

# **MINUTES OF MEETING Environment and Community Safety Scrutiny Panel HELD ON Thursday, 10th December, 2020, 6.30 pm**

## **PRESENT:**

**Councillors: Barbara Blake, Julie Davies, Scott Emery, Julia Ogiehor,  
Dana Carlin, Mike Hakata and Khaled Moyeed (Chair)**

**ALSO ATTENDING: Ian Sygrave**

### **50. 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'.

### **51. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were no apologies for absence.

### **52. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

None.

### **53. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no Declarations of Interest.

### **54. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/PRESENTATIONS/QUESTIONS**

None

### **55. MINUTES**

The Committee noted concerns about the late submission of responses to actions from the previous meeting and the Chair agreed to pick this up with an email and to take up the chasing of actions going forwards. **(Action: Chair)**.

### **RESOLVED**

That the minutes of the meeting of 3<sup>rd</sup> November were agreed as a correct record.

### **56. PRIORITIES FOR THE HARINGEY COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP**

*\*Clerk's note – The Chair agreed to take agenda items 7, 8 & 9 together and then the Committee would ask questions at the end.*

The Committee received a cover report and accompanying presentation which provided information about the Haringey Community Safety priority setting process for 2021/22. This was similar to the 2020/21 process, and was to be finalised by March 2021. The presentation was introduced by Sandeep Broca, Intelligence Analysis Manager as set out in the agenda pack at pages 9-22.

As part of the Mayor's Police and Crime Plan, MOPAC were committed to setting local policing priorities across the capital in conjunction with borough leaders and police. Alongside the local priorities were London wide policing priorities on mandatory high-harm crimes: sexual violence, domestic abuse, child sexual exploitation, weapon-based crime and hate crime. Last year, data showed that both violence (Robbery; Non-Domestic Violence with Injury) and burglary were trends on the rise and should be considered actively by boroughs when setting local priorities. As a result, many Boroughs chose a violence measure and/or burglary as a priority. Alongside this, MOPAC ensured that anti-social behaviour remained a local borough priority across London.

The following points were raised in discussion of this item:

- a. The Committee welcomed the positive news in relation to decreasing crime trends around robberies and serious youth violence but noted concerns around a rise in hate crime and the possibility of this getting worse as Britain leaves the EU. The Panel sought reassurance around what plans were in place to tackle this and in particular to support the victims of crime. In response, the Borough Commander advised that hate crimes were traditionally under reported and that she was pleased that this was now being reported to the Police. The Borough Commander advised that her aim was to ensure that every victim that wanted to pursue charges was supported in doing so and that cases were progressed in order to give the reassurance to the community that the issue was being taken seriously. However, the Panel was also advised that many victims did not want to pursue cases and that the criminal justice system could be daunting for victims and that she was also keen to explore other avenues such as restorative justice.
- b. In response to comments around restorative justice not always being applicable, the Borough Commander acknowledged this point and advised that ultimately, the pursuit of any crime was dependent upon the victim's needs. It was the Police's responsibility to investigate fully and to pursue every case where there was a will and desire from the victim to do so.
- c. It was also commented that some people perhaps didn't know how to report hate crime and that there was a communications point around the Police ensuring that this information was communicated widely to our communities.
- d. In response to a supplementary question around whether there was a breakdown of hate crimes in the borough, officers advised that some of the data was not separated out, but that the highest classification was under racism and religious hatred. It was commented that some of this rise seemed to be linked to neighbour disputes and the use of inappropriate language in shops and supermarkets, during the initial lockdown period.

- e. In response to a question around the rise in domestic violence incidents, the Borough Commander advised that this was another crime that was under reported. The Borough Commander set out the importance of schemes such as Operational Alliance which provided an opportunity to provide outreach support to young children who perhaps didn't want to be at home because of domestic violence and who perhaps would have been missed by the Police and the local authority otherwise.
- f. The AD for Safer and Stronger Communities agreed to circulate a briefing in relation to the Refuge. **(Action: Eubert Malcolm)**.
- g. In relation to a question around the setting of MOPAC funding for next year, officers advised that Haringey's crime prevention funding would be maintained at the same level for next year and this covered areas such as the Integrated Gangs Unit, ASB and VAWG. In relation to hate crime, officers advised that they had set up a hate crime awareness group to develop areas of learning and to signpost victims to voluntary sector organisations who could provide additional support. A hate crime awareness week had also been arranged to highlight the issue and highlight how victims could receive support.
- h. The Committee enquired as to how many police officers were on duty at any one time. In response, the Borough Commander advised that she couldn't give a specific figure but that there were lots of different officers on different shifts. The response teams and safeguarding teams operated a 7am-3pm shift daily. Some officers operated on a 10am-6pm shift pattern and CID operated split shifts. There was also flexible working arrangements and compressed hours. All together there was a 24/7 service in place across all of the different strands – response, neighbourhoods, CID and public protection.
- i. In response to a question around what concerned the Borough Commander in relation to the presentation, the Committee was advised that of course she would like to see the crime numbers come down further and that she would like to get robberies down to zero. The Borough Commander also set out that she would like for every residents to feel safe on the street and feel that they could call the police if they needed to.
- j. Concerns were noted about the ongoing severity of the gang problems in Haringey and assurance was sought around what was being done by the Council and the Police to address this. In response, the Borough Commander acknowledged the good work being done and also the frustration at the ongoing problems. The Borough Commander advised that this was a very complex problem which covered a range of issues including exploitation, violence and often involved children who didn't have a good home life. The Borough Commander set out that the key was around adopting a whole systems approach and early intervention with key partners, such as Children's Services and outreach workers to intervene at an early stage and prevent that child from being further embroiled in gangs. The Borough Commander emphasised the important role that Crimestoppers played in providing completely anonymous intelligence reporting.
- k. The Committee expressed concerns about loss of police stations across London and the loss of the Hornsey police station in particular, as there was no police station in the west of the borough. In response, the Borough Commander acknowledged that this was a significant concern for many residents and councillors but it was a decision that had already been taken by MOPAC and the Borough Commander was unable to do anything to stop it. The Borough

- Commander set out that with the roll-out of mobile technology, police officers were able to be out on the streets for longer and to have greater visibility.
- l. The Committee raised serious concerns about the redundancy of the Neighbourhood Watch Coordinator and Parks Links Officer. It was commented that this seemed to be a short sighted decision as any short term savings would almost certainly not justify the long term effects of losing such a valuable role.
  - m. In response, the Borough Commander acknowledged the fantastic job that the post holder had done over the last ten years. The Borough Commander set out that she had been working for the past year to try and find a solution to this problem but that the bottom line was that the Police could not afford to fund 75% of the post as there was no funding available from MOPAC. Ultimately, the only way this could be funded was to lose a dedicated ward officer, which she was unwilling to do. The Borough Commander set out that North Central was an outlier as no other BCU had a coordinator role and therefore MOPAC would not provide funding. The Borough Commander advised that she was looking at how to deliver most of the work that the post holder provided through the existing neighbourhood teams and would report back on this in due course. The Borough Commander also advised that she was undertaking a community mapping exercise to ensure that good practice was understood and replicated across different areas.
  - n. In response to a follow up, the Committee set out that although an outlier, the police should be looking to replicate this post across London. The Committee also expressed some degree of scepticism that the role of the Neighbourhood Watch Coordinator could be done by a neighbourhoods officer, due to workloads and given that exiting neighbourhood officers were regularly re-assigned to other policing duties.
  - o. In response to a question around the extent to which improvements in robberies were sustainable, the Borough Commander advised that there was a uniformed Burglary & Robbery Investigation Team in place who provided a focused investigative resource on burglaries and robberies. The Borough Commander acknowledged that it was difficult to quantify the extent to which lockdown had impacted the figures, however some of the improvement was undoubtedly due to the good work being done by police, such as Operation Vertis. Since 2017, high-visibility daily foot patrols were put in place with a specific emphasis around robberies. There was also fixed micro-beat patrols in place in hotspot locations.
  - p. In response to a question, the Borough Commander assured the Panel that she was very focused on drugs and that she recognised the close links with a range of other criminal activity including aggravated burglary.
  - q. The Borough Commander agreed that she would be happy to respond to any further questions that the Panel had via email.
  - r. The Chair thanked the Borough Commander for coming along to the panel meeting and responding to questions.

## **RESOLVED**

- l. To note that Haringey's agreed local priorities for 2020/21 are Violence with Injury (Non-Domestic) and Personal Robbery. Whilst some positive improvements have been noted in Violence with Injury (Non-Domestic) (-11%) and Personal Robbery (- 30%), 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 the volume of recorded crime has reduced significantly since March 2020, in Haringey and across London. Some crime types have experienced reductions in excess of 30% during this period.
- III. To note that as each phase of lockdown easing was implemented, crime levels have generally increased once again, however, they remained below previous baseline levels in most cases. Nonetheless, Haringey experiences over 1,600 violent crimes per year and almost 1,700 robberies, equating to one of each of these offences approximately every 5 hours, throughout the year.
- IV. To note that Violence with Injury (Non-Domestic) and Personal Robbery remain 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 also support a number of ongoing workstreams in Haringey, including the Community Safety Strategy, the Young People at Risk strategy, the Borough Plan and the North Area Violence Reduction Group (NAVRG)

## **57. UPDATE ON HARINGEY & ENFIELD BCU INTEGRATION.**

The Borough Commander, Treena Fleming gave a verbal update to the Panel on the Police's perspective on the previous presentation, current performance levels and how well the integration of the Haringey and Enfield BCU's had gone to date. The key areas highlighted were:

- The Borough Commander set out that she was very pleased with a number of the headline performance figures in the borough, including a 30% reduction in robberies which was excellent and was well above the London average.
- Haringey was one of the boroughs with high levels of serious youth violence, so the fact that knife crime had reduced 27% was also an excellent result.
- The merged Borough Command Unit (BCU) between Haringey and Enfield was implemented in April 2019 and the Borough Commander suggested that the performance figures provided an indication of the success of the merger.
- The Borough Commander advised that robbery would continue to be a key priority for the BCU and that high visibility uniformed patrols were on patrol every day in robbery hotspot locations to try and reduce offending.
- In April 2019, London went from 32 police boroughs down to 12. The Borough Commander advised that joining up resources with Enfield and Haringey had provided additional capacity to flex policing resources locally to respond to demand. There were a number of cross border problems, particularly around gangs and allowed the response teams to respond in a much more flexible way.
- The North Area tasking team was the violence suppression unit which was responsible to dealing with violent crime related to drugs. This unit comprised of over 40 high visibility officers who did a lot of work around robberies other violent crime.
- Traditionally, Haringey received a lot of central support from across London, however in light of the success of driving down violent crime this was no longer

- the case and the BCU no longer had priority status. This was seen as a significant milestone and it took around 18 months to achieve, involving the use of close joint working arrangements with partners.
- The Public Protection Unit, is what was previously called the Safeguarding Unit. This was a specialist unit that linked together rape investigations with domestic violence and child abuse investigations to provide a more holistic response. Previously, some of these areas would have involved a centralised response and that this could have resulted in three different investigating officers.
  - There was a lot of cross working with Council partners around safeguarding. This included Operation Alliance, which was a joint piece of public protection work with the local authority and the custody suite at Wood Green to introduce four outreach workers. The outreach workers worked with every child that came into custody to provide a teachable moment and to then follow that up with visits to the child and their parents/guardian.
  - The Neighbourhoods Team was in place and each ward had 2 dedicated officers and a PCSO. A youth independent advisory group had also been set up and the Committee was advised that police cadet numbers were growing.
  - CID were responsible for investigating serious crime outside of the public protection sphere. It was commented that whilst some of the reduction in crime levels was due to lower footfall levels during lockdown, part of it was also about some of the work that was being done by Police. The examples of Operation Venice and Operation Prosecco were given which had been high profile operations targeting drugs, violent crime and robbery and had achieved good results.
  - The BCU command unit were responsible for monitoring performance and driving continuous improvement. The command unit also contained a performance and ethics board that analysed information conducted in depth analysis in relation to crime data.

## **RESOLVED**

That the update was noted.

### **58. UPDATE ON ADDITIONAL POLICE NUMBERS IN HARINGEY**

In relation to the uplift programme of an additional 20k police officers promised by the Prime Minister, the Borough Commander advised that she was not able to give a Haringey specific figure. However the Metropolitan Police's allocation of that 20K was an extra 1369 officers to be recruited in 2020/21 and an extra 2623 officers to be recruited in 2021/22. It was noted that the 2020/21 allocation had been recruited with five months to spare. The Borough Commander estimated that she currently had 70 newly appointed probationers in the BCU, which was unprecedented.

## **RESOLVED**

Noted

### **59. SCRUTINY OF THE 2021/22 DRAFT BUDGET / 5 YEAR MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY (2021/22-2025/26)**

The Panel received a report which provided an update on the Council's 2021/22 Draft Budget / 5-year Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) 2021/22 – 2025/26 as well as the budget saving proposals within the Place priority. The report was introduced by Dee Ball, Finance Business Partner as set out in the agenda pack at pages 23-197. The Panel noted that the net budget expenditure within the Place priority was £31.43m. This was made up of total expenditure of £84.8m and £53.41m in income. There was a projected overall variance for Place in 2020-21 of £13.713m, the driver of which was Covid. The most notable impacts of Covid on Place were a reduction in parking and highways income of £11.39m and a loss of £1.3m income from major events not taking place.

The following was noted in discussion of the report:

- a. The Panel noted concerns in relation to undelivered savings within the MTFS and questioned the extent to which areas of growth were being used to offset these. The Panel requested further clarity be provided on the exact figure for the current budget gap, as it was commented that there seemed to be a number of different figures referred to in the report.
- b. The Panel sought clarity around where in the Place budget the overall savings were coming from. The Panel also requested further information in relation to the budget allocated to help people who had lost their jobs due to Covid. In particular, the Panel were keen to know what impact this had and how many people would this affect. **(Action: Dee Ball/Clerk).**
- c. The Panel agreed to put a recommendation forward to Cabinet around the retention of the Neighbourhood Watch Coordinator and Parks Link Officer post. The Chair also agreed that he would raise this matter separately with the Leader due to the strength of feeling on this issue and concerns that the post holder was due to be made redundant within weeks. **(Action: Chair).**
- d. Cllr Mark Blake commented that the reduction in funding for the above post was a budget decision made two years ago with a reduction in the council's contribution from 100%, to 50% this year and then to 25% for next year, so was not part of this year's MTFS. Cllr Blake highlighted that any resolution would relate to a reversal of previous decisions and, from his perspective, he would like to see the Metropolitan Police making some kind of contribution.
- e. In relation to saving PL20/17 on garden waste service, the Panel sought assurances around how feasible it was to expect increased year on year growth in subscriptions from a smaller pool of potential customers. In response, the Cabinet Member set out that the savings were anticipated as a result of increased marketing of the service and from potentially increasing take up with a reduction in the cost.
- f. The Panel also sought assurance about saving PL20/15 and what this involved. In response, the Panel was advised that this saving related to rationalising the fleet of vehicles used by the service and would be achieved through increased mechanisation of street sweeping resulting in less vehicles being required, as well as some savings relating to contract management.
- g. In relation to savings PL20/28 & PL20/29, The Panel raised concerns about the impact on businesses from introducing Sunday car parking charges, who were already struggling because of Covid, and requested assurance that the cost to local businesses would not outweigh the additional revenue received.
- h. The Committee noted concerns around a lack of funding for the principal road network from TfL (capital 302) and the fact that the report highlighted that if the

Council had to fund this again going forward, this would have an impact of other services. The Panel were particularly concerned around the need to protect funding for cycling and walking schemes and requested additional assurance from Cabinet on this.

- i. In relation to saving PL20/20, Fuel Savings from Electrical Vehicles, the Panel requested further assurance around whether additional savings could be generated through additional investment in this area.
- j. The Panel questioned whether additional revenue could be generated in relation to moving traffic enforcement as £350k did not seem a lot. In relation to a question about cameras needing to be prioritised for ASB and fly-tipping, officers advised that there had been significant investment into CCTV cameras and a new control room and that a paper had been taken to Cabinet on this. Cllr Hakata agreed that he would follow up on this with the relevant Cabinet Member outside of the meeting.
- k. In relation to the disposal of Keston Road, the Panel expressed concerns with any attempt sell off this site to a developer as land was the Council's most valuable asset and that if the depot was no longer necessary then the Council should be building houses on this site. Officers advised that the Keston Road site was largely a series of portacabins that were nearing the end of their functionality and that investment in parks depots was better spent on alternative sites.
- l. The Panel noted concerns with the year-on-year allocation of capital funding for parks asset management (311) over the 5 year period of the MTFs being a flat figure of £300k. The Panel advised that funding levels for this area had been subject to significant cuts over the last ten years and that they would like to see additional investment to offset this.
- m. In relation to Finsbury Park (322), the Panel wanted assurance that the proposed package of funding for Finsbury Park explicitly included funding for the Changing Places scheme.
- n. In relation to the capital budget allocation for Alexandra Palace maintenance (447), the Panel sought further information around what this funding was for. Officers advised that capital funding was not able to be used to cover shortfalls in revenue budgets such as staffing costs.

## **RESOLVED**

That the Panel considered and provided recommendations to Overview and Scrutiny Committee (OSC), on the 2021/22 Draft Budget/MTFS 2021/22-2025/26 and proposals relating to the Scrutiny Panel's remit.

## **60. WORK PROGRAMME**

The Panel requested that the work plan include a future item around scrutinising progress against the Cabinet pledge of £5.1m for active travel and the Cycling and Walking Action Plan. **(Action: Clerk).**

## **RESOLVED**

That the work plan was agreed.



**61. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

N/A

**62. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

Noted as 4<sup>th</sup> March 2021.

CHAIR: Councillor Khaled Moyeed

Signed by Chair .....

Date .....