

SELECT CRIME AND DISORDER COMMITTEE

at 6.30pm on Wednesday, 6th December 2017
Belle Vue Suite, 1 Belle Vue Square, Broughton Road, Skipton

Committee Members : The Chairman (Councillor Staveley) and Councillors Brown, Graham, Mason, Mercer, Moorby, Pighills, Shuttleworth, Solloway, Sutcliffe, Thompson and Whitaker.

Terms of Reference

To undertake the Council's crime and disorder functions by:

- reviewing or scrutinising decisions made, or other action taken, in connection with crime and disorder functions;
- considering crime and disorder related Councillor Calls for Action (CCFA) that arise through the Council's existing CCFA process;
- considering actions taken by the responsible authorities on the community safety partnership;
- making reports or recommendations to the local authority with regard to those functions. (In practice, the nature of the committee and its work should mean that recommendations will also be directed to responsible partners.

AGENDA

1. **Apologies for absence**
2. **Public Participation** - In the event that any questions / statements are received or members of the public attend, the public participation session will proceed for a period of up to fifteen minutes. (Note: Where the participation relates to any particular item on the agenda, participation will usually be at the point that item is considered.)
3. **Declarations of Interest** – All Members are invited to declare at this point any interests they have in items appearing on this agenda, including the nature of those interests.

(Note: Declarations should be in the form of:

a “***disclosable pecuniary interest***” under Appendix A to the Council's Code of Conduct, or “***other interests***” under Appendix B or under Paragraph 15 where a matter arises at the meeting which relates to a financial interest of a friend, relative or close associate.

A Member of Council who has a disclosable pecuniary interest must leave the room and not take part in the discussion or vote. When declaring interests under Appendix B or Paragraph 15

of the Code, Members must move to the public seating area, not vote, and speak only if members of the public are also allowed to speak at the meeting.)

4. **Policing in North Yorkshire and Local Policing Craven** – Insp. Geoff Crocker will be attending the meeting to report on local policing and respond to Members' comments and questions on local policing issues. If available Detective Sergeant Dan Ridgeway will be accompanying Inspector Crocker to enable Members to ask questions about more serious investigations and the work of the Serious Crime Team.

Report attached, together with a breakdown of crimes referenced as rural crime and the service standards data report as at 31st October 2017.

Note : A summary of recorded crimes is appended to the community safety report at Item 5 below.

Purpose of Item – To present Members with an update on crime and anti-social behaviour within Craven and local policing issues.

5. **Community Safety** – Attached, report of the Chief Executive.

Purpose of Report – To provide an update on the work of the Community Safety Partnership Hub within Craven District and North Yorkshire.

6. **Public Space Protection Order : Review** – Attached, report of the Community Safety Hub.

Purpose of Report – To provide a review of the Public Space Protection Order 01/2016. A requirement of the PSPO is that an annual review is carried out to compare numbers of incidents to make sure the order put in place is effective, and gives residents the relief they need from the specified anti-social behaviour caused by motor vehicles.

7. **Alcohol Consumption in Designated Public Places Order : Review** – To follow, report of the Community Safety Officer.

Purpose of Report – To inform the Committee of work carried out in reviewing the Alcohol Consumption in Designated Public Places Order.

8. **North Yorkshire : Police and Crime Panel** – Please find attached details of the key messages arising from the most recent meeting of the North Yorkshire Police and Crime Panel held on 16th November 2017. Arrangements have been made for the Panel Chairman, Councillor Carl Les, to attend the meeting of Select Committee scheduled for 28th February 2018.

Next Meeting : Select Crime and Disorder Committee : 27th June 2018.

- Sitting as Select Committee -

9. **Confirmation of Minutes** of the meeting of Select Committee held on 6th September 2017
10. **Date of Next Ordinary Meeting** : 10th January 2018 at 6.30pm.
11. **Any other items** which the Chairman decides are urgent in accordance with Section 100B(4) of the Local Government Act, 1972.

Agenda Contact Officer: Chris Waterhouse,
Democratic Services,
cwaterhouse@cravendc.gov.uk
Tel. 01756 706235
28th November 2017

Recording at Council Meetings

Recording is allowed at Council, committee and sub-committee meetings which are open to the public, subject to

(i) the recording being conducted with the full knowledge of the chairman of the meeting; and

(ii) compliance with the Council's protocol on audio/visual recording and photography at meetings, a copy of which is available on request. Anyone wishing to record must contact the Agenda Contact Officer (details above) prior to the start of the meeting. Any recording must be conducted openly and not disrupt proceedings.

Agenda Item 4

Police and Crime
Commissioner
North Yorkshire



Report to Craven Select (Crime and Disorder) Committee 061217 - Inspector Geoff Crocker : Craven District

Crime Overview

The figures below are from the beginning of the financial year and are accurate as of 25 November 2017. A change in the definition of what is recorded as a burglary will now effect the figures for the next couple of years as we will see an incorrect comparison appearing on our statistics.

The old definitions of Burglary Dwelling, Burglary Commercial and Burglary Other have been replaced by Burglary Residential and Burglary Business and Community.

- **Burglary - Residential**

The classification of **residential** burglary includes all buildings or parts of buildings that are within the boundary of, or form a part of, a dwelling and includes the dwelling itself, vacant dwellings, sheds, garages, outhouses, summer houses and any other structure that meets the definition of a building. It also includes other premises used for residential purposes such as houseboats, residential care homes and hostels.



















- **Burglary – Business and Community**

The classification of **business and community** burglary includes all buildings or parts of buildings that are used solely and exclusively for business purposes or are otherwise entirely outside the classification of residential burglary such as a place of worship. Where an outbuilding is within the boundary of a dwelling, but not forming part of the dwelling building, such as a garage or workshop and is used solely for business purposes this should be recorded as burglary – business and community.

This will I predict lead to an increase in the perception through the statistics of Dwellings being burgled and the simple comparisons with previous years will show increases.

Our activity is broken up into

ASB	12.9%
ROAD	25.7%
PSW	41.6%
CRIME	19.7%

RECORDED CRIME STATISTICS		Yesterday	2015/ 2016	2016/ 2017	2017/ 2018	Diff 17/18 v 16/17		Trend
Victim Based	Arson & Criminal Damage	0	206	172	181	9	5.2%	
	Burglary	1	206	215	177	-38	-17.7%	
	Robbery	0	2	2	1	-1	-50.0%	
	Sexual Offences: Other	0	35	26	36	10	38.5%	
	Sexual Offences: Rape	0	23	11	18	7	63.6%	
	Theft: All Other Theft	1	179	195	144	-51	-26.2%	
	Theft: Bicycle Theft	0	16	15	12	-3	-20.0%	
	Theft: Shoplifting	0	124	119	93	-26	-21.8%	
	Theft: Theft From Person	1	15	14	17	3	21.4%	
	Vehicle Offences	0	110	132	142	10	7.6%	
	Violence: Violence With Injury	0	146	137	138	1	0.7%	
	Violence: Violence Without Injury	0	109	170	158	-12	-7.1%	
Crimes Against Society	Drugs: Possession Of Drugs	0	41	46	26	-20	-43.5%	
	Drugs: Trafficking Of Drugs	0	7	5	7	2	40.0%	
	Misc Crimes Against Society	0	20	30	26	-4	-13.3%	
	Possession Of Weapons	0	1	11	2	-9	-81.8%	
	Public Order Offences	1	24	41	49	8	19.5%	
Total		4	1264	1341	1227	-114	-8.5%	

Arson and Criminal Damage reports are up by 9 offences on last year or 5.2% overall with 181 offences recorded against 172 last year and 206 2015/16. Most of this is damage to motor cars with Skipton South Ward and West but also Bentham being the most affected. Note there has been a national increase in reports of damage to Motor Vehicles.

Overall Burglary figures are down 38 Offences or -17.7% which is the best current measurement. 177 offences against 215 for last year and 206 for 2015/16.

Burglary 'Residential' shows as 59 offences and 17 attempts with Crosshills Wards still taking the lion's share of the offences with 23.

Agenda Item 4

Burglary 'Business and Community' shows as 71 offences and 8 attempts. Barden and Ingleton and Clapham showing the highest figures.

There has been 1 robbery reported at Skipton East on 11 June which was a 'car jacking' 2 men from Bradford have been arrested and charged.

Sexual Offences are up to 36 offences against 26 last year and 35 for 2015/16 and rape is also up to 18 offences from 11 last year but down from 23 in 2015/16.

Theft – down by 51 offences to 144 against 195 last year and 179 for 15/16

Bike Thefts down 3 to 12 offences - 15 last year and 16 in 15/16

Shoplifting – down 26 to 93 from 119 and 124 in 15/16. Skipton has seen the vast majority (67) of these offences.

Theft From the Person – up 3 to 17 from 14 last year and 15 in 15/16. In the past couple of weeks we have seen several purse dipping offences in the high street.

Vehicle Offences – up 10 to 142 offences from 132 last year but 110 in 15/16.

Violence with Injury – up 1 offence to 138 from 137 last year and 146 in 15/16

Violence without Injury – down 12 to 158 from 170 and 109 for 15/16

Drugs Possession down 20 offences to 26 against 46 and 41 for 15/16


Trafficking Drugs – up 2 to 7 against 5 and 7 for 15/16

Miscellaneous Crimes against Society – down 4 to 26

Possession offensive weapons – down 9 to 2 offences

Public Order up 8 offences to 49 from 41 and 24 for 15/16

ASB





There are no issues around ASB to report.

Stop & Search Dashboard from: 01/04/2017 to 24/11/2017

Headline Numbers and Quality Checking

SNC	Persons Stopped	Outcome		Legitimacy (QA Checking)				Vehicles Stopped	Outcome		Legitimacy (QA Checking)			
		Num Positive	% Positive Outcome	Stops QA'd	% Stops QA'd	QA Pass	% Pass		Num Positive	% Positive Outcome	Stops QA'd	% Stops QA'd	QA Pass	% Pass
Craven SNC	<u>59</u>	17	28.8%	29	49.2%	27	93.1%	<u>15</u>	0	0.0%	7	46.7%	5	71.4%
Hambleton & Richmondshire SNC	<u>80</u>	19	23.8%	13	16.3%	7	53.8%	<u>24</u>	0	0.0%	3	12.5%	2	66.7%
Harrogate SNC	<u>173</u>	47	27.2%	23	13.3%	23	100.0%	<u>37</u>	0	0.0%	3	8.1%	3	100.0%
Scarborough & Ryedale SNC	<u>137</u>	29	21.2%	19	13.9%	19	100.0%	<u>26</u>	0	0.0%	2	7.7%	2	100.0%
Selby SNC	<u>45</u>	12	26.7%	6	13.3%	5	83.3%	<u>8</u>	0	0.0%	1	12.5%	1	100.0%
York SNC	<u>253</u>	78	30.8%	17	6.7%	15	88.2%	<u>41</u>	0	0.0%	3	7.3%	3	100.0%
zUnallocated	<u>20</u>	6	30.0%	1	5.0%	1	100.0%	<u>13</u>	0	0.0%	1	7.7%	1	100.0%
⌚ Total	<u>767</u>	208	27.1%	108	14.1%	97	89.8%	164	0	0.0%	20	12.2%	17	85.0%

Nominal Searches by Ethnicity (click the graph segment to see a record level breakdown)





Disproportionality		% of Pop White	% of Pop Ethnic Origin	% S/S White	% S/S Ethnic Origin
Craven SNC		96%	4%	73%	22%
Hambleton & Richmondshire SNC		96%	4%	86%	5%
Harrogate SNC		92%	8%	75%	10%
Scarborough & Ryedale SNC		96%	4%	91%	3%
Selby SNC		96%	4%	76%	7%
York SNC		91%	9%	90%	6%
zUnallocated		0%	0%	70%	20%
Total		95%	5%	84%	8%





NB: The difference between White % and Ethnic Origin % is where the Ethnicity is Not Stated

Agenda Item 4



NB: The difference between White % and Ethnic Origin % is where the Ethnicity is Not Stated



Nominal Searches by Gender



Search Outcomes




In other news

Staffing – Our New PCSOs will shortly arrive to be tutored this will take the total number within our District to 13 and these will be posted to Crosshills, Skipton and Grassington once they are trained and successfully tutored. We still have a Neighbourhood Constable vacancy in Settle although the replacement has been identified the response team are currently unable to release him. Meanwhile PC Barton has joined the team and will cover the Settle and Grassington areas for the time being.


	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	
BURGLARY DWELLIN	3	2	4	6	3	4	1	6	5	3	2	4	
BURGLARY COMMEF	2	0	5	4	3	4	4	9	3	3	3	3	
BURGLARY OTHER	3	0	9	2									
CRIMINAL DAMAGE	2	0	3	4	1	5	0	3	2	4	1	7	
WILDLIFE	2	0	2	0	8	7	4	3	2	4	0	2	
CRIM DAM TO FIELD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
THEFT GENERAL	4	1	7	7	0	2	0	12	3	5	8	6	
AUTOCRIME	14	1	2	2	3	6	8	3	3	8	13	5	
SMV	2	1	7	3	0	0	0	3	3	0	1	1	
QUADS	2	0	4	4	1	2	0	6	6	3	2	11	
OTHER OFFENCES	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
THEFT SHEEP	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	
HERITAGE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
POACHING	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	1	4	3	0	6	
2 IN 1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	
	35		5	44	35	20	31	18	46	32	35	31	46

BURGLARY DWELL	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	
		8	2	18	12	6	8	5	15	8	6	5	7
QUADS	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	
		2	0	4	4	1	2	0	6	6	3	2	11
smv and 2 in 1	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	
		2	1	8	4	0	0	0	3	4	1	1	1
AUTOCRIME	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	
		14	1	2	2	3	6	8	3	3	8	13	5


BURGLARY DWELLING




QUADS



smv and 2 in 1



AUTOCRIME



SERVICE STANDARDS
Craven SNC

ATTENDANCE TO INCIDENTS		2016/2017	2017/2018	Difference
Number of minutes to attend an Immediate Rural incident	To attend within 20 mins	12.33	12.33	0
Number of minutes to attend an Immediate Urban incident	To attend within 15 mins	6.24	6.37	0.13
Number of minutes to attend a Priority incident	To attend within 60 mins	17.18	17.1	-0.08


SATISFACTION SURVEY		2016/2017	2017/2018	Difference
% of victims satisfied with ease of contact		98.6%	93.3%	-5.30%
% of victims satisfied with the time it took to arrive		93.3%	93.2%	-0.10%
% of victims satisfied with the treatment they received		92.6%	96.4%	3.80%
% of victims satisfied with actions taken by NYP		89.4%	84.4%	-5.00%
% of victims who felt informed about what the police would do regarding their incident		74.1%	74.0%	-0.10%
% of victims who thought their questions were answered adequately		82.4%	91.6%	9.20%
% of victims who felt reassured by what the police did		91.4%	92.7%	1.30%
% of victims satisfied with being kept informed of progress (follow up)		77.4%	81.8%	4.40%
% of victim given updates without asking		68.4%	65.1%	-3.30%
% of victims satisfied with overall service		87.2%	84.5%	-2.70%

Satisfaction Survey data is based on a representative sample of Burglary, Violence, Autocrime produced in accordance with Home Office guidance

Select Crime and Disorder Committee

6th December 2017

Community Safety



Report of the Chief Executive

Ward(s) affected: All

1. **Purpose of Report** – To provide an update about the work of the Community Safety Partnership Hub within Craven District and North Yorkshire.
2. **Recommendations** – Members are invited to note:
 - the work of the North Yorkshire Community Safety Partnership;
 - the work of Craven's Community Safety Hub;
 - The analysis of recent crime statistics for the District provided by North Yorkshire Police;
 - Other related information.
3. **North Yorkshire Community Safety Partnership (NYCSP)**

The NYCSP last met on 28th September 2017 and the key messages were:

- The **Notice, Check, Share** events continue to be rolled out across NY, Craven held their event in October and was well attended with 21 attendees from a range of agencies.
- Guidance based on the Greater Manchester Pilot Project Engage entitled "How to identify and Work with Individuals Vulnerable to Involvement in Serious Crime and Organised Crime" is a document outlining the methodology, processes and lessons learned from a project which tested the approach to identifying and working with those vulnerable to becoming involved in serious and organised crime.

In North Yorkshire the multi-agency partnership for Modern Slavery and Human Trafficking reports directly into the Serious Organised Crime Board, with future reporting and updates coming to NYCSP. Human Trafficking and Modern Slavery there are three named Inspectors coordinating local operations.

Insp Geoff Crocker (Harrogate/ Craven/ Hambleton/ Richmondshire)

Insp Lee Pointon (York/ Selby)

Insp Andy Short (Scarborough/ Ryedale).

- **95 Alive.** NYCC gave a presentation on the background to the formation of 95 Alive in 2004 and its aims. The reason for its formation was twofold, one there is a statutory duty to analyse and carry out measures to reduce road casualties and two road traffic accidents are one of the greatest killers of people. The aim of 95 Alive is to reduce injury, disability and death by road accidents in North Yorkshire.
- **Prevent Strategic Board.** A paper regarding a Serious Case Review undertaken in Brighton and Hove had been looked at. The report identified 13 key findings from that case review. As part of the Practice and Development Sub-group for North Yorkshire Local Safeguarding Children Board, partners have been asked to provide single agency reports identifying systems and processes in place locally.

Development Day 14th September: This was well attended and was facilitated by Chris Williams, Senior Prevent Advisor, Home Office. The Government is reviewing the Counter Terrorism Strategy and it is anticipated that CONTEST 3 will be launched in Spring 2018.

4. **Craven's Local Delivery**

The Craven District Community Safety Hub updates on local activities are included in Appendix A. The Hub supports the NYCSP, and is there to co-ordinate and ensures the delivery of the North Yorkshire Community Safety Plan in the District.

5. **Crime Statistics in the Craven District**

Appendix B provides an overview of crime statistics dealt with by the police in the District over the preceding two years.

6. **Financial and Value for Money (VFM) implications** – All activities are contained within allocated budgets.

7. **Legal Implications** – None.

8. **Contribution to Council Priorities** – Promoting Community Safety in the District, by contributing directly to Craven District Council's priority of Resilient Communities, by making Craven's public spaces cleaner, safer and greener. This work also supports North Yorkshire County Council's and the PCC's wider crime reduction initiatives.

9. **Risk Management** – Not applicable.

10. **Equality Analysis** – Not applicable.

11. **Consultations with Others** – North Yorkshire Police, and the Community Safety Hub.

12. **Access to Information : Background Documents** – None

13. **Author of the Report** – Stacey Reffin, Community Safety Co-ordinator, Craven District Council. 01756 706291. sreffin@cravendc.gcsx.gov.uk

Note: Members are invited to contact the author in advance of the meeting with any detailed queries or questions.

Appendices –

Appendix A – Briefing Paper – Craven’s Local Community Safety Hub Update.

Appendix B – Breakdown of crime data 1 April 2017 – 24 November 2017 and comparison for past two years.

APPENDIX A

BRIEFING PAPER – CRAVEN COMMUNITY SAFETY HUB UPDATE**Multi-Agency Problem Solving Group Meetings (MAPS)**

The monthly meetings continue to take place and include the local police commander (who chairs the meetings), various housing associations, social and mental health services, Fire Service, and District and County Council officers. Much of the focus of these meetings are various forms of anti-social behaviour causing a nuisance to residents although issues arising from the implementation of the PREVENT strategy and Hate Crime are also discussed as part of standing agenda items.

Currently there are no individuals signed up to anti-social behaviour contracts (ABC's).

We have referred 3 individuals for mediation and/or anger management service – currently funded by the PCC. This provision will be lost beyond March 2018 if it is not utilised.

Integrated Community Safety Hub

Currently we have:

- 10 live cases
- 13 closed cases (since June 17)
- 2 high VRA's (vulnerable risk assessment)
- 23 Medium VRA's
- 2 PSPO (public spaces protection order) car parks

Public Space Protection Order (PSPO)**Background**

October 2016 saw the successful implementation of a PSPO for Coach St Car Park in Skipton. Local residents and local ward councillors looked for support in being granted the same type of order for the High Street (Town hall) Car Park after being blighted by similar anti-social behaviour by young motorists.

Consultation

Consultation was carried out throughout April 2017 and again throughout July-Sept to cover the summer months. All residents and businesses were written to and information regarding the consultation was published on our website.

Response

We had a good response from residents highlighting a number of specific behaviours that were affecting their lives. As per the consultation procedure we have the support of the local Chief of Police, Town Council, ward members from Skipton North and East and the Police Crime Commissioner for North Yorkshire.

Roll Out:

The order was signed by our delegated officer and notification of the of the order was published on our web site.

A press release was issued in local press plus social media posts.
Signage has gone up in the High Street (Town Hall) Car Park and letters informing residents of the order have been posted.

The order will be in place for 3 years with an annual review will be done on the anniversary at this committee.

Annual Review Coach Street Car Park PSPO. See separate report**PREVENT Agenda**

The Notice, Check, Share event was well attended in October with 21 attendees from a range of agencies. NCS is part of the Prevent Duty working with individuals vulnerable to extremism in north Yorkshire. The 'Notice' element is all about how to spot the signs that someone may be being exploited. 'Check' is about discussing your concerns with other colleagues/agencies along with safeguarding lead officers. Share is following your organisation's safeguarding referral procedure and getting early intervention to support the individual.

(Local authorities have a statutory duty under the Government's PREVENT Strategy to have due regard to the need to prevent vulnerable people from being drawn into terrorism).

In October the Hub officer from CDC and the Chief Executive visited the Mosque in Skipton and spoke to two of the Mosque officials. The purpose of the visit was to make links, offering any guidance the community may have regarding the services run by the local authority and how we can assist with any issues that may be raised. It is hoped that ongoing dialect will be maintained and further regular visits made.

Funding

The target hardening funding provided by the PCC has focused on a scheme that offers crime prevention advice and supports victims of burglary by helping fund the installation of door/window locks. Due to the limited amount of funding we have had to focus the sheme in the South Craven area as statistically these are where the majority of cross border crime occurs.

Breakdown data based on 01/04/2017 to 24/11/2017 versus same period in previous two years

Group	Crime Type	Crime Sub Type	SNT	NYP Sector	24 Nov 2015	24 Nov 2016	24 Nov 2017	Diff 2017 from 2016
Victim Based	Arson & Criminal Damage	Arson Endangering Life			3	0	0	0 NaN
		Arson Not Endangering Life	Crosshills SNT		0	0	1	1 Infinity
			Grassington SNT		2	3	0	-3 -100.0%
			Ingleton SNT		0	0	1	1 Infinity
			Settle SNT		1	0	0	0 NaN
			Skipton Town SNT		5	2	1	-1 -50.0%
		Criminal Damage To A Building Other Than A Dwelling	Crosshills SNT		1	4	3	-1 -25.0%
			Grassington SNT		1	0	0	0 NaN
			Ingleton SNT		3	0	4	4 Infinity
			Settle SNT		0	2	1	-1 -50.0%
			Skipton Town SNT	Embsay-with-Eastby	1	2	0	-2 -100.0%
				Skipton East	0	0	1	1 Infinity
				Skipton North	10	2	6	4 200.0%
				Skipton South	1	1	5	4 400.0%
				Skipton West	9	3	6	3 100.0%
		Criminal Damage To A Dwelling	Crosshills SNT	Aire Valley with Lothersdale	1	0	0	0 NaN
				Cowling	0	1	0	-1 -100.0%
				Glusburn	1	1	1	0 0.0%
				Sutton-in-Craven	4	3	2	-1 -33.3%
				West Craven	2	0	0	0 NaN
			Grassington SNT		2	1	1	0 0.0%
			Ingleton SNT		0	4	6	2 50.0%

Breakdown data based on 01/04/2017 to 24/11/2017 versus same period in previous two years

Victim Based	Arson & Criminal Damage	Criminal Damage To A Dwelling	Settle SNT		4	6	0	-6	-100.0%
			Skipton Town SNT	Embsay-with-Eastby	1	1	0	-1	-100.0%
				Skipton East	0	0	1	1	Infinity
				Skipton North	1	3	0	-3	-100.0%
				Skipton South	2	6	5	-1	-16.7%
				Skipton West	5	6	3	-3	-50.0%
			zUnallocated		0	1	0	-1	-100.0%
		Criminal Damage To A Vehicle	Crosshills SNT	Aire Valley with Lothersdale	1	2	3	1	50.0%
				Cowling	4	1	3	2	200.0%
				Glusburn	1	0	7	7	Infinity
				Sutton-in-Craven	3	4	3	-1	-25.0%
				West Craven	10	3	1	-2	-66.7%
			Grassington SNT	Barden Fell	0	0	0	0	NaN
				Gargrave and Malhamdale	2	5	4	-1	-20.0%
				Grassington	1	1	1	0	0.0%
				Upper Wharfedale	0	0	1	1	Infinity
			Ingleton SNT	Bentham	1	2	8	6	300.0%
				Ingleton and Clapham	1	1	2	1	100.0%
			Settle SNT	Hellifield and Long Preston	5	1	6	5	500.0%
				Penyghent	4	1	1	0	0.0%
				Settle and Ribblesbanks	10	4	7	3	75.0%
			Skipton Town SNT	Embsay-with-Eastby	3	5	2	-3	-60.0%
				Skipton East	10	8	3	-5	-62.5%

Breakdown data based on 01/04/2017 to 24/11/2017 versus same period in previous two years

Victim Based	Arson & Criminal Damage	Criminal Damage To A Vehicle	Skipton Town SNT		Skipton North	21	8	5	-3	-37.5%
					Skipton South	14	8	15	7	87.5%
					Skipton West	13	11	11	0	0.0%
		Other Criminal Damage	Crosshills SNT	Aire Valley with Lothersdale		0	6	4	-2	-33.3%
				Cowling		2	3	2	-1	-33.3%
				Glusburn		3	2	3	1	50.0%
				Sutton-in-Craven		4	4	4	0	0.0%
				West Craven		2	5	4	-1	-20.0%
			Grassington SNT			5	6	8	2	33.3%
			Ingleton SNT			4	10	9	-1	-10.0%
			Settle SNT			4	4	5	1	25.0%
			Skipton Town SNT	Embsay-with-Eastby		0	3	0	-3	-100.0%
				Skipton East		2	0	1	1	Infinity
				Skipton North		6	1	4	3	300.0%
				Skipton South		4	5	2	-3	-60.0%
				Skipton West		6	6	4	-2	-33.3%
	Burglary	Aggravated Burglary In A Building Other Than A Dwelling				1	0	0	0	NaN
		Aggravated Burglary In A Dwelling				0	2	0	-2	-100.0%
		Attempted Burglary – Business And Community				0	0	9	9	Infinity
		Attempted Burglary – Residential	Crosshills SNT	Aire Valley with Lothersdale		0	0	5	5	Infinity
				Sutton-in-Craven		0	0	3	3	Infinity
			Grassington SNT			0	0	1	1	Infinity
			Ingleton SNT	Ingleton and Clapham		0	0	3	3	Infinity
			Settle SNT			0	0	2	2	Infinity

Breakdown data based on 01/04/2017 to 24/11/2017 versus same period in previous two years

Victim Based	Burglary	Attempted Burglary – Residential	Skipton Town SNT	Skipton North	0	0	1	1	Infinity
				Skipton South	0	0	1	1	Infinity
				Skipton West	0	0	2	2	Infinity
		Burglary – Business And Community	Crosshills SNT	Aire Valley with Lothersdale	0	0	7	7	Infinity
				Cowling	0	0	2	2	Infinity
				Glusburn	0	0	2	2	Infinity
				Sutton-in-Craven	0	0	2	2	Infinity
				West Craven	0	0	4	4	Infinity
			Grassington SNT	Barden Fell	0	0	12	12	Infinity
				Gargrave and Malhamdale	0	0	7	7	Infinity
				Grassington	0	0	1	1	Infinity
				Upper Wharfedale	0	0	3	3	Infinity
			Ingleton SNT	Bentham	0	0	5	5	Infinity
				Ingleton and Clapham	0	0	11	11	Infinity
			Settle SNT		0	0	8	8	Infinity
			Skipton Town SNT	Skipton East	0	0	1	1	Infinity
				Skipton North	0	0	7	7	Infinity
				Skipton South	0	0	5	5	Infinity
				Skipton West	0	0	4	4	Infinity
			zUnallocated		0	0	1	1	Infinity
		Burglary - Residential	Crosshills SNT		0	0	26	26	Infinity
			Grassington SNT		0	0	11	11	Infinity
			Ingleton SNT		0	0	5	5	Infinity
			Settle SNT		0	0	1	1	Infinity

Breakdown data based on 01/04/2017 to 24/11/2017 versus same period in previous two years

Victim Based	Burglary	Burglary -	Skipton Town SNT	0	0	25	25	Infinity
		Burglary In A Dwelling		79	89	0	-89	-100.0%
		Burglary Other		126	124	0	-124	-100.0%
	Robbery			2	2	1	-1	-50.0%
	Sexual Offences: Other	Abuse Of Children Through Sexual Exploitation		0	0	1	1	Infinity
		Exposure And Voyeurism		1	4	1	-3	-75.0%
		Incest Or Familial Sexual Offences		0	0	0	0	NaN
		Sexual Activity Involving A Child Under 13		6	3	6	3	100.0%
		Sexual Activity Involving Child Under 16	Crosshills SNT	3	2	4	2	100.0%
			Grassington SNT	2	0	0	0	NaN
			Ingleton SNT	2	0	2	2	Infinity
			Settle SNT	0	4	2	-2	-50.0%
			Skipton Town SNT	3	4	2	-2	-50.0%
			zUnallocated	0	0	1	1	Infinity
		Sexual Assault On A Female Aged 13 And Over	Crosshills SNT	4	1	1	0	0.0%
			Grassington SNT	0	1	2	1	100.0%
			Ingleton SNT	0	0	1	1	Infinity
			Settle SNT	1	0	2	2	Infinity
			Skipton Town SNT	5	5	6	1	20.0%
		Sexual Assault On A Female Child Under 13		4	1	1	0	0.0%
		Sexual Assault On A Male Aged 13 And Over		0	1	1	0	0.0%
		Sexual Assault On A Male Child Under 13		3	0	3	3	Infinity
		Sexual Grooming		1	0	0	0	NaN
	Sexual Offences: Rape	Rape Of A Female Aged 16 And Over	Crosshills SNT	2	0	6	6	Infinity
			Grassington SNT	0	0	0	0	NaN

Breakdown data based on 01/04/2017 to 24/11/2017 versus same period in previous two years

Victim Based	Sexual Offences: Rape	Rape Of A Female Aged 16 And Over		Ingleton SNT	0	0	1	1	Infinity
				Settle SNT	0	0	3	3	Infinity
				Skipton Town SNT	2	5	5	0	0.0%
		Rape Of A Female Child Under 13			7	5	1	-4	-80.0%
		Rape Of A Female Child Under 16			5	0	0	0	NaN
		Rape Of A Male Child Under 13			6	0	2	2	Infinity
		Rape Of A Male Child Under 16			1	1	0	-1	-100.0%
	Theft: All Other Theft	Blackmail			2	1	2	1	100.0%
		Dishonest Use Of Electricity			1	0	0	0	NaN
		Other Theft	Crosshills SNT	Aire Valley with Lothersdale	8	7	10	3	42.9%
				Cowling	2	5	1	-4	-80.0%
				Glusburn	11	17	11	-6	-35.3%
				Sutton-in-Craven	9	9	5	-4	-44.4%
				West Craven	2	1	6	5	500.0%
			Grassington SNT		23	19	14	-5	-26.3%
			Ingleton SNT		13	12	11	-1	-8.3%
			Settle SNT		10	14	8	-6	-42.9%
			Skipton Town SNT	Embsay-with-Eastby	1	4	0	-4	-100.0%
				Skipton East	2	3	2	-1	-33.3%
				Skipton North	34	37	18	-19	-51.4%
				Skipton South	12	9	10	1	11.1%
				Skipton West	9	16	12	-4	-25.0%
		Theft – Making Off Without Payment	Crosshills SNT		6	8	7	-1	-12.5%
			Grassington SNT		0	0	3	3	Infinity

Breakdown data based on 01/04/2017 to 24/11/2017 versus same period in previous two years

Victim Based	Theft: All Other Theft	Theft – Making Off Without Payment	Ingleton SNT	1	0	0	0	NaN
			Settle SNT	0	3	1	-2	-66.7%
			Skipton Town SNT	9	4	2	-2	-50.0%
		Theft By An Employee		3	9	10	1	11.1%
		Theft From An Automatic Machine Or Meter		5	3	1	-2	-66.7%
		Theft In A Dwelling Other Than From An Automatic Machine Or Meter		14	14	10	-4	-28.6%
		Theft Of Mail		2	0	0	0	NaN
	Theft: Bicycle Theft	Theft Or Unauthorised Taking Of A Pedal Cycle	Crosshills SNT	3	2	0	-2	-100.0%
			Grassington SNT	0	1	1	0	0.0%
			Ingleton SNT	2	0	2	2	Infinity
			Settle SNT	1	2	0	-2	-100.0%
			Skipton Town SNT	10	10	9	-1	-10.0%
	Theft: Shoplifting	Shoplifting	Crosshills SNT	18	23	16	-7	-30.4%
			Grassington SNT	3	4	1	-3	-75.0%
			Ingleton SNT	5	5	2	-3	-60.0%
			Settle SNT	5	14	7	-7	-50.0%
			Skipton Town SNT	93	72	67	-5	-6.9%
			zUnallocated	0	1	0	-1	-100.0%
	Theft: Theft From Person	Theft From The Person	Crosshills SNT	0	0	0	0	NaN
			Grassington SNT	0	1	0	-1	-100.0%
			Settle SNT	0	0	1	1	Infinity
			Skipton Town SNT	15	13	15	2	15.4%
			zUnallocated	0	0	1	1	Infinity
	Vehicle Offences	Aggravated Vehicle Taking		0	5	1	-4	-80.0%

Breakdown data based on 01/04/2017 to 24/11/2017 versus same period in previous two years


Victim Based	Vehicle Offences	Interfering With A Motor Vehicle			8	12	33	21	175.0%
		Theft From Vehicle	Crosshills SNT	Aire Valley with Lothersdale	1	15	6	-9	-60.0%
				Cowling	1	1	2	1	100.0%
				Glusburn	0	9	7	-2	-22.2%
				Sutton-in-Craven	4	4	12	8	200.0%
				West Craven	1	4	3	-1	-25.0%
			Grassington SNT		12	10	16	6	60.0%
			Ingleton SNT		11	8	2	-6	-75.0%
			Settle SNT		9	4	2	-2	-50.0%
			Skipton Town SNT		42	24	36	12	50.0%
			zUnallocated		0	1	0	-1	-100.0%
		Theft Or Unauthorised Taking Of A Motor Vehicle			21	35	22	-13	-37.1%
	Violence: Violence With Injury	Assault With Injury	Crosshills SNT		29	25	31	6	24.0%
			Grassington SNT		16	9	11	2	22.2%
			Ingleton SNT		16	12	16	4	33.3%
			Settle SNT		18	15	7	-8	-53.3%
			Skipton Town SNT		62	70	67	-3	-4.3%
		Assault With Injury On A Constable			0	0	1	1	Infinity
		Assault With Intent To Cause Serious Harm			4	4	4	0	0.0%
		Attempted Murder			0	0	1	1	Infinity
		Causing Death By Careless Driving Under Influence Of Drink Or Drugs			0	1	0	-1	-100.0%
		Endangering Life			1	0	0	0	NaN
		Manslaughter			0	0	0	0	NaN
		Racially Or Religiously Aggravated Assault With Injury			0	1	0	-1	-100.0%

Breakdown data based on 01/04/2017 to 24/11/2017 versus same period in previous two years

Victim Based	Violence: Violence Without Injury	Assault Without Injury			78	102	103	1	1.0%
		Assault Without Injury On A Constable			3	4	2	-2	-50.0%
		Cruelty To Children/ Young Persons			0	2	1	-1	-50.0%
		Harassment			26	58	33	-25	-43.1%
		Kidnapping			0	1	2	1	100.0%
		Malicious Communications			0	0	12	12	Infinity
		Racially Or Religiously Aggravated Assault Without Injury			1	0	2	2	Infinity
		Racially Or Religiously Aggravated Harassment			0	0	1	1	Infinity
		Threats To Kill			1	3	2	-1	-33.3%
						1171	1208	1117	-91
Crimes Against Society	Drugs: Possession Of Drugs	Possession Of Controlled Drugs (cannabis)	Crosshills SNT		9	8	3	-5	-62.5%
			Grassington SNT		5	3	3	0	0.0%
			Ingleton SNT		1	1	2	1	100.0%
			Settle SNT		3	2	2	0	0.0%
			Skipton Town SNT		13	21	14	-7	-33.3%
		Possession Of Controlled Drugs (excluding Cannabis)	Crosshills SNT		3	1	1	0	0.0%
			Grassington SNT		2	0	1	1	Infinity
			Ingleton SNT		1	0	0	0	NaN
			Settle SNT		1	0	0	0	NaN
			Skipton Town SNT		3	10	0	-10	-100.0%
	Drugs: Trafficking Of Drugs				7	5	7	2	40.0%
	Misc Crimes Against Society				20	30	26	-4	-13.3%
	Possession Of Weapons				1	11	2	-9	-81.8%
	Public Order Offences	Other Offences Against The State Or Public Order			9	12	10	-2	-16.7%

Breakdown data based on 01/04/2017 to 24/11/2017 versus same period in previous two years

Crimes Against Society	Public Order Offences	Public Fear, Alarm Or Distress	Crosshills SNT		1	3	5	2	66.7%
			Grassington SNT		0	3	1	-2	-66.7%
			Ingleton SNT		1	2	3	1	50.0%
			Settle SNT		1	1	7	6	600.0%
			Skipton Town SNT		6	15	13	-2	-13.3%
		Racially Or Religiously Aggravated Public Fear, Alarm Or Distress	Crosshills SNT		3	3	1	-2	-66.7%
			Grassington SNT		1	0	0	0	NaN
			Skipton Town SNT	Skipton North	0	1	3	2	200.0%
				Skipton South	0	1	1	0	0.0%
				Skipton West	1	0	5	5	Infinity
		Violent Disorder		1	0	0	0	NaN	
						93	133	110	-23
Total					1264	1341	1227	-114	-8.5%

Select Crime and Disorder Committee6th December 2017**PUBLIC SPACES PROTECTION ORDER (PSPO)
COACH STREET CAR PARK 01/2016
ANNUAL REVIEW**

Report of the Community Safety Hub

Ward(s) affected: All

1. **Purpose of Report** – To provide a review of the Public Space Protection Order 01/2016. A requirement of the Order is that an annual review is carried out to compare numbers of incidents to make sure the order put in place is effective, and gives residents the relief they need from the specified anti-social behaviour caused by motor vehicles.
2. **Recommendations** – Members are recommended to note the content of the incidents recorded in the review since its implementation, and continue to support the order which is in place for 3 years.
3. **Report**
 - a. The order came into effect on 19th October 2016. Incidents reported as breaches since the order was put in place = 3. 26/07/17, 30/08/17 and 29/09/17. Revving engines and loud music were recorded as the nuisance behaviour. All residents have been given a unique reference to give the police call centre, so as to save time and effort when reporting any breach using 101.
 - b. Any person found in breach of the order will have their details taken by a Police Officer or Police Support Officer and a fixed penalty fine of £100 will be issued by the council.
 - c. It is the opinion of officers that the order remains in place since the Town Hall car park has now also been granted a PSPO. Whilst we know it was separate groups in 2016 that were using Coach Street, there may now be potential for some displacement back to this location. Therefore both orders will protect both areas. Adding to this, since the order was put in place, there has been a significant drop in the number of reports of young drivers congregating and causing a nuisance. NYP were recording weekly if not nightly reports in some instances and this is no longer the case.
4. **Contribution to Council Priorities** – Promoting Community Safety in the District, by contributing directly to Craven District Council's priority of Resilient Communities, by making Craven's public spaces cleaner, safer and greener. This work also supports North Yorkshire County Council's and the PCC's wider crime reduction initiatives.

5. **Risk Management** – Not applicable.
6. **Equality Analysis** – Not applicable.
7. **Consultations with Others** – North Yorkshire Police.
8. **Author of the Report** – Stacey Reffin Community Safety Officer,
Tel 01756 706291 sreffin@cravendc.gvo.uk

Note : Members are invited to contact the author in advance of the meeting with any detailed queries or questions.

Wording of the Order

1. Persons must not use any motorised vehicle in a way that causes, or could potentially, cause nuisance in the Public Space.
2. Persons must not play music, or use any vehicle or device to play music or other broadcast sound, in the Public Space in such a way as to cause, or potentially cause nuisance.
3. Persons must leave the Public Space immediately and not return for a period of 24 hours when requested to do so by an authorised officer (including a police constable or police community support officer).

North Yorkshire Police and Crime Panel

Key Messages from meeting

16 November 2017

Panel challenges PCC on her bid to take over Fire Service

The Panel reviewed the PCC's report on her recent consultation proposing that she take on responsibility for oversight of the Fire and Rescue Service in North Yorkshire. A number of concerns were raised by Panel members about the methodology used, the analysis of the results by the PCC and also some of the responses to stakeholders which have since been publicised by the PCC. In particular these included:

- Concerns regarding the use of language in materials used by the independent research company engaged by the PCC to undertake a residents' survey. This included one factually inaccurate statement in the 'FAQs' for residents regarding the membership of the Fire Authority;
- Challenging the PCC on comments made publicly by her in relation to Councillors having "vested interests" in rejecting her proposal;
- Concerns regarding an apparent lack of understanding of the current resourcing for the Panel and a dismissal of the Panel's concerns about the future of robust scrutiny as a result of the PCC's proposed model being adopted.

The Panel also expressed concerns at the total bill of over £141,000 spent by the OPCC on the development of the outline business case, the consultation and the follow-up work to submit a case to the Home Office. The PCC received a grant of just under £89k from the Home Office towards these costs with the remainder met by her office.

NYP "requires improvement" on police efficiency – HMICFRS report

Further to the report issued by HMICFRS following their inspection of police efficiency at North Yorkshire Police (NYP) earlier this year, the Panel challenged the PCC on the "requires improvement" rating that has been given to NYP across four areas. The areas identified as requiring improvement included investment in ICT and NYP needing to develop a better understanding of service demand. The Panel questioned why the PCC has progressed a business case to take on oversight of the FRS and is also looking to take on a much greater role in the handling of police complaints, when there seem to be fundamental issues to address within NYP. The Panel has requested a report from the PCC to fully cover the areas outlined for improvement and the plans in place to tackle these. The HMICFRS report can be found at

<https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmicfrs/publications/peel-police-efficiency-2017-north-yorkshire/>

Next meeting – 11th January 2018, Selby District Council, Selby

This meeting will include a briefing from the PCC and her Chief Financial Officer ahead of their formal precept proposal to be submitted to Panel in February 2018.

To see details of future meetings, view copies of past agendas and papers please visit

<http://democracy.northyorks.gov.uk/committees.aspx?commid=14>

Any enquiries should be directed to the Panel Secretariat via nypcp@northyorks.gov.uk

SELECT COMMITTEE

6th September 2017

Present – The Chairman (Councillor Staveley) and Councillors Brown, Graham, Mason, Moorby, Pighills, Shuttleworth, Solloway, Sutcliffe, Thompson and Whitaker. Also in attendance Councillor Foster.

Officer – Committee Officer

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Mercer and Shuttleworth.

Start: 6.30pm

Finish: 9.04pm

Minutes for Report

OS.393

FUTURE GOVERNANCE OF THE NORTH YORKSHIRE FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE

Further to Minute OS.392/17-18, the the Chairman welcomed Julia Mulligan, Police and Crime Commissioner for North Yorkshire, who had been invited to the meeting to present and discuss her business case for the future governance of the Fire and Rescue Service which, if accepted by the Home Secretary, would result in the Commissioner taking on legal and overarching responsibility for the Fire and Rescue Service. Under the options listed within the Policing and Crime Act 2017 this was referred to as the "Governance Model". The Fire and Rescue Authority would then cease to exist as the governing body. The Commissioner was accompanied by her Chief Finance Officer, Michael Porter.

In addressing and responding to Members comments / questions, the Commissioner stated that

- 54% of all calls to North Yorkshire Police revolved around public safety and welfare, with in effect the Police picking up the gaps in service provision. The question posed by this was how should vulnerable people within the community be dealt with? Greater collaboration between the Fire and Police Services working with other agencies presented an opportunity to address this question.

- The opportunity for greater collaboration had been recognised by both the Fire and Police Services in 2013 but in the intervening period only limited progress had been achieved and the argument now before members was how best to get to the position set down within the statement of intent signed by the two forces back in 2013.

- The Fire Authority was looking to a slow and measured approach, her view was that good progress had not been made in the last 5 years and that now was the time to take the opportunity presented by the Act. The governance model would speed up collaboration, produce savings and avoid cuts to the frontline.

- The Fire Brigade Union had now expressed its support for the opportunity represented by the business case.

- Within a national overview document referencing collaboration between the emergency services across the country there were models of what could be done differently to the benefit of communities through innovation. North Yorkshire did not feature within the document.

- Although finances were important her proposal sought to focus on how services could work better together to the benefit of the community. An initiative known as the York Pathway Programme,

which focused on the overlap between services, was an example of how partners could work together, address public safety and welfare, and reduce demand on the emergency services.

- Bringing the Chief Officers together under one governance structure would benefit joint working and improve the speed of decision making in taking forward collaboration. There were those in both the Fire and Police Services who wouldn't want change, but a single governance structure could overcome that resistance.

- There was a lot of scope for sharing back office functions and utilising savings to support the frontline, improving prevention and enhancing community safety. It was acknowledged that there were good examples in North Yorkshire of working together but those examples did not represent a joined up strategy to reduce demand across the County and provide a better service.

- Figures within the business case had been provided by the Fire Service, both the Fire and Police Services had worked on the business case, including the financial information.

- In estimating potential savings to be generated were the governance model to be adopted, a cautious approach had been taken, for example a 5% saving on back office functions. Savings in the business case were conservative and deliverable.

- It would be possible to give more councillors more of a voice on proposals affecting their areas than under the current arrangements. If the County Council wished to put extra resource into the Police and Crime Panel there would be scope to direct some of the direct £900,000 governance savings for that use.

- The fire service had real resilience problems and in the face of cuts there was a need to make savings sooner, not further down the line. As Commissioner she had put the rural community at the heart of what she'd done with no drift in favour of urban areas.

- In addition to the online survey, 1500 random face to face interviews using a survey company had been conducted around North Yorkshire, as it currently stood public feedback showed a preference for the proposed business case. 60% of those interviewed in the face to face survey favoured the governance model. A 1500 sample survey on a face to face survey was the industry standard. A survey was a requirement of HM Treasury's assessment criteria.

- There was a fundamental issue with the Fire Authority's collaboration committee in that the parties had to return to their respective organisations to seek endorsement. The governance model was as single board structure which reduced the opportunity for delays.

- The shared station at Bedale was a good example of working together, but that had taken place in 2003 and there had been relatively little since then.

- It would be relatively easy to accommodate Fire Authority HQ employees at the new Police HQ, there would be a greater challenge around IT infrastructure than space for officers. The business case was a case for governance not for how the services would move into a shared HQ, the case sought to demonstrate how the rate and pace of proposed change could be increased.

- Only one additional post funded from within the £64,000 referenced in the business case would be needed to support the Commissioner's enhanced role. No additional deputies could be appointed.

- Significant savings could be found by not incurring the costs associated with borrowing currently proposed by the Fire Authority.

- She would not look to withdraw services from a locality and referred Members to her record since elected in generating savings to protect the frontline.

- Within the Act there was no provision for Commissioners to also take on the governance of ambulance services, but the Act did state a requirement for the ambulance service to collaborate. She had conducted constructive discussions with Yorkshire Ambulance Service (YAS) and would explore opportunities for working together; the governance proposal would facilitate working with YAS.

- As police and crime commissioner she could take strategic resourcing but not deployment and operational decisions, it was less clear as to how it would work with the Fire Service. This was currently the subject of a discussion with the Home Office. Her priority was vulnerability and she believed both Chief Officers were comfortable with that aim.

- She had sat as a member of the Fire Authority's collaboration committee for six months and based on that experience to date she could not see how giving that model another six to twelve months would make a material difference.

- There were no proposals for an uplift in commissioners' salaries, the pay review body was next due to review the position in 2019.

- On closure of the consultation period she would reflect on feedback received and amend the business case as she considered appropriate, there would be an opportunity to see how she had responded to comments received.

In drawing the discussion to a close the Chairman thanked Mrs Mulligan for her attendance and adjourned the meeting for a short comfort break. On reconvening and considering their recommendation to be presented to Policy Committee in respect of the Commissioner's business case there was a consensus amongst Members on the need for change and greater collaboration, but concerns were expressed with regard to scrutiny of the proposed governance model arrangement and the strength of some of the detail within the business case. The need by some means going forward to have greater engagement and collaboration with the Yorkshire Ambulance Service was also identified as an issue to be addressed irrespective of which model ultimately resulted from the current exercise. Concern was also expressed by a number of Members regarding possible democratic deficiencies associated with the governance model.

On being out to the vote it was

Resolved – (1) That the Council should express a preference for the representation model under which the Police and Crime Commissioner would be represented on the Fire Authority and its committees.

(2) That in forming the Committee's recommendation to Policy Committee, the Committee Officer, in consultation with the Chairman, incorporates the following points:-

a. In reaching the above position the Committee is clear that progress made on collaboration should be reviewed within a reasonable timescale, with options for change in the governance arrangements considered at that point should satisfactory progress not be made.

b. A desire for collaboration between the three blue light services and active investigation of the opportunities for collaboration with the ambulance service under the preferred option.

c. Reference to grey areas within the business case.

OS.394

SHARED OWNERSHIP WORKING GROUP

Resolved – That the Shared Ownership Working Group is authorised to submit its report direct to Policy Committee.

Chairman.