

## **SAFER POLICY AND PERFORMANCE BOARD**

*At a meeting of the Safer Policy and Performance Board on Tuesday, 16 November 2010 at the Council Box, Halton Stadium*

Present: Councillors Osborne (Chairman), Wallace (Vice-Chairman), M. Bradshaw, J. Gerrard, Shepherd, Thompson and Mr Hodson

Apologies for Absence: Councillor Edge, M Lloyd Jones, Morley and M. Ratcliffe

Absence declared on Council business: None

Officers present: H. Cockcroft, A. Villiers, S. Semoff, M. Andrews, S Burrows and G. Ferguson

Also in attendance: In accordance with SO33 Councillor D. Cargill and also C Walsh PCT, C Irving Our Life, and J Pride HSE.

### **ITEM DEALT WITH UNDER DUTIES EXERCISABLE BY THE BOARD**

	<i>Action</i>
SAF22 MINUTES	
The Minutes of the meeting held on 21 <sup>st</sup> September 2010 were taken as read and signed as a correct record.	
SAF23 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME	
The Board was advised that no public questions have been received.	
SAF24 SSP MINUTES	
The minutes from the last Safer Halton Partnership (SHP) Meeting held on the 7 September 2010 were presented to the Board for information.	
Arising from the discussion it was agreed that the report on Minute No SHP16 would be circulated to Members of the Board.	
RESOLVED: That the minutes be noted.	

## SAF25 PRESENTATION: OUR LIFE

The Board received a presentation from Callum Irving, a representative from 'Our Life' who outlined their work in the area to reduce alcohol consumption. Our Life was a social enterprise established by NHS North West to give local people an opportunity to get involved in tackling health inequalities and to campaign for better wellbeing and health in the region. They have also recently researched the super cheap alcohol sales in the North West and the North West opinion on the Code of Practice for Alcohol Retailers.

Members noted that:

- Halton was 8<sup>th</sup> highest Local Authority area for alcohol harm;
- Halton was 9<sup>th</sup> highest out of 20 PCT's for hospital admissions due to alcohol harm; and
- Public attitudes towards alcohol included: 80% were aware of low alcohol pricing, 45% avoided town centres in the evening, 71% were concerned about drunken behaviour of others.

The presentation outlined the results of a recent study by Sheffield University into minimum alcohol pricing policy and its anticipated impact such as reductions in harmful drinkers, fewer alcohol related deaths, fewer violent crimes and budget savings.

It was also noted that at present the prospects for national legislation were poor and local bylaws appeared to be the driver for introducing minimum alcohol pricing regionally. Members were advised that currently it was important to keep discussions on minimum alcohol pricing ongoing locally, to build momentum, to join up with adjacent local authorities and to obtain the support of local MP's.

RESOLVED: That

1. on behalf of the Board the Chairman write to the two local Members of Parliament to ask them both to support a minimum rate of £0.50 per unit on alcohol;
2. the Executive Board be requested to consider making a supporting statement on a minimum price for alcohol;
3. discussions take place with adjacent local

authority organisations such as AGMA, Cheshire and Merseyside; and

4. the Executive Board be requested to consider supporting a bylaw for a minimum price rate for alcohol.

#### SAF26 PRESENTATION: HEALTH & SAFETY EXECUTIVE

The Board received a presentation from John Pride, North West Partnership Manager for the Health and Safety Executive (HSE's), which provided an update on the HSE's work in the borough. Members were advised on:

- divisional structure of the HSE and how the service was regulated;
- HSE's role in regulating businesses in the borough and the two current key areas of focus (LPG and Asbestos); and
- how health and safety activities were split between the HSE and Local Authorities and examples of joined up working.

On behalf of the Board the Chairman thanked Mr Pride for his detailed presentation.

RESOLVED: That the presentation be received.

#### SAF27 PRIVATE LANDLORD POWERS TO TACKLE ANTI SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR

The Board considered a report on responsibilities of private landlords to tackle anti social behaviour in their properties. As a general rule landlords were not responsible for the actions of their tenants as long as they had not authorised the anti-social behaviour. Despite having the power to seek a court order when tenants exhibit anti-social behaviour, private landlords were free to decide whether or not to take action against their tenants.

It was noted that the question of liability had been considered in a number of cases and it was established that no claim could be sustained in nuisance where the nuisance was caused by an extraordinary use of the premises concerned, for example tenants being noisy or using drugs on the premises. The report outlined several examples of case law involving private landlords.

Members were advised that the main way in which private landlords could control the behaviour of their tenants

was through the terms and conditions of the tenancy agreement. Terms could be inserted into tenancy agreements to impose standards of behaviour for tenants and to prohibit unacceptable behaviour. In the event of a breach the landlord would be entitled to seek possession of the property or seek an injunction to prevent any further breach. Most landlords included in their tenancy agreements a general clause to prohibit nuisance behaviour; others included specific terms covering pets, violence and offensive language.

The report also contained details on the remedies for anti social behaviour in properties which were available to private landlords and neighbours, local authorities' powers, Anti Social Behaviour Orders, Injunctions and Anti Social Behaviour Closure Orders.

RESOLVED: That

1. the report be noted; and
2. the topic group set up by the Board to consider Private Landlords be requested to progress an action plan for anti social behaviour in private tenancies and a Private Landlords tenancy pack.

## SAF28 DRAFT HATE CRIME STRATEGY

The Board considered a copy of the draft Hate Crime Strategy and action plan developed by the Safer Halton Partnership. The Partnership was required to produce a hate crime action plan by December 2010, as set out in the Cross Government Hate Crime Action Plan. It was noted that an action plan for Halton was still being developed and a partnership "Equalities Event" would be held on 29<sup>th</sup> November, at which partners would be asked to help identify actions to address a reduction in Hate Crime across Halton. Arising from the discussion Members of the Board were invited to attend the Equalities Event, details would be circulated.

Members were advised the Safer Halton Partnership used the Home Office/Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) definition of hate crimes and hate incidents.

Members noted that the strategy aimed to address the following areas of hate crimes and incidents:

- Race hate – crimes/incidents motivated by ethnic origin, nationality, asylum seeker status.
- Faith hate – crimes/incidents motivated by

- religious belief or lack of religious belief.
- Homophobic hate– crimes/incidents motivated by sexual orientation.
  - Transphobic hate– crimes/incidents motivated by gender identity.
  - Disability related hate– crimes/incidents motivated by disability or ability, including learning difficulties.

RESOLVED: That the Hate Crime Strategy be noted.

*Meeting ended at 8.10 p.m.*