

## Community Safety & Strong Communities Scrutiny

Councillors: D. Bennett, D. Broadley, M. Campbell, H. Christer, G. Coulson, R. Ellis, G. C. Glass, R. Hemsley, J. C. Hunter, L. Marshall, I. McElhone, D. V. McMahon, S. E. Mellor, P. Murray, R. Ord, T. Parry, S. J. Rothwell, F. Todd, D. Walton, T. Westgarth, J. Wilson

Dear Councillor,

Your attendance is invited at a meeting of the Community Safety & Strong Communities Scrutiny to be held in the Council Chamber, Civic Centre, Consett on 18th December 2007 at 6.00 p.m. for consideration of the undernoted agenda.



MIKE CLARK

Chief Executive Officer

### Agenda

1 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

To receive any disclosure by Members of personal interests in matters on the agenda, identify the item on the agenda, the nature of any interest and whether the Member regards the interest as prejudicial under the terms of the Code of Conduct.

2. MINUTES

To approve the minutes of this panel's meeting held on 18th

September 2007 as a correct record. (Herewith 'A')

Attached Documents:

[MINUTES \(A\)](#)

3. SCRUTINY OF RED RISK RATED BEST VALUE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS 2007/08.

To consider the report of the Director of Corporate Administration & Policy (Herewith 'B')

Attached Documents:

[SCRUTINY OF RED RISK RATED BEST VALUE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS 2007/08 \(B\)](#)

4. CRIMINAL DAMAGE ACTION PLAN

To consider a verbal update on the above given by Chief Inspector Ivan Wood.

5. CCTV EVALUATION UPDATE

To consider the report of the Director of Corporate Administration & Policy (Herewith 'C')

Attached Documents:

[CCTV EVALUATION UPDATE \(C\)](#)

6. MAINSTREAMING OF YOUTH BUS AND SPICETACULAR

To consider the report of the Director of Corporate Administration & Policy (Herewith 'D')

Attached Documents:

[MAINSTREAMING OF YOUTH BUS AND SPICETACULAR \(D\)](#)

7. MEMBERS' LOCAL INITIATIVE FUND

To consider the report of the Head of Financial Services (Herewith 'E')

Attached Documents:

[LOCAL MEMBER INITIATIVE FUND \(E\)](#)  
[LOCAL MEMBER INITIATIVE FUND - NOTES](#)  
[LOCAL MEMBER INITIATIVE FUND - APPLICATION](#)

Agenda prepared by Lucy Stephenson Democratic Services 01207 218249  
email: [l.stephenson@derwentside.gov.uk](mailto:l.stephenson@derwentside.gov.uk)



## **COMMUNITY SAFETY AND STRONG COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY PANEL**

Minutes of a meeting of the Community Safety and Strong Communities Scrutiny Panel held in the Council Chamber, Civic Centre, Consett on 18<sup>th</sup> September 2007 at 6.00 p.m.

### **PRESENT**

Councillor L. Marshall (Chair)  
Councillor T. Parry (Vice Chair)

Councillors D. Bennett, M. Campbell, G. Coulson, R. Ellis, G.C. Glass, J. Hunter, S, Mellor, S. Rothwell, D. Walton, T. Westgarth.

### **IN ATTENDANCE**

Councillors G. Reid, W. Stelling, I. Agnew.  
Inspector J. Kilgallon, Inspector A. McConnel, Durham Constabulary.

### **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors H. Christer, I. McElhone, D.V.McMahon, R. Ord,

## **7. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

In accordance with the provision of section 94 of the local Government Act 1972 and standing order 33 the Vice Chair Cllr. Parry informed the meeting in relation to item E on the agenda she was herself employed by CVS, referred to within the report and the organisation were members of the Derwentside Partnership.

## **8. MINUTES**

The minutes of the Community Safety Scrutiny Panel meeting held on 26<sup>th</sup> June 2007 were approved as a correct record.

Members raised a number of questions around the likely timetable for the allocation of funds from the town and village centres fund. The director of Environmental Services clarified the issue, reminding members that while the fund was identified as a priority within the gold band it had not yet been allocated any funds and the final decisions on spending priorities must yet be agreed, Mr Reynolds added that this had been on the priority list for two years.

## **9. SCRUTINY OF RED RISK RATED BEST VALUE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS 2007/08**

The performance management officer explained the process for collecting and reporting Best Value Performance Indicators throughout the year. The current framework adopts a risk rating system which allocates all statutory **indicators** with either a red amber or green rating.

All of the red risks are identified at the start of the year and must report progress via an action plan to scrutiny.

All action plans have been agreed for the year 2007/2008 by the Executive on the 10<sup>th</sup> September.

For this panel the agreed indicator is number 127a which covers current initiatives being taken to address levels of violent crime. The officer explained this had fallen from 18.34 at the end of 2006/7 down to 16.08 after the first three months of the current year. This welcome fall in the violent crime figure takes the district out of the third quartile and into the second quartile.

The Systems Integration manager then updated members on the community CCTV network and the process of regular monthly meetings with the police and fire services to discuss crime hot spots or recent developments in new technology. Recent concerns had led to decisions to bring extra cameras into the district's bus station in Stanley and reposition the existing camera in the Consett bus station as well as the introduction of a tannoy system.

Members then raised a number of issues with regard to the operation of the cameras and the manager responded to questions regarding the level of monitoring of the cameras that operator levels were on a par with other local authority control rooms of this type. However while the system was technically capable of being extended the major cost factor would be in the number of operators. While at present those staffing levels were appropriate any expansion of the system would lead to a step change in costs with the need to cover the shift pattern around the clock.

In answer to direct queries over how the monitoring was carried out on individual cameras the Systems Integration Manager confirmed that all of the cameras were filming even if at a particular given time the operator's attention was on another monitor. Further, while it may appear that cameras did not move they were in fact regularly re-positioned as this was necessary to comply with the guidelines which governed system operators: Indeed to leave the cameras in one position could be construed as surveillance which would fall foul of the RIPA guidelines.

In response to questions regarding the effectiveness of the cameras Inspector McConnell explained that day to day contact between police and control room was very much on a dynamic, responsive basis with both control room staff and police able to alert each other to incidents as they occur.

It was also to be remembered that in large part the great benefit to CCTV was its deterrent effect. Both Inspector McConnell and Kilgallon responded to members that they were very happy with how the system was working.

**CONSIDERATION:** That the report be received

## **10. PROPOSED METHODOLOGY FOR THE EVALUATION OF THE PHASED INTRODUCTION OF CCTV**

The Systems Integration Manager gave a brief history of the development of the CCTV system which now included every ward, with the exception of Ebchester and Medomsley within the system.

The objective of the system was to help the authority meet the goals set out within the corporate plan in relation to its aim to deliver a safer environment and it was now time for the authority to consider how to evaluate the effectiveness of the investment.

Mr Spraggon outlined that there were complex issues involved with attempting such an assessment, for instance as community cameras had been introduced to individual wards over a period of time and issues over the possible displacement of crime within each ward could all make comparisons difficult.

Beyond investigating actual statistics there was the question of how best to measure the community's responses to the system's effectiveness and the overall affect on the fear of crime. The assessment would have to include stakeholder interviews as well as contact with members of the public.

Members raised the possibility of using the citizens panel which Mr Spraggon confirmed was a possibility. Other councillors added their concern that members of the public might provide something of a negative response in certain wards where the introduction of cameras had not been perceived a success which in fact may not be the actual case. In discussion members raised the possibility of instigating publicity to bring to the attention of the public any successes in crime detection.

Inspector McConnell commented that while cases were current the courts would take a dim view if such information was released to the media.

He added that there had been a recent high profile case where the CCTV evidence had been invaluable in securing a conviction, when the police had been able to track the suspect through out the town centre in the lead up to the crime which had helped produce a conviction and did highlight the value of the system in town centres.

He also felt there would be examples where the crime had been displaced by the community cameras but it would be simply impossible to have a camera on every corner. Mr Spraggon pointed out that the council was unusual in having this number of cameras within a district.

Members raised issues around the relocation of cameras, if it were felt they were in the wrong place. The Systems Integration Manager considered there could be quite large cost implications and other issues to consider but if this did need to be addressed it should be considered after the assessment had been completed.

The officer thanked the panel for their ideas and contributions.

**RECOMMENDATION:** That the report be received and that a further report would be prepared to update the panel on the final evaluation process

In accordance with the provision of section 94 of the local Government Act 1972 and standing order 33 the Vice Chair Cllr. Parry informed the meeting in relation to the following item on the agenda she was herself employed by CVS, referred to within the report and the organisation were members of the Derwentside Partnership

## **11. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT**

The Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) Manager introduced herself to the meeting and spoke to the paper before members on community engagement.

The LSP manager explained the external drivers which were indicating the need for change, as well as the practical and appropriate levels of involvement which should be aimed for in terms of public involvement.

The existing structures and mechanism were explained and the process of self examination which asked the pertinent questions with regard to identifying communities, the complexity of decision making and the need to agree the appropriate degree of participation

Ms Whitaker went on to explore how a particular engagement exercise could appear on a continuum between a information giving exercise at one end through to devolved decision making at the other, reflecting the appropriate level of involvement with the right people at the right time. The final form of how this would be used was now being worked up in detail to ensure that the LSP could have confidence that its mechanisms would work in practice.

In response to the presentation Members asked a number of questions and expressed a degree of concern that this was a very difficult task. There was perhaps a great degree of cynicism about almost any form of consultation amongst the public and such a centrally driven model of engaging with the grass roots did almost seem a contradiction.

Members reflected that there was also the barrier to involvement that came with the topics discussed and often the specialist terms and language used could



bewilder the average person. The Partnership manager appreciated the members' concerns and added it was often difficult to pitch the language used in a debate in such a way as to enable both the lay person and the professional to contribute to and benefit from the exercise.

Further debate followed covering the issues around dwindling public involvement and the reasons for that decline, including reference to the perception that neighbourhood renewal money had not been spent wisely nor on the community's priorities

The Partnership Manager acknowledged the negative feedback and reflected that there was an obvious message to try harder on making the consultation events and processes work.

However, in defence of the expenditure of neighbourhood renewal funds, there had been major achievements in areas such as education and health; The performance across the district in terms of GCSEs had seen Derwentside hit the national average for attainment for the first time and Derwentside was the only Spearhead Authority to be actually on target for reducing health inequalities in the country.

It was likely that much of the challenge in organising consultation would continue to be balancing the often competing priorities of central government against a local community's articulated desires.

Members were invited to the next wider stakeholder meeting. On the 1<sup>st</sup> of November.

**RECOMMENDATION:** That the report be received.

## **12. WORKING GROUP REPORT: TO DEVELOP THE ANTI SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR POLICY AND PROTOCOL**

The Community Safety and Information Officer presented a summary of the meetings minutes highlighting the main objective was to produce a single document which could be used by the public, officers and members to explain the process of making a complaint under the legislation. The group were recommending the policy be piloted in selected wards and the results fed back to the panel.

There would be a training need for both officers and members to ensure that all were aware of the issues and the council's expectations. In addition there had also been agreement that the document should be very easy to use and Individual members had expressed a desire to trial the scheme in their own wards to help make an assessment of its success or shortcomings.

**RECOMMENDATION:** That the report be received.

## **CONCLUSION OF MEETING**

The meeting closed at 7.20pm.

<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>SCRUTINY OF RED RISK RATED BEST VALUE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS 2007/08</b>
<b>TO/ON:</b>	<b>COMMUNITY SAFETY AND STRONG COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY 18<sup>TH</sup> DECEMBER 2007</b>
<b>BY:</b>	<b>DIRECTOR OF CORPORATE ADMINISTRATION AND POLICY</b>
<b>PORTFOLIO HOLDER:</b>	<b>DEPUTY LEADER</b>
<b>STATUS:</b>	<b>REPORT</b>

## **1 PURPOSE OF REPORT**

- 1.1 The purpose of this Report is to inform the panel of the action planning initiatives in place for the best value performance indicators (BVPIs) rated as a red risk for 2007/08 that report performance to the Community Safety and Strong Communities Scrutiny Panel.

## **2 BACKGROUND**

- 2.1 The final Year End Performance Monitoring report for 2005-06 introduced a traffic light risk rating system to identify the Best Value Performance Indicators where anticipated performance was deemed to be at risk of falling into or remaining within the bottom performing quartiles nationally.
- 2.2 An advantage of the current Performance Monitoring Risk Rating System is that it enables risk ratings assigned at the beginning of the financial year to be amended throughout the year to reflect slippages or significant improvements in the overall performance. This re-assessment process is carried out at quarterly intervals throughout the year and reported to the Executive Committee.
- 2.3 All red risk indicators are required to complete an Action Plan and all completed Action Plans must be referred to the relevant Scrutiny Panel within the agreed reporting mechanism throughout the year.
- 2.4 BVPI 127a that measures the recorded incidences of violent crime per 1,000 head of population was allocated a red risk rating at the beginning of 2007/08 and as part of the current Performance Monitoring Framework currently reports performance on a quarterly basis to the Community Safety and Strong Communities Scrutiny Panel.

This indicator includes:

- Violence against the person
- Sexual offences
- Robbery

### **3 RELEVANT MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS**

- 3.1 Action Plans have been produced for all red risk rated indicators at the start of the financial year for inclusion in the Quarter 1 Performance Monitoring Report to the Executive Committee on the 10<sup>th</sup> September 2007.
- 3.2 The Action Plan for BVPI 127a is updated each quarter to ensure that all initiatives developed that have contributed to a decrease in the number of recorded incidences of violent crime are recorded and monitored.
- 3.3 The rate of violent crime has demonstrated a steady improvement in performance throughout both the first and second quarters of 2007/08. In Quarter 1 the rate of recorded incidences of violent crime per 1,000 population was 16.08 in comparison to a rate of 17.40 recorded in Quarter 1 of 2006. This performance has continued during Quarter 2 where a rate of 16.11 was recorded compared with a rate of 18.37 in 2006, representing an improvement in performance of 12% in comparison to the same period last year. As a result the indicator now falls within the second best performing quartile nationally based upon the 2005/06 'All England' quartile boundary having consistently done so for the first six months of 2007/08.

Violence against the person, aggravated by alcohol has been identified as a significant problem in Derwentside, and the Crime Reduction Partnership is continuing to tackle the problem through the measures reported previously at the Community Safety and Strong Communities Scrutiny Panel held in September. Initiatives undertaken include:

- Test purchases of alcohol sales have been conducted in June and October 2007 in both on and off licensed premises and these test purchases will continue.
- A long term pro active/reactive intelligence and evidence gathering procedure has been undertaken by Durham Constabulary into offences of underage sales at off license premises. This has resulted in further action.
- Regular use of the passive drug dogs by Durham Constabulary in licensed premises resulting in a number of positive indications.
- Enhanced Pubwatch meetings providing additional information and support to Licensees.
- Continued seizures of alcohol in public places, followed by letters to parents or guardians following those seizures.
- The launch on the 12<sup>th</sup> September 2007 of the Alcohol Harm Reduction Plan for Derwentside. The strategic aims of the plan are to:

- Reduce the harm to individuals and families caused by alcohol;
  - Reduce the cost and burden of alcohol to public sector agencies;
  - Reduce crime and anti social behaviour.
- The launch in Durham and Derwentside of NightSafe on the 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2007. This is an action plan intended to address alcohol-fuelled disorder through better management of the night time economy by prevention, enforcement, intelligence and reassurance.

The Community Safety and Strong Communities Scrutiny Panel will be informed of progress against these initiatives at future meetings.

- 3.4 The current Action Plan for BVPI 127a has been updated to include any initiatives being undertaken to address poor performance during the second quarter of 2007/08 and is included for Member's information in Appendix 1 of the report.
- 3.5 As a result of the continuous improvement in the performance for this indicator the current risk rating of red has been amended to amber for the third quarter of 2007/08. Performance will however continue to be closely monitored and the new risk rating reassessed should any future deterioration in performance occur.

#### **4 RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 4.1 Members of the Community Safety and Strong Communities Scrutiny Panel are requested to note the content of this report.

For further information contact Anne Smith, Performance Management Officer, Telephone 01207 218208 or e-mail [anne.smith@derwentside.gov.uk](mailto:anne.smith@derwentside.gov.uk)

<b>Directorate:</b> Economic Development and Asset Management				<b>Director:</b> John Pearson			
<b>Scrutiny:</b> Community Safety and Strong Communities							
<b>BVPI</b>		<b>Performance</b>			<b>Corporate Aim</b>		
		<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>	Together with our partners achieve organisational excellence		
<b>BV 127a</b>	<b>Violent crime per 1,000 population</b>	Not collected	17.72	18.34			
<b>Responsible Officers</b>	Tom Clifford and Anne Smith	<b>2006/07 Quarterly Performance</b>		<b>Qtr 1</b> 17.40	<b>Qtr 2</b> 18.37	<b>Qtr 3</b> 18.52	<b>Qtr 4</b> 18.34
<b>Named Officer responsible for performance data collection</b>	Tom Gorman	<b>Direction of travel</b>		↕	↕		
		<b>2007/08 Quarterly Performance</b>		<b>Qtr 1</b> 16.08	<b>Qtr 2</b> 16.11	<b>Qtr 3</b>	<b>Qtr 4</b>
		<b>Target</b>		Qtr 1 Not set	Qtr 2 Not set	Qtr 3	Qtr 4
		<b>Target achieved</b>		N/A	N/A		
<b>Monitoring Frequency</b>	Monthly	<b>Reporting Frequency</b>		Monthly			
<b>Action Plan</b>							
<b>Action/Milestone</b>	<b>Responsible Officer</b>	<b>Deadline</b>	<b>Actual Date completed</b>	<b>Resources Required</b>	<b>Outcome/Impact</b>		
<p>As a Council: What is the Council doing to tackle violent crime through measures aimed at prevention, enforcement and rehabilitation?</p> <p>➤ To establish and review a set of local indicators accordingly</p>	- Tom Clifford	August 2007	Amended to April 2008 to reflect Statutory review of Strategy	Within existing resources	Reduced levels of violent crime through effective targeting of resources and performance management of actions		

**Action Planning – Quarter 2 2007/08  
BVPI 127a (continued)**

Action/Milestone	Responsible Officer	Deadline	Actual Date completed	Resources Required	Outcome/Impact
➤ Supporting People Initiatives	- <i>Kath Heathcote</i>	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing	Reducing incidences and repeat incidences of domestic violence
➤ Appointment of Domestic Violence Co-ordinator	- <i>Kath Heathcote</i>	July 2007	July 2007		
➤ Development of Action Plan to address issues around Domestic Violence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Development of Information Sharing Protocol</li> <li>- Development and facilitation a local multi-agency domestic violence forum</li> <li>- Development of Multi Agency Strategy/Training Programme</li> <li>- Production of Information Pack/ + for young people</li> <li>- Monitoring repeat h/less cases due to domestic violence</li> </ul>	<i>Alison Brown</i>	Ongoing	Ongoing	Within existing resources	
		Ongoing	Ongoing		
		1 <sup>st</sup> meeting – 23/11/07	Ongoing		
		March 2008	Ongoing		
		Dec 2007	Ongoing		
		Ongoing	Ongoing		

**Action Planning – Quarter 2 2007/08  
BVPI 127a (continued)**

Action/Milestone	Responsible Officer	Deadline	Actual Date completed	Resources Required	Outcome/Impact
➤ Use of CCTV in the use of securing successful prosecutions	- <i>Lee Spraggon</i>	Ongoing	Ongoing	Within existing resources	Number of successful prosecutions resulting from the implementation of Council led initiatives
➤ Enforcing of licensing conditions	- <i>Ashley Rocks Menon</i>	Ongoing	Mar/June/ Oct 07 – Test purchase scheme of licensed premises		Effective action taken in all cases reported incidences of violence against council staff  Reduction in anti social behaviour caused by underage drinking and awareness raising via reporting in local press
➤ Hate crime reporting	- <i>Toshie Habu</i>	Ongoing	Reporting mechanism established	Within existing resources	Effective action taken against hate crime reported to council  Effective recording mechanisms for monitoring incidences of hate crime reported to the Council
➤ Benchmarking with comparable authorities to identify best practice	- <i>Anne Smith</i>	Ongoing	Bench- marking undertaken with Nearest Neighbour grouping	Within existing resources	Identification of Best Practice best practices that have been successful in other authorities in tackling incidences of violent crime

**Action Planning – Quarter 2 2007/08  
BVPI 127a (continued)**

Action/Milestone	Responsible Officer	Deadline	Actual Date completed	Resources Required	Outcome/Impact
<p><b>As a Partner:</b> Liaison with Durham Constabulary to use data sets to inform performance management and strategy development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ To report performance against violent crime:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Monthly Reports to Corporate Management Team</li> <li>- Quarterly Reports to Executive</li> <li>- Regular updates to Community Safety and Strong Comm Scrutiny Panel</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ To review the joint working arrangements and priorities with partners</li> </ul>	<p>- <i>Anne Smith</i></p> <p>- <i>Christine Ramshaw / Tom Clifford</i></p>	<p>Ongoing</p> <p>Amended to April 2008 to reflect Statutory review of Strategy</p>	<p>Ongoing Reports delivered via agreed reporting mechanisms</p> <p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Within existing resources</p> <p>Within existing resources</p>	<p>Dissemination of information to councillors on a regular basis</p> <p>Reduced levels of violent crime through effective joint working</p>





<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>COMMUNITY CCTV PROJECT EVALUATION UPDATE</b>
<b>TO/ON:</b>	<b>COMMUNITY SAFETY AND STRONG COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY PANEL - 18<sup>TH</sup> DECEMBER, 2007</b>
<b>BY:</b>	<b>DIRECTOR OF CORPORATE ADMIN. &amp; POLICY</b>
<b>PORTFOLIO:</b>	<b>DEPUTY LEADER/COMMUNITY SAFETY</b>

## **1. SUBJECT MATTER AND PURPOSE OF REPORT**

- 1.1 As part of the 2006 – 2010 Corporate Plan Community Safety objectives 1 and 2 an evaluation is being undertaken to determine the effectiveness of the Community CCTV project in tackling crime and reducing the fear of crime. This report is a progress update.

## **2 BACKGROUND**

- 2.1 The extension of the Community CCTV system across Derwentside has been a substantial project undertaken by the Council. The reason for this investment in surveillance technology was to help the Council meet its aim to deliver, through partnership, a reduction in fear of crime. Fear of crime was felt to be too high in relation to the low level of recorded crime.
- 2.2 CCTV has been a key tool for law enforcement in Derwentside. Cameras placed in the town centres of both Stanley and Consett have consistently aided police in the reporting and detection of crime in the area. It continues to play a key operational role in maintaining public order in Derwentside.
- 2.3 Building on this experience the Council decided to extend CCTV into other wards in the district to contribute to its agreed objective in reducing fear of crime, as outlined in the 2002 – 2005 Corporate Plan. This programme was implemented in three phases with an evaluation after Phase one. The Phase one evaluation revealed;
- 93% of respondents believed that CCTV was an important initiative in tackling crime.
  - 78% felt CCTV reduces criminal activity.
  - 70% felt CCTV makes them feel safer.
- 2.4 Since then, the Community CCTV project has developed further objectives in tackling actual crime in addition to reducing the fear of crime. The 2006 – 2010 Corporate Plan outlined an action to produce a further evaluation to explore the systems' effectiveness as an aid to crime detection as well as a tool to reduce the fear of crime. As such, this evaluation is a consideration of the extended Community CCTV scheme and will not include town centre areas. It has two principal aims:

- To measure the effectiveness of CCTV in combating crime, disorder and the fear of crime and anti-social behaviour.
- To describe in more detail the impact of CCTV on fear of crime.

2.5 The evaluation will achieve these aims by following four lines of enquiry:

- Analysis of recorded crime.
- Analysis of CCTV data.
- Public perceptions of crime and anti-social behaviour.
- Stakeholder interviews.

### **3 PROGRESS UPDATE**

#### **3.1 Analysis of Recorded Crime**

3.1.1 The purpose of analysing recorded crime data is to measure the impact of CCTV on levels of crime over time. To achieve this aim we have analysed data, provided by police colleagues, detailing the level of crime by ward since 2002. This involved regrouping recorded crime data into Target areas (Phase one, two or three wards) and Control areas (comparable wards without CCTV) and comparing changes between pre- and post-implementation periods.

3.1.2 Preliminary analysis<sup>1</sup> indicates that recorded crime declined in Phase one wards after cameras were installed but also that recorded crime declined across the rest of the district. However, when overall crime began to increase the level of crime remained constant in Phase one wards. Further analysis is required to explore this effect and determine the reliability of any conclusion.

3.1.3 Replicating this analysis for subsequent phases is problematic because of difficulties establishing comparable Control areas for Phase two and three areas. Further work is needed.

#### **3.2 Analysis of CCTV data**

3.2.1 An investigation of the data collected during the course of the CCTV project will provide a useful measure of the effectiveness of the CCTV system in detecting crime. The outcome of incidents logged by operators will be analysed to establish a detection rate for incidents where CCTV was used. This will then be compared with a relevant overall detection rate.

3.2.2 Further analysis of this data will give an overview of which cameras are most commonly used by Police and operators.

#### **3.3 Public perceptions of crime and anti-social behaviour**

---

<sup>1</sup> Using methodology detailed in Gill et al., Home Office, **Technical Annex: methods used in assessing the impact of CCTV**, 2005

3.3.1 As part of the evaluation a questionnaire will be produced and distributed using a robust survey methodology examining the impact of CCTV on public perceptions about fear of crime and anti-social behaviour. It will be administered in an eight week period from late January 2008 with findings available in March. Appendix 1 details questions which will be used to explore these issues. The questionnaire will have four sections;

- **Concerns about crime and anti-social behaviour;** using fear of crime measures used in the BCS<sup>2</sup> and also an amended version of perceptions of anti-social behaviour.
- **Quality of Life;** questions relating to general satisfaction with local area and specifically measuring the impact of crime, fear of crime<sup>3</sup> and perceptions of antisocial behaviour.
- **Attitudes towards CCTV;** to establish local opinion towards the project including whether they feel it has been successful.
- **Demographic data;** a section collecting demographic data to aid weighting and analysis.

3.3.2 The survey will use a stratified random sampling strategy to ensure a usable response by over-sampling specific neighbourhoods where CCTV cameras have been installed. Results will then be weighted to provide an overview of the impact of CCTV across the district. This strategy should also allow for comparisons between areas where cameras are concentrated and the wider district to attempt to distinguish local effects of CCTV. Though analysis at individual ward level is likely to be unreliable due to reduced sample size.

3.3.3 The results of this survey will be considered in the context of other recent, local research into crime, fear of crime and anti-social behaviour to produce an overview of the impact of CCTV on public perception in Derwentside.

### 3.4 Stakeholder interviews

3.4.1 A series of interviews with stakeholders involved in collecting data and using the CCTV system will be included to represent other perspectives on the usefulness and efficacy of this resource. The people involved in the stakeholder interviews may include;

- CCTV Manager
- CCTV operatives
- Police Constables
- Senior Police Officers
- Fire Officers
- Crown Prosecution Service staff
- Members
- Derwentside Crime Reduction Partnership

---

<sup>2</sup> The British Crime Survey is a yearly victimisation survey commissioned by the Home Office to provide robust trends about adults' experience of crime. Used together with police recorded crime statistics it provides a comprehensive picture of household and personal crime.

<sup>3</sup> Using BCS format

- Focus groups (exploring issues arising)

#### **4 CONCLUSIONS**

- 4.1 An interim evaluation at the end of Phase one revealed strong local support for the CCTV scheme, as well as clear indications that residents perceive it is effective in tackling and deterring crime.
- 4.2 Now there is a need to investigate the system more fully to enable the Community CCTV project to be evaluated in the wider context of Local Government Re-organisation. Preliminary indications are that CCTV has reduced recorded crime in some areas though there is further analysis to be undertaken. A full report will be available by April 2008.
- 4.3 The evaluation incorporates objective measures of crime, evidence and views from all stakeholders as well as taking into account the views of the public through a survey. Systematically examining public perceptions in this way does carry significant costs. These costs will be met from the existing budget. However, the Derwentside Community CCTV project is one of the most extensive schemes in the UK and commands significant Council and LSP resources. As such the evaluation is proportionate to the size of the project.

#### **5 RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 5.1 Provide comments or suggestions about the proposed questionnaire and any groups and/or individuals for consideration at the stakeholder interview stage.

**For further information on the details of this report, please contact:**

**Stephen Tracey, Policy Officer, on 218430 / [s.tracey@derwentside.gov.uk](mailto:s.tracey@derwentside.gov.uk).**

**6 APPENDIX 1**

**6.1 CCTV evaluation Fear of Crime questionnaire (possible questions)**

6.1.1 All the following questions have been used previously in research examining perceptions and experience of crime. Some have been used in substantive studies on the effectiveness of CCTV specifically whilst others have been drawn from the British Crime Survey.

6.1.2 Community Safety colleagues will be consulted in the construction of the questionnaire. A fourth section, (not shown below) incorporating a battery of questions collecting demographic information, will be included in the final questionnaire. This will aid analysis and provide data to weight the results. Analysis will also take into account respondents' proximity to the cameras to try and distinguish any local effect.

6.1.3 In keeping with good practice questionnaires will be accompanied by a covering letter giving brief details about the CCTV scheme and the reason for evaluation at this time. To increase response rates the questionnaire will be publicised using local media.

**6.2 Concern about Crime or anti-social behaviour**

**1** In general, how much, if at all, do you worry that you or other people in your household will be victims of crime?

Worry all the time	Often worry	Sometimes worry	Hardly ever worry	Never worry	Don't know
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**2** How worried, if at all, are you about the following?

	Very worried	Fairly worried	Not very worried	Not at all worried
Having your home broken into and something stolen	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Having your car stolen	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Having things stolen from your car	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Being mugged	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Being raped	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Being physically attacked by a stranger	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Being the victim of a racially motivated assault	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**3 For each of the following please indicate how much of a problem you think they are in your area**

	A very big problem	A fairly big problem	Not a very big problem	Not a problem at all	Don't know
Gangs of young people hanging around	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People dealing or using drugs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Drunken disorderly people	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People not treating each other with respect	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People being assaulted	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People stealing or breaking into cars	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People being burgled	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People damaging or vandalising property	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**6.3 Quality of Life**

**4 How would you rate your quality of life over the last year?**

Very Good	Fairly Good	Not especially good or bad	Fairly bad	Very bad	Don't know
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**5 How satisfied are you with life in your neighbourhood over the last year?**

Very Good	Fairly Good	Not especially good or bad	Fairly bad	Very bad	Don't know
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**6 How satisfied are you with life in Derwentside over the last year?**

Very Good	Fairly Good	Not especially good or bad	Fairly bad	Very bad	Don't know
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**7** On a scale of 1 to 10, where 1 has no effect and 10 has a total effect, how much is YOUR OWN quality of life affected by fear of crime?

No effect										Total effect
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

**8** On a scale of 1 to 10, where 1 has no effect and 10 has a total effect, how much is YOUR OWN quality of life affected by crime in general?

No effect										Total effect
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

**9** On a scale of 1 to 10, where 1 has no effect and 10 has a total effect, how much is YOUR OWN quality of life affected by anti-social behaviour?

No effect										Total effect
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

**6.4 Attitudes towards CCTV**

**10** The following is a list of statements describing possible impacts that CCTV could have had in Derwentside. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each one.

	Definitely Agree	Tend to Agree	Tend to Disagree	Definitely Disagree	Don't Know
People have reported more incidents to the police because the CCTV can be used as evidence	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
With CCTV in the area, the police have responded to incidents more quickly	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CCTV cameras make places look like problem areas	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CCTV has shifted gangs of young people to other areas, which is a good thing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



CCTV has shifted gangs of young people to other areas, which is a bad thing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CCTV is an invasion of privacy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CCTV in the area has helped lower crime in my local area	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**11 How do feel about CCTV cameras operating in public areas in Derwentside?**

Very happy	Fairly happy	Neither happy nor unhappy	Fairly unhappy	Very unhappy	Don't know
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**TITLE: MAINSTREAMING OF YOUTH BUS AND SPICETACULAR**

**TO/ON: COMMUNITY SAFETY AND STRONG COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY  
PANEL- 18<sup>TH</sup> DECEMBER 2007**

**BY: DIRECTOR OF CORPORATE ADMINISTRATION AND POLICY**

**PORTFOLIO COUNCILLOR A. TAYLOR  
HOLDER:**

## **1. SUBJECT MATTER AND PURPOSE OF REPORT**

- 1.1 This report details the findings of the Scrutiny Panel's Task Groups for the Youth Bus and the Spicetacular rewards Scheme and outlines the current funding status of the initiatives.

## **2. BACKGROUND**

- 2.1 The Council is a front runner in positive youth engagement. Since 2001, the SPICE Project (Special Project for the Implementation of Children's Elections) has been leading both regionally and nationally through a range of young people initiatives. This work led to the Council being awarded Beacon Status for Positive Youth Engagement in April 2006.
- 2.2 Two specific young people schemes form part of SPICE, namely "Ellie" the Youth Bus and Spicetacular. The former targets hard to reach young people in youth nuisance hot spot areas and also undertakes young people consultations at school level. The latter is a school-based rewards scheme which promotes good citizenship at school by rewarding good behaviour, good attendance, and so on.
- 2.3 Both schemes have undergone independent evaluations in order to establish their impact and inform discussions on their future funding or mainstreaming. This evaluation work was first communicated to the Strong Communities Scrutiny Panel at their meeting of the 17th October 2006.
- 2.4 Following the completion of the two evaluations and the positive results reported for both schemes, the Community Safety and Strong Communities Panel at their meeting of 26<sup>th</sup> June 2007, decided to include the mainstreaming of the two initiatives in their work programme and allocate this work to Scrutiny Task groups to consider the impact and effectiveness of the schemes.
- 2.4.1 Two Scrutiny Task Groups meetings were held, one of the 3<sup>rd</sup> October for the Spicetacular Rewards Scheme and another on the 9<sup>th</sup> October to discuss the Youth Bus. Both meetings were well attended by members and senior representatives of partner organisations. The meetings started with a presentation from officers, outlining the results of each initiative's independent evaluation. Following the presentations a discussion took place on the opportunities for mainstreaming the projects and any issues relating to achieving this. The minutes of both meetings are attached to this report.

### **3. THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SCRUTINY TASK GROUPS**

3.1.1 SPICETACULAR. The main recommendations from the Scrutiny Task Group meeting of the Spicetacular scheme were as follows:

- Participants present supported the scheme, and agreed that there is a need to explore how funding can be secured.
- There is a need to focus on mainstreaming the scheme to secure its provision. Small amounts of funding will not provide continuity.
- It was recommended for the relevant officers to write up a business case and submit it to the Children's Services Authority.
- To explore if our Health partners can contribute to the running costs.

3.1.2 The relevant officers have taken these recommendations forward. A formal business case was prepared and submitted to Durham County Council and we are currently awaiting their response. A similar request has been sent to the Primary Care Trust.

3.1.3 Following the Task Group meeting, the County Council asked for supplementary evidence of school support relating to the added value Spicetacular provides compared to "standard" reward schemes (e.g. gold stars, etc.). An additional survey was sent to schools to gather more detailed evidence on "added value". An overwhelming positive response was received from schools confirming the added value of the scheme, This was based mainly around pupils using ICT and maths daily on the website and the life skills of managing their own spending and shopping on-line. Spicetacular was again confirmed as being better than standard reward schemes and supporting an enhanced performance. This additional information on added value was included into the business case for the County Council.

3.1.4 The local schools participating in the scheme continue to support it strongly and they like to see it mainstreamed. Schools continue to be happy to fund the £4/child contribution to the project, which equates to £13,068 of the overall running costs.

3.1.5 YOUTH BUS. The main recommendations from the Scrutiny Task Group meeting of the Youth Bus were as follows:

- a. The meeting considered the Youth Bus a priority for mainstreaming.
- b. The Youth Service representative will take a formal request for mainstream funding contribution to Carole Payne at the Children's Services Authority.
- c. The Chair of the CDRP will take the above request to the Community Safety Partnership.
- d. The Chief Constable will take the above request to Durham Constabulary
- e. The PCT representative will take the above request to County Durham PCT.

3.1.6 The relevant officers have taken these recommendations forward and submitted official requests to the aforementioned representatives. We have received a confirmation from the PCT for a contribution of £5,000 per annum for three years. We have also received informal indications that the County Council may make a contribution to the Youth Bus. We are currently awaiting for responses from the CDRP and Durham Constabulary.

#### **4. COUNCIL BUDGET PROCESS**

4.1 At the same time as submitting requests for funding to partner organisations, relevant officers prepared two revenue bids for Spicetacular and the Youth Bus requesting the Council to mainstream the projects.

4.2 The two corporate bids are as follows:

- The annual cost of Spicetacular is £60,935 to which local schools contribute £13,068. The corporate bid therefore asks the Council for a mainstream contribution of up to a maximum £47,867. This may be reduced depending on potential contributions from the County Council and/or PCT
- The annual cost of the Youth Bus is £74,895 and currently PCT have confirmed a contribution of £5,000. This corporate bid therefore asks the Council for a mainstream contribution of up to a maximum £69,895. It is expected that this will be reduced further through contributions from the County Council and the CRDP.

#### **3. RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Community Safety and Strong Communities Scrutiny Panel is requested to note the progress in securing resources for the Spicetacular and Youth Bus initiatives and confirm its support to the conclusions of the Task group findings.

**For further information on the details of this report, please contact Nick Tzamaras, Policy Manager on [218243](tel:218243), or e-mail [n.tzamaras@derwentside.gov.uk](mailto:n.tzamaras@derwentside.gov.uk)**

**Task Group of Community Safety &  
Strong Communities Scrutiny Panel**  
**The SPICETACULAR Reward Scheme**

**Minutes**

**3<sup>rd</sup> October 2007 – 6:00-7:30pm**  
**Civic Centre, Consett**

**1. Present:**

Cllr T Parry, Derwentside District Council  
Cllr A Taylor, Derwentside District Council  
Cllr R Hemsley, Derwentside District Council  
Cllr J William, Derwentside District Council  
Cllr J C Hunter, Derwentside District Council  
Cllr D Broadley, Derwentside District Council  
Cllr W Tyrie, Derwentside District Council  
Cllr S Mellor, Derwentside District Council  
Cllr C Vasey, Durham County Council  
Cllr C Robson, Durham County Council  
Cllr J Armstrong, Durham County Council  
Phillip Marshall, Young Peoples Forum  
Katherine Langton, Young Peoples Forum  
Philip Barker, Stanley Burnside Primary School  
Carole Payne, Durham County Council – CYPS  
Ginny Williams, Durham County Council – CYPS & DETF  
C Hanson, Tanfield School  
Nick Tzamarias, Derwentside District Council  
Val Hill, Derwentside District Council  
Darren Howell, Derwentside District Council

**2. Welcome & Presentation**

- a. Tina Parry, Vice Chair of Community Safety & Strong Communities Scrutiny Panel, welcomed everyone and following introductions, commented that there was good representation from both the District and County Council.
- b. Tina Parry commented that the Community Safety and Strong Communities Scrutiny Panel decided that SPICETACULAR would be one of its priorities this year and set up this special Task Group to consider the mainstreaming of SPICETACULAR and how this can be achieved.
- c. SPICETACULAR is now in its 4<sup>th</sup> year and has been funded by NRF, the District Council and the County Council.
- d. Val Hill and Nick Tzamarias gave a presentation of how the scheme works, including a live on-line demonstration of the website through the eyes of a child and as a teacher.
- e. Following the presentation, discussion clarified the following issues / questions:

### **3. Access to SPICETACULAR**

- a. SPICETACULAR is open to all schools in Derwentside.
- b. Transport for people of all ages is an issue in Derwentside and SPICETACULAR cannot resolve this.
- c. Children access the SPICETACULAR scheme themselves and choose what they want to spend their points / money on. Support is provided to children and teachers when necessary.
- d. One school chose to award extra points for attending extra classes during exam periods.
- e. Schools liked the flexibility of the scheme.
- f. The scheme also rewards non-academic things, such as attendance, which is a bonus to the scheme.

### **4. School's Response to SPICETACULAR**

- a. The scheme provides a strong incentive to encourage and support children in healthy activities e.g. swimming.
- b. School representatives felt that:
  - SPICETACULAR provided schools with a measurable tool for various purposes e.g. school attendance had increased from 91.3% to 94.7% while using the scheme.
  - Providing children and teachers with passwords for security purposes was good practice.
  - The "reward scheme is a prime motivator" for pupils and families.
  - The scheme makes a strong contribution in raising ICT skills amongst pupils since SPICETACULAR motivates them to use its internet website on a regular basis.
- c. The evaluation report highlighted issues relating to the administrative side of the scheme. However, this was due to historical issues associated with the old Smartcard scheme which was more difficult to administer. SPICETACULAR was developed as a result of feedback from teachers, and being website-based involves less administration. Schools who previously participated in the old scheme may need convincing of SPICETACULAR.
- d. Schools have responded differently to the SPICETACULAR scheme depending upon individual Head Teachers (if one was in post).
- e. Perhaps there is a need to re-look at how the scheme is marketed and promoted, and to re-approach schools in Derwentside.

### **5. Engaging Boys**

- a. Questions were raised regarding how the scheme engages boys and if it could target them to raise educational attainment.
- b. School representatives responded by saying that individual schools decide what the targets are and that these could specifically target boys. Another school representative said there is actually a balance between the number of boys and girls who use the scheme.
- c. Anne Taylor gave an example of some 14 year old boys who used the scheme to pay to go to the gym all day on a Saturday.

## **6. Local Children's Board & Future Commissioning**

- a. Carole Payne congratulated Derwentside District Council both for SPICETACULAR and more generally for the Positive Youth Engagement Beacon Award. Carole also said that as we move into the new Children's Trust arrangements and the Local Children's Boards, decisions are being made on how commissioning will work on a local and county level.
- b. It was felt important to secure local decision-making and to identify how schools will work with the Local Children's Board.
- c. Nick Tzamarias mentioned that an initiative like SPCIEACULAR will, in future, be commissioned by the Local Children's Board (LCB). However, he felt that there would be some time before the LCB reaches this full commissioning stage. Meanwhile, we need to look at securing the future of SPICETACULAR and other best practice initiatives.

## **7. Funding**

- a. There is a gap (after the District Council's and School's contributions) of about £17-18,000.
- b. The only reason identified for some schools leaving the SPICETACULAR scheme was cost. One school dropped out due to an absent Head Teacher.
- c. A Head Teacher present felt that there would be a risk of the scheme ending if the cost of £4 per pupil was raised to £6.

## **8. Recommendations**

- a. Participants present supported the scheme, and agreed that there is a need to explore how funding can be secured.
- b. There is a need to focus on mainstreaming the scheme to secure its provision. Small amounts of funding will not provide continuity.
- c. It was recommended for the relevant officers to write up a business case and submit it to the Children's Services Authority.
- d. Also to explore if our Health partners can contribute to the running costs.
- e. The website should show both points and money so that children can see both to encourage the development of their financial literacy.
- f. There was also a suggestion that in the future the scheme could try to engage a couple of schools from outside of Derwentside in order to promote the scheme as a model of good practice for deployment across Durham.

## **9. Closing**

The Chair thanked everyone for attending.

# Task Group of Community Safety & Strong Communities Scrutiny Panel

## The 'Ellie' Youth Bus

### Minutes

9<sup>th</sup> October 2007 – 6:00-7:40pm  
Civic Centre, Consett



#### 1. Present:

Cllr T Parry, Derwentside District Council  
Cllr R Hemsley, Derwentside District Council  
Cllr J Hunter, Derwentside District Council  
Cllr D Broadley, Derwentside District Council  
Cllr M Campbell, Derwentside District Council  
Cllr C Vasey, Durham County Council  
Cllr A Barker, Durham County Council  
David Walton, Durham County Council  
John Pearson, Derwentside District Council  
Luke Bateson, Young People's Forum  
Emma Herbison, Young Volunteer on the Youth Bus  
Paul Hebron, Durham County Council – CYPS  
T Watts, Durham Police  
Ivan Wood, Durham Police  
Iain Miller, CD PCT  
Gordon Elliott, Derwentside District Council  
Nick Tzamarias, Derwentside District Council  
Nigel Hogg, Derwentside District Council  
Ashley Johnson, Derwentside District Council  
Darren Howell, Derwentside District Council

#### 2. Welcome & Presentation

- a. Tina Parry, Vice Chair of Community Safety & Strong Communities Scrutiny Panel, welcomed everyone and following introductions, commented that there was good representation from both the District and County Council.
- b. Tina Parry commented that the Community Safety and Strong Communities Scrutiny Panel decided that the Youth Bus would be one of its priorities this year and set up this special Task Group to consider the mainstreaming of Youth Bus and how this can be achieved.
- c. Nigel Hogg, Darren Howell and Nick Tzamarias gave a presentation about the Youth Bus.
- d. Following the presentation, discussion clarified the following issues / questions:

#### 3. Access & Provision

- a. The Youth Bus delivers all aspects of health advice, including alcohol and other substance misuse, sexual health, etc.



- b. There was concern for areas that underreport crime and therefore their needs are not met. It was mentioned that this doesn't give a true picture of youth disorder. Claire Vasey raised the issue of the Bus visiting small remote places like 'No Place'. Nigel explained how the targeting of the Bus programme is undertaken and the work that took place when the Bus "visited No Place"
- c. Nigel said that in addition to taking requests and recommendations from professionals and elected members, assessment visits are also undertaken by the Youth Bus staff to prioritise areas.
- d. A question was asked regarding how many people contribute towards the work of the Youth Bus in real terms (i.e. other partners). The Youth Bus works in partnership with other professionals from the Youth Service, Fire Service, etc.
- e. Another issue raised related to whether the Youth Bus is too stretched to provide a service, e.g. visiting one 'needy' area once a week. Nigel explained that if an area is very much in need, the team feed back to partners for extra support.
- f. Stay Safe (ECM Outcome) to include work undertaken to prevent young people becoming victims of crime. Youth Bus staff also discuss local issues in relation to community safety with young people. The Youth Bus also has a separate room at the back of the bus for confidential sessions.

#### **4. Outcomes & Challenges**

- a. Iain Miller said that the PCT is going to be funding the Youth Bus (through a SLA) to undertake sexual health work in Wards where statistics show high teenage pregnancies. Iain also said that there are only 5 days a week and we need to prioritise where the Youth Bus goes.
- b. Question about how the Youth Bus achieves depth of work within 12 weeks. The independent evaluation of the Youth Bus by ERS gave examples of sustained impact, but highlighted a need to put better monitoring procedures in place to track longer term outcomes for users of the Youth Bus and this will be undertaken by Darren and Nigel.
- c. When the Youth Bus is due to finish its work and leave an area, Nigel feeds back to partners information regarding any continuing needs for future work. The Youth Bus also visits areas after work has been concluded to check up on developments. Partners also inform Nigel if issues continue / return.
- d. The Youth Bus consults with community members, but there is only one Youth Bus for the whole of Derwentside. There are also competing demands for the Youth Bus – areas of need vs. visiting all Wards. In the future, the Local Children's Board will look at these priorities.
- e. There was a question about what the Youth Bus provides in addition to its standard work. Some of the young people attending the Youth Bus cannot afford / do not attend / are barred from other youth clubs. The Youth Bus is specifically designed and equipped for use by young people, and does not compete with other service users of differing ages and needs. It was commented that some young people have gone back into youth clubs, even if they had been barred, after accessing the Youth Bus. The Youth Bus does not bar young people (unless it was a matter of health and safety).
- f. The high number of confidential sessions was also a positive, as the Youth Bus was accessing young people the Police have been unable to.

## 5. Staff Team

- a. It was felt that the energy of the team contributed to the success of the Youth Bus. It was commented that looking at the statistics at face value, a 10% net reduction in crime was “exceptional” and that this must be cost effective in terms of Police time saved. The example of work done to reduce youth nuisance in Stanley Bus Station was highlighted.
- b. The work of the Youth Bus staff was acknowledged, especially as they have had to deal with some challenging young people in the front line. Tina and Gordon personally thanked Nigel and Ashley.
- c. **Nigel and Ashley left at this point to allow the meeting to explore other aspects of the service.**

## 6. Young People’s Comments

- a. Emma (youth volunteer on the Youth Bus) was asked her views about the Youth Bus. Emma said that the Youth Bus got the young people out of Stanley Bus Station and agreed that the Youth Bus had ‘street cred’.

## 7. Funding

- a. The Community Safety Partnership has funded the Youth Bus for 3 years. If the Youth Bus is providing good work then it should be mainstreamed. The spread of work highlighted in the ERS evaluation is a critical issue.
- b. There are lots of changes taking place with funding streams and competing priorities. It is also mentioned that it is often difficult to assess impact due to other initiatives and services working in the same area. Nick mentioned that although this may be the case more generally, the independent ERS evaluation has proven that the Bus has undertaken targeted work which had a positive impact, and had delivered on priorities.
- c. The PCT is spending on preventive work (i.e. the Youth Bus). Not spending on preventive work is to “wait for the fall out with youth”. The Youth Bus is the cheaper option when compared with the costs for specialist services.
- d. The District Council has always asked the County Council / Children’s Services Authority to contribute towards the Youth Bus. This year the Bus is part-funded by the Children’s Fund which is a government fund for which the County Council is the accountable body.
- e. The Youth Bus needs to be secured as a provision and everyone needs to fund / contribute towards costs (including in-kind costs).
- f. There was a suggestion to approach private businesses for funding, but recognised that this cannot be relied upon for core funding. Some income is generated every year through staff initiatives. A recent example is the ‘Wasted’ DVD and educational pack being sold across the country.
- g. To secure core funding would keep the project going.
- h. “I’m impressed with what I’ve seen”, the Youth Bus is “best practice”, “inspirational” and should be “celebrated”. It was also mentioned that there has to be a partnership approach to secure funding, as we cannot expect one source of funding.

## 8. Recommendations

- f. The meeting considered the Youth Bus a priority for mainstreaming.

- g. Paul Hebron will take a formal request for mainstream funding contribution to Carole Payne at the Children's Services Authority.
- h. John Pearson will take the above request to the Community Safety Partnership.
- i. Trevor Watson will take the above request to Durham Constabulary
- j. Iain Miller will take the above request to County Durham PCT.
- k. Darren and Nigel will develop monitoring procedures for the longer term impact of the work of the Youth Bus.

## **9. Closing**

The Chair thanked everyone for attending.

<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>MEMBERS' LOCAL INITIATIVE FUND</b>
<b>TO/ON:</b>	<b>COMMUNITY SAFETY AND STRONG COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY PANEL - 18<sup>TH</sup> DECEMBER, 2007</b>
<b>BY:</b>	<b>HEAD OF FINANCE</b>
<b>PORTFOLIO:</b>	<b>STRONG COMMUNITIES</b>
<b>STATUS:</b>	<b>REPORT</b>

## **1. STRATEGIC FACTOR CHECKLIST**

- 1.1 The Council's Corporate Management Team has confirmed that the Council's Strategic Factor checklist has been applied to the development of this report and there are no key issues over and above those set out in the body of the report that need to be brought to Members' attention.

## **2. PURPOSE**

- 2.1 This report provides an overview of the Members' Local Initiative Fund's (MLIF) usage, as well as outlining the results of the recently completed audit.

## **3. BACKGROUND**

- 3.1 As detailed in the attached criteria/application (Appendix 'A') the MLIF allocates annually £2,000 to each Council Member for "initiatives" that will enhance the well-being of their ward. This amount is linked to individual councillors and is not transferable to other ward members if councillors vacate their position.
- 3.2 The MLIF falls within the Strong Communities portfolio and was established in May, 2005. Since its inception, the average size of awards is £445. In the last full financial year (2006/2007), 259 initiatives were approved and a sum of £20,810 was carried forward into the 2007/2008 financial year, so in effect, the sum available this year in the MLIF is £130,810. Spend to date in 2007/2008 is £29,630.

## **4. INTERNAL AUDIT REPORT**

- 4.1 As part of its 2007/2008 work programme, the Council's Internal Audit Section has recently completed a review of the MLIF – the primary focus of which is to ensure that the controls in place for the administration of the fund are operating efficiently and effectively.

4.2 The level of assurance of internal control was determined as follows:

Policy	Significant
Application Forms	Significant
Award of the Grant	Significant
Monitoring	Limited

4.3 The Panel will note that the only area of limited assurance relates to monitoring.

4.4 In order to address this, the Finance Directorate is drafting up a set of monitoring procedures and also redrafting the communication that goes out to successful applicants to ensure that the money is used for the intended purpose. These will be used to undertake a more proactive post award monitoring process in future.

## **5. RECOMMENDATION**

5.1 The Scrutiny Panel is asked to note the progress being made on the MLIF in the current financial year as well as the measures being put in place to address the findings of the Audit Report into the Fund.

# **MEMBERS LOCAL INITIATIVE FUND 2007/08**

Criteria for the Members Local Initiative Fund 2007/08 financial year.

## **1. Introduction**

Each Member of the authority will have £2,000 available to them as a Members Local Initiative Fund in the current financial year. This fund is to be spent in the financial year on initiatives that will enhance the well-being of their ward. Although it is anticipated that money will be spent within a given financial year, funds can be carried over to future years if necessary, but no further than the political term.

Members will have the ability to pool their funds with other Members for a particular purpose.

Expenditure should be on a one-off basis and not give rise to future financial commitment from Derwentside District Council, although the fund could be used in conjunction with other local authority expenditure.

A declaration of interest is required by law. If you are in any doubt as to whether you should declare an interest, please contact the Council's Monitoring Officer in advance for advice.

## **2. How will it work?**

Members will receive requests for support from individuals/organisations in their ward.

Applications must be completed on the pro forma provided by the Council (attached).

The form should be completed and signed by both the applicant and the Member (without outcomes identified) and submitted to the Council's Director of Finance.

The request for funding will be scrutinised by the Director of Finance and approval given within five working days (under the Delegated Powers to Chief Officers in Derwentside District Council's Standing Orders).

Subject to the officer approval (and signatures), payment will be made as requested (or added to other budgetary provision if required) within 10 working days.

If in doubt with regard to the validity of any proposed expenditure from the fund, Members should seek advice from either the Director of Finance or the Council's Monitoring Officer.

## **3. General Guidance**

Generally speaking the Members Local Initiative Fund should be used to support the activities of formally established organisations within a Member's ward.

The Fund can, however, be used to support individual projects which result in a community good being satisfied or the objectives of a Ward Partnership.

The Fund should not be used for explicitly political purposes or to support the activities of an individual within a community.

Expenditure should not be committed prior to its validation by the Council's Director of Finance.

**Derwentside District Council**

**Member Local Initiative Fund – 2005/06**

Name of Initiative:

Brief Description of Initiative:

Name of organisation or responsible individual:

Address:

Tel:

E-mail:

Has the project the support of the Ward Partnership? Yes/No If Yes, letters of support to be provided

If No – Please explain purpose:

Member Name:

Amount Requested: £

Payable to: (name/address cheque to be made out to)

**Expected outcomes of obtaining the funding**

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Do you want the cheque .... (Please tick)

**Sent direct to the organisation**

**Returned to you**

A declaration of interest is required by law. If you are in doubt as to whether you should declare an interest, please contact Ashley Rocks-Menon on ext. 8390 for advice. If you or any member of your family or any business partner or close friend will benefit financially from this expenditure, please give details below:

Signed (Applicant) \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Signed (Local Elected Member) \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Signed (Divisional Head of Finance) \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

**Please return form to Dave Watson, Divisional Head of Finance**