

Notice of Meeting

Overview and Scrutiny Commission

Councillor Angell (Chairman),
Councillor Virgo (Vice-Chairman),
Councillors Mrs Birch, Brossard, Gbadebo, Mrs McKenzie-Boyle,
McLean, Mrs Mattick, Mossom, Porter, Temperton and Tullett
Tracey Wright, Parent Governor representative
Mark Glanville, Parent Governor representative



Also Invited:

Councillor Harrison, Executive Member for Culture, Delivery and Public Protection

Wednesday 19 February 2020, 7.30 - 9.00 pm
Council Chamber - Time Square, Market Street, Bracknell,
RG12 1JD

Agenda

Item	Description	Page
1.	Apologies for Absence	
	To receive apologies for absence and to note the attendance of any substitute Members.	
2.	Minutes	3 - 8
	To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Commission held on 9 January 2020.	
3.	Declarations of Interest and Party Whip	
	<p>Members are asked to declare any disclosable pecuniary or affected interests and the nature of that interest, including the existence and nature of the party whip, in respect of any matter to be considered at this meeting.</p> <p>Any Member with a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in a matter should withdraw from the meeting when the matter is under consideration and should notify the Democratic Services Officer in attendance that they are withdrawing as they have such an interest. If the Disclosable Pecuniary Interest is not entered on the register of Members interests the Monitoring Officer must be notified of the interest within 28 days.</p> <p>Any Member with an Affected Interest in a matter must disclose the interest to the meeting. There is no requirement to withdraw from the meeting when the interest is only an affected interest, but the Monitoring Officer should be notified of the interest, if not previously notified of it, within 28 days of the meeting.</p>	
4.	Urgent Items of Business	
	Any other items which, pursuant to Section 100B(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972, the Chairman decides are urgent.	

EMERGENCY EVACUATION INSTRUCTIONS

If you hear the alarm, leave the building immediately. Follow the green signs. Use the stairs not the lifts. Do not re-enter the building until told to do so.

5.	Public Participation	
	To receive submissions from members of the public which have been submitted in advance in accordance with the Council's Public Participation Scheme for Overview and Scrutiny.	
6.	Crime and Disorder Panel - Crime Data Integrity re-inspection report	9 - 36
	<p>The Overview and Scrutiny Commission will sit as the Crime and Disorder Panel for the duration of this item.</p> <p>Deputy Chief Constable Hogg from Thames Valley Police is attending to discuss the Crime Data Integrity re-inspection report. The report was published on 25 July 2019 at https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmicfrs/publications/thames-valley-crime-data-integrity-re-inspection-2019/</p> <p><u>Evidence Pack:</u></p> <p>01 Crime Data Integrity (CDI) re-inspection report (published 25 July 2019) 02 CDI briefing note 03 CDI presentation 04 CDI delivery plan</p> <p><i>Please note the Evidence Pack should be read in advance of the meeting.</i></p>	
7.	Work Programme Update	37 - 48
	<p>Overview and Scrutiny Panel Chairmen to update the Overview & Scrutiny Commission on work programme progress including noting the Burials Phase 1 review outcome.</p> <p>The Commission to consider any proposed changes to the Overview and Scrutiny work programme such as scope, scheduling or duration and its potential impact on the delivery of the overall programme.</p>	

Date of next meeting

The next Overview and Scrutiny Commission meeting is scheduled for Tuesday 10 March 2020. The focus of the meeting will be Climate Change.

Sound recording, photographing, filming and use of social media is permitted. Please contact Kirsty Hunt, 01344 353108, kirsty.hunt@bracknell-forest.gov.uk, so that any special arrangements can be made.

Published: 10 February 2020

EMERGENCY EVACUATION INSTRUCTIONS

If you hear the alarm, leave the building immediately. Follow the green signs. Use the stairs not the lifts. Do not re-enter the building until told to do so.

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMISSION
9 JANUARY 2020
7.30 - 9.45 PM**



Present:

Councillors Angell (Chairman), Virgo (Vice-Chairman), Mrs Birch, Brossard, Gbadebo, Mrs McKenzie-Boyle, McLean, Mrs Mattick, Mossom, Porter, Temperton and Tullett
Tracey Wright, Parent Governor representative
Mark Glanville, Parent Governor representative

Executive Member Present:

Councillor Heydon, Executive Member for Transformation and Finance

Also Present:

Councillor Atkinson
Timothy Wheadon, Chief Executive
Kevin Gibbs, Executive Director: Delivery
Nikki Edwards, Executive Director: People
Andrew Hunter, Director: Place, Planning & Regeneration
Stuart McKellar, Director: Finance
Ann Moore, Head of Democratic and Registration Services
Kamay Toor, Acting Assistant Director: Property Services

24. **Minutes**

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the Commission held on 5 November 2019 be approved as a correct record, and signed by the Chairman.

25. **Declarations of Interest and Party Whip**

Councillor Gbadebo declared an affected interest as he is an observer on the board of South Hill Park for Bracknell Town Council.

Councillor Mrs McKenzie-Boyle declared an affected interest as her husband is on the board of South Hill Park.

There were no indications that members would be participating while under the party whip.

26. **Urgent Items of Business**

There were no items of urgent business.

27. **Public Participation**

No submissions had been made by members of the public under the Council's Public Participation Scheme for Overview and Scrutiny.

28. **Holding Executive to account: Councillor Heydon, Executive Member for Transformation and Finance**

Councillor Heydon, Executive Member for Transformation and Finance had been invited to attend the meeting. He explained the breadth of his portfolio responsibilities and that many areas within the Council were affected by either transformation activity or budget impact.

The Commission was advised that an indication of the financial settlement was announced on 20 December 2019 and there was one unexpected change which would bring £1million back into the 2020/21 budget as a one-off. The final settlement was expected at the end of the month and the budget could not be finalised until then.

In response to a question regarding how planning is undertaken for contingency and unknown demand Councillor Heydon stated that the Council had no real control on some of these pressures. In particular, he added that nationally there was an ageing population and they were identifying more vulnerable children and adults. The Council's strategies and objectives were cascaded by the Chief Executive and Corporate Management Team. Corporate Management Team meet regularly with Executive Members who based upon the Council Plan which was crafted from the manifesto and its political objectives also attend Departmental Management team meetings to talk to individual officers as well as being briefed on pressures and changes in risks. He advised that reviewing strategic risk was a regular part of the Executive meeting and meetings with Departmental Management Teams.

Clarification was sought on trend analysis undertaken on data to identify other pressures in the system and plan for the future. Councillor Heydon advised that there was a large contingency budget and the professional officers identify, react and respond to issues.

When asked who was responsible for setting the savings targets for each directorate and how this was done, Councillor Heydon replied that the budget was built on the previous year's spend as the baseline and then consideration of the anticipated pressures and potential areas for savings within each Directorate

In response to a question about how the Executive Member had confidence that the officers were looking at the right area within their department to make those savings Councillor Heydon said that he and other Executive Members worked closely with officers. He referred to officers' consistent track record of dealing well with challenges and uncertainties for example not closing libraries but instead increasing opening hours by doing something differently. It was acknowledged that it was not possible to continue to make savings without affecting residents directly.

29. **Budget Consultation**

Councillor Heydon, Executive Member for Transformation and Finance provided the Commission with a presentation setting the context for budget discussions. He explained the monitoring position in 2019/20 and the areas for focus in the current year.

In explaining the approach for the budget proposals he highlighted the risks and opportunities, the underlying principles and specific measures. He set out the draft budget proposals which had been agreed for consultation by the Executive.

During the discussion on the proposals the following points were raised:

- the level of contingency was arrived at following a prudent assessment of financial risks and Stuart McKellar, Director of Finance considered that £2.5m continued to feel appropriate

- in 2021/22 the Council faces a significant pressure going forward
- the New Homes Bonus reduction was deferred by 12 months which meant that the Council was in receipt of an additional £1 million than anticipated but this was a one off payment
- the Capital programme of £18.7million included schemes funded by S106 and government funding
- clarification was sought on the steps being taken to provide children in care with support in the most affordable manner. Nikki Edwards, Executive Director: People provided an explanation and emphasised that her team had to balance what was right to keep the child or adult safe versus what was commercially best value. She reassured the Commission that the Council has high quality services and the lead member was looking at that on a day to day basis.
- was sought on what the medium-term financial implications would be of the transformation programme being paused in this area. It was explained that the transformation activity was not being paused but that work was being undertaken to analyse the specifics of the system so that the team could focus on the elements that have the most positive service and financial effect
- the Bracknell Town Development Plan had been delayed and no referendum had taken place so this would be carried forward to next year
- the additional financial support referred to in the proposals was being put in place to support new schools whilst they build up their numbers on roll.
- the Director of Finance advised that no decision had yet been taken by Members relating to food waste collection and the final budget proposals would be updated if required to reflect the Executive's decision
- the Chief Executive advised that there was no evidence that the small increase in pricing had impacted on the use of car parks
- the Director of Finance explained that this was the first year that an attempt had been made to identify the specific pressure on the adult social care budget as young people reached 18 and transitioned between services
- the Executive Director: People explained that every authority was being impacted by reviews of individuals with continuing health care needs as to whether there is an ongoing health need versus care needs. This work was ongoing.
- the Executive Director: People was pleased to confirm that the rough sleeper and troubled family's grants had been extended which were achieving effective outcomes
- the Director: Place, Planning and Regeneration advised that the two figures relating to PPR – Development & Adoptions were not duplicates and were both proposed savings from two different pots of money
- the Director: Place, Planning and Regeneration confirmed that the value for money review of supported bus contracts could change how bus services were delivered and therefore impact on the level of service to residents but it would be based on patronage figures, the cost of service and affordability
- the Executive Director: People would circulate a response to the question relating to whether the transfer of aspects of the Early Years support service that relate to supporting providers, in particular Development Workers (- £140,000), to the Schools Budget would be for all Primary Schools or those that use the service
- the Executive Director: People reassured the Commission that significant checks were undertaken to prevent frauds and put safeguarding in place for direct payments to clients. The proposed £100k saving was cumulative across a large number of clients and returning the money to the budget would not affect the service to individuals. She added that the individual, key advocates

and family members were part of the processes to assess need and undertake strength-based assessments.

- it was confirmed by the Executive Director: People that as part of the commercial approach when spaces were available at Waymead, vacant beds were sold to other local authorities. Funding received would be used towards the Council's costs
- it was explained that the budget consultation could be easily found on the public website by typing 'consultation' into the search function

The Chairman thanked everyone for their participation in the scrutiny of budget consultation for 2020/2021.

30. **Corporate Performance Overview Report**

Timothy Wheadon, Chief Executive presented the highlights from the second quarter of the Council Plan Overview Report and it was hoped that the production timetable would be more closely aligned with the Commission meetings in future. There were no red actions and 80% were indicated as green.

The Council's website had been ranked second nationally as it was designed to work how residents use it. He highlighted two well managed changes during the period. The High Street car park was closed for refurbishment and process of closure had worked well with no complaints. Waste collection had changed for 7,000 residents. Budget preparation is an all year-round activity.

The Chief Executive advised that there had been a small increase in the number of complaints taken up by the Local Government Ombudsman. He reminded the Commission that this was in the context of millions of transactions every year. Of 25 complaints to the Local Government Ombudsman only five had been investigated and the Council was found to be at fault in only one. He concluded that it was nevertheless important to learn from complaints.

In response to a question relating to the original estimates for the demand for the Cemetery and Crematorium leading to a dip in demand and increased pressure of £100k the Chief Executive advised that the anticipated demand had not arisen. He confirmed that at popular times multiple activities were taking place and plans were in place to bring the costs back in balance.

When asked whether any further mitigation was required within the strategic risk register the Chief Executive advised that they believed all the key risks had been mitigated to the right level and that the risk register was reviewed every quarter.

An update was sought regarding the repairs to the High Street lift and the Commission was advised that the new contractor was waiting for parts.

31. **Work Programme Update**

The Overview and Scrutiny Panel Chairmen updated the Overview & Scrutiny Commission on work programme progress to date. The Commission considered proposed changes to the Overview and Scrutiny work programme such as scope, scheduling or duration and its potential impact on the delivery of the overall programme.

Councillor Porter, Chairman of Community and Environment Overview and Scrutiny Panel advised that the Panel was meeting on 14 January 2020 to undertake the Burials Review. The session would include a link with Bedford Council after the tour

of the site around the Cemetery and Crematorium. The Panel would meet afterwards to discuss the alternative options for burial space. He clarified that the initial discussion would focus on site options and then potentially site usage following the outcome of the Executive decision. Phase 2 would follow promptly after the Executive decision if required so an extension was not requested.

Councillor Mrs Birch, Chairman of Education, Skills and Growth Overview and Scrutiny Panel advised the Commission that her Panel was proposing that the SEND and County Lines reviews should be swapped. It was confirmed that this was a direct swap within the schedule so did not impact on the overall programme. She clarified that the new scheduling was more appropriate and officers from the People directorate were happy to support the change. The first review, Care Leavers, was on track and would be undertaken on 22 January 2020.

Councillor Tullet, Chairman of Wellbeing and Finance Overview and Scrutiny Panel advised the Commission that all his reviews were on schedule and as per the agenda report. The healthy eating, activity and exercise review activity had been set for 20 February 2020.

Councillor Angell, Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Commission advised that the activity on Climate Change would be delivered over the four-year programme rather than a single review. He confirmed that representatives from Thames Valley Police would be attending the next Commission meeting on 19 February 2020 to discuss crime data recording.

It was agreed that the Burials review would be split into two phases and scheduling of the SEND and County Lines reviews would be directly switched within the Overview and Scrutiny Work programme.

CHAIRMAN

This page is intentionally left blank



Promoting improvements
in policing and fire & rescue
services to make everyone safer (<https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmicfrs>)

Search site

About us (<https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmicfrs/about-us/>)

Police (<https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmicfrs/police-forces/>)

Fire and rescue (<https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmicfrs/fire-and-rescue-services/>)

- Home (<https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmicfrs>)
- Publications (<https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmicfrs/publications/>)
- Thames Valley Police: Crime Data Integrity re-insp... (<https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmicfrs/publications/thames-valley-c>)

Thames Valley Police: Crime Data Integrity re-inspection 2019

In November 2017, Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services (HMICFRS) conducted a crime data integrity inspection of Thames Valley Police.

We published the [report of this inspection](#) (</hmicfrs/our-work/crime-data-integrity/reports-rolling-programme-crime-data-integrity/>) in February 2018 and concluded that the force's crime recording arrangements were not acceptable. As a result, we gave Thames Valley Police an overall judgment of inadequate.

Our 2018 report gave numerous recommendations and areas for improvement aimed at improving crime recording in Thames Valley Police. This re-inspection, completed in May 2019, assessed the progress made since that report.

Our findings and judgment resulting from this re-inspection are set out below.

1. Overall judgment
2. Summary of inspection findings
3. How effective is the force at recording reported crime?
 - 3.1. Overall crime recording rate
 - 3.2. Violence against the person
 - 3.3. Sexual offences
 - 3.4. Rape
4. How efficiently do the systems and processes in the force support accurate crime recording?
 - 4.1. Crime reports held on other systems
 - 4.2. Modern slavery
 - 4.3. Timeliness
 - 4.4. Cancelled crimes
5. How well does the force demonstrate the leadership and culture necessary to meet the national standards for crime recording?
6. Conclusion
7. What next?

Overall judgment

● ○ ○ ○ Inadequate

See previous findings

From its low base Thames Valley Police has improved its crime recording arrangements since our 2017 crime data integrity (CDI) inspection. However, we found it still needs to do more.

The most significant change that it has made is to implement crime recording at the first point of contact in its contact management centre.

It has also:

- improved its overall crime recording, including of violence and sexual offences;
- significantly increased how often it records crime reports at the first point of contact;
- developed and implemented a CDI delivery plan; and
- provided comprehensive crime recording training to call handling staff in its contact management centre.

The force is determined to get crime recording right. But despite its new approach, it needs to achieve higher recording standards. To do this it should make sure it trains all staff in the contact management centre, including dispatchers, in crime recording. Failure to do this is limiting the accuracy of those recording decisions made at the point of contact.

We examined crime reports from 1 October to 31 December 2018. Based on this, we estimate that the force records 87.9 percent of crimes reported to it (with a confidence interval of +/- 1.70 percent). This is a statistically significant improvement of 7.5 percentage points when compared to our 2017 inspection finding of 80.4 percent (confidence interval +/- 1.75 percent).

We estimate that, compared to the findings of our 2017 inspection, this improved accuracy meant that the force recorded an additional 13,800 crimes (</hmicfrs/crime-data-integrity-inspections-explanatory-notes#additionally-recorded-crimes>) for the year covered by our re-inspection audit period. So, more victims will now have their reported crimes recorded. Recording these reports makes sure victims have access to the victim support service Victims First [\(http://www.victims-first.org.uk/\)](http://www.victims-first.org.uk/) when they may otherwise not have been referred to it.

But despite these improvements, the overall recording rate and the recording rate for violent crime are still too low.

Supervision of the crime recording process and decisions remains inconsistent. And there are still not enough safeguards in place to make sure reported crimes are recorded.

Also, since our last inspection the force has got worse at:

- using classification NI100 for rape reports it decides not to record as crimes;
- making decisions when cancelling recorded offences; and
- informing victims of its decision to cancel their crime.

Summary of inspection findings

See previous findings

The force has made some progress with its crime recording arrangements since our 2017 inspection. It has:

- identified gaps in its systems and processes for recording crime reports arising from domestic incidents and public protection referrals;
- made changes to address these gaps;
- introduced a process where contact management staff review the domestic abuse and vulnerable victim reports from the previous day to make sure all crimes have been recorded;
- implemented a supervisory review process and started to brief frontline supervisors on their crime recording responsibilities; and
- issued operational crime recording guidance for officers and staff responsible for making crime recording decisions.

However, at the time of our inspection these changes had not yet created the improvement required to achieve accurate crime recording.

The force still needs to address various issues.

- Frontline officers, including supervisors, have a poor understanding of the force's crime recording system (NICHE). The force relies on NICHE to record crime and assess demand. But officers and supervisors clearly still do not understand how crime records are created and what entries constitute recorded crimes.
- Officers and supervisors who work outside the contact management centre have a poor understanding of the national crime recording standards (NCRS). They have not received crime recording training.
- Incidents which have been disclosed directly to public protection teams, in particular those reported by professional third parties, and which amount to a crime in law, are not always recorded as such.
- Officers and staff are still failing to correctly identify and record domestic abuse and rape crimes.

The force has failed to make sure officers and staff fully understand and apply changes made in April 2018 to crime recording requirements for stalking, harassment and coercive and controlling behaviour. Together with common assault, these crime types made up the vast majority of missed domestic abuse crimes.

We were encouraged to find that the force has been conducting its own crime recording audits, which have already identified some of the failings described in this report. These include some of the reasons why officers and staff fail to record reported crimes and some of the procedural problems that may affect crime recording accuracy.

The force reports the results of these audits to its CDI strategic and tactical working groups. And it shares them with department leads so that they can give feedback to officers and staff. This is good practice, but the force needs to do more to make sure these feedback processes are working effectively.

The force created a CDI delivery plan to address the recommendations and areas for improvement in our previous inspection report. This plan is comprehensive and the force has started to implement the vast majority of these actions. However, the pace of implementation needs to be accelerated as much remains to be done.

How effective is the force at recording reported crime?

● ○ ○ ○ Inadequate

Overall crime recording rate

87.9% of reported crimes
were recorded

See previous findings

The force has made some progress with its processes, ensuring it now records more reports of crime in accordance with the [Home Office Counting Rules \(PDF document\)](#) (https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/534967/count-general-july-2016.pdf) (HOCR). We examined reports of crime the force received, and for which it had created an auditable record. The force told us that 90.6 percent of crime it records (except fraud) comes through an auditable route. This doesn't mean that 90.6 percent of crimes reported to Thames Valley Police come through these routes, but that 90.6 percent of crime is recorded this way.

We found that the force recorded 87.9 percent of these crimes (with a confidence interval of +/- 1.70 percent). We estimate that this means the force is recording an additional 13,800 reported crimes each year ([/hmicfrs/crime-data-integrity-inspections-explanatory-notes#unrecorded-crimes](#)) compared to our findings in 2017. This is a statistically significant improvement of 7.5 percentage points. But it falls short of what is needed.

Of the 1,419 reports of crime we audited, we assessed 379 as related to [domestic abuse](#) ([/hmicfrs/glossary/domestic-abuse/](#)). Of these, the force had recorded 289. Of the 90 offences not recorded, 80 were violence offences, including:

- common assault;
- stalking;
- harassment;
- malicious communications; and
- coercive and controlling behaviour.

Many of these were reported directly to the force. But the force didn't record them as crimes, and we found no clear evidence or explanation as to why. We also found occasions where some call handlers didn't record on the incident log full details of the conversation they had with the person reporting a crime. This means the attending officer doesn't always have the full information on which to base a crime recording decision.

Case study

A report was made of domestic abuse, amounting to an offence of controlling and coercive behaviour. The victim was a repeat victim of domestic abuse. She was reporting that she was being subject to a forced marriage. To facilitate this, relatives were controlling all aspects of her life including travel and access to documents. The victim was extremely distressed by this behaviour and had attempted suicide the previous day. Police did not attend. Nor did they record any offences or provide information to suggest a crime did not occur. The force did not identify safeguarding opportunities or carry out an investigation.

The force considered safeguarding requirements in most of the unrecorded cases. But it carried out a proportionate investigation in only 11 of them.

We are still concerned that the force is under-recording crimes relating to domestic abuse incidents. It is failing to give many of these victims a satisfactory service.

Violence against the person

79.4% of reported violent crimes were recorded

[See previous findings](#)

We found that 79.4 percent of violent crimes reported to the force are recorded (with a confidence interval of +/- 3.17 percent). This is lower than the overall crime recording rate above. We estimate that, compared to the findings of our 2017 inspection, the force is now recording an additional 5,940 reported violence crimes each year. This is a statistically significant improvement of 10.2 percentage points, but the force is still failing many victims of violent crime. As violent crime can be particularly distressing for the victim, and many of these crimes involve injury, the need for improvement in this area is particularly acute and remains a concern.

When the force doesn't record a violent crime, the principal causes are:

- misunderstanding of the crime recording rules about some violence offences such as stalking, harassment, malicious communications, coercive and controlling behaviour and common assault;
- failing to record multiple crimes in accordance with the HOOR;
- failing to record additional crimes disclosed by victims on domestic abuse risk assessment forms; and
- inconsistent supervision of the crime recording process and decisions, with inadequate safeguards to make sure it records most crimes correctly.

Victims of violence and serious violence often need a lot of support. This should come from the reporting and investigating officers, and other appropriate organisations, such as Victims First. In these circumstances, crime recording is even more important. If the force fails to record a violent crime properly, it can mean victims aren't referred to Victims First. This deprives victims of the support they need and deserve.

Sexual offences

95.3% of reported sex offences were recorded

[See previous findings](#)

The force records 95.3 percent of sexual offence crimes (including rape) that are reported to it (with a confidence interval of +/- 2.03 percent). Compared to the findings of our 2017 inspection, we estimate the force has recorded an additional 280 reported sexual offence crimes in the past year. This is a statistically significant improvement of 5.1 percentage points. These crimes may otherwise have gone unrecorded. This improvement is welcome.

The reported sexual offence crimes that were not recorded included two sexual assaults, one exposure and a variety of five sexual offences against children.

The main cause of this under-recording is failure to record multiple crimes in accordance with the [HOOR \(PDF document\)](#) (https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/534967/count-general-july-2016.pdf).

Recording sexual offence crimes is particularly important for victims, as many of these crimes are very serious in nature and cause significant harm.

Rape

126 of 138 audited rape reports were accurately recorded

[See previous findings](#)

Rape is one of the most serious crimes a victim can experience. So, it is especially important that reports of rape are recorded accurately. It helps to make sure victims receive the service and support they deserve. And it helps the police identify the nature and extent of sexual violence in their local area.

Since our 2017 inspection, the force has not noticeably changed or improved how it records reports of rape.

We found that 126 of 138 rape crimes had been correctly recorded. Of the 12 unrecorded reports:

- five were misclassified as other offences; and
- seven were not recorded at all.

The force considered safeguarding requirements for all victims. But in three cases, failing to record the rape crimes meant it didn't conduct a full investigation into the reports. This let down those victims.

When forces don't record a reported rape as a crime, they must apply a Home Office classification N100.

In 2017, we found that the standard of N100 recording was exceptionally good. But in this audit, we found that there was general confusion in making these decisions. Staff in the contact management centre don't understand whether or when to record a rape or a classification N100.

We checked 20 N100 records. Of these:

- three records, containing five rape reports, should have been recorded as rapes at the outset, but were only later recorded as crimes;
- one should not have been recorded as a N100 at all; and
- one record should have had an additional three N100s recorded as well.

The remaining N100 records were recorded correctly.

Separately, we also identified 31 other occasions where the force should have used an N100 classification. But it only did so in 23 of these.

We found that frontline officers and staff still had very little awareness of the N100 classification. Again, this is disappointing as we highlighted this matter as an area for improvement following our 2017 inspection. The force has introduced a review process for N100s. But more needs to be done to improve understanding among officers and staff to make sure it uses this classification correctly.

It is essential to record a rape report correctly as a crime as soon as possible. Victims will often need a great deal of support from the start. Any delay, or failure to record the crime correctly, can have a negative impact on both the victim's recovery and any investigation. It remains a concern that the force is still under-recording rape crimes and failing to give many of these victims a satisfactory service.

How efficiently do the systems and processes in the force support accurate crime recording?

●●○○ Requires improvement

Crime reports held on other systems

4 of 7 vulnerable victim crimes were recorded

[See previous findings](#)

To be confident that vulnerable victims always get the support they need, it is important that crimes reported directly to public protection teams are always recorded.

To make sure it does so, the force has changed its procedures for recording crimes reported in this way. It now records all such reports in the contact management centre, to try to make sure it records every reported crime. It has also introduced a daily system of checking vulnerable victim records for missed crimes. Despite these new arrangements, the force still doesn't record all such crimes.

We examined 22 vulnerable adult victim records. Unusually, there were no crime reports in them. We also examined 25 vulnerable child records in which we found seven crimes that should have been recorded. But the force had only recorded four. The unrecorded offences included:

- sexual activity with a child under 13;
- assault occasioning actual bodily harm; and
- injury caused by a dangerous dog.

All these cases involved professional third-party reports and should have been recorded as soon as they were reported.

Because the assault case was written off as an accident, there was no safeguarding or subsequent investigation. The force still has more to do to make sure it records all vulnerable victim crimes, particularly professional third-party reports received in the contact management centre.

Modern slavery

See previous findings

Offences relating to modern slavery are an important and recent addition to the crimes that forces must record and investigate. We examined how well the force records reports of modern slavery offences.

In 2017 we found that the force was recording all modern slavery offences reported to it and disclosed during investigations.

On this occasion, we checked 20 modern slavery records and found that 18 modern slavery crimes had been correctly identified and recorded. Two crimes were recorded unnecessarily. Also, we found 12 additional crimes which the force should have recorded. It had correctly identified and recorded eight of these. The four crimes that were missed were one each of:

- assault occasioning actual bodily harm;
- common assault;
- sexual assault; and
- theft.

We also looked at 20 modern slavery reports the force received through the national referral mechanism (NRM). We found that it should have recorded 11 modern slavery crimes but had only recorded seven. We found eight additional crimes which should have been recorded and the force had correctly identified and recorded five of these. Three additional common assault crimes were missed. One crime of coercive and controlling behaviour should have been classified as a modern slavery crime.

In 2017, the force was incorrectly over-recording modern slavery crimes that occurred abroad. We are pleased that this is no longer the case.

The force has recently implemented a daily audit of all modern slavery incidents to make sure it correctly identifies and records all crimes. This is welcome.

Timeliness

See previous findings

The rules require forces to record crimes within 24 hours of the report. We found that, of the crime reports Thames Valley Police had recorded, it did so within 24 hours for:

- 453 out of 479 violent crimes;
- 276 out of 305 sexual offences; and
- 399 out of 408 other offences.

In general, when Thames Valley Police makes correct crime recording decisions, its procedures successfully make sure it does so within 24 hours. This timely recording enables it to make early referrals to Victims First for those victims in need of support. This is a substantial improvement since our 2017 inspection and is very welcome.

Cancelled crimes

See previous findings

Designated decision makers (DDMs) make all crime cancellations except rape. The force crime registrar (FCR) makes rape cancellation decisions.

We found that the force correctly cancelled:

- 19 out of 20 rape crimes;
- 17 out of 20 violent crimes;
- 16 out of 21 sexual offence crimes; and
- 17 out of 20 robbery offences.

On most occasions when the force's cancellation decisions were not correct, it was because of a lack of additional verifiable information to show the recorded crime didn't take place.

Of the 50 victims the force should have told of its decision to cancel their crime, it had informed only 42.

The force's standards for cancelling recorded crime remain an area for improvement. And it remains a concern that the force does not always inform victims about the cancellation of their recorded crime.

How well does the force demonstrate the leadership and culture necessary to meet the national standards for crime recording?

●●○○ Requires improvement

The force has improved its crime recording in many ways. Recording rates have shown statistically significant improvements and it is recording many more of those crimes within 24 hours. And officers and staff generally place the victim at the forefront of their crime recording decisions.

[See previous findings](#)

After our 2017 inspection, the force developed a CDI delivery plan. The deputy chief constable (DCC) chairs the quarterly CDI strategic gold group which governs it. The plan seeks to address the recommendations and areas for improvement from our 2017 inspection. But the force recognises that its initial efforts to improve crime recording were not as successful as it expected and that it still has a lot of work to do.

The force has left primary responsibility to make the required improvements to the FCR. So the CDI delivery plan has only moved at a pace that the FCR can manage. The force acknowledges that it needs more work at a senior level to support the FCR in his endeavours. The DCC, helped by relevant staff members, is providing support to make sure the delivery plan gains the momentum needed and is successfully completed. This is a welcome development.

The force has fully implemented four out of six recommendations from our 2017 inspection. It still needs to fully implement the following recommendations:

- to develop and implement procedures for effectively supervising crime recording decisions across the whole force; and
- to design and provide training for officers who make crime recording decisions.

Also, the force needs to ensure it makes more progress with the outstanding areas for improvement identified during our 2017 inspection.

Conclusion

Thames Valley Police has made some progress with improving its crime recording standards since our 2017 inspection. This is welcome. But it now needs to work more quickly to address the outstanding causes of concern and areas for improvement identified in this and our previous report. We are confident the leadership and governance arrangements that it now has will enable it to do so.

What next?

We expect the force to continue to address the causes for concern and to fully implement the recommendations and areas for improvement from our 2017 inspection. We will continue to monitor this and will re-inspect the force again to assess its progress.

Publication types:

Crime recording (<https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmicfrs/?cat=crime-recording-2>)

Police Forces:

Thames Valley (<https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmicfrs/?force=thames-valley>)

Published on:

25 July 2019

Accessibility (<https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmicfrs/accessibility>)

Cymraeg (<https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmicfrs/cymraeg>)

Sitemap (<https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmicfrs/sitemap>)

Definitions and interpretations (<https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmicfrs/definitions-interpretations/>)

Terms and conditions (<https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmicfrs/terms-and-conditions>)

Privacy notice (<https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmicfrs/privacy-notice>)

Cookies (<https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmicfrs/cookies>)

How to contact HMICFRS (<https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmicfrs/contact-us>)

© Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services
6th Floor
Globe House
89 Eccleston Square
London
SW1V 1PN
✉ contacthmicfrs@hmicfrs.gov.uk (mailto:contacthmicfrs@hmicfrs.gov.uk)

CDI History and Context

The HMICFRS audit/inspection programme was initiated in 2013 following concern over the disparity between national police recorded crime data and figures which were produced through the National Victims of Crime Survey. The disparity prompted a concern that police forces were not recording crime appropriately, and that this was driven by performance pressures associated with national crime reduction targets.

Although the generic term Crime Data 'Integrity' is used, HMICFRS findings in both 2017 and 2019 do not identify any lack of integrity or unethical behaviour in the way TVP records, manages and files crime. In addition, they did not conclude that our failure to record crime had impacted negatively on the safeguarding of victims or on investigations. The issue is that we do not always record crime when a requirement to do so is made out; particularly where crimes arise from domestic incidents. The HMICFRS concluded that this was due to a lack of knowledge and understanding of the requirements to record crime.

The National Crime Recording Standards (NCRS) and Home Office Counting Rules for Recorded Crime (HOCR) provide the 'standards' that we are measured against when it comes to CDI. Against these standards, we have been assessed as being 'Inadequate' during our last two HMIC inspections. Like many forces, we were found to be below the standards during our first inspection in 2017, we acted on a number of the recommendations and significant improvements were achieved. This improvement was recognised by the HMICFRS in their 2019 report but they concluded that we had not improved far enough or fast enough. This prompted the establishment of the CDI Project.

We recognise that a number of previous strategic decisions have contributed to the issue, namely the requirement to make savings that resulted in the removal of posts from the Crime and Incident Management Unit (CIMU) in 2010, the rollout of Niche in 2014, our crime and intelligence record management system, where training was not as thorough as it perhaps should have been and current delays in the rollout of the Contact Management Platform (CMP), our replacement Command and Control system, where incident management is recorded through the Contact Management Centre (previously known as the Control Room and Police Enquiry Centre).

TVP is not alone in being assessed as 'Inadequate' for CDI during the HMICFRS Tier 1 audit/inspections. A further 13 forces received the same grading during this first round, with 15 others being graded as requiring improvement. However, of the 10 forces re-inspected so far under Tier 2 we and 2 other forces have failed to make the requisite advances to improve our 'Inadequate' grading.

Some forces have invested heavily to resolve the issue, significantly increasing the size of their crime registrar function. TVP has not had this luxury, as such an investment would have required cuts in other areas, including the frontline. Instead,

we have held our nerve and continued our commitment to ensuring that we maximise our effectiveness and efficiency through organisational change and cultural transformation. As good understanding of the importance and principles of crime recording are the investigative foundations on which a high quality, thoughtful and caring investigation is built, our investment in CDI will also serve as a significant factor in improving our investigative standards too.

In effecting this cultural change we've reinforced the focal role of the victim and the need to meet and where possible surpass their expectations. To achieve this, we need to be open and honest, communicative and able to complete the investigation in a timely manner. Recognition of the requirement to improve the quality of our investigations has resulted in the commissioning of Op Endeavour, a 12 point plan to overhaul our investigative response.

Indeed, it is recognised that if we don't record crime accurately, the chances of reducing the longer term risk, maintaining victim contact and satisfaction and reducing demand diminishes.

We've identified Supervisors as the Force's key influencers, able to effect the cultural change that we require to improve our CDI compliance. We've invested in their early training to ensure that they reinforce the policing benefits that result from improved crime recording and ensure that their teams remain compliant.

Analysis indicates that recording a crime accurately doesn't necessarily mean more work; we recognise that with limited resources, we need to be able to prioritise our effort which may result in some cases being filed with a limited investigation. In these cases we need to be open with our victims and explain our rationale fully.

We understand the impact of inaccurate crime recording on our crime figures, which in addition to understanding local performance, are used to inform our strategic decision making around the likes of resource allocation and force level tasking.

Through analysis of our currently recorded crime, results from crime audits and comparison against other forces who have achieved an outstanding grading, we estimate that we have a 16,000 crime shortfall against an annual total of 162,004 crimes (18/19 year-end).

Improving our CDI compliance was therefore identified as a top Force priority.

The key steps taken to effect the required improvement

1. The creation of a CDI Project, led strategically by the DCC, supported by a project manager to drive cross departmental changes; at present this temporary project manager post is the only additional resourcing cost employed within the solution.
2. Creation of a multi-layered communications plan, taking advantage of the full range of available communications channels to highlight the context, issues and solutions linked to CDI. The plan provides a continual sharing of information, with links to interdependent projects, such as Op Endeavour.

3. Training. CDI has never been subject of focused training within TVP, indeed it appears that it was also missed as a secondary subject when other relevant training packages were delivered. This position has been changed; CDI has been included as a golden thread running through all relevant training, in a similar manner to how we embedded the Code of Ethics. All supervisors (Police Sergeants and those support staff supervisors who are responsible for the recording or management of crime reports) have been subject of a mandatory CDI training course. We have addressed the recording shortfall in domestically aggravated offending through the delivery of Save 3 (stalking and harassment) and DA Safe Lives training within our Teams in Action training days, with a plan to complete a CDI and Op Endeavour training package to all frontline staff from June onwards. Additionally, we have improved the CDI training for our Contact Management staff, to increase the accuracy of our recording at the point of call.

The various training events are supported through the distribution of the Home Office Counting Rules, republishing of our crime recording operational guidance that can be accessed by staff via their mobile phones and the creation of a CDI question bank, where those who learn better through questions and answers can enhance their professional development. We have established a specialist crime recording Yammer account (an internal version of Twitter), with tips, advice and examples being shared with staff each day. These various products are accessible from the Crime Registrar website held on the Force Knowzone, which contains all relevant material in an easily accessible online location. The final support element is provided through the newly created crime recording helpdesk, accessible via a single number and resourced 10 hours per day, 5 days a week.

We have reinforced the importance of CDI by requiring candidates for promotion and specialisation to demonstrate their understanding and compliance with CDI principles. The job descriptions for those posts where CDI compliance is a significant aspect of the role have been amended to recognise its importance.

The CDI Project Manager completes ongoing evaluation of CDI compliance and performance, reporting directly to the CDI Gold Group, chaired by the DCC and into the CDI Silver Group, chaired by the Force Crime Registrar, who provide relevant governance and scrutiny.

Thus far, the development of meaningful performance tools has proved to be difficult, due to the lack of interface between our existing Command and Control system and Niche; hopefully this will be addressed when our Contact Management Platform (CMP) goes live as the platform provides a significantly improved interface with Niche. The information that is available is derived from complex analytics that complete key word searches to identify potential recording shortfalls and through detailed audit work. Both processes present a time lag to recording missed crimes, so work is ongoing to improve the timeliness of the results to support the frontline in improving their recording performance.



Domestic Incidents – front end checking process

	No. of Occurrences Reviewed	No. of Missed Crimes Identified	% of Missed Crimes
October	1315	311	23.70%
November	1318	295	22.40%
December	1357	235	17.30%
January	1238	217	17.53%

The above table below shows the number of domestic incidents that were initially recorded as a crime occurrence, rather than a 'full crime', that were subject to review by the Crime Registrar's team. These incidents have been selected because they include key words indicative of a potential unreported crime. The number of reviewed occurrences fluctuates based on the number of incidents that remain un-crimed each month. The table demonstrates a decreasing number of missed crimes (all of which are subsequently crimed) month by month, although we still have more missed crimes than is acceptable.



Domestic Incidents – front end checking process

	Violence (With Injury)	Violence (Without injury)	Violence (Stalk/Harass/Mal Comms)	Rape and Sexual Offences	Theft Offences	Criminal Damage	Other Crimes	Total
October	44	115	83	10	9	33	17	311
November	44	113	73	11	10	26	18	295
December	34	96	56	5	6	24	14	235
January	36	92	43	4	5	13	24	217

The above table breaks down the above missed domestically based crimes into the distinct crime categories. A number of the missed violence with injury offences relate to counter allegations, or where the victim refuses to support police action. The violence without injury relates generally to common assaults, where the victim isn't injured, but has been sufficiently in fear to make out the offence. The stalking and harassment offences can be difficult to identify, but the Save 3 training discussed above has contributed to a reduction in the number of missed crimes as recognition of the offence increases. The missed rape and sexual offences are generally historic offences that are retrospectively disclosed but not recorded. The theft and criminal damage errors often relate to the question of who owns the property and whether there was a propriety right to the time of the theft or damage.



Monthly crime recording changes – key offences

	Apr-19	May-19	Jun-19	Jul-19	Aug-19	Sep-19	Oct-19	Nov-19	Dec-19	Jan-20
Domestic Abuse	7%	0%	1%	11%	25%	21%	18%	23%	33%	44%
All Crime	1%	-3%	1%	6%	5%	9%	10%	8%	17%	22%
Violence	7%	1%	2%	3%	18%	15%	19%	17%	28%	43%
Sexual Offences	21%	-20%	7%	1%	0%	11%	21%	4%	15%	41%
Rape	46%	1%	14%	20%	-4%	29%	38%	-1%	25%	55%



The above table and graph show the monthly changes in this year's recording against the corresponding monthly totals from last year, with the table depicting a figures for 'all crime' as well as some key crime categories. The graph demonstrates the 'all crime' figures against our target of a 14% increase in 'all crime' recording, which we calculate as being the threshold between acceptable and unacceptable crime recording levels as laid out by HMIC.

As can be seen, there is a stepped improvement coinciding with the early delivery from the CDI Project's work. Although we still have room for improvement to reach the levels required to be confident that the force is fully performing to expectations, the early indications are reassuring, particularly as our investment has been limited in cost, designed to be sustainable and one that contributes significantly to other key deliverables.

Crime Data Integrity (CDI)

Serving with pride and confidence

1

CDI – History

- Variation in police recorded crime and Crime Survey of England and Wales
- Public Administration Select Committee/Office of National Statistics
- Home Sec. – ‘To what extent can we rely on police recorded crime figures’ ?
- Wrongdoing reporting
- Concern regarding ‘unintended consequences’ of performance regime
- HMICFRS audit/inspection

Serving with pride and confidence

2

CDI – What does it mean?

- Recording crime ethically
- Complying with NCRS/HOCR - *explicit in Code of Ethics.*
- Removing barriers to recording crime – *workload/performance pressure ?*
- HMICFRS – regular inspection and audit of compliance

'It is always better to know what might have happened, rather than not know what definitely did'.

Serving with pride and confidence

3

Benefits of accurate crime recording ?

- Victim focus – *'voice of victims'*
- Understand demand – locally and nationally
- Inform problem solving/investigation
- Evidence of ethical achievement – *stamp of approval*
- Openness/transparency – public awareness

Serving with pride and confidence

4

What does good CDI look like ?

- Processes – ensure accurate and timely recording of crime, measure compliance and promote learning.
- Knowledge/Understanding – NCRS/HOCR, recording systems (Niche) and specific crimes.
- Leadership/Culture - promotes accurate and ethical crime recording, and encourages learning/improvement.

Serving with pride and confidence

5

How are we doing ?

HMICFRS Audit/Inspection 2017 and 2019

	2017		
Compliance overall	80.4%		
Crimes of violence	69.2%		
Rape/Sexual offences	90.2%		
All other crime	86.9%		

Overall grading '*Inadequate*'

Serving with pride and confidence

6

How are we doing ?

HMICFRS Audit/Inspection 2017 and 2019

	2017	2019	
Compliance overall	80.4%	87.9%	
Crimes of violence	69.2%	79.4%	
Rape/Sexual offences	90.2%	95.3%	
All other crime	86.9%	92.9%	

Overall grading 'Inadequate'

Serving with pride and confidence

7

How are we doing ?

HMICFRS Audit/Inspection 2017 and 2019

	2017	2019	Av. 34 forces 2019
Compliance overall	80.4%	87.9%	89.3%
Crimes of violence	69.2%	79.4%	87.5%
Rape/Sexual offences	90.2%	95.3%	93.3%
All other crime	86.9%	92.9%	

Serving with pride and confidence

8

Positive Findings

- No evidence of a lack of integrity
- 'A commitment to ethical crime recording that is victim-focused and free from performance pressures of any kind'
- Chief officers encourage officers and staff to challenge activities or behaviours that are unethical, unacceptable or unprofessional in respect of the recording of reported crime.
- The force considered safeguarding requirements in most/all of the unrecorded cases

Serving with pride and confidence

9

Improvements required

- Processes – gaps around domestic incidents, adult/child protection
- Knowledge - requirement to record, 'believing' victims, multiple crimes, third party disclosures, mental health, reports of rape (N100) (NCRS/HOCR)
- Knowledge of specific crimes (violence, malicious communications, harassment, stalking, public order offences)
- Knowledge – correct use and understanding of Niche
- Leadership/Culture – more effort to improve above

Serving with pride and confidence

10

Future of CDI

State of Policing – The Annual Assessment of Policing in England and Wales 2018

'The current CDI programme is scheduled to finish in spring 2020. It will then become part of the integrated PEEL assessment process, informing other areas such as investigating crime, protecting the vulnerable and managing demand'. Sir Tom Winsor (Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Constabulary)

HMICFRS oversight will continue !

Serving with pride and confidence

11

National Crime Recording Standards (NCRS) and Home Office Counting Rules for Recorded Crime (HOOCR)

- Benchmark/standard for recording
- Promote ethical crime recording
- Take a victim oriented approach to crime recording
- Accuracy and consistency in crime records within/between police forces
- Don't dictate what should be investigated or how !

Serving with pride and confidence

12

General

- A victim focused approach is the standard - presumption that the victim should be believed.
- General requirement to record as soon as practicable or in any event within 24 hours – reasons for delay to be recorded.
- Recording what is reported – not necessarily what occurred !

'It is always better to know what might have happened, rather than not know what definitely did'.

Serving with pride and confidence

13

Myths !

- Victim does not support/want an investigation
- Offender under 10 years old
- Offender lacks mental capacity for '*mens rea*'
- Sexual activity between consenting U16 teenagers
- Lawful/reasonable chastisement of a child
- Sexting (IIOC) by consent between young people under 18

Serving with pride and confidence

14

This page is intentionally left blank

To: **Overview & Scrutiny Commission**
19 February 2020

Overview & Scrutiny Work Programme Progress **Statutory Scrutiny Officer**

1 Purpose of Report

- 1.1 This report updates the Overview & Scrutiny Commission on work programme progress, considers the impact of any emerging issues and proposed changes.

2 Recommendation

- 2.1 That the Commission considers any proposed changes to the four-year work programme.

3 Reasons for Recommendation

- 3.1 To make sure that the overview & scrutiny work programme remain fits for purpose. This includes the scope and timing for all scrutiny activities aligned to the Council Plan as well as responding to emerging and urgent short-term issues.

4 Alternative Options Considered

- 4.1 None.

5 Supporting Information

Work Programming

- 5.1 One of the Overview & Scrutiny Commission's key roles is to undertake focussed work programming in order to ensure that scrutiny activity contributes effectively to the Council Plan objectives. A four-year work programme was agreed on 5 November 2019 and is attached at Appendix A.
- 5.2 A Member, officer or member of the public can suggest a topic for inclusion in the work programme. A proforma has been developed by the overview & scrutiny team in consultation with the Commission chairman that aims to capture all the information the Commission would require to determine whether to agree items for the work programme and, if so, their priority. The team will support completion of the form. It is intended that the form will be available online.
- 5.3 The Commission may decide to amend the work programme to incorporate the new piece of work taking into account the impact on any other scrutiny work. Currently no new requests have been developed for consideration by the Commission.

Panel Activity Updates

- 5.4 The Panel Chairmen are required to report progress for each of their reviews at Commission meetings and to seek the Commission's agreement to make changes to the scope of the work and/or to the deadline for the final report to the Commission. In agreeing to any extensions for completion of the work, the Commission should take into account the impact on other scrutiny activity.
- 5.5 A progress report is attached at Appendix B which includes no amendment proposals.

7 Consultation and Other Considerations

Legal Advice

7.1 There are no legal implications arising from this report.

Financial Advice

7.2 There are no financial implications arising from this report.

Other Consultation Responses

7.3 These are included in this report.

Equalities Impact Assessment

7.4 Not required for this report.

Strategic Risk Management Issues

7.5 Effective scrutiny is important to the successful functioning of local democracy by securing the efficient delivery of Council services and driving improvements. A robust work programme is essential in order to ensure that overview and scrutiny activity contributes successfully to the work of the Council. Poor scrutiny can be indicative of wider governance, leadership and/or service failure.

Background Papers

None

Appendices

Appendix A – Current work programme as agreed 5 November 2019

Appendix B – Overview & Scrutiny Work Programme Progress report

Contact for further information

Kevin Gibbs, Statutory Scrutiny Officer

Kevin.gibbs@bracknell-forest.gov.uk

Ann Moore, Democratic & Registration Services - 01344 352260

Ann.moore@bracknell-forest.gov.uk

**Overview and Scrutiny Work programme:
Indicative scheduling November 2019 – April 2023
Updated 09.01.20**

Please note dates are subject to change depending on outside circumstances or the requirement to respond to emerging issues.

Due to commence in	Topic	Panel
Q4 2019 – 2020	Healthy eating, activity and exercise	Wellbeing and Finance
Q4 2019 – 2020	Care leavers	Education, Skills and Growth
Q4 2019 – 2020	Burials	Environment and Communities
Q4 2019 – 2020	County Lines	Education, Skills and Growth
Q4 2019 – 2020	Isolation and Loneliness	Wellbeing and Finance
Q1 2020 – 2021	Food Waste	Environment and Communities
Q2 2020 – 2021	SEND	Education, Skills and Growth
Q2 2020 – 2021	Digital Access	Wellbeing and Finance
Q3 2020 – 2021	Residential Parking	Environment and Communities
Q4 2020 – 2021	Apprentices	Education, Skills and Growth
Q1 2021 – 2022	Primary Care Networks	Wellbeing and Finance
Q1 2021 – 2022	Integrated Enforcement	Environment and Communities
Q2 2021 – 2022	CIL	Education, Skills and Growth
Q3 2021 – 2022	Housing Allocation Policy	Environment and Communities
Q3 2021 – 2022	Governors	Education, Skills and Growth

Q3 2021 – 2022	Mental Health	Wellbeing and Finance
Q4 2021 – 2022	Topic TBC	Environment and Communities
Q1 2022 – 23	Unsafe discharge	Wellbeing and Finance
Q1 2022 – 23	Topic TBC	Education, Skills and Growth
Q2 2022 – 23	Topic TBC	Environment and Communities
Q2 2022 – 23	Topic TBC	Wellbeing and Finance
Q3 2022 – 23	Evaluation of work programme	Wellbeing and Finance
Q3 2022 – 23	Evaluation of work programme	Education, Skills and Growth
Q3 2022 – 23	Evaluation of work programme	Environment and Communities

19 February 2020 Work Programme Updates

Overview and Scrutiny Commission	
Chairman's Remarks	
<p>Since the last O&S meeting on 9th January papers are being prepared for both the first Climate Change agenda item on 10th March. These will identify all the work completed by the authority, so far. Climate Change will be a frequent visitor to our agenda over the next few years. Also, arrangements are being put in place for Frimley Park Trust to visit the Commission, probably the 2nd April meeting.</p>	
Climate Change	
Due date of completion	10 March 2020 – discussion at O&S Commission
Dates of activity	10.03.20 3.30 – 6.30pm Climate Change Marketplace for Members and BFC employees 10.03.20 @ 7.30pm
Current RAG Rating	All activity is on track
Concerns/remedial work	None
Progress	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence pack in development • Arrangements for Climate Change Market Place underway and promotion of event initiated
Frimley Park Strategic Health	
Due date of completion	2 April 2020
Dates of activity	02.04.20 @ 7.30pm
Current RAG Rating	All activity is on track
Concerns/remedial work	None
Progress	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Representatives confirmed • Preparatory work underway to develop evidence pack and confirm methodology

Community and Environment Overview and Scrutiny Panel	
Chairman's Remarks	
<p>The first phase of the Burial review has been completed and the Panel will continue their work once the Executive have considered the recommendations. The Food Waste review is in the early stages of preparation co-ordinating with the launch of food waste collection across the borough.</p>	
Burial Options (2 phase review)	
Due date of completion	Phase 2 site use appraisal 13 October 2020 – report to Overview and Scrutiny Commission

Dates of activity	Phase 2 - TBC
Current RAG Rating	All activity is on track
Concerns/remedial work	The methodology has been developed based on a two-phase review: site options and site use appraisal.
Progress	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First phase completed and recommendation report attached • Second phase relating to site use appraisal on hold until the Executive has considered Phase 1 recommendations
Food Waste	
Due date of completion	13 October - report to Overview and Scrutiny Commission
Dates of activity	TBC
Current RAG Rating	All activity is on track
Concerns/remedial work	None
Progress	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Methodology for the review discussed with Chair and Vice Chair • Schedule for review (timescales) discussed

Education, Skills and Growth Overview & Scrutiny Panel

Chairman's Remarks

The Panel has one review underway and two more in early stages of preparation.

Care Leavers Review

Due date of completion	10 March - report to O&S Commission
Dates of activity	Completed
Current RAG Rating	All activity is on track
Concerns/remedial work	None
Progress	Review completed; report being drafted with recommendations.

County Lines Review

Due date of completion	9 July 2020 - report to O&S Commission
Dates of activity	13.05.20 @ 14.05.20 @
Current RAG Rating	All activity is on track
Concerns/remedial work	None as decision to do review over two days due to completing the review of Care Leavers in one day being too intense.
Progress	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Methodology for the review agreed • Schedule for review (timescales) and agenda for the two half days on May 13th and 14th agreed • Evidence pack being prepared • Visits and interviews being arranged • Key officers briefed • Members invited to take part (widen invitation to all members)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Social media to be used as part of review
SEND Review	
Due date of completion	6 Jan 2021 - report to O&S Commission
Dates of activity	TBC
Current RAG Rating	Not yet started
Concerns/remedial work	It is more important to consider the County Lines issues sooner than originally scheduled and it was therefore agreed to push this review back in the programme.
Progress	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preparatory work halted

Wellbeing and Finance Overview and Scrutiny Panel	
Chairman's Remarks	
The Panel has one review underway and one more in early stages of preparation.	
Healthy Eating	
Due date of completion	10 March 2020 - report to O&S Commission
Dates of activity	20.02.20 @ 9.30am
Current RAG Rating	All activity is on track
Concerns/remedial work	None
Progress	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence Pack has been circulated
Isolation and Loneliness	
Due date of completion	9 July - report to O&S Commission
Dates of activity	TBC
Current RAG Rating	All activity is on track
Concerns/remedial work	None
Progress	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Methodology for the review discussed and to be reviewed by the Panel Schedule for review timescales to be agreed Evidence pack being drafted

This page is intentionally left blank

Overview and Scrutiny Panel Recommendations Report

REVIEW TITLE	O&S PANEL	DATE
Burials review (Phase 1, review of site options)	Communities and Environment	14 January 2020

MEMBERS

Site visits:

Councillors John Porter (Chairman), Tina McKenzie-Boyle (Vice Chairman), Angell, Brossard, Ms Gaw, Mrs Ingham and Mrs Mattick

Meeting in the Council Chamber:

Councillors John Porter (Chairman), Tina McKenzie-Boyle (Vice Chairman), Angell, Brossard, Brown, Ms Gaw, Mrs Ingham and Mrs Mattick

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Executive continues to provide space for burials.
2. The exploration of two sites proceeds simultaneously noting that the Panel's preferred option is the pitch and putt site at Downshire Golf Club.
Their second preference is the driving range at Downshire Golf Club.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Continuation of provision of burial space.

The Panel wanted to ensure that there is still a choice for burials within Bracknell Forest.

2. Pitch and putt at Downshire Golf Club

- This facility is used less than the driving range.
- It is a large enough plot (2/3 hectares) to provide approximately 25 years worth of burial space.
- It backs on to Easthampstead Crematorium and Cemetery allowing access from the current burial ground.
- There are no Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) in effect.
- There is less financial impact on Everyone Active if this site is developed than the driving range.

3. Driving range at Downshire Golf Club

- This site is a large enough plot (2/3 hectares) to provide approximately 25 years worth of burial space.
- The trees at the side are adjacent to Easthampstead Crematorium and Cemetery allowing access from current burial ground.
- There are no Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) in effect.
- There is more financial impact on Everyone Active if this site is developed than the pitch and putt.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

Bungalow

- Whilst it was close to Easthampstead Crematorium & Cemetery it would only afford approximately six years of space as only 0.3 hectares was available.
- The land behind the bungalow was heavily wooded and would require clearing.
- The sale of the property was likely to afford a better income for the Borough than use as a cemetery.

Beaufort Park land adjacent to Easthampstead Crematorium & Cemetery

- Up to 10 hectares could be purchased which would allow for burials for many years to come. However, Bracknell Forest Council did not own the land and it would cost £2.67m per hectare, which was deemed too expensive.
- It was also noted 68 houses had received approval to be built on part of the land already.

Football pitches

- The site was good as it was directly opposite Easthampstead Crematorium & Cemetery.
- The Panel did not want to change the use.
- Concern was expressed about removing green space available to residents.
- Sport England were unlikely to approve change of use of the site.

RESPONSE FROM THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMISSION

The Overview and Scrutiny Commission has not met within the required timescales, to endorse the Panel's recommendations to the Executive. The recommendations of the review were shared with the members of the Overview and Scrutiny Commission in advance of the Executive decision to seek their views and were approved.

BACKGROUND

On 5 November 2019 the O&S Commission commissioned a scrutiny review to scrutinise the burial and funeral choices within Bracknell Forest to ensure that residents' future needs are met. It was agreed that there would be two phases to the review depending on the decision taken by the Executive on 10 March 2020.

The Panel's initial piece of work, via a one day meeting review on 14 January 2020 was an options appraisal of the likely sites where additional interment space could be created supporting the investigation work that Officers are undertaking. The Panel's recommendations will be presented to the Executive as part of the officer report, and will be taken into consideration as part of the decision-making process on which site, if any, the council should invest in.

If the Executive decision on 10 March 2020 is that additional burial space within the Borough is to be provided, the Panel intends holding a second phase of the review to recommend how this new allocation is to be used, at what cost, how that matches in with the other services provided at Easthampstead Park Cemetery & Crematorium and that it ensures residents' needs are met for at least the next 25 years.

At the Panel meeting on 14 January 2020, it was agreed that the following recommendation would be carried over to a second phase of the review if it was commissioned.

Engagement should be undertaken with local funeral directors who use Bracknell Forest Council Cemetery and Crematorium facilities to find out what types of burial are requested by their customers.

WORK PROGRAMME PROPOSAL

Review Title	Burial Choices
Why are you asking for scrutiny's input? (optional)	There is a wider variety, and greater freedoms, for funeral and burial choices than ever before. With the lack of current provision within BFC, an options appraisal of how to now meet this need is required. As clients move away from the traditional options, ensuring that any new provision is future proofed to meeting these changing client requirements, but within the resources that the council has available, needs to be investigated and options brought forward.
Scope <i>(What exactly needs to be looked at?)</i>	<p>- Review the current client requirements for funeral and burial.</p> <p>'- Produce projections to determine client needs over the next 20 years.</p> <p>'- Assess how to meet projected needs to include guidance and direction for the council for Investment options, given the council's limited financial resources and access to suitable burial locations within the borough.</p> <p>The options to review are: Traditional funeral, Cremation, Green and woodland funerals, Humanist and civic funerals, any others (new and emerging options).</p>
What is to be achieved?	Advice to the Executive on what options to invest into and recommendations on how to ensure that BFC continues to provide an excellent service, within the resources the council has available.
Council theme <i>(Select one option from drop down list)</i>	Communities
Decision maker <i>(Select one option from drop down list)</i>	Executive
Time Constraints	There is no specific time constraint on this review. An Executive decision will be taken before Christmas 2019. Scrutiny input will be required from early to mid 2020.
Portfolio holder <i>(Select one option from drop down list)</i>	Councillor Harrison, Executive Member for Culture, Delivery and Public Protection
Directorate <i>(Select one option from drop down list)</i>	Delivery
Which team is affected?	Cemetery & Crematorium
Delivery method <i>(select one option from drop down list)</i>	Mixture of Spotlight Sessions, benchmarking and site visits/observations
Are there any costs associated with completing this review?	None identified

This page is intentionally left blank