

# Public Document Pack

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE  
OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY BOARD  
Havering Town Hall, Main Road, Romford  
28 May 2019 (8.00 - 9.00 pm)**

**Present:**

**COUNCILLORS**

<b>Conservative Group</b>	Ray Best, Judith Holt, Robby Misir, John Mylod, Nisha Patel, Bob Perry, Christine Smith and Maggie Themistocli (Vice-Chair)
<b>Residents' Group</b>	Ray Morgon and Barry Mugglestone
<b>Upminster &amp; Cranham Residents' Group'</b>	Linda Hawthorn and Christopher Wilkins Natasha Summers and David Durant+
<b>Independent Residents' Group</b>	Keith Darvill
<b>Labour Group</b>	
<b>North Havering Residents' Group</b>	Brian Eagling+

Apologies were received for the absence of Councillors Darren Wise (+Brian Eagling substituting) and Graham Williamson (+David Durant substituting).

The Chairman reminded Members of the action to be taken in an emergency.

**1 DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS**

4. CALL-IN OF A CABINET DECISION RELATING TO MOPAC PARTNERSHIP PLUS SCHEME FOR s92 POLICE OFFICERS.

Councillor Viddy Persaud, Prejudicial, Requisitioned Cabinet decision relates to Member's portfolio.

**2 CALL-IN OF A CABINET DECISION RELATING TO MOPAC PARTNERSHIP PLUS SCHEME FOR S92 POLICE OFFICERS**

The report before Members detailed the call-in of a Cabinet decision relating to the MOPAC Partnership Plus Scheme for s92 Police Officers. A requisition signed by Councillors Darvill and Morgon had called-in the Cabinet decision. The grounds for the call-in were as follows:

Please accept this notice to requisition the above decision made at Cabinet on 8<sup>th</sup> May 2019 (Agenda item 12) on the following grounds:-

1. There is a lack of clarity on how these police officers will be deployed, on what, together with how this will be decided and by whom.
2. There is a lack of clarity as to who employees and is accountable for these police officers.
3. There is a lack of confirmation that officers will not be abstracted elsewhere, in the same way as they do for DWO's.
4. There is a lack of confirmation on whether any funding has been obtained from any other local partners.
5. There is a lack of information on what are the Terms and Conditions of employing these officers, how will their work be measured from the rest of the enforcement team to show their effectiveness.
6. There is a lack of clarity on when the council's Enforcement Team restructure will be completed and where precisely the police officers will sit within it.
7. There is a lack of confirmation on how the results and performance of the Enforcement Team will be shown to members?
8. There is no copy of the proposed Letter of Intention included in the report.

Response by Officers to Requisition Grounds

**Overview and Scrutiny Call-in for MOPAC Partnership Plus Scheme for 92 Police Officers on 28<sup>th</sup> May 2019.**

1. **There is a lack of clarity on how these police officers will be deployed, on what, together with how this will be decided and by whom.**

As detailed within the report should the Council make a commitment to the arrangements for the additional police officers the intention would be to co-locate them within the Enforcement Group. The introduction of a one Council approach to enforcement will ensure consistency and the effective use of resources to tackle crime and disorder issues for Havering. The deployment of these funded police officers (4 PCs and a sergeant in total) will determined by the Safer Havering Partnership priorities and Havering's Tactical Enforcement Group (TEG) which is a multi-agency group focused on tasking priorities on local anti-social behaviour and crime. This should also reflect and address the local safer neighbourhood issues including feedback from local residents and ward councillors.

- 2. There is a lack of clarity as to who employees and is accountable for these police officers.**

The proposed s92 Police officers are employed by the Metropolitan Police Service on police terms and conditions. The accountability in terms of deployment of the resource is highlighted in the response above.

- 3. There is a lack of confirmation that officers will not be abstracted elsewhere, in the same way as they do for DWO's.**

There are approximately 10 Public Order High Demand Days per annum, when these police officers will be required elsewhere. The costs have made provision for these expected abstractions and are incorporated within the rates. Should these officers be abstracted further than the agreement arrangements will be made to the refund the Council for these days/hours in accordance with the terms of the agreement.

- 4. There is a lack of confirmation on whether any funding has been obtained from any other local partners.**

Opportunity to discuss this further with partners locally including the two Business Improvement Districts will be considered.

- 5. There is a lack of information on what are the Terms and Conditions of employing these officers, how will their work be measured from the rest of the enforcement team to show their effectiveness.**

As stated before the terms and conditions of employing these S92 police officers is as per the MOPAC proposed agreement as per Appendix 1 is a letter to the Council explaining the proposed scheme. As already highlighted the work of the team will be determined by the priorities of the Safer Havering Partnership and Havering's Tactical Enforcement Group (TEG) which is a multi-agency group focused on tasking priorities on local anti-social behaviour and crime. Performance measure will be established to ensure the effectiveness of both enforcement of these wider enforcement group and these S92 Police officers, reported to Havering Community Safety Partnership periodically. The East BCU Commander will be involved in determining the effectiveness of these officers.

- 6. There is a lack of clarity on when the council's Enforcement Team restructure will be completed and where precisely the police officers will sit within it.**

The Council's enforcement restructure is currently being consulted upon with the intention of the new model in place from July/August 2019. The report highlights that the proposed S92 police officers will be located within the tactical team.

- 7. There is a lack of confirmation on how the results and performance of the Enforcement Team will be shown to members?**

The Enforcement Group is a newly formed team and therefore as highlighted above the performance and outcomes of the effectiveness of the team is still to be finalised which will be shared with members through existing arrangements Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Board the Environment Scrutiny Board.

- 8. There is no copy of the proposed Letter Of Intention included in the report.**

Attached for information

During the debate, officers clarified that the new Police Officers would be under the Council's direct supervision. Priorities would be intelligence-led with a focus on enforcement work within Havering. Governance would be via the Tactical Enforcement Group which was chaired by the Assistant Director. It was felt that the additional Police Officers would allow earlier intervention in problems, in addition to the functions of the existing Police.

The Leader of the Council added that details of the scheme were not officially received from the Mayor of London until 21 February and it was not therefore possible to include the proposals in the budget papers for full Council. Additional funding for the scheme had however been found through efficiencies.

Officers felt that, if employed correctly, the new Police team would more than pay for itself as well as send a positive message by seeking to reduce the impact of crime and anti-social behaviour in local neighbourhoods. The Leader of the Council added that the Council was not subsidising the Police and that the new officers would provide additional services to the current Police by for example engaging in more raids on landlords offering sub-standard accommodation.

The new officers would be line managed by a Metropolitan Police Sargeant but their work would be directed by the Council. A Member felt that the money involved did not represent good value and could for example keep Chafford Sports Centre open for a further year instead. The Leader of the Council disputed that this was the case and felt that it was right that the Council sought to address the rising fear of crime in Havering.

Some 75% of the salaries for the new officers would be funded by the Council. Costs of equipment, training etc were also included in what the Council would pay.

Priorities for the new Police Officers would be determined by a group of officers, based on Police data received. Police and Council officers would meet regularly to determine the top priorities. The Cabinet Member confirmed that all relevant partners were represented on the supervisory group. Further improvements to partnership working could also be considered.

It was confirmed that the effects of the new officers would be monitored closely by the Crime and Disorder Sub-Committee. It was correct that the Police Officers could be removed for up to 10 days per year in order to assist with major Police events in central London but this had been factored into the cost paid by the Council. The officers were ring fenced Havering, subject to strict contractual obligations and officers emphasised that the removal for 10 days was an absolute maximum period.

The new Havering Enforcement Model involved 12 Police Officers, each covering 1.5 wards. Information on which officers were located in which wards would be provided to Members by the end of July. The Tactical Enforcement Team would be a borough-wide daytime team focussing on Romford and the other town centre areas. It was also confirmed that the Strategic Intelligence Policy Hub would be located at River Chambers, with the Community Safety Team). The Cabinet Member added that she would encourage the reporting of anti-social behaviour to the Police via their website or the 101 telephone service as information would be passed through to the Supervisory Group.

Several Members were unhappy that some questions had not been answered during the meeting but the Chairman felt that certain questions had not addressed the grounds of the requisition.

A requisitioner felt that it was important that it was ensured that spending addressed the needs of the borough and that the report had been rushed. The requisition should therefore be upheld in order that Cabinet could give further consideration to the issue. A requisitioner further felt that it was not clear how performance of the Police Officers would be managed and the requisition should therefore be upheld.

At this point the Cabinet Member for Public Protection and Safety and any other Cabinet Members present left the meeting room.

The Board voted to dismiss the call-in by 9 votes to 7.

Councillors Best, Holt, Nisha Patel, Perry, Christine Smith, Mylod, Misir, Themistocli and Eagling voted to dismiss the requisition.

Councillors Morgon, Mugglestone, Hawthorn, Wilkins, Summers, Durant, and Darvill voted to uphold the requisition.

**RESOLVED:**

**That the requisition of the Cabinet decision dated 8 May 2019 be dismissed.**

---

**Chairman**

To MOPAC

[date]

## SUBJECT TO CONTRACT

Dear,

### **Metropolitan Police Service PartnershipPlus Scheme - Letter of Intent**

Please accept this letter as our intention that the London Borough of { } wishes to enter into a three year agreement under Section 92 of the Police Act 1996 (Grant by Local Authority) with the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime under the **PartnershipPlus Scheme**. However the London Borough of { } accepts that, as a result of this intention, the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime is not obliged to accept this offer of a grant, nor is it obliged to provide all or some of the police resources requested.

The London Borough of { } agrees to provide the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime with a Grant sufficient for the provision of {*Number*} funded police officers.

It is the belief of the London Borough of { } that the TUPE Regulations do not apply to transfer the employment contracts of any individual employed by the London Borough or any sub-contractor or agent engaged by the London Borough or any other individual to the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime on the Start Date or at any time thereafter.

Yours sincerely

[Title]

On behalf of the London Borough of { }

This page is intentionally left blank