

Cabinet

17 November 2008

Departmental action plan responses to the Patrolling the Streets Scrutiny Commission report

All Wards

Cabinet Portfolio:

Cabinet Member for Environment:
Councillor Sally Prentice
Cabinet Member for Safer Stronger
Communities: Councillor Donatus
Anyanwu

Report Authorised by:

Executive Director Finance and Resources;
Mike Suarez

Executive summary

The Patrolling the Streets report is the culmination of a scrutiny investigation led by a cross party group of councillors. The commission's initial intentions were to carry out investigations into the effective deployment of warden schemes in order to develop recommendation which would assist the eventual roll-out of a borough wide wardens scheme. With the decision to abolish warden schemes across the borough taken very early in its deliberations, the commission refocused its investigations to ask how the wardens role would be taken up by police community support officers (PCSOs). It also examined how other projects involving workers on the streets from the council, partners and local people such as Freshview and PRISM project could contribute.

Summary of financial implications

It is expected that the recommendations are met from within existing budget, projects and plans. However in developing the action plan officers may be required to apply for growth in expenditure through the normal budgetary process.

Recommendations

- (1) That the Cabinet approve the recommendations of the Patrolling the Streets Commission report and direct that the action plan be implemented.

Consultation

Name of consultee	Directorate or Organisation	Date sent to consultee	Date response received from consultee	Comments appear in report para:
Councillor Darren Sanders	Commission chair	07.08.08		App 1
Councillor Clare Whelan	Commission member	07.08.08		App 1
Councillor Stephen Morgan	Commission member	07.08.08		App 1
Councillor Imogen Walker	ECS Scrutiny chair	07.08.08		
Councillor Sally Prentice	Cabinet Member for Environment	14.08.08	22.10.0-8	
Councillor Donatus Anyanwu	Cabinet Member for Safer Stronger Communities	14.08.08	04.11.08	
Jo Cleary	ED Adults' & Community Services		04.11.08	
Tim Jackson	Public Realm HRE Finance			
Mike Dickens Peter Chapman	Legal	07.08.08	11.08.08 & 07.08.08	4.1 to 4.3
Frank Higgins	EDFR and Corporate Finance	07.08.08	11.08.08	3.1
Chris Lee	HRE	07.08.08		-
Elaine Carter	Acting Head of Scrutiny	07.08.08	12.08.08	-
Ann Edwards	Strategic Transformation	08.08.08	14.08.08	App 2
Ann Corbett	Community Safety	07.08.08	06.11.08	

Report history

Decision type: Key decision		Urgency item? No	
Authorised by Cabinet member:	Date report drafted:	Report deadline:	Date report sent:
Sally Prentice Donatus Anyanwu	7 th August	15 th August	22 nd October 2008
Report no.:	Report author and contact for queries:		
218/08-09	Byron R. Green, Lead Scrutiny Officer 020 7926 2510		

Background documents

Patrolling the Streets Commission Report (2007)

Appendices

Addendum: Action Plan response to Patrolling the Streets Commission Report

Appendix 1: Patrolling the Streets Commission Report (2007)

Departmental action plan responses to Patrolling the Streets scrutiny commission report

1. Context

- 1.1 The commission commenced its work in October 2006 with the intention of contributing to plans to roll-out a borough-wide street wardens scheme.
- 1.2 Consultation had begun with staff around the same time within the then Environment department; however, a decision was taken by Cabinet in January 2007 to abolish the majority of the street warden schemes and to support expansion PCSOs in conjunction with Lambeth Police.
- 1.3 This decision, and a later related decision to abolish Streatham Rangers by Regeneration and Housing, led to call-in meetings and widespread discussion on the impact of the loss of wardens schemes and how the introduction of PCSOs and other projects could achieve the hoped for outcomes of an expanded street wardens service.
- 1.4 The commission refocused its investigations to reflect these new circumstances and substantively completed its deliberations and produced its recommendations in November 2007.

2. Proposals and reasons

- 2.1 Members welcomed the widespread recognition that the positive impacts of wardens schemes need to be picked up by other programmes of the Council and its partners.
- 2.2 Members also supported a recommendation arising from the Housing Scrutiny Sub- Committee consideration of the call-in of the abolition of the Streatham Rangers Wardens scheme in October 2007: that a review of the effectiveness of PCSOs across the borough as a whole be undertaken and also with a focus on the impact on estates in Streatham Hill and Streatham Wells wards. The Commission requested the following:

Recommendation 1: That a report to the Environment & Community Safety Scrutiny Sub-Committee is produced reviewing how the positive impacts of warden schemes have now been taken up by new arrangements since their abolition.

Recommendation 2: That in the report, there is particular focus in the review on the impact of abolition on estates in Streatham Hill and Streatham Wells wards.

Recommendation 3: With the diversion of funds to introduce additional PCSOs across the borough, the commission recommends that a detailed analysis of their functions and effectiveness of PCSOs across the borough as a whole is undertaken and reported to back to Environment & Community Safety Scrutiny Sub-Committee.

- 2.3 Members were very positive about the Freshview concept but felt there was a further need to look at the environmental needs of the area, such as community safety, crime and deprivation. They suggested:

Recommendation 4: Members welcome the adoption of the mini-Freshview approach and recommended that there are future refinements of Freshview which are community and evidenced based.

Recommendation 5: Members recommended that officers investigate working with Groundwork when carrying out Freshview exercises.

Recommendation 6: Members welcome the December 2007 review of Freshview and the inclusion of community safety criteria into the concept and ask that regular reviews of Freshview be undertaken to see how it is working and which include more analysis of the outcomes and impact of Freshview activities.

- 2.4 Members were encouraged by the commencement of the Public Realm Integrated Systems Model or PRISM project as a key priority in the borough corporate plan. In relation to this it recommended the following:

Recommendation 7: It is recommended that the PRISM project takes account of non-Public Realm members of patrolling forces in the borough, both those across departments and those belonging to partner organisations in the community in order to encourage their engagement in and ease of communication with the reporting systems around problems with the physical environment, anti-social behaviour, crime and similar issues.

Recommendation 8: Members requested that the development and implementation of the PRISM project is monitored in the future work programme of the Environment & Community Safety Scrutiny Sub-Committee.

- 2.5 The work of the Patrolling the Streets Commission only scratched the surface of what is possible to achieve with patrolling forces.
- 2.6 It is a positive outcome that many of the suggestions and recommendations considered by the commission were taken on board and acted upon before the completion of this report.
- 2.7 There is also recognition in the work continuing elsewhere in the council and with partners that issues considered by the commission remain high on the agenda.
- 2.8 What the commission hopes is that these continuing efforts succeed in achieving a model of patrolling forces which are fit for purpose and contribute meaningfully, efficiently and in a more joined-up way to reducing crime and the fear of crime, fostering social inclusion and community cohesion, deterring anti-social behaviour, and improving the physical appearance of our streets.

3. Comments from Executive Director of Finance and Resources

- 3.1 There are no additional capital or funding commitments required by this report.

4. Comments from Director of Legal and Democratic Services

- 4.1 Arrangements for Scrutiny Commissions are set out in Rule 20 of the Scrutiny Procedure Rules, at Part 4, Section 5 of the Council's Constitution. Rule 20.1 states:

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee or relevant scrutiny sub-committee will establish all scrutiny commissions and determine their constitution, the appointment of co-optees, terms of reference and tenure of each commission.

Rule 20.5 states:

"Commission reports will be submitted to Overview and Scrutiny Committee or the relevant Scrutiny Sub-Committee for consideration, prior to submission of the report to the Cabinet, unless otherwise specified by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee."

- 4.2 By virtue of section 2, Local Government Act 2000, local authorities have the power to do anything which they consider is likely to achieve the promotion or improvement of the economic, social and environmental well-being of their area. This power may be exercised in relation to, or for the benefit of, the whole or any part of the authority's area or all or any persons resident or present in their area.
- 4.3 The section 2 power includes power for a local authority to, inter alia, give financial assistance to, enter into an agreement with, or provide staff, goods, services or accommodation to, any person. However, the well-being power does not enable the authority to raise money, nor to do anything which it is unable to do by virtue of any existing statutory prohibition, restriction or limitation on its powers.

5. Results of consultation

- 5.1 The Commission consulted widely with council officers, the Cabinet Member and welcomed contributions from the public. The commission was grateful for the contributions made and have taken the information received into account in reaching their findings.

6. Organisational implications

6.1 Risk management:

Many of the reports recommendation complement existing council projects and priorities. Failure to implement could reflect risks in these other areas..

6.2 Equalities impact assessment:

Equalities impacts were considered during the course of the commission.

6.3 Community safety implications:

The entirety of the commissions deliberations were devoted to improvement in community safety.

6.4 Environmental implications:

Projects such as Freshview are concerned with an improvement in the overall physical environment of parts of the borough which then have a subsequent impact on community safety.

6.5 Staffing and accommodation implications:

None

6.6 Any other implications: None

7. Timetable for implementation:

7.1 The detailed action plan to be implemented as set out in the addendum, to return to Environment & Community Safety Scrutiny Sub-Committee within twelve months for monitoring.



LAMBETH SCRUTINY ACTION PLAN

Report Title: Patrolling the Streets Final Report March 2008

Report of: Patrolling the Streets Commission

Report commissioned by: Environment and Community Safety Scrutiny Sub-Committee

Date adopted by Cabinet: 17th November 2008

Proposed dates for monitoring reports to Scrutiny sub-committee:

Update	Date	Completed?	Note
1 st	May 2009		c. 6 months after publication
2 nd	May 2010		c. 18 months after publication

Guide to completion of template

To be completed by	Actions ² (include additional comments and reasons for rejection where appropriate.)	Targets/Milestones ³ (measures of success)	Target dates ⁴ (do not use ongoing)	Resource Implications ⁵ (staffing financial etc. – include links and reference to key corporate priorities and projects)	Lead Officer ⁶ (insert name and role of officer responsible for the implementation of the action)
	Recommendation ¹				

NOTE: The completed template forms part of a Cabinet Report and therefore requires full Cabinet member clearance.

¹ Report recommendations are listed as found in the report.

² **If the recommendation is accepted** an explanation of the actions to be taken to implement the recommendation should also be recorded in this box. Please also complete the ‘resource implications’, ‘timetable’ and ‘lead officer’ boxes. Note if complete.

If the recommendation is rejected an explanation for its rejection should be provided. The other boxes can be left blank.

The Officer(s)/Cabinet Member(s) responsible for responding to the recommendation should indicate in this box any other comment on the recommendation. Comment may include options for the implementation of the recommendation, potential risks, or impacts on other services.

³ Detail clear achievements which will measure the success of the actions. These will be used for monitoring purposes.

⁴ Insert the significant implementation dates for the highlighted targets and milestones. Do not use “ongoing”.

⁵ Insert any resource (staffing/financial etc) implications that will arise from the actions highlighted in the ‘comment’ box.

⁶ Indicate in this box the officer responsible for the implementation of the action highlighted in the ‘comment’ box.

ADDENDUM: Patrolling the Streets Scrutiny Commission Action Plan

To be completed by	Actions ² (include additional comments and reasons for rejection where appropriate.)	Targets/Milestones ³ (measures of success)	Target dates ⁴ (do not use ongoing)	Resource Implications ⁵ (staffing financial etc. – include links and reference to key corporate priorities and projects)	Lead Officer ⁶ (insert name and role of officer responsible for the implementation of the action)
	<p>Recommendation 1:</p> <p>That a report to the ECS Scrutiny committee is produced reviewing how the positive impacts of warden schemes have now been taken up by new arrangements since their abolition.</p> <p>Recommendation 2:</p> <p>That in the report, there is particular focus in the review on the impact of abolition on estates in Streatham Hill and Streatham Wells wards.</p>				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Produce comprehensive report for presentation at ECCS Scrutiny to review the Local Authority funded PCSOs one year following the arrival of a full complement. This report will make reference to both Recommendations 1 and 2 • With reference to Recommendation 2, it should be noted that 1 LA funded PCSO has been allocated a micro-beat alongside a newly formed 'A23' Police Team, to cover the A23 corridor, Leigham Court Road and Sackville Estate. In addition, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion of Report • ECCS Scrutiny 	<p>December 2008</p> <p>March 2009</p>	<p>22 Local Authority Funded PCSOs @ £20,000 each over 2 years</p> <p>A Safer Lambeth, with Strong Communities</p> <p>Safer Lambeth Partnership Plan 2008/9</p> <p>Fear of Crime Strategy</p>	<p>Chief Inspector Pat Beynon</p> <p>Rachel Gailey</p> <p>Doug Perry</p>

ADDENDUM: Patrolling the Streets Scrutiny Commission Action Plan

To be completed by	Actions ² (include additional comments and reasons for rejection where appropriate.)	Targets/Milestones ³ (measures of success)	Target dates ⁴ (do not use ongoing)	Resource Implications ⁵ (staffing financial etc. – include links and reference to key corporate priorities and projects)	Lead Officer ⁶ (insert name and role of officer responsible for the implementation of the action)
	during December 2007, a Key Individual Network survey was conducted in Streatham Wells Ward involving 54 residents. 63% stated they had noticed an increased uniform presence in the area. 22 residents reported seeing uniformed foot or cycle patrols daily and a further 17 at least weekly.				
	Recommendation 3: With the diversion of funds to introduce additional PCSOs across the borough, the commission recommends that a detailed analysis of their functions and effectiveness of PCSOs across the borough as a whole is undertaken and reported to back to ECS Scrutiny.				
	Cabinet is asked to note that a 6 and 12 month evaluation of the functions and effectiveness of the PCSOs has been undertaken. In addition a report was presented to the Safer, Stronger Communities Transformation Board in April 2007. However, as we enter year 2 of the current contract a review of the current KPIs has been undertaken and more robust performance measures considered. In addition, there is opportunity to consider a range of alternative tasking arrangements for the LA funded PCSOs as the current Section 92	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreement of revised KPIs • Enhanced Tasking arrangements through Partnership Tasking & Coordinating group • Production of a full and detailed evaluation report including an options appraisal regarding future tasking and management arrangements 	<p>November 2008</p> <p>October 2008</p> <p>December 2008</p>	<p>22 Local Authority Funded PCSOs @ £20,000 each over 2 years</p> <p>A Safer Lambeth, with Strong Communities</p> <p>Safer Lambeth Partnership Plan 2008/9</p> <p>Fear of Crime Strategy</p>	<p>Chief Inspector Pat Beynon</p> <p>Rachel Gailey</p> <p>Doug Perry</p>

ADDENDUM: Patrolling the Streets Scrutiny Commission Action Plan

To be completed by	Actions ² (include additional comments and reasons for rejection where appropriate.)	Targets/Milestones ³ (measures of success)	Target dates ⁴ (do not use ongoing)	Resource Implications ⁵ (staffing financial etc. – include links and reference to key corporate priorities and projects)	Lead Officer ⁶ (insert name and role of officer responsible for the implementation of the action)
	<p>agreement expires in May 2009.</p> <p>Given this, a detailed analysis with options for the future will be produced in December 2008, when the full cohort of PCSOs have been in post for a full year.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ECCS Scrutiny 	March 2009		
	<p>Recommendation 4:</p> <p>Members welcome the adoption of the mini-Freshview approach and recommended that there are future refinements of Freshview which are community and evidenced based.</p>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community Freshview Operations are constantly being refined and have been very successful. To date there have been 17 Community Freshview Events across the Borough, spanning 10 Wards. These Events are kept fairly flexible to meet the many needs and aspirations of the community and are not limited to public highway. However, it is important that they are Community resourced with a Lead Community representative taking responsibility to ensure pride in the area is achieved. The identification of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Derelict Areas brought back into use Enhanced Local Communities Engagement with SNT's and Local Authority Cleaner Safer Greener Full reports of each event produced identifying aims and outcomes 	<p>September 2008</p> <p>September 2008</p> <p>September 2008.</p> <p>September 2008.</p> <p>November 2008.</p>	<p>Staff Time</p> <p>A Safer Lambeth and Stronger Communities</p> <p>Cleaner Greener Safer</p>		Doug Perry

ADDENDUM: Patrolling the Streets Scrutiny Commission Action Plan

To be completed by	Actions ² (include additional comments and reasons for rejection where appropriate.)	Targets/Milestones ³ (measures of success)	Target dates ⁴ (do not use ongoing)	Resource Implications ⁵ (staffing financial etc. – include links and reference to key corporate priorities and projects)	Lead Officer ⁶ (insert name and role of officer responsible for the implementation of the action)
	potential areas is shared between Street Care officers and the community. Council officers provide the expertise and advise to assist with achieving aims. The local Police SNT's have taken part in Many of the Community Freshview Events and provided valuable input as well as the added Community Engagement				
	<p>Recommendation 5: Members recommended that officers investigate working with Groundwork when carrying out Freshview exercises.</p>				
	Groundwork has been involved within Community Freshview Events at Unigate Wood. Discussions have also taken place with the intention of partnership working in possible future Community Freshview and Operation Freshview locations. On-street officers to engage with local communities and groups to identify possible sites for partnership approach with Groundwork through Community Freshview and Freshview Operations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of Areas/Land/Sites being brought back into use • Local Community Satisfaction 	December 2008	<p><i>Links into Corporate Plan</i></p> <p><i>Cleaner Greener Safer</i></p>	Doug Perry

ADDENDUM: Patrolling the Streets Scrutiny Commission Action Plan

To be completed by	Actions ² (include additional comments and reasons for rejection where appropriate.)	Targets/Milestones ³ (measures of success)	Target dates ⁴ (do not use ongoing)	Resource Implications ⁵ (staffing financial etc. – include links and reference to key corporate priorities and projects)	Lead Officer ⁶ (insert name and role of officer responsible for the implementation of the action)
	<p>Recommendation 6:</p> <p>Members welcome the December 2007 review of Freshview and the inclusion of community safety criteria into the concept and ask that regular reviews of Freshview be undertaken to see how it is working and which include more analysis of the outcomes and impact of Freshview activities.</p>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A review and evaluation of Freshview will be carried out annually to assess the effectiveness of the year. The review will assess Enviro quality and ASB data and partners involvement to ensure the poorest performing wards continue to be targeted by the operation; analysis of the measures of success will indicate whether improvements have been made in Freshview wards. A partner evaluation may also be included. Partners receive monthly feedback on activities undertaken. A Community Freshview evaluation form has been developed – it is to be completed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Production of review and evaluation report including assessment of performance indicators, operational and management elements of Freshview Agreed KPIs Community satisfaction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> January 2009 Monthly September 2008 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff time <i>A safer Lambeth with strong communities</i> 	<p>Doug Perry</p> <p>Anna Drinkwater</p> <p>Keith Naish</p>	

ADDENDUM: Patrolling the Streets Scrutiny Commission Action Plan

	Actions ² (include additional comments and reasons for rejection where appropriate.)	Targets/Milestones ³ (measures of success)	Target dates ⁴ (do not use ongoing)	Resource Implications ⁵ (staffing financial etc. – include links and reference to key corporate priorities and projects)	Lead Officer ⁶ (insert name and role of officer responsible for the implementation of the action)
To be completed by	by volunteers following activities. The pilot is to be trialled at the next scheduled Community Freshview.				
	Recommendation 7: It is recommended that the PRISM project takes account of non-Public Realm members of patrolling forces in the borough, both those across departments and those belonging to partner organisations in the community in order to encourage their engagement in and ease of communication with the reporting systems around problems with the physical environment, anti-social behaviour, crime and similar issues.				
	To be considered and developed by the PRISM Project Board and included where appropriate in the PRISM project plan.	A re-scoping exercise to be completed and an updated action plan issued and presented to the SSC/EDE Theme board.	December 2008	Existing staffing resources <i>Serving our customers well</i> <i>Safer, Stronger Communities</i>	Tim Jackson
	Recommendation 8: Members requested that the development and implementation of the PRISM project is monitored in the future work programme of the ECS Scrutiny Committee				
	That the implementation of the PRISM project is monitored and reported to the ECS Scrutiny Subcommittee at the same session that the Patrolling the Streets Commission action plan is monitored six months from its adoption	Report added to ECS work programme Report monitoring PRISM project submitted to ECS Scrutiny	March 2009 or first meeting thereafter. As required by the agenda management timetable	Within existing staffing implications	Byron Green Tim Jackson