

Present: Councillor Judith Skinner (Chairman), Councillor Tracey Abbott (Vice-Chairman), Councillors Peter Bedford, George Cornah, Anton Dani, Deborah Evans, Paul Goodale, Neill Hastie, Peter Watson and Judith Welbourn

Councillor Paul Skinner Lead of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Community Safety and CCTV.

In attendance:

Officers – Head of Environmental Operations and Lead Officer for the committee, IT and Transformation Manager, Community Safety Manager, CCTV Manager, Anti-Social Behaviour Officer, Senior Democratic Services Officer and Democratic Services Officer.

Guest attendee: Inspector Fran Harrod Lincolnshire Police.

52 APOLOGIES

There were no apologies for this meeting.

53 MINUTES

With the agreement of the committee, the Chairman signed the minutes of the previous meeting held on the 3 March 2020.

54 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

No declarations of interest were tabled for this meeting.

55 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

No public questions were tabled for this meeting.

56 ANNUAL CCTV REVIEW AND ANNUAL PERFORMANCE UPDATE

The CCTV Manager presented the report in two sections: the first in providing update information in respect of CCTV activity and the second in respect of the CCTV Policy in appendix B requiring a recommendation to Cabinet.

Addressing the first section of the report The CCTN Manager advised members that Boston Borough Council's public realm CCTV system consisted of digital high definition CCTV cameras and the CCTV control room equipment that covered Boston town centre, Kirton as well as other areas including Boston College, Pilgrim Hospital, Redstone Industrial Estate and Pescod Square.

The CCTV report attached at **Appendix A** provided a range of performance data for 2019/20 for members to review, comment, query and challenge. The data range in review being from 01 April 2019 to 31st March 2020.

The Council also monitored cameras on behalf of NKDC, SHDC and ELDC; however, detailed incident data for these council areas had NOT been included in the report.

During the above time period there had been:

- Recorded **17,106** daily log entries.
- Completed **3293** incident records.
- Boston Borough Council received **453** Out of Hours service calls.
- CCTV operators received **1389** calls for East Lindsey District Council and Boston Borough Council combined.
- CCTV Operators directly contributed to **238** arrests for the Boston Borough Council area, and **471** arrests for the total CCTV area.
- CCTV Operators produced **184** pieces of evidence from the Boston Borough Council area for Lincolnshire Police / Court use.
- Operators produced **393** pieces of evidence in total.

The report further included a breakdown of incident categories of crime and anti-social behaviour, with crime data for context for reference.

Referencing appendix B the CCTV Policy, the CCTV Manager confirmed that there had been no amendments to the existing policy and that the recommendation was for Cabinet to agree the continuation of the existing policy.

The Portfolio Holder Councillor Paul Skinner noted his thanks to the small team of CCTV operators who continued to work long hours and provide a key service for the Borough.

At this point in the proceedings' the Community Safety Manager requested his appreciation be formerly noted, in respect of the work undertaken by the CCTV team during the pandemic. He advised that the team been decreased by a quarter during that time to vulnerable operators and had run on a skeleton staff which had meant increased shifts and hours for the staff. Furthermore, not only had the team maintained coverage of all the hours, but they had also taken on additional work handling police imaging reviews.

In response to a member questioning payment by external businesses for CCTV coverage at their premises, the Community Safety Manager confirmed that Boston College; Pilgrim Hospital, Kirton Parish Council and Pescod Square continued to pay for their service. However, Redstone Industrial Estate currently did not pay for the service they received.

Negotiations with the people who collected the payments from the various businesses for the service had been put in abeyance due to the pandemic. Committee were also advised that a decision had been made to reduce the number of cameras' on the site down to two, to cover areas of responsibility of the Council namely the Caravan site and the area on the main road near the car wash facility. The reduction had been scheduled for 1st April 2020 but again had been postponed and it was hoped the work would be undertaken in due course.

In conclusion, the Chairman thanked the CCTV Manager for the comprehensive report and asked that her appreciation to all the CCTV team be noted.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That Members' reviewed, commented, and challenged the information presented within Appendix A.
2. That Members scrutinised the CCTV Policy set out at Appendix B and referred it to Cabinet for continued adoption in its current form.

57 CRIME AND DISORDER ANNUAL REVIEW

The Anti-Social Behaviour Officer presented the report confirming the Council's Community Safety Team used National Legislation and County-Wide Policies and Procedures when dealing with Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB). The team worked alongside numerous partner agencies, particularly the Neighbourhood Policing Team based at Boston Police Station.

The Council's two ASB Officers widely utilised the powers contained within the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime & Policing Act 2014 (**see background papers for link to legislation**), guided by the Safer Lincolnshire Partnership Strategy's 'Intervention and Incremental Approach Policy and Procedure 2015' when dealing with ASB and other non-criminal offences. The approach normally had 4 stages. The statistics throughout the report provided against each stage for ASB enforcement and PSPO enforcement.

As a point of clarification for committee members, the reporting officer confirmed that the enforcing officers were able to enter any of the stages within the stage 4 stage dependant on the nature and severity of an incident or the number of issues with any person.

Advising statistics the Anti-Social Behaviour Officers confirmed as follows:

Stage1 ASB Advice Letter:

- 2019-20 – **61** Letters Issued
- 2018-19 – **85** Letters issued

Stage 2 ASB Warning Letter:

- 2019-20 – **80** Letters issued
- 2018-19 – **22** Letters issued

Stage 3 Acceptable Behaviour Agreement:

- 2019-20 – **17** ABA's
- 2018-19 – **1** ABA

Stage 4 Civil Injunction:

- 2019-20 – **9** granted by the Court
- 2018-19 – **3** granted by the Court

For over 18's –

Stage 3 CPNW:

- 2019-20 - **2** Community Protection Notice Warnings
- 2018-19 - **12** Community Protection Notice Warnings

Stage 4 CPN:

- 2019-20 - **0** Community Protection Notices
- 2018-19 - **3** Community Protection Notices

The Public Space Protection Order (PSPO) for alcohol incremental approach also has four stages, PSPO enforcement statistics for the period 1st April 2019 – 31st March 2020 and in comparison with the previous year, 1st April 2018 – 31st March 2019 are set out within **Appendix 2**, a summary is provided below.

Stage1 PSPO Advice Letter:

- 2019-20 – **57** letters issued
- 2018-19 – **141** letters issued

Stage 2 PSPO Warning Letter:

- 2019-20 – **7** letters issued
- 2018-19 – **20** letters issued

Stage 3 Community Protection Notice Warning (CPW):

- 2019-20 – **1** letters issued
- 2018-19 – **6** letters issued

Stage 4 Community Protection Notice (CPN):

- 2019-20 – **0** letters issued
- 2018-19 – **1** letter issued

Breach of PSPO (refused a request by an authorised officer to desist from drinking alcohol within the designated area or leave the area):

Fixed Penalty Notice (FPN):

- 2019-20 – **0** FPN's issued
- 2018-19 – **0** FPN's issued

FPNs could be used for breaching the Order.

A point of clarification was tabled and members were asked to note that on page 47 of the report, March 2019 should have read March 2020.

Councillor Paul Skinner portfolio holder tabled his thanks to all the officers and police involved in the working partnership stating he was confident that the various stages served, were relative to those on whom they were served.

General committee discussion and questioning followed which included:

In response to a request for clarification on increases in both ASB and, in respect of incidents of large groups of youths, the Anti-Social Behaviour Officer and Inspector Harrod advised that during lockdown youth ASB had decreased, but was expected to increase as lockdown eased. Domestic ASB had increased which was probably due to home confinement for many families.

Referring to the incidents of large groups of youths, particularly in March, members were advised that despite trying to find a reason for the incidents, no one specific motive had been found. Those involved had been from different schools and different backgrounds with no commonality, resulting in a rainbow of children who had appeared happy to fight each other. The suggestion had been the events had been instigated on line and the events very quickly escalated with up to over 50 at the March event resulting in the police taking a very firm stance on the matter.

PCSO's had liaised with local schools in identifying those involved and with the incident being so alarming, the ASB team and the police decided to go straight in at stage 2 with warning letters being issued.

The vast majority of those involved in March were unknown to the police and when parents had viewed footage of the event, they had been horrified by the actions taking place. All those who had been served a stage 2 letter had also been referred to 'Future for Me', which was a diversionary activity, and none of the stage 2 letters had resulted in moving to stage 3.

A member suggested that future events could arise via social media Inspector Harrod stated that while the events had been extremely alarming, there had been no resurgence of such activity during lockdown or during the school holidays. As such, she had a certain degree of confidence that with the action taken and with the referrals to diversionary activity available, that no such further events would arise.

Referencing the increase of 50% in ASB noted via the CCTV data a member questioned the significant increase and the CCTV Manager advised that having looked at each incident, he noted that some had been filed under the wrong category

Asking what else the Council could do to enforce the PSPO and was a letter the final stage of enforcement, the Anti-Social Behaviour confirmed that the Council was only the administrator for the order and it was the Police, who enforced it. Inspector Harrod confirmed that in respect of the PSPO and any criminality or ASB activity, the team enforcing it, would be directed to go in at the highest level, starting with the criminal aspect. Therefore, some incidents involving street drinking could be dealt with as criminal offences and not through the PSCO.

A further point of information confirmed that there was no right appeal to a CPNW sent out: the only right to appeal was at stage 4 (CPN) when a notice was issued and the person then had 21 days in which to appeal.

Referring to incidents of ASB and in particular young people riding bikes dangerously within the village of Kirton, a member asked if letters had been issued on such incidents. The Anti-Social Behaviour officer stated that ASB did arise within Kirton and other villages sporadically. If a PCSO or a PC in the village dealt with the incidents referenced and advised the Council, then stage 1 letters would have been served. The member asked if statistics could be forwarded to him.

Concluding the Chairman thanked Inspector Harrod for her attendance and her informative appendix to the report, and thanked the Anti-Social Behaviour Officer for his detailed report.

RECOMMENDATION:

That committee members agreed that they had reviewed, commented, and challenged the information presented within the report and its appendices.

58 WORK PROGRAMME / QUARTER 4 PERFORMANCE REPORTING.

Introducing the report the Lead Officer for the committee confirmed the item was to enable members to consider the quarter 4 performance data to assist in informing any future discussions or future subject matters committee may wish to see on the agenda.

The Committee's next meeting scheduled for the 8th September 2020 currently tabled four reports, which included the Q1 performance reporting and the Council's response to the Covid-19 pandemic.

The Chairman would provide an update on the Task and Finish Review, which was currently in abeyance, at the end of the item.

Two further items were due awaiting scheduling to member briefings. The first being the Kerbside Twin Stream Recycling initiative due to be rolled out over the next three years and the second being the Boston Alternative Energy Facility, which was paused due to the pandemic, which had undergone a fundamental redesign and as a result would commence Phase 4 public consultation. The committee would be invited to provide feedback as part of the Council's formal response to the consultation.

The Transformation and Performance Manager presented the Quarter 4 performance report to the committee focusing specifically on Corporate Priority 1 and Corporate Priority 3 both of which aligned to the committee. Should members identify any suggestions under Corporate Priority 2 or 4 then they would be referred to the Corporate and Community committee.

Following the last meeting, two inquiry evenings had taken place as requested by the committee: one held in respect of car parking and the other in respect of fly tipping.

Noting the report, members' were advised that the data provided areas to celebrate of consistently good performance for planning, economic development and car parking along with events and commercial waste, all of which returned a good financial outturn compared to last year. However, the figures were pre covid and members should note that the information would look very different at the next meeting under Q1 performance. Overall 19/20 had shown well managed performance

Member questioning and comment followed which included:

In response to a members' question in respect of the new fleet of refuse vehicles and issues with breakdowns of the existing fleet, the Head of Environmental Operations advised that the new fleet had been ordered in August 2019 and were scheduled for delivery for November 2020 to align with the new fleet maintenance contract. Despite the pandemic, the supplier had confirmed that delivery of the fleet would not be affected.

The existing maintenance contract provided replacement vehicles in the event of any breakdown at no additional costs to the Council.

The vehicles ordered being Dennis Eagle 26 tonne units manufactured in Warwick.

The replacement 7.5 tonne freighter, also ordered in August last year, had been delivered as soon as it was available, to replace the existing freighter which was beyond economical repair.

A member questioned the financial data relating to the collectable business rates and the differential between the gross and nett figures provided. The Transformation and Performance Manager advised that whilst she could have sourced the information ahead of the meeting, she could not answer on behalf of the Head of Finance and therefore she would send the information to members after the meeting.

(It is noted this information is appended to these minutes following dispatch to members following the meeting)

In answer to a question in respect of the residual household waste performance target and how the target was calculated, the Head of Environmental Operations advised that the focus of the county wide waste strategy was to reduce overall weight of household waste collected and promote the waste hierarchy of Reduce, Re-use, Recycle. Reductions in household waste could be achieved if residents reduced consumption, reused goods and recycled waste. This would reduce the overall weight of waste being disposed of.

A number of members voiced strong concerns at the significant increases in fly tipping incidents over recent months and recognised that lockdown and the closure of the waste recycling sites had impacted the number of incidents. However, there were still concerns as fly tipping was prolific within the borough. Members questioned if covert operations had taken place: the success rate in identifying culprits and issuing of FPN's. The levy of the fines also needed to be increase substantially to act as a deterrent. The opening hours of the waste sites combined with the restrictions on types of rubbish and changing opening times were further questioned as they had exacerbated the problem with instances of members of the public booking a slot, queueing and then being turned away due to the site having received its quota of a certain product being referenced by members.

As green waste had been the only item accepted when the sites opened, members agreed that too had contributed to fly tipping. Complaints by residents in respect of the HWRC was common with requests for improved up to date information needed to stop wasted trips and people being turned away.

Reiterating an idea tabled at a previous meeting a member referenced a system used successfully in Australia whereby once a month everyone put items they no longer used on their drive and anybody was free to pick them up (up cycling). Goods remaining at the end of the day were then collected by the Council later in the evening.

The Head of Environmental Operations confirmed that incidents of fly tipping had escalated during the pandemic and in June 2020, the amount had quadrupled against June 2019, with incidents doubling in April and May 2020 against 2019.

It was a national problem and a major focus of the Lincolnshire Waste Partnership. The Council had not undertaken ~~and~~ covert operations but it had undertaken overt operations, which had resulted in evidence being secured and submitted to the courts to prosecute offenders.

It was a course of action the Council would continue to follow using either its' own resources or using contractors. Fines were set by the Government, but increases in the fines was something that the Lincolnshire Waste Partnership would look to lobby on.

Various actions were also ongoing including the scrap campaign; days of action and operation clean sweep whereby agencies deployed resources to one location for stop and search activities for illegal transportation of waste and follow to illegal sites.

Fly tipping was ASB and an Environmental Crime that the Council considered very seriously. The local enforcement partnership team who returned from furlough in June had already issued 57 FPNs last 4 week for fly tipping offences.

The Council did what it could through communications for the public, which had included the purple bin trial and supporting local and countywide initiatives. It was felt the site now accepted all types of waste, but on certain days of the week, and the HWRC site remained closed on Wednesday and Thursday. It was fully functional but did not receive all waste on all days and members of the public needed to check the website for latest updates on what it accepted on what days. In addition, there was a no van policy and trailers of specified maximum size.

At this point in the proceedings, the Chairman advised that she felt minded to invite Lincolnshire County Council to come to the committee and advise on its HWRC waste policy. The Head of Environmental Operations agreed it could prove to be a useful piece of work for the committee.

It was agreed to put on the agenda for a meeting.

A member asked if the committee could look at car parking figures once the free trial period had ended to see if the scheme was viable or if alternative schemes were possible with options of using smaller car parks and offering certain days suggested.

A further request to re-visit a request for better car parking signage discussed both at committee previously and at a member briefing to be included within the same reporting.

It was agreed to put an item in respect of the car park trial on the agenda for a meeting in the new year once the figures were available

The Chairman provided an update on the Task and Finish Group confirming that she had met with the Vice Chairman to look at ways to take the review forward following the pandemic. They had agreed four options, which had been tabled to the group members for reference.

RECOMMENDATION FOR TASK AND FINISH GROUP ONLY

1. That a re-cap meeting be convened to allow the group to review the work to date and to agree a way forward taking into consideration the impact of the pandemic on the original scope of the review.

The Chairman thanked all in attendance for their time and input and closed the meeting.

TO DO:

1. That an invitation be issued to Lincolnshire County Council to attend the next meeting of the committee to provide a report on Fly Tipping and overall waste disposal. CA.
2. A Report by scheduled onto the work programme for Car Parks on completion of the trial free period. KR in liaison with SR
3. That a Member Briefing be scheduled for the Kerbside Twin Stream Recycling initiative. CA / KR

The Meeting Closed at 8.20 pm