

# ITEM 4

Time commenced – 6.00pm  
Time finished – 7.40pm

## **SAFER COMMUNITIES COMMISSION 6 DECEMBER 2011**

Present: Councillor Repton (Chair)  
Councillors Davis, J. Khan and Sandhu

In attendance: Andy Thomas – Head of City and Neighbourhood Partnerships  
Michael Kay – Head of Environmental Health and Licensing  
Mahroof Hussain – Overview and Scrutiny Manager  
Clare Harrison – Overview and Scrutiny Officer

Councillor J. Khan left the meeting during consideration of 47/11 and was absent for 48/11 to 50/11 inclusive.

### **37/11 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Barker, Naitta and Tuplin.

### **38/11 Late Items Introduced by the Chair**

There were no late items.

### **39/11 Declarations of Interest**

The Chair declared a personal and prejudicial interest in item 46/11 and proposed that the item be dealt with at the next meeting and that Councillor Naitta would chair the item.

### **40/11 Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting on 2 November 2011 were agreed as a correct record subject to the following amendment and signed by the Chair.

To record that Councillor J. Khan was present for the meeting on 2 November 2011.

### **41/11 Matters referred for Call-in**

There were no items.

### **42/11 Matters referred for Councillor Call for Action**

There were no items.

### **43/11 Update on Police and Crime Commissioner and the**

## Police and Crime Panel

The Commission received an update from Andy Thomas, Head of City and Neighbourhood Partnerships, on the Police and Crime Commissioner and the Police and Crime Panel.

The Head of City and Neighbourhood Partnerships outlined the arrangements that would replace all Police Authorities in 2012. Derbyshire Constabulary would be led by a directly elected Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC). The elections would take place in November 2012. The PCC would be held to account by a Police and Crime Panel (PCP). The Chief Constable would be accountable to the PCC.

The PCC would have the power to set policing budget and strategy and to appoint and dismiss the Chief Constable.

The Commission asked how the PCC would feed into the Safer Communities Commission. It was reported that the PCC would have a mandate under which he/she was elected and that it remained to be seen how the PCC would adapt and respond to local concerns.

The Commission asked whether the PCC would be independent from Central Government. It was reported that there was criteria set down in legislation to ensure that the local plan reflected national policing policy.

The Commission discussed the process by which the candidates would be chosen and whether the successful PCC could have a party political agenda.

The Head of City and Neighbourhood Partnerships explained the arrangements for the PCP. The PCP would have a minimum of 12 members representing all the local authorities in Derbyshire. The political make-up of the PCP would be representative of the political make-up of the county and one local authority would take the lead. £30,000 would be allocated to the lead authority. All local authorities could put more money forward to facilitate the PCP in its scrutiny role.

The Commission discussed the importance of Cabinet keeping them fully informed on progress made towards the formation of the PCP.

The Commission discussed the procedure should Councillors wish to stand for election as a PCC.

### **Resolved:**

- 1. to note the update;**
- 2. to request a further update on the formation of the Police and Crime Panel at a future meeting of the Safer Communities Commission;**
- 3. to request clarification on the procedure for Councillors standing for Police Crime Commissioner.**

## 44/11 Cumulative Impact Policy

The Commission received a report from Michael Kay, Head of Environmental Health

and Licensing, on Cumulative Impact Policy – Additional Information.

The General Licensing Committee received a request from Derbyshire Constabulary to consider implementing a Cumulative Impact Policy (CIP) for the inner city area of Derby. At its meeting on 18 July 2011, the General Licensing Committee decided to defer the decision and requested more information from Derbyshire Constabulary about the impact of city centre off-licenses on the four licensing objectives:

- The Prevention of crime and disorder.
- Public Safety.
- The prevention of public nuisance.
- The protection of children from harm.

The Head of Environmental Health and Licensing explained the process for obtaining an off-licence if the CIP was adopted. It was reported that when applying for a licence, the applicant would have to put together a robust case for a licence being granted. A copy of the application would go to all responsible authorities and they could make representations if they had concerns. The General Licensing Sub Committee would then decide on individual applications.

The Commission discussed the different processes of planning and licensing. It was reported that an applicant may get planning consent but that would not mean that they would automatically get an off-licence. If the CIP was adopted by the Council, planners would inform any applicants that the CIP would be used for any off-licence applications.

The Commission discussed the different parties that could object to off-licence applications. This included responsible authorities, such as the Police, elected members of the Council, and interested parties, such as local businesses and local residents.

### **Resolved to note the report**

## **45/11 Strategic Intelligence Assessment**

The Commission received a report from the Head of City and Neighbourhood Partnerships on the outcomes of the completed Strategic Intelligence Assessment (SIA) process.

It was reported that the SIA was a statutory requirement for Community Safety Partnerships. The assessment considered all areas of crime, disorder and substance misuse within the partnership's operational area, and analysed the risk and threat that they posed to partners. The 2011 SIA identified 11 priority areas that needed to be addressed by partners during 2012.

The Commission discussed the future of the Family Justice Centre and whether it would be staying in the same building. It was reported that a decision would be made shortly and that the decision would be about delivering an effective quality service rather than where that service would be delivered from.

**Resolved to note the update.**

#### 46/11 Security Industry Authority Training update

Item to be dealt with at the next meeting of the Safer Communities Commission.

#### 47/11 Update on visit to City Centre

The Commission received an update from Mahroof Hussain, Overview and Scrutiny Manager, and Clare Harrison, Overview and Scrutiny Officer, on a recent visit to the city centre as part of the audit for Purple Flag status.

Purple Flag status was a national initiative which would only be accredited to towns and city centres that provide a safe and welcoming, high quality night time environment that was inviting to a wide cross section of people.

It was reported that the intention of the visit had been to get a snapshot of what the city centre was like in the evening.

The Commission discussed the lack of activities for families in the city centre and noted that it was very quiet during the week. The Commission discussed which areas of the city centre were busy at the weekend and at what times.

It was reported that Purple Flag accreditation was not just about tackling crime and disorder but also about transport provision and attracting people with a good mix of activities.

**Resolved to invite a representative from Purple Flag to provide an update at a future meeting of the Safer Communities Commission.**

#### 48/11 Forward Plan

There were no items.

#### 49/11 Retrospective Scrutiny

There were no items.

#### 50/11 Matters referred to the Commission by Council Cabinet

There were no items.

MINUTES END