hallmarks are:

- Empowered and Effective Leadership;
- Visible and Constructive Accountability;
- Intelligence-led Business Processes;
- Effective and Responsive Delivery Structures;
- Engaged Communities; and
- Appropriate Skills and Knowledge.

³ http://www.crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/guidance_for_effective_partnerships.pdf

KEY ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

Principle 1. All partners tackling offenders together - *local partners agree the means to share all relevant information on an offender with each other and ensure that there is a process to clearly assign responsibility for managing an identified offender. At the same time they make sure that all agencies continue to participate and they provide the offender, as far as possible, with a single lead professional. Local partners encourage the development of the multi-agency problem-solving approach by focussing on offenders, not offences.*

1.1 Are all of the relevant agencies fully committed and signed up to effectively delivering the local IOM approach, including Police, Probation, YOTs, Prisons, Court Service, CPS, Local Authority, Primary Care Trusts, drug and alcohol treatment services, third sector (this list is not exhaustive)?

1.2 Is there effective involvement from non criminal justice agencies to support offenders, in line with reducing re-offending pathways, including the third sector and private sector?

1.3 Is there a clear and common strategic vision of IOM that all agencies understand and are signed up to?

1.4 Has an IOM strategy/framework been developed that has commitment from statutory and non-statutory agencies?

1.5 Has a local governance structure been agreed that has clear lines of accountability?

1.6 Is there clear leadership within the IOM arrangements?

1.7 Are statutory and non-statutory agencies clear on their strategic and operational roles and responsibilities?

1.8 Is there agreement between agencies of what constitutes success in the IOM approach?

1.9 Are arrangements in place to assess progress against the agreed success criteria?

1.10 Are information sharing processes and protocols in place, signed up to and applied by all relevant agencies?

Principle 2. Delivering a local response to local problems - *all relevant local partners from the public, private and voluntary sectors are involved in planning, decision-making and funding choices. They jointly discuss and agree the offender groups that local agencies want to target and prioritise and ensure that existing local methods of engaging with communities are used.*

2.1 Has a local profile of crime and offending been conducted?

2.2 Are the results of the local profile used to inform the decisions about which offenders will be prioritised for interventions?

2.3 Is IOM being used to assist the delivery of local targets, such as Local Area Agreements?

2.4 Has a profile been conducted in order to align existing resources to ensure the most efficient and effective approach to offender management?

2.5 Has a communication strategy been produced in order to encourage community engagement, share good practice and increase public confidence?

2.6 Has a framework been developed to assess the impact of IOM on communities, victims and offenders?

Principle 3. Offenders facing their responsibility or facing the consequences

- local partners provide offenders with a clear understanding of what is expected of them and balance efforts to motivate offenders to change with the appropriate intensity of punishment and intervention necessary to disrupt their criminal lifestyles.

3.1 Are arrangements in place to ensure that offenders prioritised through IOM get access to timely and appropriate interventions that meet their needs and will contribute towards reducing re-offending?

3.2 Are offenders provided with timely information that indicates what is expected of them and the potential consequences if they do not engage with the interventions?

3.3 Are offenders aware of the interventions that are available to them and their intended impact?

3.4 Are offenders provided with timely information that indicates what they can expect from the agencies they are engaged with?

3.5 Where possible, are offenders who represent risk to the community, receiving appropriate support and access to interventions whilst they are in custody?

Principle 4. Making better use of existing (and proven)

programmes and governance - *this involves gaining further benefits from programmes such as PPO, DIP and Community Justice to increase the benefits for communities, as well as taking advantage of the developing roles of bodies such as CSPs in reducing re-offending.*

- 4.1 Are existing programmes and approaches, particularly PPO and DIP, embedded in the local IOM arrangements?
- 4.2 Has the PPO cohort been refreshed in accordance with Government guidance to ensure that it is focused on the most prolific and damaging offenders?
- 4.3 Is DIP effectively identifying specified Class A drug misusing offenders, assessing them and managing their cases, including referring them into treatment and/or other appropriate support?
- 4.4 Are there processes in place to highlight issues of safeguarding, including adult and young offenders and young victims?
- 4.5 Are there processes in place to manage effectively the transition of the most at risk (of re-offending) young offenders turning 18 from youth to adult services and interventions?
- 4.6 Is there alignment between IOM and wider strategies, for example increasing confidence, safer neighbourhoods, social inclusion, family interventions and reintegration?

Principle 5. All offenders at high risk of causing serious harm and/or re-offending are 'in scope' - *intensity of management relates directly to severity of risk, irrespective of position within the criminal justice system or whether statutory or non-statutory. IOM is about bringing together existing arrangements.*

5.1 Are there arrangements in place to identify offenders who pose the greatest risk/cause most damage, for prioritising under IOM?

5.2 Where an offender is assessed as posing a high risk of causing serious harm, has responsibility for multi-agency management arrangements been agreed through MAPPA?

5.3 Does the IOM approach include a flexible and robust system that enables partner agencies to review prioritised offenders and provide the appropriate level of support or control, based on their risk of re-offending?

5.4 Are there interventions in place that specifically target those offenders prioritised under local IOM arrangements, who are not subject to statutory requirements?

5.5 Are there exit strategies in place for those offenders whose risk of re-offending has significantly reduced?

STRONG AND SUPPORTIVE COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE	Agenda Item No. 8
9 NOVEMBER 2011	Public Report

Report of the Solicitor to the Council

Contact Officer(s) – Paulina Ford, Scrutiny, Performance and Research Officer
Contact Details - Tel: 452508 email: paulina.ford@peterborough.gov.uk

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CITIZENS POWER PROGRAMME - SCRUTINY TASK AND FINISH GROUP

1. PURPOSE

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Committee to consider and agree the Terms of Reference and membership of the Task and Finish Group which has been formed at the request of the Committee at its meeting on 14 September 2011 to oversee and monitor the actions and recommendations of the Citizens Power Programme Review.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Committee approves:

- I. The Terms of Reference for the Task and Finish Group
- II. The membership of the Task and Finish Group

3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1 At its meeting on 14 September 2011 and after receiving a report on the outcome of the Citizens Power Programme Review the Committee agreed:

- i. To establish a Task and Finish Group to oversee and monitor the actions and recommendations that came out of the Citizens Power Programme Review.

4. Terms of Reference

- 4.1 At its first meeting on 26 October 2011 the Group considered their terms of reference and purpose of the group. It is proposed that the Terms of Reference for the Task and Finish group are:

- 4.2 To oversee and monitor the delivery of the action plan which resulted from the review of Citizen Power Peterborough Programme, with a particular focus on the following:

- The programme has a lasting legacy for Peterborough via the City's Single Delivery Plan
- Understanding and communicating the lasting benefits of Citizen Power to Peterborough
- The process of engaging Councillors to promote understanding of the programme and provide opportunities for Member involvement in programme activities
- The methods used to promote the programme across the city to maximise public interest and participation
- Task and Finish Group Members to attend Citizen Power events as appropriate to see

the programme in action and take the opportunity to talk to participants

- Identify and interview key witnesses when appropriate to gain further evidence to support the monitoring of the action plan
- The process for making decisions on allocating delegated finance, including Section 106 funds

Given that the Citizen Power Peterborough programme in its current form completes in July 2012, the Task and Finish Group will be in place until October 2012.

The Task and Finish Group will submit an interim report on its progress to the Strong and Supportive Communities Scrutiny Committee in March 2012 with a final report being submitted in October 2012.

Membership

As part of the process of setting up the Task and Finish Group the Senior Governance Officer wrote to all the Group Secretaries to request nominations for membership. The nominations put forward were:

Councillor Todd
Councillor Burton
Councillor Casey
Councillor Jamil
Councillor JR Fox

It is therefore proposed that these nominations are confirmed as the membership of the Task and Finish Group.

- 4.3 Whilst considering the membership of the Group, the Group also considered the inclusion of co-opted members. Following discussion the Group decided that up to two co-opted members from the community may be invited to become members of the Task and Finish Group if required. Consideration would be given to who might be invited to join the group as a co-opted member at the next meeting of the group.

5. CONSULTATION

- 5.1 The proposed Task and Finish Group had been discussed and agreed by the Committee at its meeting on 14 September 2011.

6. NEXT STEPS

- 6.1 The Task and Finish Group will submit an interim report on its progress to the Strong and Supportive Communities Scrutiny Committee in March 2012 with a final report being submitted in October 2012.

7. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Used to prepare this report, in accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

- 7.1 Minutes of the Strong and Supportive Communities Committee meeting held on 14 September 2011.

STRONG AND SUPPORTIVE COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE	Agenda Item No. 9
9 NOVEMBER 2011	Public Report

Report of the Solicitor to the Council

Report Author – Paulina Ford, Senior Governance Officer, Scrutiny

Contact Details – 01733 452508 or email paulina.ford@peterborough.gov.uk

FORWARD PLAN OF KEY DECISIONS

1. PURPOSE

- 1.1 This is a regular report to the Strong and Supportive Communities Scrutiny Committee outlining the content of the Council's Forward Plan.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 That the Committee identifies any relevant items for inclusion within their work programme.

3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1 The latest version of the Forward Plan is attached at Appendix 1. The Plan contains those key decisions, which the Leader of the Council believes that the Cabinet or individual Cabinet Member(s) will be making over the next four months.
- 3.2 The information in the Forward Plan provides the Committee with the opportunity of considering whether it wishes to seek to influence any of these key decisions, or to request further information.
- 3.3 If the Committee wished to examine any of the key decisions, consideration would need to be given as to how this could be accommodated within the work programme.

4. CONSULTATION

- 4.1 Details of any consultation on individual decisions are contained within the Forward Plan.

5. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Used to prepare this report, in accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

None

6. APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – Forward Plan of Executive Decisions

This page is intentionally left blank

**PETERBOROUGH CITY
COUNCIL'S FORWARD PLAN
1 NOVEMBER 2011 TO 29 FEBRUARY 2012**

FORWARD PLAN OF KEY DECISIONS - 1 NOVEMBER 2011 TO 29 FEBRUARY 2012

During the period from 1 November 2011 To 29 February 2012 Peterborough City Council's Executive intends to take 'key decisions' on the issues set out below. Key decisions relate to those executive decisions which are likely to result in the Council spending or saving money in excess of £500,000 and/or have a significant impact on two or more wards in Peterborough.

This Forward Plan should be seen as an outline of the proposed decisions and it will be updated on a monthly basis. The dates detailed within the Plan are subject to change and those items amended or identified for decision more than one month in advance will be carried over to forthcoming plans. Each new plan supersedes the previous plan. Any questions on specific issues included on the Plan should be included on the form which appears at the back of the Plan and submitted to Alex Daynes, Senior Governance Officer, Chief Executive's Department, Town Hall, Bridge Street, PE1 1HG (fax 01733 452483). Alternatively, you can submit your views via e-mail to alexander.daynes@peterborough.gov.uk or by telephone on 01733 452447.

The Council invites members of the public to attend any of the meetings at which these decisions will be discussed and the papers listed on the Plan can be viewed free of charge although there will be a postage and photocopying charge for any copies made. All decisions will be posted on the Council's website: www.peterborough.gov.uk. If you wish to make comments or representations regarding the 'key decisions' outlined in this Plan, please submit them to the Governance Support Officer using the form attached. For your information, the contact details for the Council's various service departments are incorporated within this plan.

NEW ITEMS THIS MONTH:

War Memorial - KEY/02NOV/11

Budget 2012-13 and Medium Term Financial Strategy 2012-2023 - KEY/03NOV/11

Children's Centres Commissioning - KEY04/NOV/11

A1073 Eye Green Traffic Calming Scheme - KEY05/NOV/11

Section 75 agreement with NHS Peterborough - KEY/02DEC/11

NOVEMBER

KEY DECISION REQUIRED	DATE OF DECISION	DECISION MAKER	RELEVANT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE	CONSULTATION	CONTACT DETAILS / REPORT AUTHORS	REPORTS
<p>Delivery of the Council's Capital Receipt Programme through the Sale of Land and Buildings - Vawser Lodge Thorpe Road - KEY/04DEC/10</p> <p>To authorise the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Solicitor to the Council, Executive Director – Strategic Resources, the Corporate Property Officer and the Cabinet Member Resources, to negotiate and conclude the sale of Vawser Lodge</p>	<p>November 2011</p>	<p>Cabinet Member for Resources</p>	<p>Sustainable Growth</p>	<p>Consultation will take place with the Cabinet Member, Ward councillors, relevant internal departments & external stakeholders as appropriate</p>	<p>Andrew Edwards Head of Peterborough Delivery Partnership Tel: 01733 452303 andrew.edwards@peterborou gh.gov.uk</p>	<p>A public report will be available from the governance team one week before the decision is taken</p>

<p>Security Framework Contract - lot 2 - KEY/09DEC/10 Award lot 2 of framework contract; cash collection and cash in transit services, delivering services for the council such as collecting cash from parking meters and banking it securely.</p>	November 2011	Cabinet Member for Resources	Sustainable Growth	Internal and external stakeholders as appropriate	Matthew Rains P2P Manager Tel: 01733 317996 matthew.rains@peterborough.gov.uk	A public report will be available from the governance team one week before the decision is made
<p>Draft Housing Strategy - KEY/04JUN/11 To approve the draft Housing Strategy 2011-2014 for the purposes of public consultation.</p>	November 2011	Cabinet	Sustainable Growth	Internal and External as appropriate	Richard Kay Policy and Strategy Manager richard.kay@peterborough.gov.uk	A public report will be made available from the governance team one week before the decision is made.
<p>Nene Park Academy Award of Contract - KEY/13JUN/11 To vary the Ormiston Bushfield Academy (OBA) Design and Build Contract with Kier Regional Ltd (trading as Kier Eastern) to allow for the design and build of Nene Park Academy</p>	November 2011	Cabinet Member for Education, Skills and University, Cabinet Member for Resources	Creating Opportunities and Tackling Inequalities	Executive Director Children Services, Executive Director Resources, Solicitor to the Council, Ward Councillors	Brian Howard Programme Manager - Secondary Schools Development Tel: 01733 863976 brian.howard@peterborough.gov.uk	A public report will be available from the governance team one week before the decision is taken

<p>Amendment to terms of the Affordable Housing Fund Allocation for Stanground South phases, 3E, 3F, 3G, 3H and 3I - KEY/02JUL/11 To approve conversion of the tenure of rented units to be provided on this site from 'social rented' tenure to 'affordable rented' tenure.</p>	November 2011	<p>Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth, Strategic Planning, Economic Development and Business Engagement</p>	Sustainable Growth	Relevant internal Departments and external stakeholders.	<p>Anne Keogh Housing Strategy Manager anne.keogh@peterborough.gov.uk</p>	A public report will be available from the Governance Team one week before the decision is taken.
<p>Energy Services Company - KEY/03JUL/11 To consider potential future developments of energy related products.</p>	November 2011	<p>Cabinet Member for Environment Capital, Cabinet Member for Resources</p>	Environment Capital	Internal and External Stakeholders	<p>John Harrison Executive Director-Strategic Resources Tel: 01733 452398 john.harrison@peterborough.gov.uk</p>	A public report will be available from the Governance Team one week before the decision is taken.
<p>Expansion to Hampton College - KEY/04JUL/11 To approve the forward build of phase 2 of Hampton College.</p>	November 2011	<p>Cabinet Member for Education, Skills and University, Cabinet Member for Resources</p>	Creating Opportunities and Tackling Inequalities	Internal and external stakeholders	<p>Jonathan Lewis Assistant Director - Resources, Commissioning and Performance jonathan.lewis@peterborough.gov.uk</p>	A public report will be available from the Governance team one week before the decision is taken.

<p>Street Lighting Policy - KEY/04SEP/11 To agree the street lighting policy for PCC.</p>	November 2011	<p>Cabinet Member for Housing, Neighbourhoods and Planning</p>	Environment Capital	<p>Internal and External stakeholders as appropriate.</p> <p>With internal and external stakeholders as appropriate.</p>	<p>Mark Speed Transport Planning Team Manager Tel: 317471 mark.speed@peterborough.gov.uk</p>	<p>A public report will be available from the Governance Team one week before the decision is taken.</p>
<p>Sale of surplus former residential care home - Eye - KEY/01OCT/11 To authorise the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Solicitor to the Council, Executive Director – Strategic Resources, the Corporate Property Officer and the Cabinet Member for Resources, to negotiate and conclude the sale of a former care home now surplus to requirement -The Croft, Eye.</p>	November 2011	<p>Cabinet Member for Resources</p>	Sustainable Growth	<p>Consultation will take place with the Cabinet Member, & Ward councillors, as appropriate</p>	<p>Simon Webber Capital Receipts Officer Tel: 01733 384545 simon.webber@peterborough.gov.uk</p>	<p>A public report will be available from the Governance team one week before the decision is taken.</p>
<p>Section 75 agreement with Cambridge and Peterborough Foundation Trust - KEY/03OCT/11 To approve the section 75 agreement with CPFT for the provision of mental health services.</p>	November 2011	<p>Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care</p>	Health Issues	<p>Internal and external stakeholders as appropriate.</p>	<p>Denise Radley Executive Director of Adult Social Services Tel: 01733 758444 denise.radley@peterborough.gov.uk</p>	<p>A public report will be available from the Governance Team one week before the decision is taken.</p>

<p>Hampton Community School - KEY/07OCT/11 To vary the Ormiston Bushfield Academy (OBA) Design and Build Contract with Kier Eastern to allow for the design and build of Hampton Community School.</p>	November 2011	Cabinet Member for Education, Skills and University	Creating Opportunities and Tackling Inequalities	Public, ward councillors and internal departments	Brian Howard Programme Manager - Secondary Schools Development Tel: 01733 863976 brian.howard@peterborough.gov.uk	A public report will be available from the Governance Team one week before the decision is taken
<p>Review of Play Centres in Peterborough - KEY/09OCT/11 To approve recommendations for changes in play centre delivery.</p>	November 2011	Cabinet Member for Children's Services	Creating Opportunities and Tackling Inequalities	Officers and a Councillor Reference Group	Karen Moody Head of Early Intervention & Prevention and Strategic Lead for Adult L&S Tel: 01733 863938 karen.moody@peterborough.gov.uk	A public report will be available from the Governance Team one week before the decision is taken.
<p>Single Equality Scheme - KEY/02SEP/11 To approve the final scheme following consultation</p>	November 2011	Cabinet	Creating Opportunities and Tackling Inequalities.	Public consultation via stakeholders and partnerships.	Denise Radley Executive Director of Adult Social Services Tel: 01733 758444 denise.radley@peterborough.gov.uk	A public report will be available from the governance team one week before the decision is taken.

<p>Peterborough's Transport Partnership Policy for pupils aged 4-16 years - KEY/01NOV/11 To approve the new policy for September 2012.</p>	November 2011	Cabinet Member for Education, Skills and University	Creating Opportunities and Tackling Inequalities	Internal and public consultation	Rowena Sampson Transport Officer rowena.sampson@peterborough.gov.uk	A public report will be available from the Governance team one week before the decision is taken.
<p>War Memorial - KEY/02NOV/11 To approve the contract, installation and location for a new War Memorial in the city centre.</p>	November 2011	Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth, Strategic Planning, Economic Development and Business Engagement	Strong and Supportive Communities	Members of public and city councillors.	Jim Daley Principal Built Environment Officer Tel: 01733 453522 jim.daley@peterborough.gov.uk	A public report will be available from the Governance Team one week before the decision is taken.
<p>Budget 2012-13 and Medium Term Financial Strategy 2012-2023 - KEY/03NOV/11 Draft budget proposals and Medium Term Financial Strategy to 2022/23 to be agreed as a basis for consultation.</p>	November 2011	Cabinet	Sustainable Growth	Internal and external stakeholders as appropriate.	John Harrison Executive Director-Strategic Resources Tel: 01733 452398 john.harrison@peterborough.gov.uk	A public report will be available from the governance team one week before the decision is taken.

<p>Children's Centres Commissioning - KEY04/NOV/11 To approve the award of contracts for the management and operation of 12 Children Centres in Peterborough.</p>	November 2011	Cabinet Member for Children's Services	Creating Opportunities and Tackling Inequalities	Providers, Councillors, Staff,	Pam Setterfield Assistant Head of Children & Families Services (0-13) Tel: 01733 863897 pam.setterfield@peterborough.gov.uk	A public report will be available from the Governance Team one week before the decision is taken.
<p>A1073 Eye Green Traffic Calming Scheme - KEY05/NOV/11 To award a contract for the A1073 Eye Green Traffic Calming Scheme</p>	November 2011	Cabinet Member for Housing, Neighbourhoods and Planning	Sustainable Growth	Members of public and ward councillors	Victoria Tyers Senior Engineer (Development) Tel: 01733 453440 victoria.tyers@peterborough.gov.uk	A public report will be available from the Governance Team one week before the decision is taken.
<p>Stanground College - award of contract - KEY/06NOV/11 To vary the Ormiston Bushfield Academy (OBA) Design and Build Contract with Kier Regional Ltd (trading as Kier Eastern) to allow for the design and build of Stanground College</p>	November 2011	Cabinet Member for Education, Skills and University, Cabinet Member for Resources	Creating Opportunities and Tackling Inequalities	Executive Director Children Services, Executive Director Resources, Solicitor to the Council, Ward Councillors	Brian Howard Programme Manager - Secondary Schools Development Tel: 01733 863976 brian.howard@peterborough.gov.uk	A public report will be available from the Governance Team one week before the decision is taken.

DECEMBER

KEY DECISION REQUIRED	DATE OF DECISION	DECISION MAKER	RELEVANT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE	CONSULTATION	CONTACT DETAILS / REPORT AUTHORS	REPORTS
<p>Minerals and Waste: Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) - KEY/01DEC/11 To adopt the Waste Management Design Guide SPD</p>	December 2011	Cabinet	Sustainable Growth	Internal and External stakeholders as appropriate	Richard Kay Policy and Strategy Manager richard.kay@peterborough.gov.uk	A public report will be available from the Governance Team one week before the decision is taken.
<p>Section 75 agreement with NHS Peterborough - KEY/02DEC/11 To approve the section 75 agreement with NHSP for the commissioning and provision of learning disability services.</p>	December 2011	Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care	Health Issues	Internal and external stakeholders as appropriate	Denise Radley Executive Director of Adult Social Services Tel: 01733 758444 denise.radley@peterborough.gov.uk	A public report will be available from the Governance Team one week before the decision is taken.

JANUARY

KEY DECISION REQUIRED	DATE OF DECISION	DECISION MAKER	RELEVANT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE	CONSULTATION	CONTACT DETAILS / REPORT AUTHORS	REPORTS
<p>Traffic Signals LED Project - award of contract - KEY/03SEP/11 Contract to replace all traffic signal head lamps in Peterborough with LED as LED Heads are more efficient brighter, safer and have a much longer life.</p>	<p>January 2012</p>	<p>Cabinet Member for Housing, Neighbourhoods and Planning</p>	<p>Environment Capital</p>	<p>Internal and external stakeholders as appropriate</p>	<p>Amy Wardell Team Manager - Passenger Transport Projects Tel: 01733 317481 amy.wardell@peterborough.gov.uk</p>	<p>A public report will be available from the Governance Team one week before the decision is taken.</p>

FEBRUARY

There are currently no Key Decisions scheduled for February.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S DEPARTMENT Town Hall, Bridge Street, Peterborough, PE1 1HG

Communications
Strategic Growth and Development Services
Legal and Democratic Services
Policy and Research
Economic and Community Regeneration
HR Business Relations, Training & Development, Occupational Health & Reward & Policy

STRATEGIC RESOURCES DEPARTMENT Director's Office at Town Hall, Bridge Street, Peterborough, PE1 1HG

Finance
Internal Audit
Information Communications Technology (ICT)
Business Transformation
Strategic Improvement
Strategic Property
Waste
Customer Services
Business Support
Shared Transactional Services
Cultural Trust Client

CHILDRENS' SERVICES DEPARTMENT Bayard Place, Broadway, PE1 1FB

Safeguarding, Family & Communities
Education & Resources
Children's Community Health

OPERATIONS DEPARTMENT Bridge House, Town Bridge, PE1 1HB

Planning Transport & Engineering (Development Management, Construction & Compliance, Infrastructure Planning & Delivery, Network Management)

Commercial Operations (Resilience, Strategic Parking and Commercial CCTV, City Centre, Markets & Commercial Trading, Passenger Transport)

Neighbourhoods (Strategic Regulatory Services, Safer Peterborough, Strategic Housing, Cohesion, Social Inclusion)

Operations Business Support (Finance)

Planning Transport & Engineering (Development Management, Construction & Compliance, Infrastructure Planning & Delivery, Network Management)

This page is intentionally left blank

**STRONG AND SUPPORTIVE COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
WORK PROGRAMME 2011/12**

Meeting Date	Item	Progress
15 June 2011 <i>Draft Report 27 May</i> <i>Final Report 6 June</i>	Strong and Supportive communities: introduction, Overview and Work Programme To receive a comprehensive overview of the issues, opportunities, priorities and challenges in connection with the strong and supportive communities theme, with the aim of establishing a scrutiny work programme for the year. Contact Officer: Adrian Chapman	Suggested items from the presentation to be included in the work programme to be discussed at the next Group Representatives meeting.
	Review of 2010/11 and Future Work Programme To review the work undertaken during 2010/11 and to consider the future work programme of the Committee Contact Officer: Paulina Ford	Items for work programme to be considered at Group Representatives Meeting.
20 July 2011 <i>Draft Report 4 July</i> <i>Final Report 11 July</i>	CRIME AND DISORDER SCRUTINY COMMITTEE	
	Single Delivery Plan To scrutinise the delivery of Programmes 5 and 6 of the Single Delivery Plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Empowering people and creating cohesive communities • Reducing crime and tackling anti-social behaviour Contact Officer: Adrian Chapman	
	Neighbourhood Committee – Progress Report To receive an update report on the progress of the recommendations made by the Neighbourhood Council Review Group to Cabinet. Contact Officer: Adrian Chapman	

Meeting Date	Item	Progress
<p>14 September 2011</p> <p><i>Draft Report 26 August</i> <i>Final Report 5 Sept</i></p>	<p>Trees in Bridge Street</p> <p>To receive a report at the request of Cllr Sandford on the consultation regarding the trees in Bridge Street</p> <p>Contact Officer: Andrew Edwards</p>	
	<p>Neighbourhood Council Review Group</p> <p>To receive a report to agree the new Terms of Reference for the Neighbourhood Council Review Group</p> <p>Contact Officer: Paulina Ford</p>	
	<p>Citizen Power Programme – Outcome of Review</p> <p>To receive a report on the outcome of the review of the Citizen Power Programme in response to recommendations made by the Committee at its meeting in March 2011.</p> <p>Contact Officer: Paul Phillipson</p>	
	<p>CRIME AND DISORDER SCRUTINY COMMITTEE</p> <p>Designated Public Places Order</p> <p>To scrutinise the proposal to extend the existing Designated Public Places Order (DPPO).</p> <p>Contact Officer: Katy Softley</p>	
<p>9 November 2011</p> <p><i>Draft Report 24 Oct</i> <i>Final Report 31 Oct</i></p>	<p>CRIME AND DISORDER SCRUTINY COMMITTEE</p> <p>Single Delivery Plan - Integrated Offender Management</p> <p>To scrutinize the delivery of Programme 6 – Integrated Offender Management including an update on Restorative Justice.</p> <p>Contact Officer: Gary Goose</p>	

Meeting Date	Item	Progress
	<p>Commercial Operations</p> <p>To scrutinise the delivery of Programme 1 of the Single Delivery Plan - Create a safe, clean and vibrant city centre and make any recommendations</p> <p>Contact Officer: Annette Joyce</p> <p>Dog Control Orders</p> <p>To Scrutinise the use of Dog Control Orders and make recommendations.</p> <p>Contact Officer: David Marshall</p> <p>Citizens Power Task and Finish Group</p> <p>To receive a report on the formation of the Citizens Power Task and Finish Group for approval.</p> <p>Contact Officer: Paulina Ford</p>	
<p>5 January 2012 (Joint Meeting of the Scrutiny Committees and Commissions)</p>	<p>Budget 2012/13 and Medium Term Financial Plan</p> <p>To scrutinise the Executive's proposals for the Budget 2012/13 and Medium Term Financial Plan.</p> <p>Contact Officer: John Harrison/Steven Pilsworth</p>	
<p>18 January 2012</p> <p><i>Draft Report 4 Jan</i> <i>Final Report 10 Jan</i></p>	<p>Housing Allocations Policy</p> <p>To scrutinise the Housing Allocations Policy to include the Homelessness Strategy and the Empty Homes Strategy</p> <p>Contact Officer: Sharon Malia</p> <p>Homelessness Prevention</p> <p>To scrutinise and comment on the actions being taken to prevent Homelessness in the City and make any necessary recommendations.</p>	

Meeting Date	Item	Progress
	<p>Contact Officer: Sharon Malia Single Delivery Plan - Building VCS capacity to deliver local services.</p> <p>To scrutinize the delivery of Programme 5 –Building VCS capacity to deliver local services.</p> <p>Contact Officer: Leonie McCarthy</p>	
<p>7 March 2012</p> <p><i>Draft Report 20 Feb</i> <i>Final Report 27 Feb</i></p>	<p>Vivacity</p> <p>To Scrutinise the progress of the Vivacity Cultural and Leisure Trust.</p> <p>Contact Officer: Kevin Tighe</p> <p>Single Delivery Plan</p> <p>To scrutinize the delivery of Programme 5 – Receive an update report on delivering the localism agenda</p> <p>Contact Officer: Adrian Chapman</p> <p>Community Cohesion Strategy</p> <p>To scrutinise the impact of the implementation of the Community Cohesion Strategy and make any recommendations.</p> <p>Contact Officer: Jawaid khan</p> <p>CRIME AND DISORDER SCRUTINY COMMITTEE</p> <p>Safer Peterborough Partnership Plan</p> <p>To scrutinise and comment on the Safer Peterborough Partnership Plan 2012/2013 prior to its consideration by the Executive.</p> <p>Contact Officer: Gary Goose / Karen Kibblewhite</p>	

To be programmed into work programme:

- Police Reform and Social Responsibility Bill
- Strategic Tenancy Policy (Guidance for Housing Associations relating to Social Housing Reform)
- Single Delivery Plan – Tackling Domestic Abuse

Regular update reports to be received on

- Neighbourhood Committees
- Citizen Power Programme

To be programmed in when applicable

This page is intentionally left blank