

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SAFETY SCRUTINY PANEL HELD ON THURSDAY 12TH OCTOBER 2017

PRESENT:

Councillors: Tim Gallagher (Chair), Barbara Blake, Clive Carter, Makbule Gunes, Bob Hare and Anne Stennett

6. FILMING AT MEETINGS

The Chair referred Members present to agenda Item 1 as shown on the agenda in respect of filming. Members noted the information contained therein.

7. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

An apology for absence was received from Mr Sygrave.

8. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None.

9. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

10. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/PRESENTATIONS/QUESTIONS

None.

11. MINUTES

Panel Members requested that the further information regarding responsibility for the removal of abandoned bicycle parts from cycle stands that had been circulated following the last meeting of the Panel be re-circulated.

In respect of the review of the services commissioned from Kingdom, as referred to under item 11 (Cabinet Member Questions), the Panel noted that this would be looking, amongst other issues, at the type of fines levied. The services that they provided were separate from the Council's enforcement function. In respect of item 12 (Waste, Recycling and Street Cleansing Data) Panel Members also requested information on what the level of recycling would be had there not been an increase in the number of loads rejected. Councillor Ahmet, the Cabinet Member for Environment, stated that it was undoubtedly a contributory factor in targets not being met and agreed to obtain further information for the next meeting.

AGREED;

1. That further information about the impact of change in government regulations regarding contaminated loads on the Council's recycling performance be circulated to the Panel; and
2. That the minutes of the meeting of 26 June 2017 be approved.

12. CABINET MEMBER QUESTIONS - COMMUNITIES

Councillor Eugene Ayisi, the Cabinet Member for Communities, reported on developments within his portfolio as follows:

- Consultation had taken place on proposals in respect of the Police estate. As part of this, it was proposed that there would no longer be a Police contact centre in the west of the borough, However, there would still be a 24 hour presence at Tottenham Police station. The proposal had been discussed at the Community Safety Partnership and there had also been a public meeting to receive the views of local residents. Concerns had been expressed regarding the visibility of the Police but an average of only 1.5 crimes were day were currently reported to Hornsey Police station. By contrast, approximately 34 crimes per day were reported at Tottenham Police station. The way that people reported crime had changed and people now tended to telephone. In addition, they could now report on-line. Police officers would soon also be able to input crime data directly into the system without the need to return to the Police station. Maintaining the physical space would cost the borough 8 Police officers. There was a need to communicate the new arrangements effectively to residents. A range of public spaces could also be used to increase the visibility and accessibility of the Police;
- In respect of the voluntary sector, there had been a meeting of relevant community organisations last November. Good progress had been made since then and there was now greater clarity regarding where decisions were made. As a result of this, community organisations could now bid more confidently for grants and could operate more strategically;
- On 30 November, the annual Violence Against Women and Girls (VAWG) White Ribbon Day would take place. Men were a key component of the work to prevent VAWG as they were often the perpetrators and therefore needed to take ownership of the issue. The aim of White Ribbon Day was to highlight the issue, particularly within organisations;
- Communities had highlighted the need for young people to have somewhere to go in order to divert them from anti-social behaviour. The proposal to develop a Youth Space could provide an opportunity to address this as part of an improved offer for youth within the borough;
- In response to the terrorist incident that had occurred in Finsbury Park, the Faith Forum was being launched and work was being undertaken to develop resilience within communities.

In answer to a question regarding the large increase in gun crime within the borough and its relationship to young people, the Cabinet Member reported that similar

increases had been reported across London. The issues that could lead to gun crime started from a young age and early intervention could assist in addressing them. A high percentage of young people who became involved in knife crime had been exposed to domestic violence. They could also be coerced into crime. There had been a stripping out of services for young people in the past few years. Work was taking place with schools to address the issue of attainment amongst black young people. Work was also being undertaken with the Police which was based on viewing such young people as vulnerable with a safeguarding approach more appropriate than enforcement. The view was that Early Help could cut the supply of young adults that get involved in gun crime.

Eubert Malcolm, Head of Community Safety and Enforcement, reported that 9 of the gun discharges that had been recorded were linked to Ducketts Common and issues related to drug dealing and anti social behaviour that had taken place there. Acting Detective Superintendent Caroline Haines, from Haringey Police, reported that current figures showed 29 gun discharges which equated to a 107% increase. There had been a spike between September and October last year when there had been 9 firearm discharges in the Ducketts Common area. An operation had been mounted to address the issues that had arisen in the area and these had now diminished. The 9 discharges that had occurred had accounted for one third of the ones that had taken place in the borough in the past year. They were often linked to gang disputes and the numbers had levelled out recently. There needed to be a balance between diversion and enforcement.

In answer to a question regarding the whether young people would be prepared to travel across the borough to access youth facilities, he stated that a large number travelled from west to east on a regular basis. Only 5 young people had been identified as having specific issues with travelling across the borough. He felt that the Youth Zone was a much needed facility that would provide activities for a large number of young people every day of the week. Its benefits far outweighed the alternative of doing nothing. The offer would be varied and suitable for all sections of the community. It would be remiss of the Council to turn down the offer, which would provide £3 million of capital and revenue funding as well. The Friends of Chestnuts Park had indicated that they did not want their park used for the project but the intention was to come back with further proposals in due course.

In answer to a question regarding CCTV installation, he stated that gangs knew exactly where cameras were located and often inflicted damage on them. Their installation could also merely displace crime and anti social behaviour. Care therefore needed to be exercised when deploying them, despite their popularity with residents. Each licensed bar was required to provide and monitor its own system.

The Panel noted that the new on-line system of reporting crime removed the need to engage with the Police on a face-to-face basis. Information could be inputted using a map and the new system had the potential to improve intelligence on crime. Work was being undertaken with libraries on the possibility of them being used as a contact point.

Panel Members commented that there were people who lived in the vicinity of Chestnuts who were in favour of the proposed Youth Zone as they were concerned at

the lack of facilities for young people in the area. Councillor Ayisi stated that there was only currently £250,000 for youth services in the borough. He felt that serious consideration should be given to developing the Youth Zone should an alternative site come available.

The Panel thanked Councillor Ayisi for his contribution.

13. HARINGEY COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP: PERFORMANCE AND PRIORITIES

Mr Malcolm reported that the funding available from the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime to fund work to address priority crimes would be reduced from £781k in 2017/18 to £518k in 2018/19. This currently financed a range of programmes within the borough. In terms of performance in the past year, the increase in total notifiable offences had been slightly higher than the average for London and was higher in the east of the borough.

There had been a significant increase in hate crime. It was thought that this had been influenced by the Brexit vote as well as recent terrorist incidents. Increases in the rate of reporting were nevertheless welcome as they could demonstrate a greater level of confidence in the response to crimes. There was particular under reporting of homophobic crimes and it had been estimated that only 1 in 5 offences were reported nationally. Whilst there had been no increase in anti-Semitic offences reported, it was possible that this was due to under reporting.

The Cabinet Member for Communities commented that there were concerns regarding Islamophobic crimes against women, who were more visibly Muslim and therefore more likely to be victims. However, engagement with them in order to provide support and reassurance was not always easy.

Christina Andrew, Strategic Lead for Communities, reported that those hate crimes that were reported were likely to be just a fraction of total offences. Work was planned to improve levels through hate crime awareness. In particular, an event was being planned that would be aimed specifically at women.

Ms Haines commented that the Police viewed the increase in reporting of hate crime as positive. It was bigger than the London average and could show that the level of under reporting in Haringey was not as great as elsewhere. An Engagement Officer from Counter Terrorism was now working within the borough and was undertaking work to develop third party reporting.

A Panel Member commented that statistics that showed trends over a period of time would enable Members to make a clearer judgement regarding progress. Statistical changes were not necessarily always significant as there was an in-built degree of variability. Ms. Haines agreed to take this issue back for further consideration with partners.

In answer to a question, Ms Haines stated that there had been successful prosecutions of people for hate crimes in the borough. Perpetrators were being caught and charged but more work was needed to keep the local community

informed. She did not have access to data on detection rates but could bring such information to a future meeting.

Mr Malcolm reported that there had been a 32% increase in personal robbery, which was above the average of 29% for London. Much of this had been due to theft of mobile phones. Young knife injury victims had reduced by 12.4%, compared to a London wide increase of 14.7%. There had been an increase of 220% in firearm discharges. These had mainly occurred in the east of the borough. There also had been an above average increase in non-domestic violence with injury offences of 3.5%. It was thought that this was related to the night time economy. The level of confidence and satisfaction with the Police was the fourth lowest in London and the second lowest amongst the Black and Minority Ethnic community. The statistics that were used came from the MOPAC.

Mr Malcolm reported that comparisons were taken with the Council's most similar group of boroughs and, in particular, what others were doing to address crime and anti social behaviour. In respect of knife crime, he stated that just addressing it through enforcement would not be effective. A knife crime action plan was being developed, which aimed to improve performance. In addition, a knife crime summit for the borough was being arranged by the Bridge Community Trust.

Ms Haines reported that there was a large amount of joint work between the Council and the Police. Partners were currently facing severe challenges regarding resources though and there were emerging issues to address such as the proposed merger between Haringey and Enfield Police. She felt that the performance data was an accurate picture of performance.

In answer to a question regarding ease of contact, Ms Haines reported that greater publicity was taking place on how to contact the Police. Although it was now possible to report crime on-line, it was acknowledged that this would not suit everyone and more could be done to assist people in contacting the Police. Easier ways to report crime could help to free up officer time and therefore help the Police to respond more quickly to emergencies. The use of body worn cameras by officers had helped to build public confidence and save officer time. In particular, there was now less chance of stop and searches being contested.

In respect of the theft of mobile phones, Ms Haines stated that additional resources would be needed to record them separately. Such incidents could either be regarded as robbery if force was used or theft if not. Tactics in respect of moped riders, the risk of pursuing them had to be assessed but tactics were currently being reviewed.

14. SCRUTINY REVIEW ON COMMUNITY SAFETY IN PARKS - UPDATE ON IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Simon Farrow, Highways, Parking, Parks and Open Space Manager, reported on progress with the implementation of recommendations from the Panel's review on community safety in parks as follows:

- Crime in parks had not increased, although there had been issues at Ducketts Common. This had now been addressed, although there was some evidence of it being displaced to Finsbury Park;

- As part of the changes brought about by the Council's new branding, new signage had been introduced including emergency contact information;
- It had not been possible for the Police to establish a team of Special Officers to patrol in parks due to budget cuts. Additional Police patrols had taken place in Finsbury Park though. Action had been taken in parks by the Police to tackle dumping and rough sleeping, especially in the Paddock. These actions had also involved the Council and other partners;
- In terms of vehicular access, a lot of work had been undertaken in Finsbury Park. Traffic was now segregated and there was now a curfew before and after school. New powers were awaited that would allow enforcement without parking bays. There were currently issues with cyclists not observing speed limits when crossing the park;
- The locking of parks was still being considered. There were also issues in respect of deterring access by groups of travellers that needed to be addressed;
- Work was taking place on Public Space Protection Orders (PSPO), which were felt to be a more effective means of enforcement than replacing antiquated by-laws;
- Unlawful camping and rough sleeping were still issues for the borough. In addition, there were also concerns regarding travellers entering parks and commercial waste dumping. These could be very costly for local authorities to deal with;
- Community payback was now being used extensively in Haringey; and
- There was a strong relationship with Friends groups and a number of new groups had been established. They had played an important role in maintaining and developing facilities in parks.

Mr Malcolm reported that Enfield had obtained a three year green space preventative injunction that provided a faster mechanism to move Travellers on. The use of PSPOs was also being looked at. Mr Farrow commented that even if parks were unlocked, they still needed to be made secure.

In respect of litter in parks, this was costing circa £250k per year. There had been issues with bins being full. Larger compacting bins that could hold six times more waste were being brought in. These would include sensors that would indicate when bins were full. Education, information and enforcement were also being used. If the amount of litter could be halved, this would be enough to pay for 5 additional gardeners.

15. FINANCIAL MONITORING

Funmi Olagbaiye from Corporate Finance reported that there was currently an overspend of £1 million relating to the budget for Priority 3 of the Council's Corporate Plan and efforts were being made to mitigate this. There were particular issues with parking income due to the temporary move of Tottenham Hotspur to Wembley Stadium, which had caused a shortfall in income from parking penalties. In addition, the move to cashless parking had not delivered the savings anticipated. Despite this, £2.5 million of savings had been delivered. In terms of capital, there was a £2.1 million underspend relating to the refurbishment of CCTV cameras, which was to be deferred to 2018/19. Despite the overspend, there was nothing within the plan for the year that was severely off track or unachievable.

16. SCRUTINY REVIEW ON STREET SWEEPING - CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Panel considered the evidence that had been received to date as part of the review on street sweeping. It was felt that a greater degree of flexibility was needed within the contract in order to ensure that there was a consistent level of cleanliness across the borough. A needs or outcome based model might therefore work better than rigid schedules, which did not appear to be working everywhere. This needed to be underpinned by a guaranteed level of cleanliness for all areas with robust monitoring to ensure that this was taking place. In addition, the greater use of machinery should also be considered.

AGREED:

That the Panel recommend that a more flexible system of street sweeping be established, underpinned by a minimum standard for all streets, and that the greater use of machinery be considered.

17. WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE

AGREED:

That the work plan for the Panel be approved.

CHAIR: Councillor Tim Gallagher

Signed by Chair

Date