Members

*Councillor Nilgun Canver (Chair), *David Grant (Vice Chair), Lee Bojtor, *John Brown, *Sue Brown, *Stephen Carroll, Jean Croot, *Jennifer James, *Claire Kowalska, *Enid Ledgister, *Mohamed Maigag, *Joanne McCartney, *Marion Morris, Barbara Nicholls, *Rev. Nims Obunge, Dr Ita O'Donovan, *Robin Payne, *Mary Pilgrim, *James Slater and *Jackie Thomas.

*Present

Also Present Joe Benmore, Tina Cramer, Hywel Ebsworth, Eliza Meechan, Rohan Sankey, Simon Stone, Sean Sweeney, F.G. Williams and Sonia Wilson.

LC127. APOLOGIES (Agenda Item 1)

Apologies for absence were received from Lee Bojtor, Niall Bolger (for whom Robin Payne substituted), Paul Bridge (for whom Jackie Thomas substituted) Peter Lewis (for whom Jennifer James substituted) Barbara Nicholls and Dr. Ita O'Donovan.

LC128. MINUTES (Agenda Item 4)

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 7 May 2009 be confirmed as a correct record.

LC129. TERRORISM UPDATE (Agenda Item 5)

We noted that the threat of terrorism had been downgraded to 'severe – plots ongoing'. Reference was also made to media coverage of verdicts in recently concluded terrorist trials. The Police remained in a state of preparedness and asked that the public remain vigilant.

RESOLVED:

That the verbal update be noted.

LC130. OFFENDER MANAGEMENT IN HARINGEY AND UPDATE ON PPO SCHEME (Agenda Item 6)

We received a presentation from the Haringey Probation Service on a report which had been completed in June 2008 on developing a Haringey response to reducing reoffending through a co-ordinated rehabilitation and resettlement service. The Probation Service was to become a responsible authority to the Crime and Disorder reduction Partnerships (CDRPs) with effect from April 2010 with a view to increasing public protection and public confidence.

We noted the numerical profile of offenders in Haringey as well as the Offender Assessment System (OASys) Profiles by gender, age offence type and criminogenic need. We also noted the main points of the Prolific and other Priority Offender (PPO) Scheme and the Haringey profile of non statutory offences by category for the period July 2008 – June 2009. In terms of the report's original recommendations we were

informed that the reducing Re-offending Co-ordinator had been recruited and that a SCEB Sub-group on Adult Re-offending was in place. It was also proposed that in future OASys data be reported to SCEB on an on-going basis and that there should be discussion about the establishment of a multi-disciplinary team with a view to taking forward integrated offender management. However, the funding required to support this agenda would be dependent on the approval of a business case.

Our Chair having thanked the Probation Service for their presentation and their ongoing support to SCEB, we endorsed the proposal that OASys data be reported to SCEB on a quarterly basis and Board Members then commented. It was noted that 'hate crimes' had not been included as an offence type because that had not formed part of the analysis but this category and statistics relating to it could be included in future reports. It was also noted that, in terms of criminogenic need, accommodation was ranked joint fourth of the ten categories shown and it was suggested that social environment often dictated life choices and that this might be an appropriate matter for the Re-offending Sub-group to consider.

Clarification was then sought of whether further work could be done to improve the recording of the information around ethnicity and reference made to the earlier mention of information about hate crimes we asked that these be looked in greater detail by the Sub-group.

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

LC131. OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY - RESPONSE TO HOME OFFICE GUIDANCE ON SCRUTINY OF CDRPS / WORK PROGRAMME RELATING TO SAFER COMMUNITIES (Agenda Item 7)

We noted that the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Committee had considered a report on the local implications of Home Office Guidance on the scrutiny of crime and disorder. We also noted that the guidance provided a framework for the development of a closer relationship between Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRP's) and scrutiny.

We were informed that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee would be the designated scrutiny body in Haringey that dealt with the scrutiny of crime and disorder matters. In addition there would be "task and finish" review panels which would undertake parts of the work with the Committee retaining ultimate responsibility.

We were also informed that the Committee had agreed to continue with the current Haringey practice of a joint and collective response to scrutiny recommendations on community safety issues being considered by our Board, via the Council's Cabinet, and co-ordinated by the Council's community safety team. The Committee had taken the view that that as the CDRP would normally be acting as an integral part of the local strategic partnership it would be included in the general protocols relating to the scrutiny of them and local improvement targets thus obviating the need for a separate protocol for CDRP matters. Having endorsed the Committee's decision that closer links needed to be developed with the Consultative Police Community Group, we

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

LC132. CRIMINAL JUSTICE AND IMMIGRATION ACT (Agenda Item 8)

We received a presentation from the Youth Offending Service on the Criminal Justice and Immigration Act 2008, the main provisions of the Youth Rehabilitation Order (YRO) and the Scaled Approach and its implications for our Board members.

We were informed that the key aspects of the Act were changes to the purposes of sentencing, the introduction of the Youth Rehabilitation Order (YRO), changes to Referral Orders, the Youth Conditional Caution as well as custody-related changes Anti-social behaviour, Youth Default Orders and Rehabilitation of Offenders Act updates.

We were also informed that the YRO was intended to simplify juvenile sentencing structure with a sentencing proposal tailored to individual risk and need as well as a menu of interventions to tackle offending behaviour including provision for robust community sentences which could be used on multiple occasions by adapting the 'menu'. The YRO replaced a number of existing Orders and carried with it a variety of requirements.

With regard to a scaled approach evidence suggested that interventions were more effective when the level and intensity of intervention was matched to an assessment of the risk of re-offending, was focused on the risk factors associated with offending and mirrored the adult sector tiered framework of interventions. The YRO required a more tailored and targeted approach to the proposals made in court reports. Interventions would be designed to reduce the likelihood of re-offending reduce the risk of serious harm to others support the new sentencing framework tailor intervention to individual risk and need. The anticipated benefits of the YRO were –

- More efficient and effective allocation of Youth Offending Team (YOT) resources
- Fewer young people in custody
- Strengthened case management across the youth justice system
- Improved practice in assessment quality, pre-sentence reports and intervention planning.

Through these benefits there would be reduced re-offending and reduced risk of serious harm leading to increased public confidence.

Our Chair thanked the Youth Offending Service for their presentation and sought clarification of how track would be kept of the new Scaled Approach following the implementation date in response to which it was confirmed that our Board would be expected to play a monitoring role.

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

We noted that the key performance issues against the improvement targets for Quarter 1 were most serious violent crime which was showing a downward trend due to problems with youth related violence earlier in the financial year and the change in classification to include where an object was perceived, intimated or used. Also, although acquisitive crime performed well overall in the first quarter, there were concerns about achieving performance throughout the year relative to last year's successes and about maintaining reductions against burglary and robbery simultaneously during a recession.

We were also informed that the current year was the final year of the LAA stretch target agreement in relation to performance on personal robbery and domestic violence. While the robbery target had already been exceeded close monitoring of changes would be required. Haringey had recently re-negotiated the target to reduce repeat victims of domestic violence which was based on a flawed calculation. The newly agreed should now be within reach and also be closely monitored.

We were pleased to note that the ratings for project delivery were predominantly good although there had been some delay in recruiting a CCTV Manager and a Reducing Re-offending officer. While the problem solving budget had been slow to spend a number of projects had now been approved and bids were underway for others. There remained uncertainty about the delivery of Victim Support services to young people as the committed funding of certain posts within the Youth Offending Service was for the first half only of the financial year.

Discrepancies between figures reported to the Board and those reported to the Council's Cabinet were a question of timing only. Concern was expressed about funding issues and the likelihood of reduced levels of grants in the next financial year. Particular disquiet was voiced about the need for partner agencies to give some form of undertaking in relation to the continued support for agreed long term projects.

RESOLVED:

- 1. That the report be noted and a half year performance report and full finance update be presented to the Board in November.
- 2. That a specific more detailed report on individual projects be brought back to a future meeting of the Board.

LC134. HARINGEY'S CRIME AND DISORDER INFORMATION SHARING PROTOCOL (Agenda Item 10)

We noted that the purpose of the report was to provide an update on the work that had been undertaken relating to Haringey's Crime and Disorder Information Sharing Protocol and sought our approval prior to its submission to the Haringey Strategic Partnership Board in November 2009.

In response to a question about the changes being proposed we were informed that these were not considered to be significant but were more concerned with practical changes to make the protocol more user friendly including by reducing and simplifying

the number of forms used and by simplifying the language used with the removal of legalistic terminology to make the forms less daunting.

Concern was expressed that the protocol failed to address the ethos of sharing personalised information in sufficient depth and did not define whether for this purpose 'information' was written material only or if it included other sources such as CCTV footage. We were of the view that a greater input was required from the Community Safety Unit that some reference to domestic violence needed to be included and reference was made to the recurring theme in serious case reviews about the failure of agencies involved to share information. Disquiet was also voiced about the lack of clarity concerning the role of the voluntary/community sector in the protocol.

RESOLVED:

- 1. That the report be noted.
- 2. That a further report addressing the issues outlined above be submitted in November following further consultation with relevant partner organisations.

LC135. FINAL ANALYSIS OF PLACE SURVEY - WHAT IT MEANS FOR THE SAFER COMMUNITIES PARTNERSHIP (Agenda Item 11)

We received a presentation on the Highlights from the Place Survey and we noted the following key messages –

- Satisfaction with the Council and perceived value for money were near the bottom in London environment (Key drivers of satisfaction were litter and social housing)
- An issue with local public services not just the Council (few people thought they received respect and consideration)
- Satisfaction levels with area, and anti social behaviour orders were not universal (black and minority ethnic residents and social renters were less positive)
- Emergency/health services were rated less well than the London average
- Housing was a key issue (this was lower in Haringey than almost anywhere else in London)
- · Satisfaction with the area had increased
- · Fewer residents now thought there were problems with anti social behaviour
- Community cohesion and feeling safe outdoors were near the London average
- Haringey residents were more likely to feel empowered in decision making than elsewhere in London
- There were some successes in the services provided:
 - Waste collection was important, and was perceived in an increasingly positive light here (while London-wide ratings had remained static)
 - Consistent improvements in sports & leisure services
 - Satisfaction with other services was steady, no better or worse

While we were pleased to note that fewer people were concerned about anti social behaviour we were disappointed that satisfaction with the Council and with some key services including the Police and the Fire Service were below the London average. Board members commented that a piece of work needed to be done to improve communications and to challenge perceptions especially those of younger residents and tenants who tended to rate cohesion more negatively. Reference was made to the need to recognise that people identified with the area I which they lived and for

information to be localised In this connection reference was made to an initiative by Homes for Haringey to produce information at estate level. Reference was also made about the production and distribution of collegiate information and how the partner statutory agencies might involve the voluntary/community sector which would have a key role in the dissemination of information and influencing perceptions. We noted that the survey would be conducted again in a year's time so there was a chance to challenge perceptions although there was much work to be done.

RESOLVED:

- 1. That the presentation be noted.
- 2. That Board Members be invited to share the highlights of the Place Survey with their respective organisations and that the question of influencing perceptions be raised at the Board's Performance Management Group.

LC136. RESPONSE TO SWINE FLU (Agenda Item 12)

We received a verbal update and were advised that Phase 1 of the epidemic was considered to be over and preparations were in hand for Phase 2 which was now expected in mid-October. Lessons had been learned from Phase 1, the strain of flu had been much milder than expected but still posed a serious threat to certain groups of people.

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

LC137. FLOOD CONTINGENCY PLAN (Agenda Item 13)

We noted that the Department for the Environment Food and Rural Affairs had required that Multi-Agency Flood Plans were prepared for all areas susceptible to flooding. The Haringey Multi Agency Flood Plan would support the London Regional Flood Response Framework which governed how widespread or severe flooding in London would be addressed and would set out how emergency services, the Council, NHS and other partners would work together.

We also noted that the document was an operational plan and would require agreement from all key statutory partners. Consultation was on-going to ensure the Plan reflected the actions to which all partners could reasonably commit. The Plan would be a public document with the intention of re-assuring the people of Haringey that the Partnership was ready for the risk of flooding.

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

LC138. UPDATE FROM PARTNERSHIP BOARDS (Agenda Item 14)

We considered a report which outlined the key issues and developments from the main sub-boards which reported to our Board.

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

LC139. PROGRESS ON RESPONSE TO THE RECESSION (Agenda Item 15)

We received a verbal update on the progress on the response to the recession and we noted that a report on this matter would be submitted to the Haringey Strategic Partnership Board on 5 November.

LC140. ANY OTHER BUSINESS (Agenda Item 17)

1. Crown Prosecution Service

We welcomed Hywel Ebsworth and Rohan Sankey from the Crown Prosecution Service and we agreed that they be invited to attend future meetings of our Board.

2. London Week of Peace – 20/27 September 2009

We noted that there were a number of events to celebrate the London Week of Peace including –

- London Peace Debate (21 September)
- Peace Awards (23 September)
- Sponsored Run/Walk (26 September)
- Trafalgar Square Events (27 September)

LC141. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS (Agenda Item 18)

RESOLVED:

That it be noted that future meetings of the Board were scheduled for 19 November 2009 and 4 February 2010.

The meeting ended at 13.05 hours.

NILGUN CANVER Chair