



Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Committee

Date: TUESDAY, 13 JUNE 2023
Time: 11.00 am
Venue: COMMITTEE ROOMS, 2ND FLOOR, WEST WING, GUILDHALL

Members:

Tijs Broeke	Caroline Haines
Deputy Peter Dunphy	Deputy Shravan Joshi
Mary Durcan	Ruby Sayed
Helen Fentimen	Deputy James Thomson
Deputy John Fletcher	Luis Tilleria
Deputy Marianne Fredericks	James Tumbridge

Enquiries: **Richard Holt**
Richard.Holt@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Accessing the virtual public meeting Members of the public can observe all virtual public meetings of the City of London Corporation by following the below link:
<https://www.youtube.com/@CityofLondonCorporation/streams>

A recording of the public meeting will be available via the above link following the end of the public meeting for up to one civic year. Please note: Online meeting recordings do not constitute the formal minutes of the meeting; minutes are written and are available on the City of London Corporation's website. Recordings may be edited, at the discretion of the proper officer, to remove any inappropriate material. Whilst we endeavour to livestream all of our public meetings, this is not always possible due to technical difficulties. In these instances, if possible, a recording will be uploaded following the end of the meeting

Ian Thomas CBE
Town Clerk and Chief Executive

AGENDA

1. **APOLOGIES**

2. **MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THE AGENDA**

3. **ORDER OF THE COURT OF COMMON COUNCIL**

To receive the Order of the Court of Common Council appointing the Committee, dated 27th of April 2023.

For Information
(Pages 5 - 6)

4. **ELECTION OF CHAIR**

To elect a Chair in line with Standing Order 29.

For Decision

5. **ELECTION OF DEPUTY CHAIR**

To elect a Deputy Chair in line with Standing Order 30.

For Decision

6. **SUGGESTED WAYS OF WORKING FOR THE CRIME & DISORDER SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

Report of the Town Clerk.

For Decision
(Pages 7 - 12)

7. **REFOCUSING PRIORITIES FOR THE SAFER CITY PARTNERSHIP**

Report of the Town Clerk.

For Information
(Pages 13 - 16)

8. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE BOARD**

9. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIR CONSIDERS URGENT**

10. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

MOTION - That under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

For Decision

Part 2 - Non-Public Agenda

11. **NON-PUBLIC QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE BOARD**

12. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIR CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE BOARD AGREES SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 3

LYONS, Mayor	RESOLVED: That the Court of Common Council holden in the Guildhall of the City of London on Thursday 27 th April 2023, doth hereby appoint the following Committee until the first meeting of the Court in April, 2024.
--------------	---

CRIME AND DISORDER SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

1. **Constitution**

A Non-Ward Committee consisting of the Chairman and Deputy Chairman¹ of the:

- Policy and Resources Committee, or their representatives;
- Police Authority Board or their representatives;
- Community and Children's Services Committee or their representatives;
- Licensing Committee, or their representatives.
- Planning and Transportation Committee, or their representatives
- Health and Wellbeing Board, or their representatives
- Port Health and Environmental Services Committee, or their representatives

Appointed in accordance with section 19 of the Police and Justice Act 2006.

2. **Quorum**

The quorum consists of any three Members.

3. **Membership 2023/24**

The Members referred to in paragraph 1 above

4. **Terms of Reference**

To be responsible for:-

- (a) To review or scrutinise decisions made, or other action taken, in connection with the discharge by the responsible authorities of their crime and disorder functions;
- (b) To make reports or recommendations to the local authority with respect to the discharge of those functions.

¹ These appointments are to be made with the approval of the committee in question and are, therefore, not considered to be ex-officio positions.

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee(s): Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Committee – For decision	Dated: 13/06/23
Subject: Suggested ways of working for the Crime & Disorder Scrutiny Committee	Public
Which outcomes in the City Corporation’s Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?	N/a
Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?	N
If so, how much?	N/a
What is the source of Funding?	N/a
Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain’s Department?	N/a
Report of: Deputy Town Clerk	For decision
Report author: Richard Riley	

Summary

This note sets out the Safer City Partnership’s suggested ways of working for the Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Committee – i.e. what we believe will best aid Member scrutiny and avoid duplication of the work of other existing policing and community safety committees.

Section 1 sets out the Committee’s formal terms of reference, section 2 sets out its formal agreed activities, and section 3 details what we suggest these should mean in practice. The most important point to note is that, legally and according to its Terms of Reference, this Committee’s purpose is to scrutinise, not direct the work of the Safer City Partnership on tackling crime and disorder.

Recommendation(s)

Members are asked to endorse these suggested ways of working or to set out – within the bounds of the formal terms of reference and agreed activities – where they wish to see them amended.

Main Report

Section 1 – Formal terms of reference

The City Corporation is required by law to have a committee overseeing the work of local 'responsible authorities' (statutory members of the Safer City Partnership) on crime and disorder. In line with that legislation¹, the below terms of reference were prepared by Corporation officials and lawyers and agreed by Members at an informal meeting of the nascent C&D Committee in January:

- *To review or scrutinise decisions made, or other action taken, in connection with the discharge by the responsible authorities of their crime and disorder functions;*
- *To make reports or recommendations to the local authority with respect to the discharge of those functions.*

Section 2 – Agreed activities

Under the ToR, and again in line with legislation and as agreed in January, the Committee's 'agreed activities' in its governance advisory schedule are:

- *Reviewing and scrutinising reports relating to (a) the discharge, or decisions made or other action taken in connection with the discharge, by the responsible authorities of their crime and disorder functions; or (b) local crime and disorder matters within the Committee's remit;*
- *In undertaking this, the Committee may comment on strategic alignment across and within the responsible authorities on issues relating to crime and community safety within its remit;*
- *In undertaking this, the Committee may comment on the impact of organisational policy on crime and community safety insofar as this relates to the Committee's remit;*
- *Requesting and receiving information from the responsible authorities or the co-operating persons relating to (a) the discharge, or decisions made or other action taken in connection with the discharge, by the responsible authorities of their crime and disorder functions; or (b) local crime and disorder matters within its remit;*
- *Requesting the attendance at crime and disorder committee meetings of an officer or employee of a responsible authority or of a co-operating person or body in order to answer questions.*

Section 3 – The Committee's work in practice

This section sets out how we suggest the above should translate into practical ways of working. The key point guiding its work in practice is that the Committee is not a decision-making forum for crime and disorder policy and does not have the power to itself direct the work of the Safer City Partnership.

- *Focus of scrutiny* – We suggest the Committee should, at a high level, act as a check on whether the SCP has 'done what it said it would do' – i.e. whether it is

¹ Section 19 of the Police and Justice Act 2006

meeting the plans and milestones agreed at official level, and if not to request explanations. We do not suggest it looks in detail at delivery plans – sub-groups of the SCP (violent crime, ASB etc.) will instead articulate its key priorities and where it is against them, and Members will assess if this performance is adequate, making recommendations for improvement as appropriate.

- *A note on 'responsible authorities'* – The SCP is composed of several 'responsible authorities' (organisations that have a legislative requirement to take part), including the fire and rescue service, local health board, and probation service. We suggest part of the Committee's focus could be on ensuring, where relevant, that these organisations are properly involved in jointly formulating and implementing plans, and on holding them to account where not.
- *Focus of advice and comment* – We suggest the Committee discusses with officials the SCP's main next steps and, using their wider view across the Corporation, advises on where these could better align with other priorities and ambitions. For example, it may query whether the SCP's comms plans on violent crime are fully aligned with comms plans for Destination City advertising the City as a safe place to visit. In line with its Terms of Reference, the Committee does not have any formal powers to re-direct the work of the SCP – e.g. to say that it must do more on mental health – though it can informally recommend similar actions and/or take these to other relevant committees for action.
- *Commissioning of briefing papers* – We suggest the Committee is serviced by short (1-2 page) update papers from officials and its (draft) working documents where relevant – e.g. it may be sent the draft serious violence strategy (which legislation requires us to produce for January 2024). We do not recommend that the Committee itself commissions background briefing on, for example, NTE-related serious violence in the City. Doing so risks duplication and/or adding to the work of pre-existing committees in an uncoordinated way – we recommend instead that, if C&D committee meetings identify a knowledge gap, Members bring this issue to e.g. the next PAB meeting which can decide if a paper is needed.
- *Frequency and length of meetings* – Given the above – i.e. our recommendation that the Committee provides high-level scrutiny and strategic advice – we suggest hour-long meetings once a quarter would be proportionate. Or rather, we suggest starting with this format and reviewing whether it provides enough time after the first 2 or so meetings. In practice – as the SCP is composed of seniors from across the Force and Corporation – shorter meetings will also make diarising easier.

Appendix: Governance advisory schedule for the Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Committee

Richard Riley
Director, Police Authority Team

E: Richard.Riley@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Governance advisory schedule for the Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Committee

1. Purpose

- 1.1 A committee, constituted in accordance with the requirements of section 19 of the Police and Justice Act 2006, with power to:
- 1.2 (a) review or scrutinise decisions made, or other action taken, in connection with the discharge by the responsible authorities¹ of their crime and disorder functions²; (b) make reports or recommendations to the relevant Committee(s) of the Common Council with respect to the discharge of those functions.

2. Activities:

- 2.1 Reviewing and scrutinising reports relating to (a) the discharge, or decisions made or other action taken in connection with the discharge, by the responsible authorities of their crime and disorder functions; or (b) local crime and disorder matters within the Committee's remit;
- 2.2 In undertaking 2.1, the Committee may comment on strategic alignment across and within the responsible authorities on issues relating to crime and community safety within its remit;
- 2.3 In undertaking 2.1, the Committee may comment on the impact of organisational policy on crime and community safety insofar as this relates to the Committee's remit;
- 2.4 Requesting and receiving information from the responsible authorities or the co-operating persons³ relating to (a) the discharge, or decisions made or other action taken in connection with the discharge, by the responsible authorities of their crime and disorder functions; or (b) local crime and disorder matters within its remit;
- 2.5 Requesting the attendance at crime and disorder committee meetings of an officer or employee of a responsible authority or of a co-operating person or body in order to answer questions.

3. Frequency of meetings

The Committee will meet at least three times a year.

4. Agenda

Prior to the meeting of each Scrutiny Committee, the Town Clerk committee services will circulate to all Members of the Scrutiny Committees the Agenda and Reports to be considered by the relevant Scrutiny Committee(s) for which they are Members.

¹ "responsible authorities" means the bodies and persons who are responsible authorities within the meaning given by [section 5](#) of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998;

² "crime and disorder functions" means functions conferred by or under [section 6](#) of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998;

³ those persons and bodies with whom the responsible authorities have a duty to co-operate under section 5(2) of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998

5. Proceedings

- 5.1 The Town Clerk will support the governance of the Committee with a member of the Governance Team fulfilling the role of clerk of the Committees.
- 5.2 The Standing Orders of the Court of Common Council Rules will apply to the Committee and its proceedings.

6. Co-option

- 6.1 The regulations allow crime and disorder committees to co-opt additional members to serve on the Committee.
- 6.2 The regulations make clear that co-optees, at the discretion of the committee, may or may not be voting members or may restrict these voting rights to particular matters.

Agenda Item 7

Committee(s): Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Committee – For Information	Dated: 13/06/2023
Subject: Refocussing priorities for the Safer City Partnership	Public
Which outcomes in the City Corporation’s Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?	#1 – People are safe and feel safe
Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?	N
If so, how much?	
What is the source of Funding?	
Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain’s Department?	
Report of: Richard Riley, Director of Police Authority	For Information
Report author: Charles Smart, Police Authority	

Summary

At its quarterly meeting on 5th June the SCP Board considered the attached paper about refocussing its priorities from the seven set out in its strategy last year down to three, as below.

It was proposed, and agreed, that the SCP should in the forthcoming year focus on a) tackling serious violence, incorporating VAWG, by implementing the Serious Violence duty, b) reducing ASB, by establishing an effective ‘task and finish’ group and c) reoffending, by implementing the new out-of-court disposals framework and refreshing the Integrated Offender Management framework.

The Board agreed to pause its own proactive work on substance misuse, safeguarding, and hate crime, as there are already other established multi-agency groups addressing these. The Board agreed it could still receive and consider updates on these areas by exception, where important. The board noted that, within the agreed priorities, it would need to be clear on the definition of VAWG as the national definition includes a broad range of offences.

Recommendation(s)

Members are asked to note the SCP Board’s decision, and the attached report. .

Appendices

- Appendix 1 – SCP Board paper – *Refocussing priorities for the Safer City Partnership*

Charles Smart

Policy Officer, Police Authority

charles.smart@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Refocusing priorities for the Safer City Partnership

Summary

The Safer City Partnership (SCP), following publication of its 2022-25 strategy last year, currently has seven 'key areas of focus'. We suggest this is too broad - some of these areas have little incidence in the City and/or are already covered by other groupings, and this breadth of focus risks detracting from progress on our higher-priority areas.

Recommendation

We recommend the SCP board agrees to refocus on three key areas:

- Reducing violence, including violence against women and girls (VAWG), with a focus on the Night-time economy and on producing our legally-required Serious Violence Duty
- Tackling and prevention anti-social behaviour (ASB), with a focus on establishing an effective multi-organisational 'task and finish' group to progress new initiatives
- Reducing reoffending, with a focus on improving Integrated Offender Management and implementing the new 'two tier' community disposals framework

The rationale for this refocusing is set out below.

Summary of changes

Current key areas	Proposed change
Serious violence	Retained and merged , focussing on night-time economy
Violence against women and girls	
Anti-social behaviour and neighbourhood crime	Retained , focussing on ASB
Reducing reoffending	Retained , focussing on IOM
Tackling substance misuse	Paused (updates by exception)
Safeguarding vulnerable children and adults	
Hate crime	

Rationale for changes

- **Serious violence and VAWG – Retained and merged -** We have a legislative requirement to produce a strategy to reduce serious violence by January 2024, with input legally required from many SCP member organisations. Strategically, we need to address the risk of increased violence including VAWG that may accompany the City's growing night-time economy. VAWG has also been designated a national threat in the latest Strategic Policing Requirement, and given its public and political prominence a robust response is more widely vital to trust and confidence in policing. The SCP provides a ready-made forum for developing our SV strategy and, through this, agreeing a Corporation-wide crime and disorder response to the expanding NTE. While there is an existing City VAWG Delivery Group, this focusses largely on operational issues and exchanging information, so the SCP's sub-group would not be duplicative.
- **Anti-social behaviour – Retained –** ASB ranks highly as a local concern for residents and members, and its national priority has increased following publication of the government's ASB Action Plan. Reducing ASB is important to ensuring a City that is both safe and feels safe, and is strongly associated with wider trust and confidence in policing. The SCP provides an opportunity to rebalance our local response to ASB, with greater action from the Corporation reducing the burden on police.

- **Reoffending – Retained -** While the City has no resident ‘prolific or priority’ offenders, there is an identified need to refresh our Integrated Offender Management framework to improve effectiveness in handling non-resident offenders apprehended in the City. The City Police are also implementing the new ‘two tier’ framework for community resolutions. Both of these entail improvements to referral pathways to support services and so are a logical fit for the SCP.
- **Tackling substance misuse – Paused –** At present, there is little evidence to show that the City has a problem with resident substance misuse offenders (the SCP 2022-25 strategy does not provide hard data on this). Action on non-resident problem users is largely already undertaken by local homelessness and rough sleeping services, the City-specific group of the Community Drugs Partnership led by the City’s Director of Public Health, and City’s Health and Wellbeing Board, which provides collective leadership on the public health aspects. In this context, there is not a clear justification that the SCP can provide added strategic value, or that there is a significant crime and disorder rationale for it to do so. To the extent to which substance misuse is associated with ASB, violence, or reoffending in the City, it can be addressed under the above areas.
- **Safeguarding vulnerable children and adults – Paused –** At present, there is little evidence that the City faces a significant crime and disorder risk relating to safeguarding, and the SCP 2022-25 strategy does not provide any data on local incidence or level of harm. As for substance misuse, there are existing groupings in the police-led Vulnerability Board and the multi-agency safeguarding partnerships for children and adults. So, again, the SCP’s scope to add value, or need to given level of severity, are low.
- **Hate crime – Paused –** At present, there is little evidence that the City faces a significant risk from hate crime, and the SCP 2022-25 strategy does not set out data on its incidence or level of severity. The actions proposed in the SCP strategy mainly relate to policing response and victim support, and so require limited multi-agency working through SCP partners. While SCP can continue to be a forum for raising relevant cross-organisational issues on hate crime, this seems more appropriate on an issue-by-issue basis rather than as a key area of focus.

Where we suggest discontinuing areas, this should not suggest these are not priorities for the City Corporation – rather, we suggest they should not be priorities specifically for the Safer City Partnership. However, this can be kept under review and the existing multi-agency groups listed above can escalate cross-cutting operational or strategic issues on substance misuse, safeguarding, or hate crime as necessary.

This page is intentionally left blank