1. **Purpose of Report**

   To seek formal approval to the draft report of the scrutiny project – ‘To investigate the case for additional enforcement resources for Southend’.

2. **Recommendations**

   2.1 That the report and the recommendations from the joint in-depth scrutiny project, attached at **Appendix 1**, be agreed.

   2.2 That the Chairman of the Policy & Resources Scrutiny Committee, in consultation with the Chairman of the Place Scrutiny Committee, be authorised to agree any final minor amendments to the draft report.

   2.3 That, in accordance with Scrutiny Procedure Rule 10 (Part 4 (e) of the Constitution), the Chairman of the Project Team present the final report to a future Cabinet meeting.

3. **Background**

   3.1 At their meetings on Monday, 11th July 2016 and Thursday, 14th July 2016, the Place Scrutiny Committee and Policy & Resources Scrutiny Committee (Minutes 110 and 153 refer respectively) approved the suggestion for a joint in-depth study to investigate the case for additional enforcement resources for Southend. The project plan was agreed by both Scrutiny Committees at their meetings on Monday, 10th October 2016 and Thursday, 13th October 2016 respectively (Minutes 340 and 372 refer).

   3.2 The specific focus of the review was to:

   (i) To investigate the possibility of the Council increasing resources for enforcement activity including consideration of the Council employing its own PCSOs or financing the provision of additional “Specials” by the Police. In the context of “Specials” specific consideration should be given to whether financial support could be offered to such officers and how they would be dedicated to the Borough of Southend-on-Sea; and

   (ii) To consider how such PCSO’s or additional “Specials” could contribute to an improved level of service in connection with the enforcement of public protection, waste, graffiti, street scene etc.
3.2 The Committees also agreed that ‘officers proceed with background work in advance of the scope of the topic being fully developed.

3.3 The Member Project Team, which was chaired by Councillor Brian Ayling, met on 9 occasions and considered a range of evidence to inform their approach, including witness sessions and a site visit. The Project Team comprised Councillors Robinson (Vice-Chairman), Arscott, Assenheim, Bright, Burzotta, Callaghan, D Garston, J Garston and Gilbert. Officer support was provided by Lysanne Eddy (Project Manager), Tim Row (Project Support Officer), Tim MacGregor, Ade Butteriss, Kelly Clarke and Rob Walters.

4 Recommendations

4.1 The scrutiny report is attached at Appendix 1. The report has been discussed and agreed by the Member Project Team and will be shared with the witnesses.

4.2 The review was set within the context of continuing budget cuts to the Council of at least £28m over the next 3 years; and continuing budget reductions to the Police which required them to prioritise and reduce services. It also came at a time where the Council was looking at the future vision of the Borough and redefining its contribution through the Our Town; Our Future programme.

4.3 It should be noted that approval of any recommendations with budget implications will require consideration as part of future years' budget processes prior to implementation.

4.4 Scrutiny is recommended to endorse the following conclusions from the review, for approval by Cabinet:

1. That the Council actively promotes the recruitment and retention of Special Constables within Southend as a sustainable and active part of reinforcing an enhanced uniformed presence by:
   1.1. Enrolling in the ‘Employer Supported Scheme’ for Special Constables run by Essex Police and actively promoting it to council employees with an initial target commitment of up to five staff enlisted and trained;
   1.2. Investigating the appetite of Essex authorities to a County wide approach for a Council Tax incentive scheme that promotes and encourages the recruitment and retention of Special Constables.

2. That the Council explores the potential for a revised ‘Borough Patrol’ model to be reintroduced by:
   2.1. Further investigating Maldon District Council’s example of community enforcement as a potential updated delivery model;
   2.2. Aligning existing council resources for enforcement more clearly under the premise of the ‘Borough Patrol’;
   2.3. Investigating opportunities from the income generation proposals that support, fund and expand the role of the revised ‘Borough Patrol’.
3. That the Council leads a renewed emphasis on the importance of continued strong and effective partnership working that achieves better coordinated working between existing enforcement agencies through clearly identified and articulated priorities by:

3.1. Undertaking a review of the governance, purpose and membership of the Southend Community Safety Partnership (CSP) to reinforce essential partnership relationships and ensure the inclusion of wider community and private sector partners in priority setting, information and intelligence gathering;

3.2. Commissioning an evaluation of the Community Safety Hub (CSH) with particular emphasis on reducing the apparent disconnect between the priorities of the CSP and the operational response of the CSH; ensuring more effective sharing, appropriate focus and direction of the current resourcing of wider enforcement across Southend partners;

3.3. Looking at how the Council currently uses the Community Safety Accreditation Scheme (CSAS), with a view to widening the scope of its use;

3.4. Tasking the CSP with ensuring that night time provision of suitable uniformed resourcing is identified and strengthened with particular emphasis on the high street and the night time economy;

3.5. That the Council instigates and facilitates quarterly updates to all Elected Members by the Southend Community Safety Partnership and in parallel with the Essex Police briefings.

4. That the Council explores potential income generation that supports the resourcing of enforcement activities through initially investigating:

4.1. The Proceeds of Crime Act 2002 to identify how recoverable funds could be better aligned to local enforcement response;

4.2. The options available through re-negotiation of key council contracts to better utilise corporate social responsibility accountability and social value legislation; for example the introduction of Waste Champions as identified in the waste contract;

4.3. A commercial approach to management of the CCTV capability and offer;

4.4. Sponsorship from private businesses;

4.5. How council contracts (for example, the parking contract) could be used to enhance the use of wider enforcement powers;
4.6. Reviewing Maldon’s experience to take a more pro-active approach to enforcement, including in relation to the issuing of Fixed Penalty Notices.

5. That the council promote the use of technology to enable real time processing of information and enhance intelligence capture that supports enforcement activities by:

5.1. Investing in appropriate equipment, such as handheld reporting devices and cam-vests for council personnel;

5.2. Ensuring that mobile technology requirements are met as part of contract re-negotiations as appropriate;

5.3. Supporting and investing in the creation of an ‘Intelligence Hub’, focused around the current CCTV unit and clearly linked with the Council’s SMART City programme;

6. That the Council proposes that the CSP realigns and strengthens its core communications across wider enforcement agencies and builds on existing channels by:

6.1. Establishing a Communications Group with representation across key agencies;

6.2. Producing a structured approach to communications across agencies with a coordinated and agreed strategy and projects identified;

6.3. Producing a succinct directory of local agencies that support the delivery of CSP priorities for coordination of messaging and clear sign posting;

6.4. Leading on key campaigns that promote community resilience such as the national campaign ‘Killing with Kindness’;

6.5. Ensuring that all activities for high level campaigns are ‘front loaded’ with adequate and accessible legal advice; as well as adequate resourcing of officers across the partnership to be visible and meet the challenges that prompted this review, such as street begging and anti-social behaviour.

7. That, given the Police and Crime Commissioner’s point during session two that the Council plays a vital and unique leadership role through the promotion of community cohesion and by championing community resilience, consideration should be given to how these messages are reinforced through existing networks, such as Tenants and Residents Associations, Active Citizens and Neighbourhood Watch Areas.
5. **Other Options**

Not applicable.

6. **Corporate Implications**

6.1 **Contribution to Council’s Vision and Critical Priorities** –

(a) **Excellent**:

- Work with and listen to our communities and partners to achieve better outcomes for all;
- Enable communities to be self-sufficient and foster pride in the town; and
- Promote and lead an entrepreneurial, creative and innovative approach to the development of our town.

(b) **Safe**:

- Create a safe environment across the town for residents, workers and visitors;
- Work in partnership with Essex Police and other agencies to tackle crime; and
- Look after and safeguard our children and vulnerable adults.

(c) **Clean**:

- Continue to promote the use of green technology and initiatives to benefit the local economy and environment; and
- Encourage and enforce high standards of environmental stewardship.

6.2 **Financial Implications** – The review was set within the context of continuing budget cuts to the Council of at least £28m over the next 3 years; and continuing budget reductions to the Police which required them to prioritise and reduce services. It also came at a time where the Council was looking at the future vision of the Borough and redefining its contribution through the Our Town; Our Future programme. There are financial implications to some recommendations but as yet they are unquantifiable. However, any recommendations progressing with associated financial implications will need to go through the annual budgetary process before implementation, as currently no revenue or capital budgets exist for the proposals.

6.3 **Legal Implications** – none.

6.4 **People Implications** – as described in report.
6.5 **Property Implications** – none.

6.6 **Consultation** – as described in report.

6.7 **Equalities Impact Assessment** – none.

6.8 **Risk Assessment** – none.

7. **Background Papers** –

   - Witness Session meetings held on 19\(^{th}\) October 2016, 19\(^{th}\) December 2016, 1\(^{st}\) February 2017, 7\(^{th}\) February 2017, 15\(^{th}\) February 2017, 22\(^{nd}\) February 2017 and 6\(^{th}\) March 2017
   - Updates to Scrutiny Committees on – 10\(^{th}\) October 2016, 13\(^{th}\) October 2016, 28\(^{th}\) November 2016, 1\(^{st}\) December 2016, 23\(^{rd}\) January 2017 and 25\(^{th}\) January 2017
   - Other evidence as described in the report.

8. **Appendix**

   **Appendix 1** – Joint In-depth Scrutiny Project Draft Report