

**Please ask for:** J. Hunt  
**Extension No.:** 4623  
**Email:** [joannahunt@cannockchasedc.gov.uk](mailto:joannahunt@cannockchasedc.gov.uk)

19 March 2025

Dear Councillor,

**Health, Wellbeing, & The Community Scrutiny Committee**

**6:00pm, Monday 31 March 2025**

**Esperance Room, Civic Centre, Cannock**

You are invited to attend this meeting for consideration of the matters itemised in the following Agenda.

Yours sincerely,



**T. Clegg**  
**Chief Executive**

To: Councillors:

Prestwood, F. (Chair)  
Dunnett, M. (Vice-Chair)

Bancroft, J.	Fisher, P.
Boulton, C.	Jones, V.
Cartwright, S.	Page, H.
Craddock, R.	Samuels, G.
Elson, J.	

Staffordshire County Council Appointee for the purposes of the Committee's Statutory Functions under the National Health Service Act 2006:

- County Councillor P. Hewitt

Independent Co-opted Representative:

- Healthwatch Staffordshire

# Agenda

## Part 1

### 1. Apologies

### 2. Declarations of Interests of Members in Contracts and Other Matters and Restriction on Voting by Members

- (i) To declare any interests in accordance with the Code of Conduct and any possible contraventions under Section 106 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992.
- (ii) To receive any Party Whip declarations.

### 3. Minutes

To approve the Minutes of the meeting held on 16 December 2024 (enclosed).

### 4. Statutory Health Scrutiny Items

#### (i) Staffordshire County Council's Health and Care and Overview Scrutiny Committee

Please refer to Staffordshire County Council's [website](#) for details of all recently held meetings of the Health and Care Overview & Scrutiny Committee. Alternatively, the Chair may provide verbal updates on any recent meetings attended.

### 5. Quarter 3 2024-25 PDP Progress Report - Health, Wellbeing and the Community

To receive the Quarter 3 2024-25 PDP Progress Report - Health, Wellbeing and the Community (Item 5.1 - 5.15).

### 6. Recommendations from the Review of the Anti-Social Behaviour Policy Working Group

Report of the Head of Wellbeing (Item 6.1 - 6.31 - including notes of the meetings of the Working Group and Updated ASB Policy).

**Cannock Chase Council**  
**Minutes of the Meeting of the**  
**Health, Wellbeing and The Community Scrutiny Committee**

**Held on Monday 16 December at 6:00 p.m.**

**Esperance Room, Civic Centre, Cannock**

**Part 1**

**Present:** Councillors:

Prestwood, F. (Chair)  
Dunnett, M. (Vice-Chair)  
Bancroft, J.      Fisher, P.  
Boulton, C.      Jones, V.  
Cartwright, S.    Samuels, G.  
Craddock, R.

Also present: County Councillor P. Hewitt, Staffordshire County Council.

**14. Apologies**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor H. Page and J. Elson.

**15. Declarations of Interests of Members in Contracts and Other Matters and Restrictions on Voting by Members and Party Whip Declarations**

No declarations of interests in additions to those already confirmed by Members in the Register of Members Interests were made.

**16. Minutes**

**Resolved:**

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 15 October 2024 be approved.

**17. Statutory Health Scrutiny Items**

**Update - Staffordshire County Council's Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee.**

The Chair reported on the meeting he had attended on 2 December and provided Members with a brief update of what had been discussed. Items discussed at the meeting included the Walley's Quarry Community Impact Study, Integrated Care Hubs and the Staffordshire's All Age Carers Strategy 2024-2029 Action Plan.

The Chair also reported that following the last meeting, an invite had been extended to Peter Axon, the Chief Executive of the Integrated Care Board/Integrated Care Partnership to attend a future meeting to discuss the situation with the Minor Injuries Unit located at Cannock Chase Hospital. Members would be kept informed of progress.

## 18. **Quarter 2 2024-25 PDP Progress report - Health, Wellbeing and the Community**

Consideration was given to the Quarter 2 2024-25 PDP Progress report - Health, Wellbeing and the Community (Item 5.1 - 5.16 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Chair asked Members if they had any questions on the performance information. Questions were asked on the following areas:

### ***Item No. 5.4 - Annual report from Inspiring Healthy Lifestyles setting out Performance of all facilities***

A Member queried why there was no target available for the year end 24/35. The Head of Wellbeing responded and advised that although IHL had previously provided data, as there was no context, it was not easy to understand the information provided. Therefore, the Leadership Team had agreed that an annual report should be produced which would pull all the data together. Quarterly data was still available however this would need to be presented in a better way for the Committee. She suggested that the 24/25 report would be complete by summer and progressed for the September meeting.

In response to a further question from a Member, the Head of Wellbeing referred to the contract and how it related to the end of year report and advised that the data that came out of the review would form part of the annual report.

### ***Item No. 5.10 - % Environmental Protection Act permitted processes inspected in line with risk rating***

In response to a general Member question around the indicator, the Head of Regulatory Services discussed environmental contracts with Members and suggested that the target should be met by the end of the financial year.

### ***Item 5.10 - % households had a positive outcome and secured accommodation for 6 plus months***

A Member was keen to seek some clarification and explanation around the annual target. The Head of Wellbeing provided information around the target and explained the position with regard to people who presented as homeless. She also discussed the implementation of a new I.T. system and the speed it could produce information compared to the current system. She was hopeful that for next year information could be produced on a quarterly basis.

### ***Item No. 5.14 - Housing Applications Processed within 28 days***

In response to a Member question, the Head of Housing and Corporate Assets reported on the current position regarding sickness and an increase in applications. She advised that the target should be achieved by the year end.

### ***Item No. 5.15 - No of tenants awaiting disabled facilities work***

In response to a Member question concerning the target, the Head of Housing and Corporate Assets reported that the information was based on Council tenants who had received home adaptations. She reported that the Council was seeing a high number of requests coming through of people wanting to remain in their own homes, and this was largely due to the population living longer. She reported that residents would be asked to complete a survey around what they think their needs would be in the next 5 years.

Members noted the Quarter 2 2024-25 PDP Progress report.

## 19. Streetscene and Natural Environment Update

A presentation was given by the Natural Environment Manager and the Streetscene Manager.

The first slide was shown that provided an overview of the Operations Shared Service Structure together with a slide that detailed the roles of each person.

Information was then shown about the Streetscene service with some of the priority areas including the next steps for shared services, fleet review, parks capital investment programme and street cleansing and grounds maintenance.

A Member referred to the presentation and the sharing of the vehicle used for road sweeping. She suggested that there may be an issue if the local area required more frequent sweeping, but the vehicle was being loaned to Stafford Borough. The Head of Operations responded and advised that the current CCDC driver was not available to use the vehicle, therefore it was better that the vehicle was used and not sitting still given that the Council were paying a contract on it. He also advised that that both Council's had a reciprocal arrangement.

In response to a Member question regarding a replacement fund, the Streetscene Manager advised that both Council's had separate funds as Cannock finances were managed differently. The Head of Operations reported that both Council's used capital funding for the purchase of vehicles, although Stafford Borough had a slightly larger reserve. He reported that borrowing would be reviewed with how the funding could be better spent for the year, and Service Managers would be responsible for distribution of this.

Further slides were shown which provided information around shared services and included a bullet point around building resilience across both local authorities for the front-line delivery services. The fleet review was discussed, and it was reported that there were several vehicles and road going plant machinery that were either past or close to the end of their lifespan, other bullet points were discussed.

A presentation slide was shown that provided information about the park's capital investment programme. This included current working on an ongoing 4-year capital investment programme for the parks and play areas, in the New Year there would be a review of the programme and what the capital investment programme would be for the next couple of years. The street cleansing and grounds maintenance slide was discussed, and it was reported that there was an opportunity to bring the services closer together, to ensure the Council were working in the most effective and mutually beneficial way.

Members then discussed in detail the culture around people littering and street cleansing.

Information was then shown about the Natural Environment that included the countryside service. Several bullet points were shown that included information on CCDC-Devalles Farm-Workshop, cattle crush, training center and offices. 7 FTEs, 300Ha of land managed, 9 yr HLS agreement, SBC 1 Officer under Planning-Land to be classified and Issues around CCDC - 3 Vacancies and aging fleet.

A further slide was then shown that provided information on biodiversity net gain and the key components of mandatory biodiversity net gain. Information was also shown that included the nature recovery network and Arboricultural Management. This included the number of tree officers for Cannock and Stafford, the size the urban forest covered and the numbers of tree preservation orders and conservation areas.

*(6.50pm Councillor J. Bancroft left the room, he returned at 6.50pm).*

A Member referred to the number of vacancies for Tree Officers and was keen to know the reasons. The Natural Environment Manager advised that one Tree Officer had left CCDC this year, however there would be a review of the structure taking place at some point.

In response to a Member question concerning developers, the Natural Environment Manager responded and advised that it was a mandatory requirement for developers to have a minimum 10% biodiversity gain. He also advised that as a District, each development would be required to be a net gain.

A Member asked about large areas and if the net gain also applied to those. The Natural Environment Manager reported that from next year, all large schemes and all developments would need to consider this. He then talked about open spaces that could be improved. He gave an example of a local cemetery in Cannock where the dingy skipper moth was discovered, and part of the cemetery had been improved to retain and enhance that habitat.

Further slides were shown that gave information on the risks associated with trees, and some bullet points around transformation. The bullet points included unifying the service under one management line and re-structuring and introduction of online access to the public for tree management and TPOs.

Slides were then shown about cemeteries and crematorium and included bullet points around headstone testing done in-house and families contacted if necessary and also headstone externally surveyed and repaired at Stafford Borough Council cost. Cemeteries and crematorium issues included investigating sites for potential sub depots to reduce travel time and a need to standardize maintenance and build up work programs to allow burials and maintenance schedules.

Members thanked the Natural Environment Manager and the Streetscene Manager for the presentation.

## **20. Review of the Work Programme - 2024/25**

The Head of Wellbeing reported that the Working Group had met in December where discussion and further comments had been received on the draft Anti-Social Behaviour Policy. The Community Safety and Partnerships Manager would collate all comments and present a draft final version of the Policy to Members on the Working Group at the next meeting scheduled for 24 February 2025. If Members agree the draft final version, this would then be presented to the next Scrutiny Committee meeting on 31 March 2025. If agreed by Members on the Committee, any recommendations would then be presented to Cabinet.

The meeting closed at 7:10pm





---

**Chair**

## Priority Delivery Plan for 2024-25

## Priority 2 - Health &amp; Wellbeing

## Summary of Progress as at end of Quarter 3

Quarter					Total Number of Projects
	Action completed	Work on target	Work < 3 months behind schedule	Work > 3 months behind schedule	
1&2	3				3
3	2				2
4					2
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>5 (100%)</b>				<b>5 to Q3</b>

**Summary of Successes as at Quarter 3**

All of the actions due up to the end of Quarter 3 have been completed. The review of the leisure, culture and heritage offer has been completed and proposals to close the theatre and museum have been included in the General Fund Revenue Budget and Capital Programme 2025-28 report which is to be considered by Council on 12 February 2025. The Council is however working with interested parties to explore whether it is feasible for them to take on the running of these facilities. A consultation exercise has been undertaken as part of this process to inform the future culture and heritage service offer; the results of this are included in the budget report.

**Summary of Slippage as at Quarter 3**

None - all actions completed

## Priority 2 - Health &amp; Wellbeing

Project	Actions and Milestones	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Progress Update	Symbol
<b>Review of the Leisure, Culture and Heritage Contract</b>	Commission strategic support to review the leisure, culture and heritage offer in Cannock Chase		X			Strategic support in place and review of current service completed.	★
	Commission technical support to carry out stock condition surveys of CCDC leisure, culture and heritage buildings		X			The stock condition surveys have been completed.	★
	Preparation of report setting out options			X		A report setting out the findings and conclusions of the review was presented to Cabinet on 28 November 2024. A final decision on the proposals will be taken at Council on 12 February 2025.	★
	Decision on Cannock Chase leisure, culture and heritage provision and scope of future commissioned service				X		
<b>Design and Deliver Cannock Chase District's approach to Health</b>	Complete delivery of health inequalities funded projects		X			All funded projects successfully completed.	★
	Evaluation of health inequalities funded projects to inform future activity			X		Evaluation of health inequalities funded projects completed	★
	Extend the scope of the Cannock Community Safety Partnership to ensure health and wellbeing are fully integrated.				X		



## KPIs for Priority 2 - Health and Wellbeing





Symbol	Description	Qtr 2	Qtr 3	Qtr 4	End of Year
	Performance exceeds target				
	Performance on target				
	Performance < 5% below target				
	Performance > 5% below target				
N/A	Reported Annually / Not Applicable				1
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>

Indicator	Year End 23/24	Target 24/25	Qtr 1	Qtr 2	Qtr 3	Qtr 4	Year End 24/25	Rating Symbol	Comments
<b>Leisure</b>									
Annual report from Inspiring Healthy Lifestyles setting out the performance of all facilities, including comparison to previous years as well as narrative on the wider wellbeing work and events they facilitate.		N/A						N/A	Annual report to be produced

## Priority Delivery Plan for 2024-25

## Priority 3 - The Community

## Summary of Progress as at end of Quarter 3

Quarter					N/A	Total Number of Projects
	Action completed	Work on target	Work < 3 months behind schedule	Work > 3 months behind schedule	Not Applicable	
1&2	1					1
3	1	3			1	5
4						7
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2 (33%)</b>	<b>3 (50%)</b>			<b>1 (17%)</b>	<b>6 to Q3</b>

## Summary of Successes as at Quarter 3

The waste collection service has been reviewed in line with the results of the recently published (Summer 2024) final version of the Resources and Waste Strategy 2018. With the exception of the new national statutory requirement for weekly food waste collections, the changes required to the current collection service / materials are relatively minor and will be completed as part of the normal contracting process / negotiations, and as such are considered as little more than 'business as usual'. Councils across England are still awaiting details of the new burdens' 'revenue' funding for the introduction of the new food waste service but it has been made clear that all Councils are expected to begin collections from April 2026 regardless of the funding.

The play area investment programme has been reviewed and updated by officers. The updated play area improvement programme will be reported to Cabinet during Q4. A small number of play areas have been identified that given their proximity to other parks may be suitable for rationalisation, subject to consultation. A report will be taken to Cabinet during Q4.

## Summary of Slippage as at Quarter 3


None

## Priority 3 - The Community

Project	Actions and Milestones	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Progress Update	Symbol
<b>Place based housing strategy</b>	Prepare documents to commission Cannock Place Based Housing Strategy			X		Draft documents have been prepared in order to commission a housing strategy	★
	Start procurement of the Cannock Place Based Housing Strategy				X		
<b>Waste &amp; Recycling - Kerbside collection contract (2025-2032)</b>	Complete procurement process and award contract		X			Procurement and award of 7+6-year kerbside waste and recycling collection contract completed during September 2024	★
	Complete preparation for mobilisation of new waste and recycling contract				X		
<b>Waste &amp; Recycling - Introduction of mandatory food waste kerbside collections</b> [* denotes action subject to confirmation of government funding settlement]	Design of new service model and discussions with contractor			X		Cabinet briefing has been prepared, to be delivered at the start of Q4 on the proposed new service provision and operation and discussions ongoing with the incumbent contractor	✓
	Consider and action revenue settlement offered by Government			X*		Still awaiting revenue settlement from Government	N/A
	Cabinet approval for new service, start date, and permission to spend				X*		
	Prepare to tender for the procurement of food waste caddies				X*		




Project	Actions and Milestones	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Progress Update	Symbol
<b>Tree Management</b>	Review current services & establish requirements (including Tree Protection Orders)				X		
<b>Play Area / Parks Improvements</b>	Review and update current play area investment programme			X		Play area investment programme has been reviewed and updated. The updated play area improvement programme will be reported to Cabinet during Q4.	✓
	Create potential rationalisation lists			X		A small number of play areas have been identified that given their proximity to other parks may be suitable for rationalisation, subject to consultation. Report going to Cabinet during Q4.	✓
	Consult on potential rationalisation lists				X		
	Report to Cabinet on recommended rationalisations				X		

### KPIs for Priority 3 - The Community

Symbol	Description	Qtr 2	Qtr 3	Qtr 4	End of Year
	Performance exceeds target	3	4		
	Performance on target	2	0		
	Performance < 5% below target	3	3		
	Performance > 5% below target	2	2		
N/A	Reported Annually / Not Applicable	5	6		
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>		

Indicator	Year End 23/24	Target 24/25	Qtr 1	Qtr 2	Qtr 3	Qtr 4	Year End 24/25	Rating Symbol	Comments
<b>Operations - Waste &amp; Recycling</b>									
% collections completed first time	NEW	99.90%	99.98%	99.97%	99.97%			★	
Number of missed bin collections (including assisted) / 100,000	NEW	<40 per 100,000	19 per 100,000	23 per 100,000	25 per 100,000			★	897,000 collections/qtr.
% Household waste sent for re-use, recycling and composting	40.45%	45%	43.22%	36.77%	34.49%			✘	Reduction in the main is due to expected decrease in garden waste collections, seen elsewhere initially when the service has become chargeable.
Amount of residual waste collected per household (Kgs)	482.58 kg	<480 kg or 120 kgs / qtr. (equivalent)	115.79 kg	129.23 kg	121.18 kg			▲	Q3 figure is just below (1.18kg) the quarter target but shows a reduction of 8.05kg on Q2.
<b>Environmental Health</b>									
% of food businesses inspected	100%	100%	30%	59%	88%			★	
% of food businesses inspected which are broadly compliant (rating of 3 or better)	97.5%	N/A	97%	97%	98%			N/A	This is a measure, not target

Item No. 5.10

Indicator	Year End 23/24	Target 24/25	Qtr 1	Qtr 2	Qtr 3	Qtr 4	Year End 24/25	Rating Symbol	Comments
% of service requests responded to within target (all service areas)	NEW	95%	88%	90%	94%				very low number of responses out of target
% Environmental Protection Act permitted processes inspected in line with risk rating	NEW	100%						N/A Annual Target	
% Taxi / PHV fleet inspected	NEW	90%	25%	41%	57%				Shortfall to be recovered in Q4
% Taxi / PHV fleet compliant	NEW	90%	97%	93.5%	94%			N/A	Measure not a target (as for food hygiene compliance)
<b>Housing Assistance</b>									
No of DFGs completed		80	26	14	19				Quarterly Targets: 20, 20, 20, 20 And annual report with wider data. Performance is just 1 below target for the quarter and year to date
<b>Strategic Housing &amp; Homelessness</b>									
% households had a positive outcome and secured accommodation for 6 + months		41%						N/A	Annual Target



Indicator	Year End 23/24	Target 24/25	Qtr 1	Qtr 2	Qtr 3	Qtr 4	Year End 24/25	Rating Symbol	Comments
<b>Community Safety &amp; Partnerships</b>									
Number of residents/cases dealt with by the CAB	New	N/A	814	792	782			N/A	Measure / contextual information only
Total value of financial outcomes achieved as a result of the CAB contract	New	Measure only	£1,342,740	£941,705	£1,047,952			N/A	
Community Safety Partnership Hub referrals and case closures within 3 months	New	90% closed within 3 months	27 referrals 96% closed	26 referrals 92% closed	31 referrals 100% closed			★	

### KPIs for Priority 3 - The Community (Housing)

Symbol	Description	Qtr 2	Qtr 3	Qtr 4	End of Year
★	Performance exceeds target	1	3		
✓	Performance on target	11	12		
▲	Performance < 5% below target	2	1		
✘	Performance > 5% below target	3	1		
N/A	Reported Annually / Not Applicable	7	7		
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>24</b>		

Indicator	Year End 23/24	Target 24/25	Qtr 1	Qtr 2	Qtr 3	Qtr 4	Year End 24/25	Rating Symbol	Comments
<b>Housing Repairs</b>									
% emergency repairs completed in time	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%			✓	
% of non-emergency repairs completed in time	82%	65%	68.40%	69.96%	73.07%			★	Q1 and Q2 figures revised.
<b>Building Safety/Decency</b>									
% of properties with a valid annual landlord Gas Safety Record	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%			✓	
% of properties with a valid Electrical Certificate (within 5 years)	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%			✓	
% of passenger lifts that have a valid 6 monthly thorough examination record	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%			✓	
% of buildings that have a current Legionella risk assessment	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%			✓	
% of buildings that have a current Fire risk assessment	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%			✓	
Proportion of homes for which all required asbestos management surveys or re-inspections have been carried out.	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%			✓	
Proportion of homes that do not meet the Decent Homes Standard at year end.	0.28%	0%						N/A	Annual Figure will be reported

Indicator	Year End 23/24	Target 24/25	Qtr 1	Qtr 2	Qtr 3	Qtr 4	Year End 24/25	Rating Symbol	Comments
<b>Tenancy Management</b>									
Housing Applications Processed within 28 days	57%	95%	84%	43%	95%			✓	
% of Mutual Exchange applications determined (approved or refused) within 42 days	65%	100%	89%	-	100%			✓	
% of dwellings that are vacant and available for let (at period end)	0.58%	N/A	0.99%	0.60%	0.64%			N/A	Measure only
Average re-let time for Voids	42.50	50	62.24	63.39	53.06			▲	Improvement in Q3, but still above target. Improvement work still ongoing.
No. of tenants benefiting from disabled facilities work (major and minor)	170	100	58	80	51			★	189 cumulative for Q3 compared to annual target of 100
No of tenants awaiting disabled facilities work (registered and work approved (major and minor))	90	62	71	62	83			✗	Improvement expected in Q4 to get closer to target number awaiting work at year end.
Rent collected as proportion of rent due	100.20%	100%	99.31%	99.96%	99.76%			✓	
% of Former Tenant Arrears (FTA) collected as a proportion of total FTA	5.78%	6%	1.71%	4.10%	6.86%			★	Target is 1.5% per quarter.

Indicator	Year End 23/24	Target 24/25	Qtr 1	Qtr 2	Qtr 3	Qtr 4	Year End 24/25	Rating Symbol	Comments
Number of ASB cases opened per 1,000 homes by or on behalf of the registered provider during the reporting year	9.94	N/A	0.99	5.17	2.99			N/A	Measure only
Number of ASB cases which involve hate incidents.	0.79	N/A	0.00	0.60	0.60			N/A	Measure only
<b>Housing Complaints</b>									
Stage one complaints received per 1,000 homes during the reporting year.	7.15	N/A	2.59	2.19	1.99			N/A	Measure only
Proportion of Stage one complaints responded to within 10 days	83.33%	95%	92.31%	90.91%	100%			✓	
Stage two complaints received per 1,000 homes during the reporting year.	1.39	N/A	0.80	0.20	0.20			N/A	Measure only
Proportion of Stage two complaints responded to within 20 days	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%			✓	
No. of escalations to the Ombudsman (LGO or Housing Ombudsman)	1	N/A	1	1	1			N/A	Measure only. Two of these have subsequently been determined as not to be investigated by the Ombudsman, due to lack of evidence of fault.

## Updated Corporate Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB) Policy

**Committee:** Health, Wellbeing and The Community Scrutiny Committee

**Date of Meeting:** 31 March 2025

**Report of:** Head of Wellbeing

---

### **1 Purpose of Report**

- 1.1 To update the Health, Wellbeing and The Community Scrutiny Committee on the proposed updated Corporate ASB Policy for Cannock Chase Council (the policy).
- 1.2 To seek Committee approval for the new policy, following a review process through a Scrutiny Committee Working Group.

### **2 Recommendations**

- 2.1 That Committee note the content of the policy and recommend its approval at Cabinet.

#### **Reasons for Recommendations**

- 2.2 Cannock Chase Council has a statutory duty under the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 to work with authorities to prevent and reduce crime, disorder and re-offending.
- 2.3 Cannock Chase Council also has a statutory duty to investigate reports and complaints of ASB under the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014.

### **3 Key Issues**

- 3.1 In addition to our statutory responsibilities, if left unchallenged, ASB can have a significant negative impact upon the lives of our communities - including those who live, work, visit and invest in our district. It can also be a precursor to more serious crime. It is our belief that no-one should have to suffer ASB.

### **4 Relationship to Corporate Priorities**

- 4.1 This report supports the Council's Corporate Priorities as follows:

**Health and Wellbeing** - by helping to ensure the most vulnerable people in our district are safeguarded.

**The Community** - by assisting in ensuring our neighbourhoods are safe.

## 5 Report Detail

5.1 On the 2 July 2024, the Health, Wellbeing and The Community Scrutiny Committee discussed the work programme for the forthcoming year. The Committee agreed that one area for review would be the Corporate ASB Policy for Cannock Chase Council. It was agreed to form a Working Group to discuss and progress this piece.

5.2 The 'Review of the ASB Policy Working Group' was then established and included the following Councillors who all wished to contribute to the scrutiny review:

- Councillor F. Prestwood (Chair)
- Councillor A. Dunnett
- Councillor S. Cartwright
- Councillor G. Samuels
- Councillor V. Jones
- Councillor R. Craddock
- Councillor H. Page

5.3 Prior to initial discussions, it was noted that the current policy did not expire until November 2025, however it no longer aligned to the Corporate Plan, and enforcement responsibilities within the policy were no longer accurate. It was also felt that the current policy lacked the level of clarity required.

5.4 Officers and members worked collaboratively to craft and shape a new policy, which sets out Cannock Chase Council's commitment to tackling ASB and improving the quality of life for residents and visitors by:

- Placing victims and witnesses at the core of our procedures;
- Ensuring that all reports of ASB are treated seriously and dealt with professionally;
- Making effective and appropriate use of the tools and powers available to us, to allow ASB to be addressed firmly, fairly and proportionately;
- Co-ordinating joint working with partner agencies to deliver the most effective service;
- Raising awareness of what constitutes ASB and empowering our communities, and;
- Publicising and promoting support and diversionary services.

**5.5 The new policy:**

- Supports Cannock Chase Council's Corporate Plan, in particular the priority to "ensure Cannock Chase is a place that residents are proud to call home";
- Clarifies definitions and subcategories of ASB;
- Provides enhanced clarity and assurance to professionals and members of the public regarding roles, responsibilities, reporting routes, timescales, enforcement options and escalation pathways;
- Is robust, and has been independently verified as complying with best practice;
- Shall be monitored for effectiveness;
- Shall be promoted digitally, primarily, but we would ensure that call takers, reception staff and all key stakeholders were aware of the revised policy - in order to signpost customers effectively. There will also be hard copies of the policy available on request.
- Shall be reviewed annually and updated immediately in cases of legislature or national policy changes.

## **6 Implications**

### **6.1 Financial**

Cases progressing to court would attract legal costs, but the Council would seek to retrieve these upon prosecution.

### **6.2 Legal**

We will continue to consult with Legal Services regarding advice around cases, and appropriate and proportionate escalation methods.

Where escalation to court is necessary, consideration will need to be given to the capacity within the Legal Services team, and whether the work will need to be outsourced or can be carried out in-house.

### **6.3 Human Resources**

None

### **6.4 Risk Management**

The policy ensures the Council are complying with their statutory duties surrounding crime and disorder.

### **6.5 Equalities and Diversity**



The policy's affect on the community, and of all equality strands, has been considered.

Any vulnerabilities identified will be actioned using existing mechanisms within the Community Safety Partnership.

## **6.6 Health**

The impact of ASB on individuals and communities is well documented and is known to impact upon both physical and mental health. By seeking to address these issues via a robust policy, it is hoped that these negative effects shall be minimised.

## **6.7 Climate Change**

None

## **7 Appendices**

Appendix 1: Notes of the Review of the Anti-Social Behaviour Policy Working Group:

- 2 December 2024
- 6 August 2024
- 7 October 2024
- 24 February 2025

Appendix 2: Draft Corporate ASB Policy

## **8 Previous Consideration**

None

## **9 Background Papers**

None

**Contact Officer:** Oliver Greatbatch

**Telephone Number:** 01543 464477

**Ward Interest:** All

**Report Track:** Cabinet (TBC)

**Key Decision:** N/A

Appendix 1

**Cannock Chase Council**

**Notes -  
Review of the Anti-Social Behaviour Policy Working Group**

**Monday 2 December 2024 at 4:00pm**

**Remote Meeting via MS Teams**

Present: Councillors:

F. Prestwood  
R. Craddock  
V. Jones (joined later)  
G. Samuels

Officers:

O. Greatbatch	Community Safety & Partnerships Manager
J. Hunt	Senior Committee Officer

**1 Apologies**

Apologies received from Cllrs. M. Dunnett, H. Page, S. Cartwright and J. Elson. Apology also received from A. Nevin, Head of Wellbeing.

**2. Declarations of Interest from Members**

None.

**3. Notes**

The Notes of the meeting held on 7 October 2024 were agreed.

**4. Draft Anti-Social Behaviour Policy**

The Community Safety Manager had previously circulated the first draft of the Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB) Policy. He explained that the previous policy required substantial amendments, and that this version represented a complete re-write. He had consulted on the draft policy with an external ASB provider (Green and Burton ASB Associates) who were experts in this field, and they were happy that this policy was more robust and followed best practice.

He advised that he had incorporated information around some of the comments/points that had been received at the last meeting. There were 4 main points:

## Item No 6.6

- Cllr. Jones - advised that there were some typographical errors within the policy.

*These had now been removed, however if Members spotted any further errors, then they should advise as necessary.*

- The second point was around the confusion with Council, private tenancies and registered social landlords.

*He referred to best practice and advised that the housing policy had been removed to avoid confusion.*

- Cllr. Dunnett - raised an issue around vehicular ASB.

*This had been added in the policy and links had also been provided for alternative ways of reporting non ASB issues.*

- Cllr Samuels - raised a point around the lack of timescales which were not obvious.

*The initial timescales had been recognised in the first reporting stage which was reflected in the policy. The timescales after the first reporting stage were not easy to determine as it is hard to predict what levels of enforcement would be taken.*

The Community Safety Manager asked Members if they had any further comments in relation to the draft ASB Policy.

Cllr Samuels referred to appendix A of the policy which showed a flow chart. He suggested that the wording in relation to 'incident logs being returned within 21 days' needed to be included within the policy.

He then referred to page 7 of the document and 2 The Process. The wording stated that acknowledgement would be provided within one business day, and the assessment would be actioned with 2 business days. He questioned if this was achievable. The Community Safety Manager explained that this had been discussed and he was comfortable with this.

Cllr Samuels then referred to page 10 of the policy, in particular the paragraph relating to Fixed Penalty Notices. He was conscious that the wording and word 'numerous' may be a little ambiguous. The Community Safety Partnership Manager agreed and would send through to legal for clarity.

Cllr Jones discussed and asked how the policy would be monitored, and how the effectiveness of the policy would be managed. The Community Safety Manager explained the difficulties with this and would speak further with Janine Green around what effectiveness looks like.

**5. Next Steps**

Following this, it was agreed that Members would email their final comments to the Community Safety Manager by the end of December, and a further meeting would be arranged early/late February.

The meeting closed at 4.30pm

**Cannock Chase Council**

**Notes -  
Review of the Anti-Social Behaviour Policy Working Group**

**Tuesday 6 August 2024 at 5:00pm**

**Remote Meeting via MS Teams**

Present: Councillors:

Cllr. R. Craddock  
Cllr. M. Dunnett  
Cllr. V. Jones  
Cllr. H. Page  
Cllr. G. Samuels - joined later

Officers:

A. Nevin	Head of Wellbeing
O. Greatbatch	Community Safety & Partnerships Manager
J. Hunt	Senior Committee Officer

**1 Apologies**

Apology received for Councillor J. Elson.

**2. Declarations of Interest from Members**

None.

**3. Welcome / Introductions**

The Head of Wellbeing discussed the role of the Working Group and reported that at the Scrutiny Committee held in July it was agreed to consider the review of the anti-social behaviour policy as the work programme item for the year.

She advised that the meeting would provide a lot of information and was keen for both input and views from Members of the working group around the presentation that the Community Safety & Partnerships Manager would give today. She also indicated that Members would be asked to take some work away to bring back in readiness for the next meeting.

**4. Focus of the Working Group**

The Community Safety & Partnerships Manager then gave his presentation based around anti-social behaviour.

**What is Anti-Social Behaviour**

Information was provided on the slide that covered the definition of anti-social behaviour and the three main categories.

**Within the 3 main categories, there are 13 different types of Anti-Social Behaviour**

Members were asked how many types of anti-social behaviour they could name.

Members named noise nuisance which included noisy parties/neighbours, dog fouling, drinking alcohol in the street, inconsiderate (inconvenient) parking in the street and fly tipping.

The Head of Wellbeing also added graffiti and littering.

The Community Safety & Partnerships Manager listed the 13 types of anti-social behaviour including trespassing, begging and rowdy or nuisance neighbours however he advised that some could be confusing with the terminology used.

A Member was keen to know the definition of trespassing and asked if this also covered neighbour disputes.

The Community Safety & Partnerships Manager provided Members with the legal definition and explained that it could cover neighbour disputes depending on what the behaviour was.

*(Cllr. G. Samuels joined the meeting.)*

He reported that trespassing and drinking alcohol in parks was an issue and the definition of begging could be interpreted differently by people. He also commented that threatening and aggressive behaviour could fall under either of the two types of anti-social behaviour.

He added that most complaints received related to vehicle nuisance for example street racing, people on quad bikes and scooters.

**Responsibility of the Council (ASB)**

The Community Safety & Partnerships Manager discussed with Members the various meetings that were held with partners such as the Police, County Council and Integrated Care Board which fed into the Community Safety Partnership Strategic Board.

**ASB situation in Cannock Chase**

A slide was shown which gave the rates of recorded ASB which were low in Cannock. Some parts of the CSP area experienced above average levels of ASB. The issues were focussed on the town centre and within vulnerable residential areas. Other areas of interest were Brereton, Ravenhill and Hagley where neighbour disputes were high.

The Community Safety & Partnerships Manager reported that there were issues with car racing at night and some reports and issues around drinking/rowdy behaviour at

nighttime in the Rugeley area. He advised that consideration was being given to expanding the Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO) in these areas.

**Data**

A slide was then shown that provided data on ASB over time. The Percentage change in the last 12 months reflected -38% which had reduced.

The Community Safety & Partnerships Manager presented the information and asked Members if the data produced was what they would have expected.

A Member was keen to understand what had contributed to the 38% reduction in anti-social behaviour and asked if there was a strategy to reduce this, or if there had been some changes in the way issues were reported.

The Community Safety & Partnerships Manager commented and suggested that it was difficult to establish, and it was possibly both. He explained that the Partnership and Police worked very closely together. He advised that funding was used for youth diversionary activities, with this being expanded. He commented that assistance was provided to the police to utilise PSPO's and advised that there was now a Section 59 in place, which referred to vehicles being used in a manner which caused alarm, distress or annoyance.

He reported that by placing Section 59 notices in hotspot areas, this was considered a first warning, then on the first offence the Police could act and seize vehicles. He suggested that the situation in Cannock Chase was good, and any previous issues pertained to the previous wards.

The Head of Wellbeing asked that if reporting issues had changed, would most Local Authorities see a similar reduction, and did we have the measure for Cannock. She advised that there could be differences between national and local, and it would be interesting to see how Cannock compared to other Staffordshire Local Authorities. The Community Safety & Partnerships Manager reported that he could circulate this data to Members following the meeting.

In response to a Member question, the Community Safety & Partnerships Manager showed the data to Members which was broken down into policing areas and referred to where the figure of 38% had come from. He advised that the data could be broken down further, however this depended on where an actual report was made.

The Community Safety & Partnerships Manager updated Members regarding safer streets and advised that the contract for lighting works had been awarded and work would commence in September in Cannock Park. He also reported that due to a change in funding, this was to be expanded to other routes and CCTV would be installed on the lighting columns.

He then referred to the presentation and the low rates of Anti-social behaviour in Cannock and asked Members if they thought the rate of 11 per 1000 was low in

comparison to the national level and per population across Staffordshire and Stoke-On-Trent.

A Member advised that some residents made complaints of a similar nature, however he believed residents would probably not quite believe the figures as it was possible that people's perceptions were worse.

The Community Safety & Partnerships Manager commented and explained that anti-social behaviour could be very consuming and damaging on people's health and wellbeing and some people may be more impacted than others. He advised that the Council could signpost people to many organisations if they were experiencing issues.

The Head of Wellbeing advised that people should be encouraged to make reports of anti-social behaviour or other issues as this would provide more accurate figures, allow a better picture to be built up and then allow additional resources to be placed in those areas.

In response to a Member question asking if the figure was low due to under reporting, the Community Safety & Partnerships Manager reported that if this was the case, he would expect to see this across the County as reports were made using the Police 101 number.

The Member reported the difficulty experienced with some constituents who were dissatisfied using the 101-reporting mechanism and would rely on local Councillors at times to make reports. The Community Safety & Partnerships Manager commented that it was important that individuals made reports directly and this would provide a more accurate picture. He went on to add that individuals could use either the 101 reporting or reports could be made online which was quick and simple to use.

#### **Why do we need to renew the existing policy?**

The current Policy would not expire until November 2025, however it no longer aligned with the Corporate Plan, new legislation etc was not reflected and did not reflect enforcement duties.

#### **Current principles of the policy**

Some of the current principles of the policy included that no one should have to suffer from ASB, ASB would be addressed firmly, fairly and proportionately and work would be active to seek to prevent ASB.

Members of the Working Group agreed with the current principles of the policy when asked by the Community Safety & Partnerships Manager.

#### **Slide 8 - homework for Members**

Members were asked to:

- Read the existing policy (to be sent)
- Consider what you would like the new policy to look like?
- Consider what if anything, did they think needs changing – added or removed?



- Would there be any other areas of focus that should be considered?

The Community Safety & Partnerships Manager asked Members to consider the above.

In response to a Member question, the Community Safety & Partnerships Manager would provide Members with the anti-social behaviour stats/data sets broken down by age group.

## **5. Next Steps**

Following this, it was agreed:

- (A) That Members would read the existing policy (also consider if there were any policies that worked well within other Councils)
- (B) That Members would consider what a new policy would look like, and consider what if anything, needs changing
- (C) To think about any other areas of focus that should be considered
- (D) That the next meeting of the Working Group to be arranged early October
- (E) That the presentation slides along with other information requested be emailed to Members on the Working Group.

The Head of Wellbeing and Vice-Chair thanked everyone for their attendance.

The meeting closed at 5.45pm

**Cannock Chase Council**

**Notes -  
Review of the Anti-Social Behaviour Policy Working Group**

**Monday 7 October 2024 at 4:30pm**

**Remote Meeting via MS Teams**

Present: Councillors:

R. Craddock  
M. Dunnett  
J. Elson  
V. Jones  
H. Page  
F. Prestwood  
G. Samuels

Officers:

A. Nevin	Head of Wellbeing
O. Greatbatch	Community Safety & Partnerships Manager
J. Hunt	Senior Committee Officer

**1 Apologies**

None received.

**2. Declarations of Interest from Members**

None.

**3. Notes**

The Notes of the meeting held on 6 August 2024 were agreed.

**4. Feedback from Members (following next steps discussed at the meeting held 6 August)**

The Head of Wellbeing referred to the previous meeting and informed Members that there was a significant amount of information available around anti-social behaviour within the district. She advised that the current policy had been circulated, and Members had been tasked with considering any areas that did not fit with what the priorities should be, or areas that they considered to be acceptable. She was keen to seek Members views on this as it was important they help to shape the policy.

Members were then asked if they had any comments in relation to the policy.

A Member referred to the policy and some typographical errors in paragraphs 4 and 7 that should refer to 'lead' and not leading. She also pointed out that the document referred to the previous Clinical Commissioning Group which should now read Integrated Care Board.

She referred to the presentation given at the last meeting and asked for clarification of the definition of anti-social behaviour given that the slide referred to personal, nuisance and environmental, and the nuisance element included community. The Community Safety and Partnerships Manager clarified and provided further detail around this.

The Member was also keen to know the differences with a fixed penalty notice and a community protection notice, and she also noted that whilst considering the policy, the wording in relation to tenants and tenancy was slightly confusing and there was also a need to be able to understand the differences between a Council tenant and non-Council tenant.

The Community Safety and Partnerships Manager suggested that the policy was outdated and the terminology in some areas was confusing. He went on to discuss fixed penalty notices and community protection notices with different powers being able to be used simultaneously. He advised that a fixed penalty notice is a fine which can be issued for a wide breadth of offences. A Community Protection Notice is a specific power within the Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act, of which one of the penalties for a breach is a Fixed Penalty Notice. He advised that these powers would be used on a case-by-case basis.

He then referred to the Anti-Social Behaviour stats previously circulated to Members and the breakdown and occurrences. He advised that the main offending group was under 18s which included offences linked to e-bikes/scooters, loitering etc. He suggested that the 39-49 age range was predominantly linked to neighbour disputes of ASB. He advised that following some information from a Member, work was being undertaken to try and obtain further information regarding the offences and ages.

The Head of Wellbeing referred to the policy around tenants and landlords. She explained that the threat of eviction and ASB proved challenging as the best outcome for families was to maintain a permanent home, it was only pursued if all other options had been explored.

A Member then expressed similar points around Council tenancies and private tenancies, and then referred to paragraph 5.1 of the policy in terms of acceptable behaviour and how this could impact upon a tenancy. He suggested that the policy had areas that needed to be addressed and asked how the policy was communicated to people and how people were aware of it.

The Head of Wellbeing and the Community Safety and Partnerships Manager responded and would pick up the points raised.

A Member referred to the policy which did not contain anything around vehicle ASB. She reported that she had looked at other Local Authorities including Adur and

Worthing where their website had a link to access a page for reporting abandoned vehicles and anti-social driving. The page was linked with Sussex Police and appropriate action would be taken to tackle anti-social driving behaviour. The Member suggested that this was a productive way of tackling these issues for both the Police and residents.

A Member referred to the policy and thought it was comprehensive, however he advised that timescales were not obvious. He provided an example in respect of the timescale for how quickly ASB would be looked at and dealt with. He suggested that it could be benchmarked, and something included within the policy. The Community Safety and Partnerships Manager commented and advised that it was possible that something could be included within the new policy regarding initial acknowledgment, although warned that it may not be universally possible within case management, due to the complexities and differences between each case.

The Head of Wellbeing summarised and suggested that further clarity was required within the policy on roles/responsibilities. She touched on the importance of timescales in some areas and suggested that it may be appropriate to include an appendix with the policy of the powers that could be used by the Council. She advised that further thought was needed on how the policy was communicated, and how important it was for Members to understand the role of Officers and the Community Safety Team.

The Community Safety and Partnerships Manager would consider all the comments made as part of the discussion held today and bring back a revised version of the Anti-Social Behaviour Policy to the Working Group.

The Head of Wellbeing then discussed the next steps, what the role of the Working Group could be as a next meeting and thanked Members for attending.

## **5. Next Steps**

Following this, it was agreed that a further meeting of the Working Group be arranged either the last week of November or the first week of December, where Members would consider a revised draft of the Anti-Social Behaviour Policy.

The meeting closed at 5.00pm

**Cannock Chase Council**

**Notes -  
Review of the Anti-Social Behaviour Policy Working Group**

**Monday 24 February 2025 at 4:00pm**

**Remote Meeting via MS Teams**

Present: Councillors:

F. Prestwood  
M. Dunnett  
G. Samuels  
R. Craddock  
J. Elson  
V. Jones

Officers:

A. Nevin	Head of Wellbeing
O. Greatbatch	Community Safety & Partnerships Manager
J. Hunt	Senior Committee Officer

**1 Apologies**

Apology received from Cllr. H. Page.

**2. Declarations of Interest from Members**

None.

**3. Notes**

The Notes of the meeting held on 2 December 2024 were agreed.

**4. Updated Anti-Social Behaviour Policy**

(Cllr. G. Samuels joined the meeting).

The Community Safety and Partnerships Manager reported that the comments provided by Members in relation to the draft Policy at the last meeting had been incorporated into the document.

Those comments included:

- Mention of 'return of incident logs' in the flowchart replicated in the main body of the policy. Business day responses - extended by a day.

- Page 10 - wording around Fixed Penalty notices had now been clarified.
- Policy effectiveness judged by KPIs on timescales to monitor performance, satisfaction surveys for all closed cases and follow-up contacts where there is dissatisfaction to enable the potential for learning.

(A. Nevin joined the meeting).

He reported that Members had been requested to provide any further comments on the draft policy by no later than the end of December 2024. He advised that one further comment had been received from Cllr. Prestwood around promotion and how the policy would be promoted.

The Community Safety and Partnerships Manager explained that the policy itself would not discuss promotion. However, he suggested that the primary form of promotion would be digital, but would ensure that call takers, reception staff and all key stakeholders were aware of the revised policy - in order to signpost customers effectively. There would also be hard copies of the policy available on request.

Cllr. Jones referred to the policy and made several comments:

She advised that on page 11 there was a typo - to insert the word 'behaviour' after the word persistent.

Cllr. Jones then made reference to the Criminal Behaviour Order and what the situation was if this persisted.

The Community Safety and Partnerships Manager advised that the Orders were aimed at tackling the most serious and persistent anti-social behaviour. Breaches of CBOs could lead to up to two years in a detention centre for under 18's and up to five years in prison or an unlimited fine (or both) for those over 18.

## **5. Next Steps**

Following the Working Group meeting and discussion by Members, it was agreed that the following be recommended to the Health Wellbeing and the Community Scrutiny Committee on 31 March for consideration:

That the Updated Anti-Social Behaviour Policy be agreed and recommended to Cabinet for approval.

The Chair thanked everyone for their attendance.

The meeting closed at 4.17pm



**DRAFT**

# **Corporate Anti-social Behaviour Policy**

**2025 - 2028**

**Review Schedule**

This policy will be reviewed annually.

Policy Approval Date	TBC
Policy Last Reviewed	TBC
Next Review Date	TBC



**Contents**

Policy Statement and Commitment ..... 21

Definitions and Explanations of Anti-social Behaviour..... 21

Our Responsibilities ..... 22

1 Reporting Anti-social Behaviour..... 23

2 The Process.....7

3 Action we can take - Tools and Powers.....8

4 Case Review..... 28

Supporting Policies and Procedures ..... 29

Safeguarding Our Staff..... 29

Complaints ..... 30

Appendix A - ASB Complaint Process.....14

## **Policy Statement and Commitment**

This Policy sets out Cannock Chase District Council's commitment to reducing anti-social behaviour (ASB) and supports Cannock Chase District Council's Corporate Plan, in particular the priority to "ensure Cannock Chase is a place that residents are proud to call home".

ASB can devastate the lives of individuals and communities - including those who live, work, visit and invest in our District. It can also be a precursor to more serious crime. No-one should have to suffer ASB, and to support our commitment to reducing ASB we will:

- Place victims and witnesses at the core of our procedures;
- Ensure that all reports of ASB are treated seriously and dealt with professionally;
- Make effective and appropriate use of the tools and powers available to us, allowing ASB to be addressed firmly, fairly and proportionately;
- Co-ordinate joint working with partner agencies to deliver the most effective service;
- Raise awareness of what constitutes ASB and empower our communities, and;
- Publicise and promote available support and diversionary services.

This is a Corporate ASB Policy, under the remit of the Community Safety Team. For specific Service Area procedures, we will refer to the relevant departmental policies.

## **Definitions and Explanations of Anti-social Behaviour**

The legal definition of ASB is provided within several Acts:

- [Crime and Disorder Act 1998](#)
- [Anti-social Behaviour Act 2003](#)
- [Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011](#)
- [Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014](#)

In general, ASB is considered to include behaviour capable of causing nuisance, annoyance or disturbance to any person; or an act that causes, or is likely to cause harassment, alarm or distress to one or more persons, not of the same household.

There are three main types of ASB. These are:

- Personal
- Nuisance
- Environmental

### **Personal ASB**

These are usually incidences that deliberately target an individual or group of people, rather than the community. For example:

- Intimidation or harassment
- Violence or threats of violence
- Abusive or insulting behaviour

### **Nuisance ASB**

These are usually incidences that affect the community, rather than an individual victim. For example:

- Drug or substance misuse
- Vehicle nuisance (reckless driving, damage, abandonment)
- Noise nuisance

### **Environmental ASB**

These are incidences when individuals or groups impact their wider surroundings. It includes environmental damage and the misuse of public spaces or buildings. For example:

- Accumulations of waste
- Littering
- Fly-tipping

The topics and behaviours listed may fall into more than one category.

### **What isn't ASB?**

Some examples of behaviours which aren't considered anti-social are listed below. Please note that this is not an exhaustive list:

- People playing in parks and gardens (with no associated anti-social behaviour)
- Reasonable domestic noise
- Disagreements between members of the same household
- Inconsiderate parking. Please refer to information on the County Council website for additional information - [Parking and Enforcement - Staffordshire County Council](#)
- Disputes over property and boundaries
- Private use of CCTV and Smart Doorbells

### **Our Responsibilities**

Under the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, Cannock Chase District Council as a Local Authority, has a statutory responsibility to work in partnership with other Responsible

Authorities<sup>1</sup> to reduce crime, disorder, substance misuse and re-offending in their localities.

We also have a statutory duty to consider and investigate ASB, courtesy of the Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 and, where appropriate, have a range of powers to tackle it. We shall liaise with, and signpost to other agencies, such as the police or housing associations, where relevant.

We are also required to conduct an ASB Case Review where a victim requests one, and where their case meets the locally determined threshold. Further information regarding this process is listed under the 'Case Review' section of this Policy.

## **1 Reporting Anti-social Behaviour**

There are several ways in which you can report ASB to Cannock Chase District Council.

**Online:**

[Anti Social Behaviour | Cannock Chase District Council](#)

**Email:**

[partnership@cannockchasedc.gov.uk](mailto:partnership@cannockchasedc.gov.uk)

**Telephone:**

01543 462621

Reports of ASB can be made by those directly affected or by a third party, for example, a local Councillor, Member of Parliament, or social worker, for example. If a report is made via a third party, we will always seek the consent of the individual concerned to communicate and share information with the third party.

It should also be noted that Registered Social landlords also have powers that they can utilise. If you feel you are a victim of ASB and live in a property that is managed by a social landlord, it is recommended that issues are reported to them in the first instance.

The police also have the same, and in some cases, additional powers as the Council under the Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014. ASB can be reported to the police via the following methods:

- By telephone on 101
- Online at [Report antisocial behaviour | Staffordshire Police](#)

---

<sup>1</sup> Responsible Authorities are defined as the Local Authority, County Council, Police Service, Fire and Rescue, Probation Service and the Integrated Care Board.

- If anyone is seriously injured, or if there is an immediate danger or risk to public safety, a call must be made to 999.

## **2 The Process**

When a report of ASB is made, we will endeavour to discuss the alleged issues with the reporter, any other persons directly impacted, the alleged perpetrator (if safe and appropriate to do so), and any other relevant partner agencies. This will help us gain an understanding of what is occurring and the persistence of the behaviour.

Consent for this will be sought from the individual concerned, but information can legally be shared without consent if it is in relation to the prevention and detection of crime and disorder, or if there is an overriding safeguarding concern.

We adopt a harm centred approach and will also consider the impact that the ASB is having on individuals, families, and the community. This enables us to better understand the harm that may be being caused.

Each ASB case is individual. As a result, we cannot provide fixed timescales following the 'Report assessment' stage.

**Report received** - Acknowledgement within 2 business days.

**Initial triage** - Where it is determined that cases are more appropriately dealt with by other Council departments (for example, Environmental Health or Housing), we shall forward onwards, and update the individual concerned. This will be actioned within 2 business days.

**Report assessment** - An officer will assess if the report reaches the criteria for investigation. If so, a case will be logged, a risk assessment will be completed, and incident logs will be provided. This shall be actioned within 3 business days, but any urgent advice or Safeguarding issues will be actioned immediately.

**Ongoing case management** - Following receipt of incident logs, a decision will be made regarding how to manage the case (Note that if incident logs are not returned within 21 days, the case will be closed). Officers will usually conduct a wider investigation with partner agencies such as Staffordshire Police, or via multi-agency meetings. During most investigations, contact will be made with the alleged perpetrator to allow them a fair opportunity to respond to the allegations. The Officer will explain the consequences of carrying out ASB and summarise the next steps in the investigation.

Throughout the process, we will:

- Record all complaints received;
- Remain in regular contact, and offer advice/support - this can include referring and signposting to appropriate agencies, and is not limited to the reporter;

- Agree an action plan of proposed, proportionate steps, detailing what is expected from all parties at each stage.

Appendix A details the process in flowchart form.

### **3 Action we can take - Tools and Powers**

The Officer will assess each case individually, and the actions taken will be proportionate to the circumstances of the case. Tools and powers are usually implemented incrementally.

Many complaints can be resolved through early intervention, and these will be considered with the reporter. Legal action will only usually be approved where early intervention methods have not been successful, or where there is a serious risk of harm.

Most anti-social behaviour investigations take place within civil law, meaning a civil standard of proof is applicable. The Council needs only to be able to demonstrate that the incident(s) is more likely than not to have happened. When civil legal action has been taken and a Court Order has been disobeyed i.e., breach of an Injunction, Closure Order, or prosecution for breach of a Community Protection Notice; the criminal standard of proof applies. This means that the Council will need to demonstrate that the incident(s) happened "beyond reasonable doubt".

#### **No Action**

In some cases, no action will be taken. These reasons may include:

- Establishing that the incident did not happen
- Not having sufficient evidence to prove the matter to the relevant standard of proof
- Assessing that the issues reported are not what the Council considers antisocial
- Being unable to investigate fully due to non-cooperation of the reporter/witness
- The ASB has stopped and the likelihood of further ASB is low

The Council recognises that individuals have different tolerance thresholds, so we would expect both parties to work together to discuss any minor issues or disagreements before a complaint is made - if it is safe to do so.

#### **Letters and or Word of Advice**

Occasionally a letter or phone call with an alleged perpetrator of low level ASB is all that may be required to resolve some issues. The perpetrator will be informed of the nature of the complaint about them; along with potential consequences should their behaviour continue or escalate. In many cases, awareness of the impact of their behaviour on victims, and the threat of more formal enforcement tools, can be a sufficient incentive for an individual to change their behaviour

Informal interventions should be considered first in most cases, particularly when dealing with young people, as they can stop bad behaviour before it escalates. This should be determined by professionals on a case-by-case basis.

### **Acceptable Behaviour Contracts**

These are voluntary written agreements which are signed by an individual committing anti-social behaviour. The agreement can be with agencies such as the Council, housing provider, education and police - and can include both restrictions and positive requirements. They are most regularly issued to young people over the age of 10, with parent/guardian involvement.

These agreements are not legally binding; however, they are useful in highlighting children's behaviour to their parents and letting them know the consequences if they continue to act in an anti-social manner. Multiple breaches can be used to illustrate that non-legal tools have been unable to tackle the problem and that escalation to enforcement may be required.

The contract normally lasts for six months but it is recommended that it is reviewed at approximately three months to ensure it is still fit for purpose and does not require amending.

### **Mediation**

Mediation can play a key role in anti-social behaviour issues, and can be seen as a medium between self-resolution, and more formal tools and powers. Mediation can be offered to parties involved in an ASB case, where it is deemed appropriate and accepted by both parties.

### **Community Protection Warning / Community Protection Notices**

The Community Protection Notice (CPN) is designed to stop a person aged 16 or over, business or organisation committing anti-social behaviour which spoils the community's quality of life.

The anti-social behaviour has to:

- have a detrimental effect on the quality of life of those in the locality;
- be of a persistent or continuing nature; and
- be unreasonable.

A Community Protection Warning (CPW) must be served before a CPN can be issued.

Both positive requirements and prohibitions can be included in both the CPW and the CPN and could include reasonable timescales for certain actions to be carried out, or for behaviours to cease.

Breach of a CPN is a criminal offence. The punishment for a breach is a Fixed Penalty Notice (FPN) of £100 which discharges all liability for the offence. If the FPN remains unpaid after 14 days we will seek to prosecute, whereby the maximum penalty is a fine of up to £2,500 for individuals, or £20,000 for businesses.

The FPN is a discretionary stage of the process, and any further or subsequent breaches of a CPN will progress directly to prosecution. The Council will also pursue all costs relating to the case.

### **Public Spaces Protection Orders (PSPOs)**

PSPOs are aimed at ensuring public spaces can be enjoyed free from anti-social behaviour. They are intended to provide a means of preventing individuals, or groups, committing anti-social behaviour in a public space where the behaviour:

- is having, or is likely to have, a detrimental effect on the quality of life for those in the locality;
- is persistent or continuing in nature;
- is unreasonable, and;
- justifies the restrictions being imposed.

Councils can use PSPOs to prohibit specified activities within a defined public area. PSPOs differ from other tools introduced under the Act as they focus on the identified problem behaviour in a specific location, as opposed to targeting specific individuals.

A breach of a PSPO can result in a Fixed Penalty Notice of £100 which discharges all liability, or a fine on prosecution of up to £1,000.

Further information on Cannock Chase Council's PSPOs can be found at: [Public Spaces Protection Orders | Cannock Chase District Council](#)

### **Closure Powers**

This power can be used by the police and authorised officers from Cannock Chase Council, where there are high levels of nuisance, disorder, or illegal activity - either currently ongoing, or expected imminently. A closure notice prohibits access to the premises for up to 48 hours. A Closure Order can then be requested through the court for the property to be closed for up to 3 months.

This power will only be considered where other tools i.e. CPN's have failed to stop behaviour, or where the behaviour is so significant that the only way to stop it would be to close the premises.

It is a criminal offence to breach the conditions imposed by a closure notice or order, with up to three months imprisonment for a Notice and six months/unlimited fine for an Order.



## **Criminal Behaviour Orders**

Criminal Behaviour Orders (CBO) give agencies the power to deal with persistent ASB from individuals, who are also engaged in criminal activity.

A (CBO) can be issued by a court, and is available on conviction for any criminal offence. The order is aimed at tackling the most serious and persistent offenders. The CBO can deal with a wide range of anti-social behaviours following the individual's conviction for a criminal offence, for example, threatening violence against others in the community, and persistently being drunk and aggressive in public.

## **Civil Injunctions**

Civil Injunctions are a court order which can be issued to stop individuals engaging in ASB. It can be used to prevent someone from doing something, but positive requirements can also be added to encourage the perpetrator to change their behaviour. These are generally used when the level of harm is significant, and other tools have been utilised without effect.

Injunctions can be used for anyone from the age of 10 years old. For juveniles, the Youth Offending Team must be consulted.

A power of arrest can be attached to an injunction, but this is normally reserved for instances where the offender has been violent, threatened violence, or where there is a reasonable chance that violence could occur.

Breach of an injunction can result in an unlimited fine, or imprisonment for up to 2 years. For young people under 18 the court can issue a supervision order or detention of up to 3 months.

## **4 Case Review**

The ASB Case Review, formerly known as the Community Trigger, is a process which allows for victims of ongoing, persistent ASB to request a multi-agency review of their case. Any person has the right to activate a multi-agency review if they feel their complaint(s) regarding ASB has not been dealt with appropriately.

The Review is designed to ensure the Council, and our partners, are responding appropriately to cases of persistent ASB, especially where the victim is vulnerable or at greater risk.

This is not a complaints escalation procedure, its purpose is to identify if any further actions can be taken amongst agencies to address the ASB, with an Action Plan being formulated.

In Staffordshire, the agreed threshold for activating a Case Review is:

- Three separate incidents have been reported in the last 6 months to the police, council, or social landlord;
- The ASB was reported within 30 days of it taking place, and;
- The ASB is continuing.

Staffordshire Police are the single point of contact for a Case Review and a victim of ASB, or someone acting on their behalf, can ask to activate the review in one of the following ways:

- By telephoning Staffordshire Police on 101 and request that you wish to apply for a Case Review
- By using the Live Message service on Staffordshire Police's website - [Home | Staffordshire Police](#)
- By completing an online Case Review application here - [Request an ASB Case Review | Staffordshire Police](#)
- By visiting the front desk of Cannock Police Station
- By writing to the Central Disclosure Unit, Staffordshire Police HQ, Weston Road, Stafford, ST18 0YY

The Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 places a duty on the relevant bodies to respond to the victim at points in the Case Review process. These include:

- The decision as to whether or not the threshold is met;
- The outcome of the Review, and;
- Any recommendations or actions agreed, as an outcome of the Review.

More information on the Case Review, including the full policy, can be found here - [ASB case review | Staffordshire Police](#)

## **Supporting Policies and Procedures**

This Policy links to a number of other existing policies and procedures that may impact upon the reduction of ASB in Cannock Chase District. This includes:

- Allocations Policy
- Housing Services Anti-social Behaviour Policy
- Community Safety Delivery Plan
- Environmental Health Enforcement Policy
- Safeguarding Policy

## **Safeguarding Our Staff**

Cannock Chase Council will not tolerate, under any circumstance, any threats, violence or abusive behaviour towards our staff or contractors. We will act against any person who shows acts of aggression towards any person carrying out their work in respect of

this ASB Policy or any other service. We may involve the police if it is decided that this course of action is appropriate, and we may also stop investigating the case.

## **Complaints**

The Council is committed to handling complaints of ASB in a professional manner. If anyone is not happy with the way we have managed their case, we would welcome feedback so that we can review and improve our service.

Full information of the Complaints Procedure can be found here - [Customer Feedback - Help us to get it right | Cannock Chase District Council](#)

**Appendix A - ASB Complaint Process**

