

Dear _____,

Further to your correspondence with John Fuller, I hope the following will lend some clarity to the issue of the revised Section 30 dispersal order and linked matters. I think the two key issues are:

- The process of engaging the community as part of collecting data ahead of review
- The renewal decision itself

Firstly, I accept responsibility for a failure on this occasion to *fully* consult formally with key community members on this issue, ahead of the ultimate decision. I can now understand the disquiet amongst some trusted community links that have been omitted and I apologise. The process this time around has provided organisational learning from which we will improve when we come to consider future renewals.

As promised, I attach a copy of the document that was prepared to inform decision-makers in the Police and the Council. The findings are very clear and denote significant reductions in incidents for which we should all be pleased. The methodology is also explained.

I believe it is important to reflect that those in the community to whom we have spoken with, including some who have rightly complained of lack of engagement, have nevertheless acknowledged, that they continue to see a far better quality of life in the area. This is a finding in keeping with the quantitative data within the report. I also detect that there is a sense within the hearts of some members of the community that they wish to keep the order in place just in case unacceptable behaviour returns. Whilst I can empathise with those feelings they do not provide a basis in law to make an order.

Looking forward, I expect the most pressing question will be about how we will respond if the situation regresses. We now have the "machinery" and expertise to identify and implement quickly new dispersal orders where it is necessary and proportionate to do so. My message to the City East area is to say we are alive to the situation and we will work with you to ensure changes are monitored and acted up swiftly. I recognise that some localities are more vulnerable than others and we will be watching closely what happens. I am confident with your support we will manage outcomes effectively.

Finally, I have been asked this week how the issue of the removal of Section 30 in Mill Road can be "squared away" with the material provided to the Council's licensing sub-committee on Monday. This successfully challenged the grant of a liquor licence to Tesco for their East Road store.

For me, much of what was reported in the Cambridge Evening News and clearly viewed as exciting and emotive, was a section of the hearing where the anti-social behaviour *history* of the last 10 years or so in Petersfield and Market wards was discussed. This was to set a historical context and was not a reflection of the "here and now" in Petersfield. Quite the contrary; the information used to highlight the "here and now" was much more about Market, the current City West priority for Streetlife anti-social behaviour in that ward and the findings of the latest analytical document for that area.

I hope this goes some way to answer questions that have been raised and you find the document useful. As John Fuller has mentioned the document has been cleared

for public release which generated some additional work that was completed today. There is nothing underhand about this process. We are legally obliged to review and mark documents in accordance with government guidance and compliance with the law. The original document contained names of individuals and similar material that legally we cannot disclose.

Kind regards,

Inspector Steve Kerridge
Sector Commander – Cambridge City