

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 25TH JULY, 2018,

PRESENT:

Cllr Mark Blake – Cabinet Member for Communities, Safety and Engagement
Cllr Liz Morris - Leader of the Opposition
Helen Millichap – Borough Commander
David Murray – Interim Assistant Director for Environment and neighbourhoods
Ann Graham - Director for Children’s Services
Jennifer Sergeant - Head of Targeted Response & Youth Justice
Beverley Tarka – Director for Adults and Health
Sean McLaughlin - Director for Homes for Haringey
Jo Benmore – Community Safety and Enforcement
Chantelle Fatania - Public Health
Douglas Charlton - London Probation
Geoffrey Ocen - Bridge Renewal Trust
Andrew Blight - London Probation
Sandeep Broca – Haringey Council
Astrid Kjelberg Obst - HfH
Nigel Brooks – Police representative
Hugh Smith – Policy Team

1. 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.

2. APOLOGIES

- There were apologies from Cllr Weston and Cllr Ogiehor. Cllr Liz Morris attended the meeting.
- There were apologies from Stephen McDonnell and Eubert Malcolm.
- There were apologies for lateness from Beverley Tarka.

3. CSP AGENDA ONLY 25TH JULY 2018

It was noted that the September meeting of the CSP would be moved to October.

4. URGENT BUSINESS

None.

5. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None

6. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on the 26th of February 2018 were confirmed as a correct record of the meeting.

7. INTRODUCTION OF NEW CHAIRS AND PRIORITIES

At the outset of the meeting, there was introductions from Helen Millichap - Borough Commander, Cllr Blake – Cabinet member for Communities, Safety and Engagement, and David Murray – Interim Assistant Director of Environment and Neighbourhood.

- The Borough Commander noted that it was a challenging time with finite resources available to the police. Further, there was a challenge to ensure that the police were effective enforcers of the law whilst creating trust in young people. The Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) acknowledged the tricky areas that existed and was mindful of setting challenges that were both realistic and achievable. It was paramount that there was trust and confidence in the police, particularly amongst young people. It was important that shared endeavours were agreed and also what the next practical steps would be.
- The Cabinet Member for Communities, Engagement and Safety outlined the manifesto of the new Labour administration at Haringey Council, which he stated was clear in its commitment to reduce the level of crime in the borough. The Cabinet Member highlighted that a number of the commitments, such as reducing crime amongst young people, chimed with the challenges highlighted by the MPS, particularly that the community felt reassured that the Council was doing all it could to reduce crime. The focus of the new administration was at the prevention and intervention stage. The Cabinet Member further stated that recent public funding cuts had affected the current state of affairs. With regard to the increase in crime across London, it was noted that the Labour administration at Haringey had a manifesto commitment to increase investment in youth services throughout the borough.
- Interim Assistant Director of Environment and Neighbourhood outlined the commitment of Haringey Council to bring plans and strategies, agreed with the CSP, into action. The Council would be working to avoid any disconnect between theory and reality in the delivery of any strategies agreed.

8. BOROUGH PLAN OVERVIEW

The Partnership heard an overview of the Borough Plan. It was explained that the Borough Plan set out a list of priorities for the Council, which was expected to be going out to public consultation in October. The Council had been undertaking extensive engagement with its partners to gather their views to develop the Plan. This was facilitated by a partner engagement event which provided useful feedback.

Following discussion, it was recognised that 'trust' and 'confidence' should be defined within the context of what the CSP was seeking to achieve and, further, what it meant to 'build' these. In response, it was noted that confidence, in this remit, had many far ranging connotations. The main objective was to improve confidence in the community that crime was being seriously looked into and all efforts were being made to address these. Improving trust was a prerequisite amongst young people and they had to be able to rely on the police and the Council to do all they can to protect them from crime (particularly through preventative action).

The Cabinet Member detailed that there appeared to be a feeling of mistrust with the authorities, and attributed this to being a by-product from the era of austerity. Building effective relationships with the community should be a key objective for the Community Safety Partnership.

The Borough Commander stated that confidence in this arena was essentially about building the following:

- Confidence in the Police;
- Confidence in the institutions; and
- Confidence in the community to feel safe

9. COMMUNITY SAFETY STRATEGY DEVELOPMENTS

The CSP considered this report which provided an update on the status of the borough's Community Safety Strategy. The report explained that the current Community Safety Strategy was extended to 2018 to allow alignment with the new Borough Plan (discussed at Agenda Item 8).

The CSP was informed that the emerging Community Safety Strategy aimed to improve the quality of life in the borough by addressing the outcomes arising out of local, national, and regional drivers, such as reducing high crime rates and reducing reoffending. Further, the CSP noted that there had historically been an issue between the fit of single agency plans and partnership ones but that the new Borough Plan would be a Partnership Plan and so presented an opportunity for stronger alignment with the Community Safety Strategy. The Strategy would be looking to build on the outcomes of the previous Strategy, such as continuing to prevent and minimise gang-related activity and victimisation.

The CSP was notified that, as the Borough Plan is finalised, a draft Community Safety Strategy would also be drawn up and shared among partners for comment. Given the progress to date this work could be finalised through bilateral meetings and a new Strategy presented to the next meeting of this Partnership.

Following discussion, it was queried what the process involved in changing attitudinal issues was. It was noted that, in order to change attitudes through reasoning, it was important to listen to the views and experiences of individuals in the community. Only once people and their situation were understood, could a tailor made response be developed to change their attitude.

RESOLVED

To note that officers will align a refreshed Community Safety Strategy with the new Borough Plan, taking account of the latest Strategic Assessment.

10. SERIOUS YOUTH VIOLENCE STRATEGY DEVELOPMENTS

The CSP considered the new strategy in development to combat serious youth violence. The CSP were advised that the purpose of the Young People at Risk Strategy was to prevent serious youth violence and improve outcomes for young people at risk of becoming victims or perpetrators. A key focal point was to reduce the number of young people in the criminal system and those involved in crime. Particular emphasis would be placed on prevention and early intervention, seeking to nurture the protective factors that help young people to stay safe and keep them on a positive path. The strategy would propose a vision communities celebrated and one that nurtured young people. It was emphasised that it would be essential to support young people to grow up safe from harm.

The CSP was informed that the strategy focused on ensuring that the following key outcomes were met:

- young people were safe, and felt safe from violence;
- young people had good mental health; and
- young people had positive aspirations.

To achieve the above, there would be a greater focus on a preventative approach. This included addressing and identifying factors which would identify young people before they became at more significant risk of becoming victims of violent crime. The CSP was informed that the Council would intervene or enable partners to intervene as early as possible in a young person's life if they were at risk of becoming a victim or perpetrator of violent crime. Families, communities and schools were at the heart of this approach.

The MPS and authorities were recognised as being crucial in playing lead roles to ensure that the outcomes of the strategy were achieved. Additionally, it was noted that significant partner engagement needed to take place with schools, communities and families to see what different roles actors and agencies should be taking.

The CSP was notified of the timeline of the Young People at Risk Strategy, which was as follows:

- a needs analysis in July 2018;
- an evidence review in August 2018;
- a practice review in September 2018;
- partner engagement in October 2018; and
- Presented to Cabinet in January 2019.

The CSP was asked to consider its view on whether the Council had the right vision for the strategy and how organisations represented in the CSP could contribute to achieving the outcomes identified above.

The following points were raised in discussion:

- The co-producing of the strategy between the Council's partners, communities and young people was welcomed but that housing needed representation and true co-producing involved families. In response, it was noted that housing participation was welcomed in the strategy and acknowledged that the voice of young people would be essential to this piece of work.
- Significant data existed elsewhere, such as in New York and Glasgow, where similar strategies had been created. It was acknowledged that such data and information was useful and issues like mediation would be looked into to ascertain how effective they had been elsewhere and whether they should be replicated in the Strategy.
- It would be important to assist community groups that do valuable work with young people. The community wanted to know that the Council provided support around safeguarding and to know related support and training was available.
- A needs assessment was being created to identify those who might be at greater risk of violence. Data being used to facilitate this was: housing data; looking at specific groups of identified vulnerable people; those under child protection plans; those already in the youth justice system; and information about children who were frequently absent from school or those excluded.

RESOLVED

To note the presentation and above comments which would feed into the development of the strategy.

11. STRATEGIC ASSESSMENT

The CSP considered the presentation at Annex A which summarised the 2017-18 Haringey Community Safety Partnership Strategic Assessment. The presentation outlined areas of concern and/or where performance was not in line with the London average. Areas covered were critical locations and emerging problems. The Strategic Assessment would be used to form the basis of the Community Safety Strategy (as discussed at Item 9) and the key areas of focus. The CSP was advised that the Strategic Assessment was an annual statutory requirement of all Community Safety Partnerships in England and Wales, authored between September and March.

The CSP was informed that the Strategic Assessment corroborated with the Mayor's priority areas to address. Amongst the priorities were:

- A commitment to tackling violence against women and girls;
- Working with community organisations to further youth engagement; and
- Zero tolerance approach to hate crime.

The local priorities identified for the borough of Haringey included robbery and Non-Domestic Violence with Injury (VWI). The Strategic Assessment placed particular emphasis on the pressing need for violence reduction (such as in knife crime, firearms and gang related activity) and that this should be one of the principal objectives for Haringey.

It was noted that, whilst overall recorded crimes in Haringey had increased (+7%), Haringey had experienced a smaller increase than the London average (+8%). The CSP's attention was drawn to the fact that there were specific areas where Haringey was not performing as well when compared to London as a whole, such as an increase of +3.5% in hate crime reports in the 12 months to December 2017, whilst London had seen an increase of +3% during the same period. However, there were areas where Haringey was doing better than London as a whole, such as the statistic which showed that there had been a reduction in young victims of knife injuries, reducing by -8% in the 12 months to February 2018. During this period, London overall had increased by 8%.

In further discussing the statistic on the reduction of young victims of crime, specifically 'knife injury victims aged under 25 (non-domestic)', it was noted that this had fallen by 28% in Haringey. It was queried how accurate this figure was, given that this statistic was only from what had been reported to the police and there might have been more cases than those reported. In response, it was noted that this figure was more likely than not to be correct as there were alternative means by which it could have been discovered that there had been a knife injury to a victim, other than it being reported to the police, such as the analysis of hospital admissions or data attained from young people. Lastly, it was acknowledged that, although the figure was a positive one and indicated a general move in the right direction, it must be noted that knife enabled crime was on the increase year on year and complacency must be avoided in view of positive statistics.

The following points were also raised in discussion:

- Different issues affected different parts of the borough, e.g. the rise of robbery in the west wards. Further, it was noted that particular schools had more issues than others and it should be the focus to identify which schools were having problems in order to address them. It was acknowledged that, with regard to causes, the data was significant in providing causational issues. The example of data around school exclusions was highlighted as being useful in showing which schools required greater intervention to address why there was a pattern of exclusions.
- It was noted that drug dealing was felt to be far more pervasive than it had done in the past in Haringey and that it formed a large part of street culture.
- It was queried to what extent mental health was being seriously engaged with, specifically amongst youth at risk, and that this should be a focus for the strategy. It was raised that the threshold for admission for those displaying mental health problems appeared to be too high, potentially due to the cuts to mental health services in previous years. This was a particular problem for youth who had to wait a significant period of time to be seen.

- With regard to unreported crime, it was queried how confidence was restored amongst the community in the police and institutions so that individuals felt comfortable to report criminal acts. In response, it was noted that there had been piloted schemes, such as one in Northumberland Park, which allowed individuals to report crime anonymously. This could serve as a blueprint for future schemes in the borough to follow.
- Drugs was a driver for crime and that, if it was known where the drug problems were, then this should be tackled as a priority. It was noted that Homes for Haringey was working in tandem with the Council and police to identify and report properties that it was aware of where drug dealing was taking place.
- It was questioned whether there was a link between the drop in knife crime in Haringey (as discussed above), and the increase in gun offences (such as Lethal barrelled firearm discharges increasing from 17 up to 44 year on year, a 160% increase). It was noted that, in terms of the data, it was difficult to categorically say if the increase in gun offences was on the up because knife crime was down but that this would continue to be monitored.
- Perception was important to note. There needed to be confidence in the authorities that the figures being reported were the correct ones.

Resolved

To note the contents of the Strategic Assessment and that the Key findings are used to inform the Community Safety Strategy.

12. DISCUSSION ON ABOVE

Following group discussions amongst the Community Safety Partnership, there was a positive reaction to the new emphasis on focussing strategically on intervention and prevention. It was acknowledged that, moving forward, better identifying factors which could help prevent crime, such as those discussed in Agenda Item 11, as being the fundamental point that would underpin the success of any strategies created.

It was identified that a large number of those who were found to be engaged with criminal activity had already had some dealings with the authority in one way or another. It was felt that a key focus should be to look at how a preventative approach could be adopted to ensure that individuals were not caught up in a cycle of criminal activity and constant engagement with the authorities. For those that were identified as being at risk of becoming involved with crime, what could be offered to them (in terms of support) to prevent initial involvement with the authorities. The use of role models and mentors who could embody a positive image for young people to emulate was suggested as an effective preventative measure, as had been shown by other systems that successfully used similar tactics to prevent and combat criminal activity.

Additionally, agencies such as local groups with a far reach and a high number of members should be utilised in spreading positive messages.

It was noted that there existed a range of strategies used by the police, Haringey Council and the Safer Neighbourhood Board to treat similar issues. Issues such as these must be addressed to reduce the potential for duplicate activity. It was felt that it would be helpful if strategies used by the various agencies were aligned so that resources could be better strategically used.

In looking at the issue of serious youth violence and the causes of it, with regard to wider factors such as organisation of crime, it was acknowledged that the Council and its partners had significant scope to contribute to the reduction of this. For example, Homes for Housing could be a significant resource tool for the police in alerting them when it becomes apparent that homes within their jurisdiction were being used for criminal and gang related activity. Homes for Haringey could also help to prevent criminal activities operating out of these properties by evicting those individuals found to be using the property as a base to operate. Also it would to obtain the learning from other cities such as New York when considering actions on youth violence.

There was discussion about support to children who are at risk of future offending and who despite going to a school where there were good results were not achieving their potential. This meant exploring different methods for supporting these children and their families from a young age to learn and continue engaging with learning through secondary school to deter from offending. This could mean looking in detail at home factors connected with learning and better supporting the family from a child's early developmental stages. Also looking at ways for encouraging children's with involvement in extra - curricular activities where there are positive roles available.

There was group discussion about operation Marlon which could be used as a example when considering the places to put in interventions such as secondary schools. There could be focus on specific secondary schools and emphasis on the vulnerability of children crossing borough lines.

Resolved

To note the above in the development of the CSP strategy.

13. INFORMATION SHARING PROTOCOL

The CSP considered the report which detailed updated information about the MOPAC London Crime Prevention Fund (LCPF), and Co-Commissioning fund, outlining the current progress of the fund(s) to date and next steps.

The CSP was notified that the current information sharing arrangement was due for review in December 2018. However, it had been suggested that the review date for this was brought forward so that the Council could ensure the information sharing arrangement complied with General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), following its implementation on 25 May 2018.

Resolved

To note the contents of the MOPAC LCPF and Co-Commissioning Fund Update.

14. MOPAC COMMISSIONING

The CPS considered the report which detailed updated information about the MOPAC London Crime Prevention Fund (LCPF) and Co-Commissioning Fund Update. The CSP heard that A new approach to the LCPF has been introduced that safeguards and protects local community safety and preventative services while also enabling innovation through co-commissioning to collectively achieve more than would have otherwise been possible under the previous funding formula.

The CSP noted that the Mayor of London was continuing the LCPF budget over the next four years, (2017/18 to 2020/21) and a key focus for the Council was to think consciously about how best how the money provided was spent to utilise the funds available.

The CSP heard that there would be a wide ranging focus from direct work with women and young people (specifically on 18-25 year olds) who had been involved with crime, and tackling the sexualisation of young people to help prevent sexual violence of young people.

Resolved

To note the contents of the MOPAC LCPF and Co-Commissioning Fund Update.

15. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None

16. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

None

17. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

15th October 2018 2pm
12 December 2018 2pm
13 March 2019 2pm

CHAIR:

Signed by Chair

Date