

WEST LINDSEY DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES of the Meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held in the Council Chamber - The Guildhall on 6 September 2022 commencing at 6.30 pm.

Present: Councillor Mrs Diana Rodgers (Chairman)
Councillor Roger Patterson (Vice-Chairman)

Councillor Mrs Tracey Coulson
Councillor Christopher Darcel
Councillor Timothy Davies
Councillor Mrs Caralyne Grimble
Councillor Cherie Hill
Councillor John McNeill
Councillor Peter Morris
Councillor Robert Waller

Also Present: Councillor Stephen Bunney
Councillor Michael Devine
Councillor Mrs Mandy Snee
Councillor Trevor Young

In Attendance:

Nova Roberts	Director of Change Management, ICT & Regulatory Services
Inspector Gary Brockie	Lincolnshire Police
Ele Snow	Senior Democratic and Civic Officer
Darren Mellors	Performance & Programme Manager
Claire Bailey	Assistant Planning Services Team Manager

Also In Attendance: 1 member of the public

Apologies: Councillor Paul Howitt-Cowan
Councillor Mrs Cordelia McCartney

15 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 5 July 2022 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

16 MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest made at this point in the meeting.

17 MATTERS ARISING SCHEDULE

The matters arising schedule, setting out the position of previously agreed actions, as at 26 August 2022, was **NOTED**.

18 PRESENTATION ITEM: LINCOLNSHIRE POLICE

The Chairman welcomed Inspector Brockie for his return visit to the Committee. The Committee were given details of the current Neighbourhood Policing Teams across the district, including areas covered and the PCSOs aligned to each team. It was explained that PCSO recruitment was ongoing with an intake due to start in October. This meant, allowing for training time, the new recruits would be 'on the ground' from January 2023. Members also heard that Inspector Brockie was leaving his role to a promotion at the Force Headquarters, with the Community Policing Inspector role having been advertised for his replacement. He advised he would share details of his replacement once known.

It was also noted that across the area the Neighbourhood Teams continued to be supported by Response officers based out of Gainsborough and Market Rasen Stations. These were the teams who the community would likely see in the first instance, responding to calls for managing scenes or road closures at collisions and undertaking general or directed tasking patrols. There also remained a CID presence within West Lindsey with Detectives working out of Gainsborough Station, and access to centralised support for larger incidents or any specialist requirements.

With regard to increased Officer numbers, it was highlighted that it was a work in progress, with an ongoing uplift in recruitment but by the nature of the roles and the training required, this was a lengthy process. Positive changes coming from this to date were that the Force had introduced a dedicated Roads Policing Team, to be based across two locations to provide for appropriate Force wide coverage. Within West Lindsey, Officers had been able to engage this team with problematic locations such as Willingham Woods. They had also been supported around large events, such as car meets and bike nights.

The Rural Crime Action Team used to be managed from North Kesteven but was now operating within the central Specialist Operations department. The team was in its infancy but continued to develop.

Neighbourhood Policing had been designated an uplift of 12 officers across the Force. The decision making around post locations was completed using a vulnerability referencing matrix, with West Lindsey receiving one additional officer. To demonstrate the spread across the county, Members heard that of the current establishment across all roles, approximately 14% of PCSOs, 11% of NPAs and 15% of CBMs were based in West Lindsey.

It was explained that Response Policing was the obvious core Policing role, it was the largest department and, with that, was gaining the bulk of the uplift Officers. It was not known how the allocation would be seen across the district. The Committee heard there was also an upcoming shift pattern change, based on demand profile assessments, which looked at service demand, workloads, locations and the geographical considerations of the county.

Members heard details of ongoing activities, such as the involvement with Mutual Gain,

seeking to sustain long term improvements for the South West Ward in Gainsborough, as well as significant work alongside West Lindsey District Council addressing areas of concern such as antisocial behaviour. The approach of joint patrols with council staff had shown positive outcomes and with a greater return to face-to-face service delivery, would be increasing in benefit and opportunity for further improvements. With regard to specific issues raised regarding cannabis grow sites, Members heard that there had been warrants executed, with further warrants obtained, however it was not appropriate to discuss details in a public meeting. Inspector Brockie reiterated his plea for anyone aware of a potential grow site to report it either to the Police directly or anonymously through Crimestoppers.

The Committee heard that the main priorities across the district, and county, continued to be, Rural Crime, the Fatal Four (drink driving, speeding, use of mobile devices and not wearing seatbelts), Youth Antisocial Behaviour and shop theft.

With regard specifically to antisocial behaviour (ASB) legislation, it was explained that, following legislative change in 2014, the replacement to Antisocial Behaviour Orders (ASBOs) were either Civic Injunctions, which could be applied for by the Police or Local Authorities, or Criminal Behaviour Orders (CBOs), which were applied for on the back of a criminal conviction. The Committee were informed that ASB was dealt with in an incremental manner, in a similar approach taken when ASBO's were the potential end outcome. This approach was taken across the county, and the country, the preference being to educate change rather than enforce it, and therefore needlessly enter those who were usually children into a criminal justice system where mistakes in early life could have a lasting negative impact on their prospects.

The opening approach was direct engagement with perpetrators and, where age-appropriate, parents. Advice letters were the next stage, being case specific and outlining the behaviour which was clearly causing concern. Advice letters remained open and valid for a 6-month period, a Final warning letter would then be issued if the advice letter was breached.

An Acceptable Behaviour Contract was then used, this being a voluntary agreement signed up by the perpetrator, which might include conditions such as area or curfew restrictions. A breach of this would lead towards either an application for a Civil Injunction, or, if linked to a criminal conviction, a Criminal Behaviour Order.

To conclude, Members were informed that, in the previous 12 months, 74 stage one advice letters had been issued. Seven had progressed to stage two warning letters, with none progressing to the stage three Acceptable Behaviour Contract. Criminal Behaviour Orders had been obtained for various offences including violence and thefts; restrictions applied by the courts ranged from curfews, non-association and not to enter certain locations; breaches of a CBO had resulted in prison sentences.

The Chairman thanked Inspector Brockie for his detailed information and invited comments from the Committee and Visiting Members.

All expressed their thanks for his attendance and the level of detail provided. With regard to levels of youth antisocial behaviour, in response to a question as to whether levels had significantly increased, it was explained that it continued to be the most reported concern, although it was unclear if there was still an element of lowered tolerance levels following the

pandemic lockdowns and restrictions. Members heard that the ‘type’ of antisocial behaviour varied from location to location, with the main aspect being that it involved groups of young people, regardless of the actual antisocial activity.

A Member of the Committee enquired as to whether there was a role to play for the Member Development Group to assess how Councillors could be better informed as to how the Council, and Councillors, interacted with the Police under the relevant legislation. It was agreed this could be looked at by the group and potentially included in the Member Induction.

With regard to Police recruitment, a Member of the Committee enquired as to whether there were difficulties with recruiting new Officers. It was explained that, due to the process of the recruitment and the training involved, there was a time delay between successful recruits being seen ‘on the ground’. It was reiterated that October recruits would be in post January 2023.

In response to a question regarding levels of prosecutions against numbers of reported incidents, Inspector Brockie stated he could raise the query with the Police Communications team, as the information available on the website to the public was outside of his control. Likewise, in relation to a query raised by a Visiting Member regarding ease of access to the Police by members of the public, Members heard there was work undertaken centrally regarding the number of options when using the 101 telephone line, but Inspector Brockie did not have that information available to him.

Members were also reminded, with regard to youth antisocial behaviour, that the November meeting would see a presentation from the youth offenders’ team.

The Chairman again reiterated her thanks to Inspector Brockie, and wished him all the best for his future role.

19 SCRUTINY OF PROGRESS & DELIVERY QUARTER 4 AND YEAR END REPORTS, AS CONSIDERED BY POLICY COMMITTEES

The Committee gave consideration to the Progress and Delivery Quarter Four and Year End reports, as previously presented to the two policy committees. The minutes of each meeting were included within the report and it was explained that Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee were required to scrutinise the challenge of the two policy committees to the content of the council’s Progress and Delivery reports.

Note: Councillor C. Darcel left the meeting at 7.24pm and returned to the Chamber at 7. 26pm.

Councillor T. Young left the meeting at 7.26pm

The Chairman read aloud the recommendation within the report and Members expressed their satisfaction with the contents as presented. Having been moved and seconded, the Chairman took the vote and it was unanimously

RESOLVED that the Committee had examined the responses given to the report by

the Corporate Policy and Resources and the Prosperous Communities Committees and had assured themselves that the appropriate level of challenge had been made by those committees to the information contained in the report.

20 FORWARD PLAN

With no comments, questions, or requirement for a vote, the Forward Plan was **DULY NOTED.**

21 COMMITTEE WORKPLAN

Members gave consideration to the proposed work plan for upcoming meetings of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. With no questions or comments, the work plan was **DULY NOTED.**

The meeting concluded at 7.30 pm.

Chairman