

NOTICE OF MEETING

CLIMATE, COMMUNITY SAFETY & CULTURE SCRUTINY PANEL

Monday, 6th November, 2023, 7.00 pm - George Meehan House, 294 High Road, N22 8JZ (watch the live meeting [here](#), watch the recording [here](#))

Councillors: Eldridge Culverwell, George Dunstall, Gina Adamou, Isodoris Diakides, Luke Cawley-Harrison and Simmons-Safo (Chair)

Co-optees/Non Voting Members: Ian Sygrave (Haringey Association of Neighbourhood Watches) (Co-Optee)

Quorum: 3

1. FILMING AT MEETINGS

Please note that this meeting may be filmed or recorded by the Council for live or subsequent broadcast via the Council's internet site or by anyone attending the meeting using any communication method. Although we ask members of the public recording, filming or reporting on the meeting not to include the public seating areas, members of the public attending the meeting should be aware that we cannot guarantee that they will not be filmed or recorded by others attending the meeting. Members of the public participating in the meeting (e.g. making deputations, asking questions, making oral protests) should be aware that they are likely to be filmed, recorded or reported on.

By entering the meeting room and using the public seating area, you are consenting to being filmed and to the possible use of those images and sound recordings.

The chair of the meeting has the discretion to terminate or suspend filming or recording, if in his or her opinion continuation of the filming, recording or reporting would disrupt or prejudice the proceedings, infringe the rights of any individual or may lead to the breach of a legal obligation by the Council.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

3. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

The Chair will consider the admission of any late items of urgent business (late items will be considered under the agenda item where they appear. New items will be dealt with as noted below).

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

A member with a disclosable pecuniary interest or a prejudicial interest in a matter who attends a meeting of the authority at which the matter is considered:

- (i) must disclose the interest at the start of the meeting or when the interest becomes apparent, and
- (ii) may not participate in any discussion or vote on the matter and must withdraw from the meeting room.

A member who discloses at a meeting a disclosable pecuniary interest which is not registered in the Register of Members' Interests or the subject of a pending notification must notify the Monitoring Officer of the interest within 28 days of the disclosure.

Disclosable pecuniary interests, personal interests and prejudicial interests are defined at Paragraphs 5-7 and Appendix A of the Members' Code of Conduct

5. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/PRESENTATIONS/QUESTIONS

To consider any requests received in accordance with Part 4, Section B, Paragraph 29 of the Council's Constitution.

6. MINUTES (PAGES 1 - 8)

To approve the minutes of the previous meeting on 11 September.

7. HARINGEY CRIME PERFORMANCE AND PRIORITIES OVERVIEW (PAGES 9 - 24)

8. RESPONSE TO THE BARONESS CASEY REVIEW AND A NEW MET FOR LONDON

To follow

9. WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE (PAGES 25 - 30)

10. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

To consider any items admitted at item 3 above.

11. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

- 19th December
- 27th February

Philip Slawther, Principal Scrutiny Officer
Tel – 020 8489 2957

Fax – 020 8881 5218

Email: philip.slawther2@haringey.gov.uk

Fiona Alderman

Head of Legal & Governance (Monitoring Officer)

George Meehan House, 294 High Road, Wood Green, N22 8JZ

Friday, 27 October 2023

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF MEETING Climate, Community Safety & Culture
Scrutiny Panel HELD ON Monday, 11th September, 2023, 6.40 -
9.00 pm**

PRESENT:

**Councillors: Luke Cawley-Harrison, Michelle Simmons-Safo (Chair) and
Tammy Hymas**

ALSO ATTENDING: Ian Sygrave (Co-Optee)

223. FILMING AT MEETINGS

The Chair referred Members present to agenda Item 1 as shown on the agenda in respect of filming at this meeting, and Members noted the information contained therein'.

224. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Diakides and Cllr Dunstall. Cllr Hymas attended the meeting as a substitute

225. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None

226. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None

227. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/PRESENTATIONS/QUESTIONS

There were no deputations, petitions or public questions received.

228. MINUTES

In regards to a previous action around blocked footway gullies, officers asked the co-opted member of the Panel to email them with details of which gullies were blocked on Harringay Passage and these would be passed on to the drainage team. **(Action: Ian).**

The Panel enquired whether footway gullies could be marked with spray paint when they had been cleaned, as happened with road gullies. Officers advised that they would feed this back to the team.

Officers advised that they had contacted TfL about installing a joint SUDS scheme on Council land but that TfL had not shown any interest in undertaking such a scheme. The Chair agreed to pick up with officers outside of the meeting about would could be done to push back to TfL and get them to undertake drainage works in and around the road network that they manage. **(Action: Chair).**

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting on 13th July were agreed as a correct record of the meeting.

229. BARONESS CASEY REVIEW- (UPDATE ON COUNCIL'S RESPONSE)

The Panel received a report and accompanying presentation which set out the Council's response to the Baroness Casey Review into the standards of behaviour and the internal culture of the Metropolitan Police Service. The report was introduced by Cllr Adam Jogee, Cabinet Member for Community Safety & Cohesion, as set out in the agenda pack at pages 7 to 23.

The Cabinet Member welcomed the fact that the Panel had requested an update on this subject, given the concerns shared by a lot of people about racism, homophobia, misogyny and the generally shocking mind sets of some members of the police, as outlined in the Casey report. The Cabinet Member set out that he had emailed members separately outlining the discussions he had with the police. The Cabinet Member commented it was incumbent upon Members to keep our communities safe and to hold the police to account.

The Cabinet Member advised that he and the Leader saw their role as acting as a critical friend and were not there to make excuses on behalf of the police. To that end, there had been frank discussions with senior police colleagues. The Met Commissioner had visited Haringey twice in recent months and the Cabinet Member and Leader met regularly with the Borough Commander. The Cabinet Member set out that during these discussions there was no space for Police colleagues to not understand how seriously the Council was taking the issues raised in the Casey report. The Cabinet Member reiterated that the administration was not seeking to do the Police's job for them, but that they would be seeking to hold them to account.

The following arose during the discussion of this report:

- a. The Panel commented that one concern that had been raised in the past was that a lot of police officers in London had been drawn from all over the country and perhaps did not understand the different communities and cultures that they served. Members would like to see police officers be representative of communities like those in Haringey. Members sought clarity about how future community engagement events with police would focus on the bigger picture, rather than quite localised problems. The Cabinet Member responded that, in his experience, the vast majority of police officers were hard working, law-abiding, public servants who did understand the communities they served and were willing to learn about them when they did not. It was commented that the

Safer Neighbourhood Teams did care about communities and wanted to serve them.

- b. The Cabinet Member set out that the background to this was 14 years of austerity and sustained attacks on the funding model for public services, including policing which had led to the scaling back of Safer Neighbourhood policing. Within this context, morale within the police was not great. The Cabinet Member acknowledged the need for police to represent the communities that they served and that he had seen the Police have stalls in Wood Green where they held pop-up recruitment drives.
- c. In response to a question about a previous meeting between councillors and the Police in July, the Cabinet Member advised that all colleagues were invited but that it was arranged at short-notice, based on the Met Commissioner's availability and the fact that he wanted Haringey to be the first borough that he visited due to the unique history and challenges of policing in Haringey.
- d. In light of the conclusions of the Casey Review, the Panel characterised the institutional structure of the Met as being racist and sought clarification from the Cabinet Member whether he agreed with this assessment. In response, the Cabinet Member set out that everyone could see evidence that there had been examples of racism, sexism and other discriminatory behaviour, but that he did not think it was helpful for him to give a yes or no answer to this question. The Cabinet Member set out that he was not here to make excuses for an agency that was failing to uphold the standards expected of it as a public body. The Cabinet Member set out that he had been assured personally by the Commissioner of the Metropolitan police that the examples of this appalling behaviour would not be allowed to continue. As councillors, it was important that Members call out instances where they have seen examples of discriminatory behaviour.
- e. The Panel set out that the Police had been found to be institutionally racist following the Stephen Lawrence enquiry and that very little seemed to have changed since then. There was a new Community Safety & Hate Crime strategy out to consultation and Members queried whether as part of this, the police should be given increased powers with a greater police presence, or whether their role in community justice should be reduced. In response, the Cabinet Member advised that he wanted to see a Haringey where people were free from fear of criminals and fear from the police violence. The issue was not about whether the police had more or less power but it was about police doing their jobs properly. The Cabinet Member advised that whilst in his role he would make sure that the police were held to account and that they did their jobs properly.
- f. The Chair set out that in her experience the institutional discriminatory behaviour was embedded within in the structure of the organisation and that the concerns raised in the Macpherson Report had still not been addressed. It was commented that until the issue was fully recognised, it would never be tackled. It was suggested that the key issue during the riots in Tottenham both in 1985 and in 2011 was to do with relations with the police. The Chair advocated that it was important that the findings of the Casey Review were embraced and that there it was a catalyst for change.
- g. The Chair sought clarification about the Met's commitment to put more officers and PCSOs into local neighbourhoods and questioned how many additional

officers this would mean. In response, the Cabinet Member advised that they were still working through this and he had not been given an exact figure, but that he would speak to the Police and see if there was an exact figure on this. **(Action: Cllr Jogee)**. The Cabinet Member set out that community policing needed to mean community policing and that the police should be embedded within our communities.

- h. In response to a question about what strategy the police had to address a lack of diversity and ensure that their values aligned with the values of our communities, the Cabinet Member commented that this was a question that should be put to the Police at the next meeting. The Cabinet Member commented that the question about police values seemed like the right question and that if policing was done by consent then it had to reflect the values of our communities. Officers noted that one of the key recommendations from the Baroness Casey Review was around recruitment and making the force more representative.
- i. The Panel commented that there used to be regular meetings between all members and the police in the Civic Centre and questioned whether these meetings could be reinstated. The Cabinet Member responded that if there was the appetite then he would look at reinstating these but reflected that the last meeting with Members and the borough commander that he arranged was only attended by five councillors. The Cabinet Member agreed to give some thought about how best to take forward the request for regular all member meetings with the police. **(Action: Cllr Jogee)**.
- j. The Panel commented that there seemed to be a marked difference in community policing across different parts of the borough and queried what could be done to make this more uniformed and to learn lessons from where this worked well. In response, the Cabinet Member acknowledged the need to learn from where this was done well but emphasised that a key element of this was around community by-in. The Cabinet Member advised that one of the senior officers within the Haringey & Enfield BCU was looking at how this could be improved. The Cabinet Member set out that the Commissioner had identified a renewed focus on community policing.
- k. The Panel sought clarification whether the police and Council's priorities were aligned in terms of local policing in Haringey. In response, the Cabinet Member advised that priorities aligned in terms hotspots, trends, domestic violence, alcohol and drug related crime. The Cabinet Member recognised that priorities could change but the overarching values were aligned.
- l. The Chair of Haringey Neighbourhood Watch reiterated the fact that, following the Casey Report and the development of a New Met for London, the police seemed to be putting a new emphasis on community policing and that he had been told that undertaking a community policing role would be a key consideration for promotion within the Met going forward. In terms of numbers, it was suggested that the Met were looking to recruit an additional 500 PCSOs in the coming months. It was suggested that the numbers and timescales were set out within A New Met for London.

RESOLVED.

Noted

230. STREET LIGHTING CONTRACT PERFORMANCE

The Panel received a report which provided feedback on the Council's current street lighting contractor's programmes and performance, and also discusses other issues relating to the street lighting central management system (CMS) and UK Power Networks (UKPN). The report was introduced by Mark Stevens, AD for Direct Services as set out in the agenda pack at pages 23 -28. The following arose as part of the discussion of this report:

- a. The Panel sought clarification about whether the Council was on target to for the implementation of a new central management system by November 2023. In response, officers advised that a new lead officer had been appointed by Marlborough Highways and that they would be pushing Urbis Schreder to ensure that this was achieved. In general, officers advised that they were satisfied with the performance of Marlborough Highways but acknowledged that the performance of Urbis Schreder was less satisfactory.
- b. The Chair advocated the importance of street lighting in terms of keeping people safe, and in particular in terms of preventing violence against women and girls. The Panel sought clarification about the process for fixing lamp columns that were broken. In response, officers advised that Marlborough Highways would go out and attempt to fix the problem, if the LED was damaged for instance. In some cases, the issue may be caused by a conflict between the CMS and the lighting equipment and they would try to resolve this where possible, however it may be a more fundamental problem. In cases where there was an electricity supply problem, the issue had to be referred to UKPN and they had 28 days to resolve the issue.
- c. The Panel raised concerns about the time taken to fix broken lamp columns, particularly in Harringay ward. In response, officers apologised and acknowledged that there was a breakdown in the process between inspections and columns being incorrectly recorded as being fixed, which led to complaints. Officers advised that there was progress being made on this issue and advised that the team were working hard to resolve it.
- d. In response to a follow up question, the Assistant Director advised that he first became aware that this was a bigger problem than just individual components not working, following the last scrutiny panel meeting. Officers advised that they were concerned that there was a bigger problem after hearing from Members of the panel and going back to the team and looking at the issue in more detail. Officers advised that they shared members' frustrations about lamp columns seemingly being reported as fixed when they were not.
- e. In response to a further question, officers set out that the Highways Group Engineer had been tasked with overseeing this issue and that it was expected that the issue would be resolved. The Team had been asked to keep a record of the works that had been done and the issues that came up, and to ensure that issues were being fixed.
- f. The Panel suggested that the number of open cases should be a red flag, both in terms of street lighting faults, but also more widely across frontline services. Concerns were raised that in this instance it seems to have been councillors raising the issue that has alerted officers to their being a more fundamental

problem. In response, the Assistant Director acknowledged these concerns and advised that the KPI data around street lighting faults was now being examined as a much higher level than it had previously and that he expected that the problem would be resolved fairly shortly.

RESOLVED

Noted

231. UPDATE ON ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING

The Panel received a report which provided an update on Electric Vehicle (EV) charging across the borough and the Council's wider Ultra Low Emission Vehicle (ULEV) Action Plan. The report was introduced by Joe Baker, Head of Carbon Management as set out in the additional report pages 1-4. Mark Stevens, AD for Direct Services was present for this Item. Cllr Mike Hakata, Cabinet Member for Climate Action, Environment and Transport, and Deputy Leader of the Council was also present online. The following arose in discussion of the report:

- a. The Panel sought clarification around instances of people without a driveway trailing charging cables over the footway to charge their vehicles and whether this was allowed. In response, officers advised that this was an offence under the Highways Act. It is possible to have a channel cut into the footway so that the cable was no longer a trip hazard but the person would have to pay the cost for the works and would need public liability insurance. Furthermore, that person would not have an automatic right to park in front of their own property. The Panel noted that whilst some local authorities would permit a channel to be installed many were reluctant to do so, as it was costly and impractical. Instead, Haringey was seeking to increase the number of on-street EV charging points.
- b. The Panel noted that channels had been cut in front of the Civic Centre to support a SUDS scheme. It was also commented that when a person applied for a crossover they were essentially preventing anyone parking in front of their property. In response to a request for clarification, officers advised that, pertaining to trailing cables over the footway being an offence, the relevant part of the Highways Act 1980 was Section 178, sub-section 1.
- c. The Panel suggested that the stated goal of 400 on-street chargers was not enough to support large scale usage of EVs. It was commented that if everyone had an EV, two or three charging points would be needed on every street. The Panel also questioned why the on-street chargers were at the end of streets and queried whether this was related to CPZ boundaries and the need for a new CPZ consultation to be undertaken. In response, officers advised that whilst the number of vehicles was increasing, so was their range and so they required less charging time. This would reduce the number of charging points needed over time. In regard to chargers being located at the end of roads, officers advised that this was more do with the charger having more accessibility at the end of roads and the fact that people were more likely to object if one was installed in front of their home. It was also noted that the solution to widespread access to EV charging would likely be market driven and EV charging facilities available at petrol stations, for example.

- d. The Panel referred to small cylindrical charging points recently installed by Barnet, called Trojan energy hubs. In response, officers advised that they would look into these chargers in more detail outside of the meeting but that a cursory look on the internet raised concerns that these would be too low down and would have wheelchair accessibility concerns as well as potentially being a trip hazard. There was DfT guidance about installing street furniture that was less than 600mm from the ground.
- e. In response to a question, it was commented that Part S of the new building regulations stated that all new car parks had to have EV charging points.
- f. The Panel suggested that 400 charging points across the borough did not seem enough, when you considered the amount of terraced housing and flats in the borough that did not have driveways. In response, the Cabinet Member acknowledged 400 alone may not be enough, but that the volume of charging stations would rise further with market driven solutions. It was suggested that private sector solutions would likely receive increasing incentivisation from the government as we headed to the 2030 cut off point for new petrol and diesel cars being sold in the UK.
- g. The Panel stressed the importance of having multiple providers for EV charging across the borough.

RESOLVED

Noted

232. WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE

The following items were put forward for the following meeting:

- The Priorities for the Community Safety partnership for the year
- The Police's response to Baroness Casey Review and A new Met for London.

RESOLVED

That the Panel considered its work plan for 2022-24, attached at Appendix A of the report, and whether any amendments were required.

233. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

N/A

234. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

- 6th November
- 19th December
- 27th February

CHAIR: Councillor Michelle Simmons-Safo

Signed by Chair

Date

Title: Haringey Crime Performance and Priorities Overview Nov 2023

Report authorised by: Eubert Malcolm, Assistant Director Stronger and Safer Communities

Lead Officers: Sandeep Broca, Intelligence Analysis Manager

Ward(s) affected: Key crime wards

Report for Key/

Non Key Decision: Non key decision

1. Describe the issue under consideration

- 1.1 This report should be read in conjunction with the presentation attached. The presentation shows Haringey's performance against the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) Police and Crime Plan (PCP) key priorities, including personal robbery and violence, as well as an outline of the priority setting process.
- 1.2 The presentation focuses on crime performance in the 12-months to September 2023 as compared to the preceding 12-month period, as well as compared to the previous 3-year average.
- 1.3 It should be noted that overall crime has increased by 3% in the past 12-months. Haringey has also noted an increase of 4% as compared to the 3-year baseline.
- 1.4 Performance in most areas has been similar to or better than the crime trends noted across London as a whole and better than the performance of most other boroughs.
- 1.5 Haringey has worked with MOPAC's London Police and Crime Plan to jointly determine key priorities for the borough, which were previously chosen to be non-domestic violence with injury and robbery. Additional areas of focus also included sexual violence, domestic abuse, women's safety, child sexual exploitation, weapon-based crime, hate crime and anti-social behaviour.
- 1.6 Local data analysis suggests that the priorities should be retained for the next year i.e. robbery and non-domestic violence with injury. This will support current and ongoing partnership activities around knife crime reduction, robbery focus and tackling violent crime and vulnerability. Robbery and non-domestic violence with injury are also key crime types which involve young people as both victims and perpetrators and there is a clear cross over with the Borough Plan, Serious Violence Duty (SVD), Community Safety Strategy, Young People At Risk Strategy, North Area Violence Reduction Group (NAVRG) and others.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 That the Panel note the content of the accompanying pack, which highlights the changes to crime performance in the past 12-months and 3-years.
- 2.2 That the Panel note the recommendation that robbery and non-domestic violence with injury should be retained as the key priorities for the next year.

3. Reasons for decision

n/a

4. Alternative options considered

n/a

5. Background information

- 5.1 Haringey has a signed agreement with the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime to contribute to tackling the Mayor's priority crimes. The agreement is accompanied by a grant of £553K per year for 2022-2025. This is allocated across seven areas: Drug treatment intervention to reduce reoffending; an integrated Gang Exit Programme; Hate crime prevention; Advocacy and support to victims of domestic violence; Cross-borough support to ASB victims and witnesses (Haringey and Enfield); A dedicated Pentonville Prison worker; Gangs outreach training.
- 5.2 Quarterly returns are required which give considerable detail about our expenditure and performance to date. Haringey has an excellent reputation for compliance on both fronts.
- 5.3 Performance monitoring occurs in between Community Safety Partnership board meetings and attendance includes the holders of KPIs, the budget holders and statutory partners such as the police.

6. Contribution to strategic outcomes

- 6.1 This work contributes to the Mayor of London's Policing and Crime Plan and the Haringey Community Safety Strategy. It will also help to deliver Haringey's Borough Plan, Serious Violence Duty, Young People at Risk strategy, as well as the North Area Violence Reduction Group (NAVRG), Violent Crime Action Plan and the Community Safety Strategy.
- 6.2 Officers and partners work strategically across related work areas and boards such as Youth Offending, Safeguarding Children and Adults, Health and Wellbeing, Tottenham Regeneration, Early Help and the Community Strategy.

7. Statutory Officers comments (Chief Finance Officer (including procurement), Assistant Director of Corporate Governance, Equalities)

n/a

Finance and Procurement

The LCPF funding supports existing Community Safety workstreams. Quarterly returns are required which give considerable detail about our expenditure and

performance to date. Haringey has an excellent reputation for compliance on both fronts.

Legal

n/a

Equality

There is an inherent impact on equalities of much of our community safety work and this is presented and discussed at the Community Safety Partnership meetings. This includes the peak age of offending being between 16 and 24; a very high percentage of young black males (mostly of African-Caribbean origin) involved in street-based violence (approx. 80%); the impact of domestic and sexual violence on women and girls; high concentrations of crime occurring in areas of deprivation; and vulnerable individuals and communities becoming victims of hate crime.

This report considers the areas of challenge in direct correlation with the impact on victims, especially vulnerable victims. In this respect, significant attention is being given to the disproportionate impact.

8. Use of Appendices

Appendix A – Haringey Crime Performance and Priorities Overview November 2023 pack

9. Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

This page is intentionally left blank

Crime Performance and Priorities Overview

November 2023

Sources: All data from Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) Website and Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) Website and covers the period April 2020 to September 2023.

Haringey has worked with MOPAC’s London Police and Crime Plan 2022-25 to jointly determine key priorities for the borough:


Key Haringey Priorities:

- Non-domestic violence with injury (VWI)
- Robbery

Focus will also be retained on Violence, Vulnerability and Exploitation, whilst balancing the response to volume crime:

Additional areas of focus:

- Sexual Violence
- Domestic Abuse
- Women’s Safety
- Child Sexual Exploitation
- Weapon-Based Crime
- Hate Crime
- Anti-Social Behaviour




	Haringey			North Area BCU	London
	Offences Current R12	12-Month Change	3-Year Change	12-Month Change	12-Month Change
Total Notifiable Offences (TNO)	33,772	3%	4%	0.4%	5%
Burglary (Residential)	1,351	-6%	-26%	-7%	-1%
Violence with Injury (Domestic)	788	-3%	2%	4%	5%
Robbery of Personal Property	1,419	14%	14%	3%	18%
Violence with Injury (Non-Domestic)	1,856	-4%	11%	-6%	0.3%
Knife Crime with Injury	120	-18%	-3%	-16%	11%
Knife Crime Offences	711	14%	15%	7%	20%
Total Gun Crime	90	8%	22%	7%	7%
Lethal-Barrelled Firearm Discharges	15	36%	-17%	25%	-17%

London Total Crime (TNO) – 12-Months to Sep 2023


Borough	Oct21-Sep22	Oct22-Sep23	Change
Barking & Dagenham	24,074	26,013	8%
Barnet	31,508	32,721	4%
Bexley	18,912	19,173	1%
Brent	34,337	34,757	1%
Bromley	26,662	26,757	0%
Camden	36,767	41,688	13%
Croydon	40,414	39,433	-2%
Ealing	34,760	36,362	5%
Enfield	34,754	33,970	-2%
Greenwich	31,989	32,902	3%
Hackney	36,095	35,384	-2%
Hammersmith & Fulham	24,103	25,021	4%
Haringey	32,730	33,772	3%
Harrow	18,409	18,927	3%
Havering	22,374	23,737	6%
Hillingdon	28,150	29,315	4%
Hounslow	28,535	30,897	8%
Islington	30,753	32,023	4%
Kensington & Chelsea	22,791	24,381	7%
Kingston upon Thames	14,258	14,533	2%
Lambeth	37,596	39,040	4%
Lewisham	32,185	33,678	5%
Merton	15,817	16,022	1%
Newham	41,435	42,659	3%
Redbridge	28,013	28,187	1%
Richmond upon Thames	12,961	13,615	5%
Southwark	38,205	41,110	8%
Sutton	16,050	15,330	-4%
Tower Hamlets	39,229	40,637	4%
Waltham Forest	26,354	26,294	0%
Wandsworth	28,270	29,224	3%
Westminster	76,193	94,452	24%
London Total	968,063	1,015,863	5%

Page 10




Haringey Total Crime (TNO) – 12-Months to Sep 2023

Ward	Oct21-Sep22	Oct22-Sep23	Change
Alexandra Park	596	700	17%
Bounds Green	774	870	12%
Bruce Castle	1733	1673	-3%
Crouch End	970	907	-6%
Fortis Green	542	599	11%
Harringay	1508	1689	12%
Hermitage & Gardens	1101	1208	10%
Highgate	815	932	14%
Hornsey	1140	1118	-2%
Muswell Hill	806	874	8%
Noel Park	3204	3534	10%
Northumberland Park	2302	2194	-5%
Seven Sisters	1303	1245	-4%
South Tottenham	1904	1915	1%
St Ann's	902	935	4%
Stroud Green	1193	1141	-4%
Tottenham Central	1607	1734	8%
Tottenham Hale	1583	1825	15%
West Green	1489	1475	-1%
White Hart Lane	1322	1217	-8%
Woodside	1541	1635	6%




In the 12-months to September 2023, there was a **3%** increase in overall recorded crime in Haringey, as compared to the previous 12-months, and a **4%** increase compared to the previous 3-year baseline. London experienced an overall increase of **5%** in recorded crime in the past 12-months.



Haringey currently sits 8th bottom in London for public perception responses to the question “Do the police do a good job in the local area?”, at 44%. This is below the London average of 48%.

Public Perception Responses to "Police do a good job in the local area"



- Haringey's Community Safety strategy is currently being refreshed, with the new strategy running from 2023-2027.
- The strategy presents the Haringey CSP's approach and priorities to achieving a reduction in crime and anti-social behaviour in Haringey.
- The strategy is being informed by an extensive consultation and engagement with partners across the system, with community groups, and with Haringey residents and businesses.
- The outcomes that the CSP seeks to achieve through the strategy are a reflection both of data and what will have heard through engagement.
- The aim of the strategy is to improve the quality of life in the borough by focussing and co-ordinating partnership actions.

The Serious Violence Duty (SVD) was introduced by government through the Police, Crime, Sentencing and Courts Act 2022, and commenced on 31st January 2023.

- There are a number of requirements for CSPs to fulfil together:
 - Undertake an ***evidence-based analysis*** of the causes of serious violence in the area and establish effective data sharing
 - Develop a ***strategic needs assessment*** based on the analysis
 - Develop and implement a ***strategy*** with solutions to prevent and reduce serious violence in the area, to be reviewed every year

The responsible authorities (also known as ‘duty holders’) in the Serious Violence Duty are:

- The police
- Fire and rescue authorities
- Justice organisations (youth offending teams and probation services)
- Health bodies (Integrated Care Boards)
- Local authorities

- The overall volume of violence with injury in Haringey has remained **relatively stable** in the short and medium term.
- Haringey is now ranked around **mid-table** in London for the number of non-domestic violence with injury offences.
- Haringey's rate of domestic violence with injury is currently **2.5 per 1,000 pop.n.**, which is slightly above the London average of 2.4 per 1,000 pop.n.
- There is a significant geographical correlation between **violent** crime in Haringey and **drug** related disorder.
- Violence is not distributed equally across the borough and significant concentrations are noted in areas with high levels of **deprivation**.
- Key violence generators and attractors in the borough include **transport hubs** (train, tube and buses), **parks** and **open spaces** and busy **high street** locations.

- Local data analysis suggests that the priorities should be retained for the next year i.e. Robbery and Violence with Injury (Non-Domestic).
- This will support current and ongoing partnership activities around knife crime reduction, robbery focus and tackling violent crime and vulnerability.
- Robbery and Non-Domestic VWI are also key crime types which involve young people as both victims and perpetrators and there is a clear cross over with the Borough Plan, Serious Violence Duty (SVD), Community Safety Strategy, Young People At Risk Strategy, North Area Violence Reduction Group (NAVRG) and others.

This page is intentionally left blank

Environment & Community Safety Scrutiny Panel

Work Plan 2022 - 24

1. Scrutiny review projects; These are dealt with through a combination of specific evidence gathering meetings that will be arranged as and when required and other activities, such as visits. Should there not be sufficient capacity to cover all these issues through in-depth pieces of work, they could instead be addressed through a “one-off” item at a scheduled meeting of the Panel. These issues will be subject to further development and scoping. It is proposed that the Committee consider issues that are “cross cutting” in nature for review by itself i.e., ones that cover the terms of reference of more than one of the panels.

Project	Comments	Priority
Litter/fly tipping	The Panel would like to do a [piece of detailed scrutiny work around litter and fly-tipping and how this could be improved. It’s noted that the Veolia contract is due for renewal and there is an opportunity to link in the with priority setting process for a new waste contract.	

2. “One-off” Items; These will be dealt with at scheduled meetings of the Panel. The following are suggestions for when particular items may be scheduled.

Date	Potential Items
2022-23	

<p>30 June 2022</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Membership and Terms of Reference • Appointment of Non-Voting Co-opted Member • Waste and Recycling Update • Community Safety Update • Work Programme
<p>05 September 2022</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cabinet Members Questions, Cabinet Member for Climate Action, Environment & Transport, and Deputy Leader of the Council • Low Traffic Neighbourhoods • Walking and Cycling Action Plan • Update on Parking Management It System • Street Trees • Pocket Parks • Work Programme

<p>14 November 2022</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cabinet Member Questions – Cabinet Member for Economic Development, Jobs & Community Cohesion (to cover areas within the Panel’s terms of reference that are within that portfolio). * <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ How is the Council encouraging use of brownfield sites in the borough to protect green spaces. ○ Interaction between crime and youth service provision • Police Priorities in Haringey & Community Safety Partnership Update; To invite comments from the Panel on current performance issues and priorities for the borough’s Community Safety Partnership. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Update on Police activities to combat Domestic violence and under reporting of this crime type ○ Hate Crime <p>* Item withdrawn – to be rescheduled.</p>
<p>15 December 2022 (Budget Meeting)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cabinet Member Questions – Cabinet Member for Communities and Civic Life • Budget Scrutiny • Update on Leisure Services inc take up discretionary rate. • Parks Performance. • Summer Major Events programme in Finsbury Park
<p>16 March 2023</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cabinet Member Questions – Cabinet Member for Tackling Inequality & Resident Services <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Highways Update and progress around introduction of 20mph speed limits. • Update on Litter and Fly tipping

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on Recycling Performance • Update on PMIS
2023/24	
13 July	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Terms of Reference • Appointment of Non-Voting Co-opted Member • Floodwater Management • Work Programme
11th September 2023	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council's response to date on Baroness Casey's Review into the Metropolitan Police. • Street Lighting • EV charging
6 November 2023	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Police Priorities in Haringey & Community Safety Partnership Update; To invite comments from the Panel on current performance issues and priorities for the borough's Community Safety Partnership. • A New Met for London

19 December 2023 (Budget)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Budget Scrutiny• CS&HC strategy
27 February 2023	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Cabinet Member Questions

This page is intentionally left blank