

**MINUTES OF THE ADULTS AND COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD AT 7PM ON
TUESDAY 10 JULY 2018
BOURGES/VIERSEN ROOMS, TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH**

Committee Members Present: Councillors: N Simons (Chair), A Ali, S Bashir, R Bisby, A Ellis, J Fox, S Hemraj, D King, G Nawaz, N Sandford, L Serluca,
Co-opted Members: Parish Councillors N Boyce, J Hayes

Officers Present: Adrian Chapman – Service Director, Community and Safety
Ian Phillips - Head of Community and Safety Transformation
Sarah Ferguson - Assistant Director of Housing, Communities and Youth
Jawaid Khan - Cohesion Manager
Sean Evans - Head of Housing Needs
Rob Hill - Assistant Director of Community Safety / Prevention and Enforcement
Sarah Hebblethwaite - Housing Needs Operations Manager
Daniel Kalley - Senior Democratic Services Officer
David Beauchamp - Democratic Services Officer

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence received

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND WHIPPING DECLARATIONS

There were no declarations of interest or whipping declarations.

3. MINUTES OF THE ADULTS AND COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 13 MARCH 2018.

The minutes of the Adults and Communities Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 13 March 2018 were agreed as a true and accurate record.

4. CALL IN OF ANY CABINET, CABINET MEMBER OR KEY OFFICER DECISIONS

There were no requests for Call-in to consider.

5. APPOINTMENT OF CO-OPTED MEMBERS

The Senior Democratic Services Officer introduced the report which recommended that the Committee appoint Parish Councillor Neil Boyce as a non-voting co-opted member to represent the rural area. A further recommendation included in the report was to appoint a second Parish Councillor James Hayes as a non-voting co-opted member also to represent the rural area. Both nominations had been put forward from the Parish Council Liaison forum. The incorrect spelling of Parish Cllr. James Hayes surname on the report was noted.

The Committee unanimously agreed to appoint both Neil Boyce and James Hayes as co-opted members of the Committee to represent the rural area.

The nominated persons were in attendance at the meeting and the Chairman invited both Neil Boyce and James Hayes join the Committee for the remainder of the meeting.

AGREED ACTIONS:

The Adults and Communities Scrutiny Committee considered the report and **RESOLVED** to appoint both Parish Councillor Neil Boyce and Parish Councillor James Hayes as non-voting co-opted members to represent the rural areas for the municipal year 2018/2019. Both appointments to be reviewed annually at the beginning of the next municipal year.

6. INTEGRATED COMMUNITIES STRATEGY

The report was introduced by the Head of Community and Safety Transformation accompanied by the Assistant Director of Housing, Communities and Youth and the Cohesion Manager. The report asked the Committee to review the progress made in developing the Peterborough Together Partnership and proposals for developing the delivery plan for submission to Government and to review and comment on the strategic priorities identified.

The Adults and Communities Scrutiny Committee debated the report and in summary, key points raised and responses to questions included:

- There was a limited timeframe available to set up the programme and write a delivery plan and was therefore not as comprehensive as officers would like, hence the limited discussion around older and lonely people within the report. It was highlighted that this was a delivery plan to go through to government.
- Conversations with Age U.K. were ongoing about what could be done to support and integrate elderly people. Although a solution had not yet been found, the issues surrounding older people were being considered and would be part of plans going forward.
- No mention was made of the Armed Services Board. Officers had spoken at the Armed Forces Partnership Board about issues such as upskilling and unemployment. The Integrated Communities Strategy aimed to be as inclusive as possible however there were a limited number of seats on the Peterborough Together Partnership Board. The Peterborough Together Partnership Board's Select Committees and Working Groups would make sure engagement takes place.
- It was noted that sections of the community were being left behind, especially young people of Asian background with good qualifications raised in Peterborough who still ended up in low paying work. In order to achieve real integration and cohesion, all communities needed to be represented within the public sector and within organisations with whom the council had contracts that were not necessarily always adhering to the principles of equal opportunities. This could be a major barrier to integration and cohesion.
- There was general recognition of the importance of the English language as a tool of integration.
- Members noted that the Inclusive Cities Programme provided an opportunity to share learning and understanding about how cities in the UK and the USA experienced significant population change as a result of inward migration and how to develop inclusive and welcoming communities.
- An active dialogue would need to take place with employers to ensure all young people had employment and education opportunities.
- Work would be undertaken with the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government to identify the correct indicators of integration and cohesion. The Ministry were keen to identify the council's ideas about how to measure success and work together to build a robust performance framework around the strategy. Sustainability was key and short term investment must generate long-term change.
- European citizens who may feel isolated due to the national debate surrounding Brexit would be engaged through supplementary schools, projects on a national level and adequate emphasis on engaging with all communities including Europeans and through connectors and champions. It was noted that there were five major European communities

in Peterborough including Polish, Lithuanian, Latvian, Roma and Portuguese. Officers were confident about the strategy.

- It was noted that Community Cohesion should not be considered a new phenomenon in Peterborough. Goals should not be too difficult to reach despite national challenges such as Brexit. The strategy should be 'linked in' and 'mainstreamed' and should be sustainable for a long period of time.
- The Peterborough Racial Equality Council had been absent from the agenda of community engagement. Their offices had closed and their participation in community groups was very limited. There were doubts over whether they were still in operation although there were links with their volunteers who were active.
- It was mentioned that many European workers may lack a voice due to working long hours and that engagement with trade unions may help with this. It was asked if there should be a representative from a trade union or the Peterborough Trades Union Council on the Board. Officers responded that they would consult with the Chairman regarding this. The Peterborough Community Group Forum worked with members of European Communities to ensure their voices were heard.
- Members noted the lack of cross-party representation from Peterborough City Councillors on the Board. Members were informed that the Select Committees were being organised on a tight timeframe, with the focus being on working with community organisations and other public sector providers to try and pull information together. The Board was only one part of the process and engaging with members and the wider community had been identified as important and detailed consultation and research would be undertaken. The Adults and Communities Scrutiny Community was seen as having an important role. Queries regarding representation from a wider group of stakeholders would be discussed as the strategies developed in the months following this meeting.
- Members mentioned that it was important that the process was open and inclusive to show this had not been planned and imposed on a 'top down' basis. It was also queried as to whether the meetings would be held in public. Officers responded that that they would be working with different neighbourhoods to develop closer engagement. Integration could not be decided at Board level but from the communities themselves. Both urban and rural areas would be included and meetings had already taken place in Millfield and New England. There was a need to proceed quickly.
- Members expressed general support for the Integrated Communities Strategy.
- Members asked if the advertised Integration Programme Manager Role would be focusing on women or young people and women. Officers responded that the Integration Programme Manager role was in addition to the work currently being done by the Cohesion Team. Women had been specifically mentioned in the advertisement for this post because of issues highlighted in the 2016 Casey review of integration about women, marginalised women and young people and encouraging social mixing. Work needed to be done with existing partners representing women but there was an appetite to bring women from different communities together. Examples were given of collaborative initiatives between women from different religious backgrounds in Peterborough.
- Members commented that funding should be prioritised to groups with equal gender representation.
- Members commented that further support was needed for the hard to reach and marginalised groups.
- The size of Peterborough presented a good opportunity to make an impact and the support of committee members was encouraged to help keep the strategy sustainable over a long period of time.
- Officer's agreed that young people needed to be at the heart of the Integrated Communities Strategy. The Young People's Select Committee had met and the deputy youth MP was present Work with young people would take place to gain initial ideas and National Citizen Service was being used as part of this.
- Encouraging people from different social backgrounds to meet socially was important.

- There was a limit to how many people could be involved on the Board, hence the lack of representatives from Further and Higher Education providers. However, they have been consulted with.
- A good relationship had emerged with the University Centre with research pieces having been undertaken in social science programmes which provided a new insight. This provided an opportunity to work in a different way.
- The importance of engaging the Gypsy, Traveller and Roma communities was noted and great efforts were made in this area. The Peterborough Community Group Forum was chaired by a member of the Roma community.
- Members suggested that the work of the Select Committees should be carried out in public and in as open and inclusive way as is possible. This was proposed by Councillor Sandford and Seconded by Councillor Fox. The Chairman put the recommendation to the vote (7 in favour, 0 against, 2 abstentions). The additional recommendation was therefore agreed upon.
- The Service Director, Community and Safety suggested that the committee recommend that additional members are included on the Board and noted those organisations that had been previously mentioned by members. Councillor Ellis, seconded by Councillor Sandford proposed this as an additional recommendation. The Chairman put the recommendation to the vote (8 in favour, 0 against 2 abstentions). The additional recommendation was therefore carried.

AGREED ACTIONS:

The Adults and Communities Scrutiny Committee **RESOLVED** to note the contents of the report and

1. Review the progress made in developing the Peterborough Together Partnership and proposals for developing the delivery plan for submission to Government; and
2. Review and comment on the strategic priorities identified.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The Adults and Communities Scrutiny Committee **RESOLVED** to recommend to the Peterborough Together Partnership that the work of the Select Committees be carried out in public in an open and inclusive way as much as possible.
2. The Adults and Communities Scrutiny Committee **RESOLVED** to recommended that representatives of the following organisations are included on the Board of the Peterborough Together Partnership:
 - Peterborough Trades Union Council
 - Armed Forces Partnership Board
 - Representatives from opposition parties of the Council
 - North West Anglia NHS Foundation Trust
 - Peterborough Regional College
 - City College Peterborough

7. HOMELESSNESS STRATEGY AND ROUGH SLEEPING ACTION PLANS PROGRESS REPORT

The Report was introduced by the Housing Needs Operations Manager accompanied by the Head of Housing Needs. The report provided the Committee with an update of progress on the Homelessness Reductions Strategy Action Plan and the recommendations of the Rough

Sleeping Task & Finish Group, which were agreed by Cabinet on the 20th March 2017. The report also provides an update on the Housing Needs service.

The Adults and Communities Scrutiny Committee debated the report and in summary, key points raised and responses to questions included:

- Work to prevent homelessness had been tried for a number of years. Under the Homelessness Reduction Act, all local authorities would work in the same way which was welcomed.
- From October 2018 statutory agencies would have a duty to refer those who are or at risk of becoming homeless to the council. The Homelessness Team had worked with many partners across a range of agencies to ensure that people knew where to go to access the services they needed.
- The successful funding bid to the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government for Rough Sleeping initiatives represented what was needed for the city. Work was done with those who became 'street homeless' and the additional funding would give the council an opportunity to work further with them. The council did not wish to exclude anyone who became homeless. If a person did not have a local connection with Peterborough, the team would support them to return to where their local connections and support networks were to give them the opportunity to thrive.
- Recommendation RS13 (in Appendix 2) had been closed without being taken forward as officers had received advice from colleagues in Housing Strategy and Planning that such quotas could not be included because of the viability assessments undertaken by developers. If such quotas were applied, many schemes would not go forward. The recommendation was that the percentage of affordable homes required in the Local Plan be increased from 30% to 35% with 70% being affordable rented housing.
- The Service Director, Community and Safety clarified that the requirement for affordable housing was still present in the Local Plan. It was also clarified that the recommendation in the report was to increase the proportion of affordable rented accommodation, rather than affordable housing more generally and it was this more specific recommendation that was difficult to provide evidence for.
- Members queried why including a quota in the Local Plan was considered unviable when it had been included in the Housing Strategy and asked if planning law had changed to prevent this. Members commented that planning committees often drop affordable housing requirements when asked by developers and suggested a failure of the council to implement quotas.
- Members suggested that affordable rented accommodation was likely to be the only type of accommodation accessible to those who were homeless.
- Members asked if a quota of affordable rented accommodation could be provided if it could be proved that there was a link between homelessness and a lack of affordable rented accommodation.
- There was a 'break clause' in the St Michael's Gate contract in November 2018. The council would review temporary accommodation requirements and decide whether to enter into the third year of the contract until November 2019. The situation is different to when the contract was signed with demand exceeding supply. If the contract was not extended 72 units would be lost, potentially to another local authority.
- It was suggested that a lack of housing was the primary cause of homelessness with more council houses being required. More support needed to be put in place for those in temporary accommodation with complex needs.
- Members asked if officers were confident that the budget could be found to keep the work going and if the recommendations of the Task and Finish Group could be implemented given that the funding was time-limited. Officers highlighted the importance of partnership governance and working with partners to develop a holistic response. A strong group had been brought together including the voluntary, community and faith sector within which the

council was a key partner. Funding had been received this year and discussions would take place with the Ministry about the possibility of extending funding into the following year. This would then give the council time to embed its 'whole system approach'.

- The Medesham Homes programme would include the delivery of affordable rented accommodation. Although some of this might be used as temporary accommodation in the early stages, 'temporary accommodation' in the present context did not mean someone living in a property for a few weeks and then moving on. Some households had lived in St Michael's Gate for 12-15 months which was possibly longer than if they had rented a property in the private sector. It was hoped that the majority of Medesham properties would be let as affordable rented accommodation through the choice-based lettings system to people on the housing register and in need.
- Medesham was scheduled to come on-line in July and concern was expressed by Members about how long it had taken and asked how many properties were being provided this year and in the future. Officers stated that 260 units were planned over the next three years. Figures were available on how many per year but these were not immediately accessible during the meeting.
- Members stated that Peterborough's Homelessness Strategy compared favourably with other cities and that underlying issues, such as drug and alcohol addiction and mental health need to be tackled.
- Some members commented that building council houses would not help to alleviate homelessness and suggested that care should be taken that homeless people outside of Peterborough were not attracted to the city by the extent of the council's housing provision.
- Members asked if the recorded number of homelessness cases referred to individuals or families. Officers clarified that cases ranged from a single individual to families with 5 children. Most of those in temporary accommodation would be families or vulnerable single people, for example those with a mental illness or problems with drug or alcohol misuse. Those visible on the streets were generally not those who voluntarily present themselves as homeless and required further outreach work.
- The main reason for homelessness was the loss of private sector accommodation caused by rents rising higher than household incomes, the decreased profitability of being a private landlord and the selling of properties by landlords when prices were high. Prices had increased and accommodation was increasingly being used as an investment.
- Members asked whether rough sleepers generally wanted support or if they were 'happy' living on the street. Officers responded that this was not a simple situation. Rough sleepers fell into different categories.
 - Those who are new to the streets and were willing to engage with the council to embrace an offer to leave the streets and accept support.
 - Long term rough sleepers with highly complex needs
- The Housing Needs Manager Operations Manager was asked to organise a visit for Members of the Committee to speak to rough sleepers to better understand the situations they find themselves in.
- Members had previously been invited to a prison to investigate the release process. They were told that prisoners are given £46 and told go to the council offices at Bayard Place. Members asked what happens after this. Officers responded that every person's situation was different although the assessment undertaken would be consistent. An action plan to help each individual secure accommodation would be developed although the level of support available would depend on their needs. Some would receive emergency accommodation until somewhere permanent could be secured although this was not for everyone. The council did have a duty to assist however and this could include financial support for finding accommodation in the private sector.
- Members stated that prisoners said that they would likely return to prison if they were unable to gain accommodation on the day of release with prison being seen as an 'easy option'. The duty to refer that would apply from October 2018 would mean the prison service would provide the maximum notice possible of upcoming releases. This would

allow prisoners to make alternative provision for their accommodation should provision not be available on the day of release.

- Officers stated that prisoners were among the most at-risk groups and noted the good work that had taken place across the County in partnership with Cambridgeshire County Council, the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner and district council partners. A workshop was held in May 2018 to look at this issue and generated recommendations to develop new pathways to deliver better working relationships with the probation, the prison service and housing services. This was being worked on and would be released imminently.
- Members stated that the demand for housing has not been met locally or nationally over the last few decades and that it would be necessary to 'catch up'. It was noted that homelessness was embarrassing in the 21st century. The hard work of the officers under difficult circumstances and with limited resources was noted.
- Officers stated that they shared members' sentiments and stated that as hard as the team work, if 20 people were sleeping rough, it appeared that the service was not performing even if 1,000 other people were housed. The Housing Needs team did not want anyone to be sleeping rough. They were aware of the increase of numbers and were confident that the additional funding will help to tackle this.
- Members asked if there was evidence that changing to direct payments of housing benefits to tenants had led to an increase in evictions. Officers responded that the issues surrounding evictions and Universal Credit and direct payment were well documented with private sector landlords nervous about letting properties to people in receipt of benefits.
- Members suggested there was a distinction to draw between those who were forced to live on the streets, e.g. through death, divorce or unemployment and those who did so voluntarily, e.g. through drug, alcohol or gambling abuse. It was asked how the council assessed and prioritised who to help and what the 'exit strategy' was to help people rebuild their lives.
- Officers responded that the council would consider anyone's case regardless of needs or circumstances and that everybody's situation was different. A non-discriminatory approach was used although a person's circumstances or level of need might have a bearing on the final outcome. The approach was to empower people to make a change. Many entrenched rough sleepers considered their situation to be normal. It was not easy to change their perception and months of engagement was necessary. They might not take up the offer of help and the support needed to be available when they changed their mind which could be a long term process.
- The difference between beggars and rough sleepers was highlighted and Members challenged the idea that people chose to sleep rough.
- It was asked what extra work would be taken on by the additional 2 outreach officers (4 in total). It was noted that there were rough sleepers across the city, in places such as Bretton, Werrington and Millfield, not just the city centre, and it was asked if the Outreach Team would be working in these areas. Outreach workers were out across the city every day responding and engaging with individuals. Increasing the number of officers would mean that double the work could be done. Regular day-to-day contact with all those who sleep rough was important to build support plans as well as work with partner agencies such as Aspire and mental health services. The funding package would enable officers to give anyone an offer to leave the streets and empower and sustain them to find accommodation.
- The StreetLink project, provided by the Homeless Link charitable organisation, enabled members of the public to report incidents when people were sleeping rough. These reports came from all areas of the city
- One of the 'Amber' actions was about the Communication Strategy. This work had developed since the report was produced and more information would come out in the months to follow after the meeting. Officers would ensure that engagement with councillors was part of the strategy and that members of the Committee were included in this.
- Members sought clarification on the progress of utilising empty homes and asked how many landlords had come forward. Officers mentioned that there had been media

coverage of empty homes and the leasing scheme which resulted in encouraging signs with a number of landlords contacting officers to help with demand issues. The newly appointed Housing Commissioner, Adam Cliff, was helping to lease homes from private sector landlords to increase levels of temporary and move-on accommodation. Rachel Hughes had been recruited to Adam's former role of Empty Homes Officer and was working closely with him.

- It was asked what work was being done with housing associations to increase stock and buy properties as they became available. Officers stated that housing associations played a vital role and that the council had a positive relationship with them. Cross Keys homes had previously been buying homes off the open market to increase their stock and this was being restarted as part of the Medesham Homes programme. Consideration was being given to how the council could utilise the private ownership market alongside the development pipeline of accommodation.
- Members commented that there appeared to be an increase in the use of abandoned boats being used by people sleeping rough. Officers responded that this had not been looked at as a matter of course. Historically, reports had been received about abandoned or derelict boats being used by rough sleepers and those people were engaged with as the reports came in. Officers would pass on Members' comments to the Outreach Team so they could investigate further. Members noted that boats were particularly prevalent around Millennium Bridge and many were in poor condition.

AGREED ACTIONS:

The Adults and Communities Scrutiny Committee **RESOLVED** to note the contents of the report and scrutinise the progress updates in relation to the Homelessness Reduction Strategy Action Plan, the Rough Sleeper Task and Finish Group recommendations and the Housing Needs Service update. It was also agreed that;

1. The Head of Housing Needs would provide the Committee with the number of homes provided this year by Medesham and the projected figure per year over the next three years; and
2. Organise a visit for Members of the Committee to speak to rough sleepers to better understand the situations they find themselves in.

20:45hrs. Councillor Bisby left the meeting.

CRIME AND DISORDER SCRUTINY COMMITTEE FOR ITEMS 8 & 9 ONLY

8. DOMESTIC ABUSE AND SEXUAL VIOLENCE STRATEGY - PROGRESS IN 2017/18

The Report was introduced by the Assistant Director for Housing Communities and Youth which updated members on the Countywide work carried out during 2017 - 2018 to tackle domestic abuse and sexual violence in line with the countywide strategy, in the context of local priorities of the Safer Peterborough Partnership.

The Adults and Communities Scrutiny Committee debated the report and in summary, key points raised and responses to questions included:

- Members sought clarification as to whether victims, male or female, came from a particular cultural background or if rates of abuse were evenly spread among different communities. Officers responded that domestic violence could affect anyone and the council was only aware of reported incidents, not the overall occurrence. Services, such as Children's Services, did have anecdotal evidence about communities in which domestic abuse and sexual violence were underreported.

- No specific data was available about the sexual abuse of vulnerable people, primarily women, in the street. However the council had secured funding for an Independent Domestic Violence Advisor, specialising in stalking and harassment, covered under Paragraph 4.6 of the report under the 'Prepare' heading. The government were keen to fund this and this work would take place from the Victims' Hub in Peterborough.
- There was a national correlation between high profile football matches and domestic abuse incidents. This had nothing to do with football specifically, but stemmed more from the abuse of alcohol. The Council had tried to build in sufficient capacity to respond to spikes in incident rates.
- 'Children of Adam' was a local charity run by young people. It was non-political and helped all communities.
- Members of the committee were offered the opportunity visit the Cambridgeshire Constabulary's Domestic Violence team to gain a greater understanding of the challenges being faced.

AGREED ACTIONS:

1. The Adults and Communities Scrutiny Committee **RESOLVED** to note the contents of the report and;
 - Scrutinise the progress of the delivery of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Violence Against Women and Girls (Domestic Abuse and Sexual Violence) Strategy during 2017 - 18.
 - Comment on priorities for 2018/19
 - Note the intention to bring a further paper to the Committee in September 2018 to consider Peterborough City Council's plan for accreditation to the White Ribbon Campaign.

9. ENVIRONMENTAL ENFORCEMENT - KINGDOM REVIEW

The report was introduced by the Assistant Director of Community Safety and Prevention and Enforcement which updated members on the current performance and delivery in relationship to the existing environmental enforcement contract as well as future plans.

The Adults and Communities Scrutiny Committee debated the report and in summary, key points raised and responses to questions included:

- Members felt that the Kingdom Environmental Services trial had been effective and highlighted the actions that had been targeted were anti-social behaviour. Members cited specific examples which they found particularly concerning including spitting and urinating. Members stated that more officers were needed and that the work needed to be spread around the city.
- Members asked for clarity on the 35 cases of 'Failing to dismount from a cycle' and asked if this was a different offence to 'Unauthorised cycling (on Bridge Street)'. It was noted that the data regarding cycling in the restricted area may have been slightly misleading as the Kingdom computer system sometimes produced data under this alternative heading but both referred to the same offence of cycling through the restricted zone.
- Members stated that the work done was vital and expressed support for this being extended across the city. Parking enforcement was highlighted as being a particular issue.
- Whilst members considered the work to be vital, concerns were expressed about anti-social behaviour enforcement being privatised alongside the reduction of the numbers of police officers. It was suggested that the self-funding nature of the scheme could mean enforcement becomes excessive with 'easy hits' being targeted. Members expressed

support for in-house delivery of the Environmental Enforcement work once the trial period had concluded.

- Officers were aiming to have final plans for the next financial year and would then present to Cabinet.
- Officers stated that Kingdom Environmental Services were paid a proportion of every ticket issued but that regular reviews were undertaken with Kingdom and few tickets had been issued incorrectly. Some had been overruled, e.g. for medical reasons, but there were very few of these.
- Concerns were also expressed about cycling enforcement and whether this could be off-putting to cyclists. Officers responded that different delivery options were being explored. More work needed to be done with organisations such as Sustrans. An alternative route had been provided around the back of Bridge Street and more needed to be done to publicise this.
- Members suggested that the in-house delivery should be considered because of its potential to generate revenue for the Council. The importance of acting commercially by making money to invest in services was noted. Members mentioned that the 'cost neutral' nature of the scheme was concerning as any profits would go the company and not the council and this was not logical. Officers emphasised that that this was a trial to see how the service could make a difference and it would be necessary to examine the best of way doing this in the future.
- Members questioned the prioritisation of enforcement and stated that people attending ward surgeries were generally more concerned with issues such as fly-tipping and verge parking than illicit cycling or littering in Bridge Street. It was asked why cycling on Bridge Street was being prioritised at the expense of other issues when no one has been injured from this.
- No warnings were given prior to issuing a ticket except for under-18s who are not fined. However, when introducing the system, a six-week transition period was in place where people were given warnings.
- The City Centre and Millfield were picked as the most suitable areas for the trial and information from these areas was being evaluated before the council moved towards the next stage. The possibility of a Public Space Protection Order for Woodston was being investigated by officers and issues were being looked at that affected that particular community, e.g. discarded needles, not cycling. Officers would like to see this develop around every area
- Members asked if there was any data available about the number of tickets issued to different age groups and other demographic information. Officers stated while they did not have the data to hand, it was available and would be circulated to members of the committee.
- Members expressed general support for enforcing the law and felt that activities such as spitting, littering, cycling along Bridge Street and fly tipping were not acceptable and must be clamped down on. This enforcement could no longer be left to the police and other agencies must be involved.
- Members raised the possibility of expanding the remit of the enforcement scheme to incorporate additional areas environmental enforcement, especially fly tipping and parking crime. Officers stated that this was a supplementary service on top of existing parking enforcement and that the council's enforcement programme goes beyond the trial with Kingdom Environmental Services.
- Members requested that a hierarchy of enforcement priorities be made available to the committee for future scrutiny. The Service Director for Community and Safety suggested that a briefing note should be circulated to members of the committee outlining all the areas of enforcement that the council was responsible for. If something was not on this list, the possibility of these powers being secured could be investigated to inform the Service Director of Community Safety's work on his options paper.
- The Service Director for Community and Safety welcomed the recommendation to review the potential for bringing the service in-house in order to generate income to reinvest in other services, and have more control over priorities.

AGREED ACTIONS:

The Adults and Communities Scrutiny Committee **RESOLVED** to note the contents of the report and

1. Scrutinised the report and provided feedback on current performance, delivery arrangements and future service plans and:
2. Requested that the Assistant Director of Community Safety and Prevention and Enforcement provides a briefing note to the Committee outlining all the areas of enforcement that the Council is responsible for.
3. Requested the Assistant Director of Community Safety and Prevention and Enforcement provides members of the committee with a briefing note containing information on the number of tickets issued to particular age groups and other demographic information.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Adults and Communities Scrutiny Committee **RESOLVED** to recommend to Cabinet that those areas of enforcement currently carried out by Kingdom Environmental Services should be brought in-house and operated directly by the Council once the trial period had concluded.

10. REVIEW OF 2017/18 AND WORK PROGRAMME FOR 2018/2019

The Senior Democratic Services Officer introduced the report which invited the Committee to approve its draft work programme for the 2018/19 municipal years, consider its work in the previous year, monitor previous recommendations and note the terms of reference for the Committee.

AGREED ACTIONS

The Adults and Communities Scrutiny Committee noted the contents of the report and

1. Considered items presented to the Adults and Communities Scrutiny Committee during 2017/18.
2. Determined its priorities, and approved the draft work programme for 2018/2019 in Appendix 1.
3. Noted the Recommendations Monitoring Report attached at Appendix 2.
4. Noted the Terms of Reference for this Committee as set out in Part 3, Section 4, Overview and Scrutiny Functions and in particular paragraph, 2.1, item 2 Adults and Communities Scrutiny Committee and paragraph 3.4 Crime and Disorder as attached at Appendix 3.

11. FORWARD PLAN OF EXECUTIVE DECISIONS

The Senior Democratic Services Officer introduced the report which invited members to consider the most recent version of the Forward Plan of Executive Decisions and identify any relevant items for inclusion within the Committee's work programme or to request further information.

AGREED ACTIONS:

The Adults and Communities Scrutiny Committee considered the contents of the report and **RESOLVED** to note the Forward Plan of Executive Decisions.

12. DATE OF NEXT MEETING:

11th September 2018

CHAIRMAN
7.00pm – 9.31pm