

# **MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 27TH FEBRUARY, 2019, 14:00.**

## **PRESENT:**

Cllr Mark Blake – Cabinet Member for Communities, Safety and Engagement

Cllr Elin Weston – Cabinet Member for Children and Families

Tarka Beverley – Director of for Adult Social Services

Graham Ann – Director of Children's Services

Geoffrey Ocen - Bridge Renewal Trust

Helen Millichap – Metropolitan Police (Chair)

Broca Sandeep – Haringey Council

Benmore Joe – Community Safety and Enforcement

Malcolm Eubert – AD Interim Assistant Director Stronger Communities

Hugh Smith – Policy Team

Fatania Chantelle - Community Safety and Enforcement

McDonnell Stephen – Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods.

Jonathan Joels – London Probations

Mukhtar Kauser – London Community Rehabilitation Company

Ruchi Singh – MOPAC

Neil Billany – Metropolitan Police

Keshia Phipps - Victim Support

Marc Isaacs - Communications Team

Lauritz Hanson-Bay

## **49. 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.

## **50. APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were noted from Cllr Ogiehor, Joanne McCartney, Sean McLaughlin, Astrid Kjellberg-Obst & Gill Gibson.

Apologies were also received from Nigel Brookes. Neil Billany attended the meeting in his absence.

**51. URGENT BUSINESS**

There were no items of urgent business

**52. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

**53. MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting on 12<sup>th</sup> December were agreed as a correct record.

**54. MEMBERSHIP AND TERMS OF REFERENCE**

The Partnership noted the Membership and Terms of Reference.

**55. YOUNG PEOPLE AT RISK**

The Partnership received a report for noting which set out a long term strategic approach to reducing and preventing youth violence based on a public health model, as well as the strategic priorities identified for the following four years. The report included a copy of the Young People at Risk Action Plan. The report was introduced by Hugh Smith, Policy and Equalities Officer as set out in the agenda pack at pages 17-32. The following arose from the discussion of the report:

- a. In response to a question around signposting and information relating to where young people could get help, officers responded that this was a priority and that funding had been secured for Haringey Community Gold. The programme involved the placement of detached youth workers within the community. It was suggested that this would be a key resource, particularly in terms of signposting how to access wider services. In response to a follow up question around information available online, officers acknowledged the need to start mapping this information on to the Council's website but cautioned that this would likely take some time. The Partnership noted that there was a young person's crimestoppers website called Fearless which also provided some of this information.
- b. In response to a request for clarification on what aspects would be different, the Partnership was advised that one of the key aims was to improve partnership working and to ensure a strategic joined up approach across the Partnership. It was also suggested that there would be a much greater provision of youth services across the Borough going forward.
- c. The Cabinet Member for Communities, Safety and Engagement acknowledged that there was a need to bridge the disconnect between the different agencies. The Partnership noted that the BRT were organising a youth summit on 12<sup>th</sup> March with the PRU attending along with a number of local schools.
- d. In response to a question around the evaluation process, officers advised that a series of key indicators were being developed as part of a performance dashboard to monitor performance of the strategy and its related activities.

- e. The Partnership noted the implementation timeline of April 2019 for Haringey Community Gold and sought reassurance as to whether this was achievable. In response, officers advised that the Haringey Community Gold involve £1.5m funding over a three year period and the aim was for 2000 young people to go through the different interventions available over that three year period. The Partnership was advised that work was already on the ground and that there were a number of different reporting mechanisms in place to support this. The Chair emphasised that the key link for the CSP going forward would be with the Executive Sub-Board.

The Partnership undertook a workshop exercise and were allocated around 15 minutes to give some thought and provide feedback on the following questions:

1. What were the roles of community safety partners in achieving the outcomes and priorities outlined in the strategy?
2. How could the CSP support the delivery of the strategy?
3. What role did the CSP wish to play in the governance of the strategy?
4. Were current partnership arrangements sufficient for successful delivery of the strategy?

The following key points were noted in response to the feedback from the workshop exercise:

- a. The role of the VRU in achieving some of the outcomes and priorities identified would be around sharing intelligence and sharing information about successful initiatives, especially at a pan-London level. The VRU also had a role in terms of convening partners.
- b. The Selby Centre held a key role in relation to early identification and intervention. The Council had a key role around community based early intervention.
- c. The CSP was an important forum for partnership working and a space for different agencies to work creatively. The need for representation of young people on the CSP was discussed as well as the capacity to develop leadership roles for young people.
- d. Should the CSP adopt a 'hub and spoke' model or should it adopt an approach of continuous improvement where the different constituent parts worked independently but came together often to learn lessons and ensure continuity.
- e. Public Health were undertaking a range of activities through schools around VAWG. There was also work being undertaken around drugs and alcohol as well as the Anchor project.
- f. Neighbourhood Watch also had a key role in terms of getting the messaging out.
- g. There was a need to develop a directory of key services and ways for the community to get involved in this.
- h. There was also a need to ensure that the strategy was a live document and regularly updated and refreshed to ensure that it met the needs of the community.

- i. Victim Support had a number of projects already up and running around children and violence within the home and had developed links with other organisations around early interventions.
- j. The importance of the voluntary sector's role was discussed, as well as the need for their input at an executive level, in order to ensure community based delivery of priorities and outcomes.
- k. The need for a whole systems approach was discussed but feedback from partners was that there were some concerns about information sharing and that clarity was needed on what this would entail.

In response to a question around the future governance arrangements, the Director of Children's Services advised that she would be chairing the Executive Sub-Board. The Partnership noted that, within the governance arrangements, there was a small group which would be responsible for looking at the ongoing governance process and there would also be a wider group involving key partners. Some further thought was required around the make-up of the wider reporting arrangements and whether the Sub-Board could perhaps report up to the CSP.

## **56. VIOLENCE REDUCTION UNIT**

\*Clerks note – the Chair amended the order of the agenda and brought item 12 on the VRU forward so that external representatives from MOPAC did not need to be present for the duration of the meeting. The order of the minutes reflects the order that the business was taken, rather than the order on the published agenda.

The Partnership received a verbal update in relation to the MOPAC Violence Reduction Unit (VRU) from Ruchi Singh from the Mayor's Officer for Policing and Crime. The Partnership noted that MOPAC were seeking to adopt a public health approach as well as a co-design approach, to ensure that there was a strong sense of community involvement in everything they did. Ms Singh identified that there was already a significant amount of work being undertaken by practitioners across different agencies and the VRU would be looking to build on this and learn from others. MOPAC were working with the ICO to ensure that they could share intelligence and data analytics across partnership networks and it was envisaged that this would be a key function of the VRU. A communication and engagement strategy was being developed to support this.

The following was noted in response to the discussion of this update:

- a. In response to a question on the types of practitioners involved, MOPAC advised that they were seeking to involve a wide array of practitioners including children's services and other local authority representatives, PRUs, youth workers as well as community networks.
- b. The Partnership sought clarification over the nature of the public health approach being adopted by MOPAC. In response, Ms Singh advised that there was recognition of the need for a balance between early intervention and enforcement. The VRU recognised the value of the Met. in enforcement, but also recognised the importance of prevention and early intervention,

particularly in terms of health, education and safeguarding services. As an example, the Partnership noted that the VRU were doing some work on the role of school exclusions and the correlation between this and violent crime. The Partnership was advised that some problems needed to be solved at a London-wide level and that the Mayor's Office had a convening power to lobby and influence at the government level.

- c. The Partnership requested that further information be provided at a later date around the reporting arrangements of the VRU and how it would interact with some of the violence reduction work being undertaken by the joint BCU in Haringey and Enfield.
- d. The Partnership noted that a Director of the VRU had just been appointed. The Partnership requested that either the new Director or Lynne Abrams come back to a future meeting of the CSP to provide a further update. **(Action: Clerk).**

## 57. MOPAC PERFORMANCE REWARD GRANT

The Partnership received a report which set out the details of the MOPAC Performance Reward Grant (PRG) for 2018/20. Haringey was awarded £471,591 to fund a number of agreed projects to address the three strategic themes of; reducing and preventing VAWG, improving community engagement and confidence in Police and delivering MPOAC's Business Crime Strategy in key town centre areas. The report was introduced by Joe Benmore, Interim Head of Community Safety and Enforcement and included in the agenda pack at pages 33-35.

The Partnership undertook a workshop exercise and were allocated around 5-10 minutes to give some thought and provide feedback on the following questions:

- 1. How should the CSP target the funds from the PRG for the biggest impact?
- 2. How do we promote the CSP as a brand?
- 3. What other schemes were already in place?

In discussion of the workshop exercise the following points were noted:

- a. There was a need to focus on youth engagement as a priority.
- b. There was also a need to develop an ongoing dialogue through digital channels. Consideration should be given to how young people used social media rather than how it was used currently.
- c. Developing a brand for the CSP was a good idea but it needed to be evidence based and demonstrate outcomes.
- d. Any communications or social media needed to be targeted to its intended audience.
- e. Putting in place a comprehensive directory of services was highlighted as an effective low-cost proposal.
- f. The idea of having themed CSP meetings was put forward. It was also suggested that a 'you said, we did' approach be adopted for communications.
- g. One example of existing services that could be utilised was neighbourhood watches, it was suggested that they had access to thousands of people's contact information.
- h. A suggestion for branding was around young people staying safe. It was proposed that an advertising campaign on the back of bus seats could be effective.

In response to a question around next steps, officers advised that responses from the workshop would be collated and proposals on how to move the process forward would be drawn up and circulated. Officers agreed to bring a further update on the PRG to the next meeting of the CSP. **(Action: Eubert Malcolm).**

The Partnership considered that this was an excellent opportunity and that quick progress should be made. It was discussed whether a sub-group or task and finish group should be set up to drive this forward. The AD for Community Safety and Enforcement agreed to Chair this and would speak to colleagues outside of the meeting to agree further details. **(Action: Eubert Malcolm).**

## **RESOLVED**

- I. That Board members noted the successful bid aligned to meet the strategic priorities of the Mayor's Police and Crime Plan 2017-2021.
- II. That Board members were invited to suggest effective ways to deliver the biggest impact on communications spend within the PRG.

### **58. NORTH AREA BASIC COMMAND UNIT UPDATE**

The Borough Commander provided a verbal update for noting on the North Area Basic Command Unit (BCU). The Partnership were advised that the BCU went live on the 9<sup>th</sup> January, however the senior team for both boroughs had been working together for a year prior to that date. The Partnership was advised that overall the transition had gone well and that for example, response rates to 999 calls were comparable with the average across the Metropolitan Police area. The Borough Commander acknowledged that there were a number of operational advantages in having a joint BCU, including there being a central hub for dealing with safeguarding issues.

The Borough Commander set out that it was envisaged that there would be a strong sense of continuity and that there would still be the same faces working across the two boroughs. The Partnership noted that a further update on how well the BCU was performing would be brought back in due course once sufficient performance data was available around solving rates and response times etcetera. **(Action: Helen Millichap/Clerk).**

### **59. MOPAC PRIORITY SETTING**

The Partnership received a report which set out the MOPAC local priority setting process for 2019/20. In addition to agreed local priorities for Haringey in 2018/19 such as Violence with Injury and Personal Robbery, there were also London-wide policing priorities on mandatory high-harm crimes such as; sexual violence, domestic abuse, CSE, weapon-based crime and hate crime. The report was introduced by Sandeep Broca, intelligence Analysis Manager as set out in the agenda pack at pages 37-41.

The following points were raised in response to the discussion of this item:

- a. The Cabinet Member highlighted that there had been an announcement from the Mayor's Office that there would be an extra £110m for policing in the next financial year and sought assurances around when this would translate into

seeing extra officers on the beat. In response, the Borough Commander acknowledged a desire to see more police officers on the streets but cautioned that there would inevitably be a lag between the announcement, undertaking an effective recruitment process and then training and deploying those officers on the ground. The Borough Commander also highlighted that there was currently a vacancy factor within the BCU hence, in effect, the Metropolitan Police were not even able to recruit officers to the level that they could currently afford. Therefore, adding more officers to that frontline offer would take some time. The Borough Commander agreed to bring an update on recruitment of additional officers back to the partnership in due course. **(Action: Helen Millichap).**

- b. In response to a request for prioritisation of car theft as part of the wider robbery priority, the Borough Commander advised that robbery required violence in order to meet the definition. Concerns around car theft were acknowledged but the Partnership was advised that priority was given to the high harm basket of crimes. The Borough Commander suggested that this may be an issue that members of the public could address with their local ward panels with a request for extra resources within a specific location or area, capacity permitting.
- c. The Partnership advised that there were some ongoing concerns within the community around reporting crimes through the non-emergency telephone number, as well as reporting crimes online. In response, the Borough Commander acknowledged issues with the 101 telephone line but advised that the website had been completely updated to accommodate online reporting and that she was not aware of any issues. The Borough Commander encouraged anyone with concerns to feed these back to Neil Billany.

## RESOLVED

- I. To note that Haringey's agreed local priorities for 2018/19 are Violence with Injury (Non-Domestic) and Personal Robbery. Whilst some positive improvements have been noted in both of these categories, (-7% and -1% respectively), both of these remain significant challenges for the borough. The seriousness of such incidents continues to also remain high, with levels of injury sustained often being significant.
- II. To note that whilst some other crime categories are also experiencing challenging performance, such as burglary, the focus on Violence and Robbery over the past year appears to have had a positive effect.
- III. To note that Haringey experiences over 2,000 violent crimes per year and almost 1,800 robberies, equating to one of each of these offences approximately every 4 hours, throughout the year.
- IV. Due to these factors, the Partnership agreed that Violence with Injury (Non-Domestic) and Personal Robbery remained key local priorities for Haringey, along with the basket of high-harm crimes (sexual violence, domestic abuse, child sexual exploitation, weapon-based crime and hate crime) and anti-social behaviour. These priorities would support a number of ongoing workstreams in Haringey, including the refreshed Community Safety Strategy, the Young

People at Risk strategy, the refreshed Borough Plan and the North Area Violence Reduction Group (NAVRG).

- V. To note that MOPAC would be liaising with Haringey to determine local priorities. This would take place between February and March, with a final decision to be agreed by 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2019. Priorities for 2019/20 would be published on 5<sup>th</sup> April 2019.

**60. UPDATE ON NORTH AREA KNIFE CRIME & SERIOUS YOUTH VIOLENCE ACTION PLAN**

The Partnership received a report which summarised the background and implementation of consistent knife crime and serious youth violence action plans across London and how this work was being developed and implemented across Haringey and Enfield. The report was introduced by Neil Billany from the Metropolitan Police as set out in the agenda pack at pages 43-46. The Partnership was advised that the North Area Violence Reduction Group had met three times prior to this meeting of the CSP.

The Partnership enquired how long the Met. funding would be available and what resources would be required to ensure that this was sustainable long-term. In response, police colleagues advised that the funding was provided for the initial set up and implementation and so would be for one to two years. Following this initial period, additional funding streams would need to be developed and that work would continue with voluntary and community sector partners around this.

**RESOLVED**

- I. To note the update provided and to support the work of the North Area Violence Reduction Delivery Group.
- II. To agree that further updates be provide to future CSP meetings.

**61. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

N/A

**62. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

**63. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

The Council Calendar for 2019/2020 is due to be agreed at Annual Council in May.

CHAIR:

Signed by Chair .....



Date .....