

MINUTES OF THE COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 25 JUNE 2025, 12:00PM – 2:00PM

PRESENT:

Councillor Ajda Ovat - Cabinet Member for Communities (Co-Chair)

Caroline Haines – Detective Chief Superintendent (Co-Chair)

Sandeep Broca – Intelligence Analysis Manager

Abigail Wycherley – VAWG Programme Lead

Councillor Zena Brabazon

Eubert Malcolm – AD Stronger and Safer Communities

Joe Benmore – IOM Lead

Dina Samhanovic – Victim Support

Superintendent Ian Martin – Metropolitan Police.

Mark Wolski – Head of Community Safety

Chantelle Fatania – Consultant in Public Health

Eleanor Girling – Strategic Lead, Communities

Lee McKean – Metropolitan Police

Adam Browne - ASB, CCTV & Enforcement Manager

Nazyer Choudhury – Principal Committee Co-Ordinator

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

Apologies had been received from Councillor Nick da Costa, Will Maimaris and Barry Francis.

3. URGENT BUSINESS

There was no urgent business.

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

5. MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 6 March 2025 be agreed as an accurate record.

6. MEMBERSHIP

Ms Cynthia Tuitt, Head of Service for Enfield and Haringey to be added to the Membership list.

7. INTRODUCTION TO THEMED DISCUSSION 'STOCKTAKE ON HARINGEY COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP'

Mr Sandeep Broca introduced the report.

The meeting heard:

- London as a whole was challenged by gun crime. Some of that recording was based on a true increase in gun related activity. There had been a reduction in the discharge of firearms, even though there had been an increase in the overall count of firearms.
- Violence reduction was a positive trend. Some of the surrounding boroughs had actually seen increases. A lot of this had been driven by robbery. Around 30% of all youth related crime was robbery related, so a lot of the good work had been done to reduce robbery. This impacted positively around the youth work.
- Gun crime was one of the biggest concerns and one of the biggest risks in terms of increases, particularly because Haringey was an outlier across London. In terms of firearms being discharged, Haringey was lower than Enfield which was driving up the North London BCU total.
- The '98' figure listed in the report was the figure for all gun crime, the actual lethal barrel discharges was at '12' for the last rolling year. Enfield was at '13'.
- Roughly 50% of all robberies were now knife enabled. This was not to say that a knife was used, but it was in the category where it was either used, seen or intimated, which was significant. Robbery was generally driving a lot of the knife crime so despite the decrease, there was still quite a lot of knife-enabled robbery.
- Reduction in domestic abuse was positive, but was estimated to be under-reported by about 40%. The British Crime Survey would look at domestic abuse levels differently.
- In relation to the confidence in Police overall, the figures related to it would be better taken as a judgment on the whole system rather than exclusively the Police alone.
- The challenge for the Police was that the data on Police Confidence was not available at a more local level.
- In relation to domestic abuse data, this was violence with injury. There was a desire to reduce domestic violence as a whole, but the Police did not have a specific aspiration about reduction of volume of domestic abuse due to the under-reporting. The Police wished to reduce the impact and the severity. This was about homicide prevention where violence with injury was a specific element that the Police worked to try and tackle. This included predatory offenders, repeat victimisation and the violent element of domestic abuse. This may translate to what the borough wanted to measure for outputs and outcomes for victims of domestic abuse. This would be observed in MARAC as repeat incidences or repeat perpetration. The Partnership would benefit from having oversight of this. Some of this information was available and could be shared at future meetings. Various similar statistics comparing with other local authorities would also be useful.
- In relation to partnership funding, it was notable that large chunks of funding was coming in from various organisations and it was unclear how the money could be used in a coherent manner. It would be useful for the Partnership to look at this holistically. In relation to the Youth related service, the initiatives were given scrutiny through the Young People at Risk Strategy. Everything was underpinned by the key performance indicators there and at a future meeting, whether it was a youth related topic or

another topic, an impact report for the Young People At Risk Strategy could be presented to provide assurance about the interventions.

- For young people at risk, there was a Young People At Risk Network. There were about 20 different stakeholders on this network. Some of those directly delivered the projects within the strategy. Some of those were part of the Youth Justice System and they met on a regular basis. Their role was to make sure they delivered against the strategy and objectives within it.
- In relation to MOPAC funding, there were quarterly review meetings with MOPAC (the funders). There were also quarterly project leads meetings, where the project leads had to come and present their quarterly KPIs to ensure that they were meeting the KPIs. The only gap related to how it was scrutinised at the Partnership meeting.
- The meeting should report on a periodic basis on partnership funding so it could see highlight reports of what was being done, what might be available in the future and then looking at intelligence and risk. The Partnership could then get involved properly in terms of informing those decisions about what to bid for and not to bid for and where the funding got allocated. This could be presented to the meeting possibly on a six-monthly basis, possibly for an update alongside performance. Alternatively, a separate group could look at the funding and a highlight report could be presented to the Partnership instead due to the timings of different discussions.
- A youth voice was needed within the Partnership.
- A highlight report from other meetings could be put forward to the CSP at the next meeting. Draft reports could also be brought forward to the meeting for approval.
- Representatives from MOPAC, LCPF and VRU teams could attend a future meeting.

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

8. HARINGEY CRIME PERFORMANCE AND PARTNERSHIP FUNDING OVERVIEW - JUNE 2025

Mr Mark Wolski presented the report.

The meeting welcomed the report and heard:

- It was clear that drug dealing was going on in the community along with antisocial behaviour. A common query was what the Council would do about it. Northumberland Park had enormous amounts of resource over the years, but was resistant to change. It was not clear what the sanctions there were for these sorts of issues.
- It was important for the meeting to set priorities, making it clear as to what the priorities were and it was important to see how the Partnership was managing to progress on the outcomes.
- Although a strategy was present and priorities within it were clearly outlined, it was important to challenge how frequently these were discussed and reminded of them. It was unclear how much they drove the progress of the meeting. It could be useful to set a standard agenda to include the statute of responsibilities and priorities that was diarised to ensure everything was covered.
- If only one area was focused upon, it was possible to go a whole year without actually discussing a priority. A summary report of the outputs and headlines in relation to the priority could be done.
- The strategy was clear in the priorities, but there were also visions and objectives. Sometimes the priorities appeared in all of the areas.

- Having space on the agenda for any new and important issues that could arise was important.
- It was difficult to determine how focus was improved in areas like Youth Justice where different partners were delivering different parts of it.
- Various other boards such as the Strategic Board and other strategic meetings occurred and it was important that representatives attended those - as regular updates on what was happening were delivered in those meetings.
- The Council was undergoing a financial process and would be actively reducing the number of meetings.
- It was unclear what the Partnership actually did which affected any improvement. Evidence for this was difficult to gather. It was important for the Partnership to test itself against real life improvements. KPIs were useful, but real-life experience was another standard of measurement. Officers or councillors often only got a snapshot of people's lives. Public Health needed to be involved. There were some public health issues around drug dealing, drug taking or substance abuse in families. Representatives from Housing were present at the meeting and the collaboration needed to be wider.
- Other parties could be invited to the meeting including Probation, Education, the Chair of the Secondary Heads Group could also be invited. However, this could be discussed separately, as part of the Secondary Heads were part of the Youth Justice Management. This link could be strengthened in a different way to feed into the Partnership.
- Smartphones were being discussed as a public health issue as it related to harassment, bullying and trolling.
- A small group from across the Partnership could get together to think about what had been discussed and contemplate it further. Priorities were still valid, but setting up to discuss the rigor around what would be reported on could mean priorities being neglected. It was important to focus on what the CSP did in the next 18 months based on its priorities during that time.
- It would be useful to understand what kind of different support was activated at different stages for an individual or a family. This would help give a practical understanding of what strategic priorities were being implemented and helping people operationally.
- Priorities subject to the existing strategy may use language not precise enough. The use of a small group could define what was going to be focused upon.
- The performance report was really positive. These could sometimes be too long with too much data. Alongside it, a thematic update on priorities would be useful. Different parts of the Partnership could provide a report and it would be possible to work out where re-prioritisation was needed. This could be something that could be part of the small group to consider.
- An updated terms of reference could go back to the dashboard.

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

9. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

The next meeting would be held on 22 October 2025.

10. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Ms Jackie Difolco informed the meeting that the youth justice inspection was held in January 2025 and the report was published in late March 2025. The Youth Justice Partnership

received an overall grading of 'good with outstanding features'. She wished to thank the Community Safety Partnership as well due to the close ties and many of the representatives at this meeting were also on the Youth Justice Management Board and they felt the leadership and partnership arrangements around youth justice were very strong.

Mr Eubert Malcolm stated that Clear, Hold Build could be subject to further progress reports. There were developments on two or the three of the operations including one on communities. Dr Will Maimaris may chair that strand of meetings. Some active discussions had been held with residents about the challenges they were facing. There were a number of operational delivery groups set up and then there would be a 'silver' meeting that fitted into the existing 'gold' meeting. An Executive Board was also in place. A meeting of Clear, Hold, Build was in place on 8 July 2025 around sex workers and the approach needed to support women - not just via enforcement.

Mr Joe Benmore discussed a ninja ban in place just outside Wood Green from 10 July 2025.

Mr Adam Browne stated that hopefully by the next meeting, a cuckooing team - one of the Mopac funded projects – would be in place. A project steering board for this had been appointed. This linked to the priorities around reducing ASB, supporting victims, vulnerable adults and children. An update on this could be given at the next meeting.

The meeting thanked Mr Wolski and the team for putting forward a refresh of the Community Safety Partnership.

CHAIR: Councillor Ajda Ovat

Signed by Chair

Date

This page is intentionally left blank