CRIME & DISORDER COMMITTEE
AGENDA

7.30pm Wednesday, 1 December 2010 Havering Town Hall, Main Road, Romford.

Members 9: Quorum 3

COUNCILLORS:
Conservatives (5) Residents (2) Labour (1) Independent Residents (1)
Ted Eden John Wood Denis Breading David Durant
(Chairman)
Rebecca Bennett (Vice Chairman)
Georgina Galpin Linda Van den Hende
Fred Osborne
Melvin Wallace

For information about the meeting please contact:
James Goodwin (01708) 432432
E-mail: james.goodwin@havering.gov.uk
Crime & Disorder Committee, 1 December 2010

What is Overview & Scrutiny?

Each local authority is required by law to establish an overview and scrutiny function to support and scrutinise the Council’s executive arrangements. Each overview and scrutiny committee has its own remit as set out in the terms of reference but they each meet to consider issues of local importance.

They have a number of key roles:

1. Providing a critical friend challenge to policy and decision makers;
2. Driving improvement in public services;
3. Holding key local partners to account; and
4. Enabling the voice and concerns of the public.

The Crime and Disorder Committee considers issues by receiving information from, and questioning, Cabinet Members, officers and external partners, particularly the Responsible Authorities, i.e. Metropolitan Police, Metropolitan Police Authority, Fire and Rescue Authorities, and Primary Care Trusts, to develop an understanding of proposals, policy and practices. They can then develop recommendations that they believe will improve performance, or as a response to public consultations.

Committees will often establish Topic Groups to examine specific areas in much greater detail. These groups typically consist of between 3-6 Members and the review period can last for anything from a few weeks to a year or more to allow the Members to comprehensively examine an issue through interviewing expert witnesses, conducting research and site visits. Once the topic group has finished its work it will send a report to the Committee that created it and it will often suggest recommendations to the executive.

Terms of Reference

The areas scrutinised by the Committee are in exercise of the functions conferred by the Police and Justice Act 2006, Section 19-22 and Schedules 8 & 9.
AGENDA ITEMS

1. CHAIRMAN’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman will announce details of the arrangements in case of fire or other events that might require the meeting room or building’s evacuation.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND ANNOUNCEMENT OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

(if any) – receive.

3. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

Members are invited to declare any interests in any of the items on the agenda at this point of the meeting. Members may still declare an interest in any item at any time prior to the consideration of the matter.

4. MINUTES OF THE MEETING

To approve as correct the minutes of the meeting held on 12 October 2010, and authorise the Chairman to sign them.

5. LONDON FIRE AND EMERGENCY PLANNING AUTHORITY - presentation from Trevor Meers, Borough Commander.

6. VOLUNTEERING WITH THE METROPOLITAN POLICE - presentation by Mrs Jo Hudson, Metropolitan Police Volunteer Co-ordinator.


8. ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR – report from the London Borough of Havering, Community Safety Manager

9. SAFER NEIGHBOURHOOD TEAMS – CONSULTATION – report from the London Borough of Havering Community Safety Manager (to follow)
Crime & Disorder Committee, 1 December 2010

10. FUTURE AGENDAS

Committee Members are invited to indicate to the Chairman, items within this Committee's terms of reference they would like to see discussed at a future meeting. Note: it is not considered appropriate for issues relating to individuals to be discussed under this provision.

11. URGENT BUSINESS

To consider any other item in respect of which the Chairman is of the opinion, by reason of special circumstances which shall be specific in the minutes that the item should be considered at the meeting as a matter of urgency.

Philip Heady
Democratic Services Manager
MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE CRIME & DISORDER COMMITTEE
Havering Town Hall, Romford
12 October 2010 (7.30pm–9.35pm)

Present:


Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Fred Osborne ** (Councillor Lynden Thorpe substituting) and Melvin Wallace* (Councillor Sandra Binion substituting).

All decisions were made with no member voting against.

The Chairman advised the Committee of action to be taken in the event of emergency evacuation of the Town Hall becoming necessary.

10. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 7 July 2010 and of the special meetings held on 3 August 2010 and 8 September 2010 were agreed as correct records of the meetings, subject to the following amendments, and signed by the Chairman.

- 7 July 2010 – minute 6: Last paragraph amended to read ‘The Committee noted the concerns and thanked the Borough Commander for his honest responses.’
- 8 September 2010 – minute 9: Last sentence of second paragraph amended to read ‘The Chairman informed the meeting that he felt it was too early in the life of the Committee to formulate a response to the consultation.’
- 8 September 2010 – minute 9: Add a new paragraph reading ‘In response to a question officers informed the Committee that the Council would not be submitting an individual response to the consultation but would be responding on behalf of the Havering Community Safety Partnership.’ As a penultimate paragraph.

11. INTEGRATED OFFENDER MANAGEMENT

Andrew Blight, Assistant Chief Officer, London Probation Service attended the meeting and delivered a presentation on the work of the Barking/Dagenham & Havering Local Delivery Unit and his work on Integrated Offender Management. The unit had five operational teams under the control of individual managers:

- Barking & Dagenham Offender Management Unit;
- Havering Offender Management Unit;
- Barking/Havering Courts;
- Public Protection Unit;
- Substance Misuse/PPO

However, as a cost saving measure across London 20 of middle managers would
be made redundant. Barking/Dagenham & Havering Local Delivery Unit would lose one manager.

The Committee were provided details of the unit’s workload which indicated that approximately 1% of the two boroughs’ population was being dealt with by the Probation Service. Over 78,000 hours of unpaid work was carried out by people on probation in the last 12 months.

Drug misuse was not seen as a major problem in the borough with alcohol misuse being as a larger issue.

Andrew also outlined the work of the Community Safety Partnership – Offender Management Group, of which he was Chairman.

The Committee noted the presentation and thanked Andrew for responding to all their questions.

12. LICENSING ISSUES

The Licensing and Health & Safety Manager delivered a presentation on the work of the Licensing Team and how it impacted on Crime & Disorder in the borough. The Licensing Team comprised 3 Licensing Officers, 2 Licensing Technicians and the Manager, Licensing and Health and Safety.

For this committee the key area was the issue of licences under the Licensing Act 2003. In 2009/10 over 1350 applications or variations were dealt with by the section. A risk rating system for all applications had been developed and the section had close links with partner responsible authorities who included Police, noise team, planning, London Fire Brigade, children’s services and trading standards. The team also investigated complaints, carried out reviews, undertook prosecutions and participated in the Safe and Sound initiative.

The Council were consulting on proposed changes to the Statement of Licensing Policy. The main changes proposed were:

- The introduction of times when regulated activities will normally be permitted to:
  - Until 11.30pm in residential areas,
  - Until 00.30 am in mixed use areas, and
  - No limits in leisure areas.

- The introduction of a saturation policy for St Andrews Ward because of the effect of the number of licensed premises in that ward on crime and disorder (48 out of 78 applications related to properties in that ward.)

- The introduction of a saturation policy for Romford, within the ring road, because of the affect of the number of late night venues on crime and disorder.

In accordance with the saturation policy there would be a presumption that all applications for (i) pubs and bars, (ii) late night take-aways, (iii) off licences and (iv)
premises for music and dancing would be refused in these two areas. Restaurants and entertainment venues were excluded from this policy.

The Licensing Authority would consider any applications but the applicant would need to prove why their application would not have an effect on the reasons why a saturation policy had been introduced.

The Home Office had issued a consultation document ‘Rebalancing the Licensing Act.’ These proposals would be introduced by the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Bill which was due to be published in October. The key points of the consultation paper were:

- The presumption to grant licenses will be removed and replaced with local authorities and the police being able to respond to residents’ concerns.
- The cost of licensing to be reflected in fees and an additional charge to be levied for late night premises to help pay for policing.
- More sanctions against premises selling alcohol to children, and
- Ban the sale of alcohol below cost.

The Committee noted the report and thanked the Licensing and Health & Safety Manager for her presentation.

13. PRESENTATION BY CHIEF SUPERINTENDENT MICK SMITH, BOROUGH COMMANDER

The Borough Commander delivered a presentation regarding policing in the borough. He referred to the challenges he faced which included budget reductions in April and mid-term. He advised the Committee that he was not responsible for paying Police Officers and PCSOs salary costs, this funding came from the centre. His budget paid for civilian employees of which he had 60.

Discussions were being held centrally to look at making the most efficient use of resources. This included options on brigading, i.e. sharing resources across borough boundaries. He believed that after the 2012 Olympics the Metropolitan Police would look different due to necessary budget cuts. Territorial Policing anticipated a reduction in budget of around £200m over the next 3 years. The intention was to focus on keeping front-line services in place, with management and back office functions being rationalised to make savings.

He was looking at rosters to increase the number of officers available at periods of peak demand. The Safer Neighbourhood Teams roster has been changed to facilitate 12 hour tours of duty, and availability at weekends. The service was also looking at new rosters for response policing and CID.

Customer service was a clear focus for the service, monitored through confidence and satisfaction data. Recent surveys had indicated that 80% of the public were satisfied with the level of policing in the borough. Public confidence was continuing to rise due to the work of the police and its partners.
The borough had seen a reduction in crime with Havering being seen as a very safe borough. An example was residential burglary, where the level of crime was at its lowest level in five years with 250 crimes fewer than last year. A current challenge being faced was motor vehicle crime which was up on last year, but lower than the previous year.

The Borough Commander answered a series of questions asked by the Committee and the Committee thanked him for his presentation.

14. SAFER AND STRONGER COMMUNITIES FUND SPEND 2010-11

Officers advised the Committee that £245,841 had been allocated to the Havering Community Safety Partnership (HCSP) for spend on Safer and Stronger Communities in 2010-11. This had been reduced by 6% in year. A further sum of £35,397.50 had been allocated by the Home Office for capital expenditure.

The funding had been allocated across the five themes identified as priorities for the HCSP. The HCSP had agreed that the capital funding should be allocated to develop projects that fell within one of the following areas:
- Designing out crime;
- Addressing environmental crime; or
- The purchase of technical equipment to address one of the priority themes identified in the Community Safety Plan.

The Community Safety Manager explained the procedure adopted to allocate the funds which had to be agreed by the HCSP Implementation Group. 35 projects had been funded to date with each of the themes having money available to allocate for fresh projects.

Concern was expressed that no projects tackling Hate Crime had been approved this year. The Community Safety Manager advised that fresh projects were being considered by the Violent Crime Group for consideration by the Implementation Group.

The Committee noted the report and the progress made in allocating the funding.

15. COMMUNITY SAFETY EXTERNAL GRANT FUNDING 2009-10

As requested by the Chairman the Community Safety Manager submitted a report detailing the total expenditure and project outcomes achieved from external funding secured by the Community Safety Service in 2009-10 to deliver key programmes to address crime and disorder in 2009-10. Approximately £320,000 of external funding had been secured from external sources in 2009-10.

An update on the key projects funded was given by the Community Safety Manager.
16. **TOPIC GROUPS**

Having discussed a variety of options for a Topic Group the Committee requested a report on Anti Social Behaviour for the next meeting as a preface to a Topic Group on this subject.
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This report provides an overview of the current practice and future developments in relation to anti-social behaviour in Havering.

That Members note the content of the report.

Anti-social behaviour, current practice and future developments.

History

In March 2003 the government published a White Paper that outlined its proposals for tackling anti-social behaviour that recommended the government provide local authorities and the police with a wider, more flexible range of powers to tackle nuisance crime and low-level criminality. The Bill was designed to target what the
(then) Home Secretary, David Blunkett, described as "a yobbish minority" who could make "the lives of hard-working citizens a living hell" and included a wide range of sanctions such as parenting orders and contracts, curfews, and fixed penalty notices. The Bill also proposed the strengthening and an extention of the application of anti-social behaviour orders (ASBO’s) first introduced in England, Scotland and Wales by the Crime and Disorder Act 1998. The White Paper was later transacted as legislation under the Anti-Social Behaviour Act 2003.

The Act provides a range of powers and sanctions aimed at managing or modifying the behaviour of those whose behaviour was blighting society and the focus has been largely upon these people rather than those whose lives have been affected.

Current Landscape

As an outer London Borough, Havering has experienced relatively low levels of anti-social behaviour (ASB) and crime generally but with one of the largest population of ageing residents, the fear of ASB and crime is disproportionately high. This directly affects the nature of ASB that is reported which can, on occasions, appear to be somewhat minor in nature but which clearly have an impact upon the residents reporting the issues. A recent piece of work around public perceptions of community safety in Mawneys and Elm Park wards highlighted the fact that the majority of residents actually feel safe in their own neighbourhoods but less so elsewhere in Havering. Furthermore, the perception is very much that the police have, in spite of the introduction of Safer Neighbourhood Teams (SNT’s), retreated over the years from dealing with the ‘yobbish behaviour’ as described by David Blunkett when drafting the legislation.

The figures available locally suggest that the most common types of ASB are rowdy and inconsiderate behaviour and occur primarily in Romford town centre and the Hilldene and Petersfield areas of Harold Hill . To a lesser extent, ASB is experienced in Hornchurch town centre but a recent Problem Oriented Partnership (POP) in Hornchurch has had some impact upon these levels. Thus, those most likely to be affected by this type of ASB are the young and those who use our public places more frequently. At this point it might be prudent to point out that the MPS have adopted a far wider definition of what constitutes ASB as, in effect, almost any criminal activity could be defined as being ‘anti-social’. However, locally police and LBH have agreed a specific set of criteria drawn from the police command and control (CAD) codes in order to ensure attention is focused on those areas where one would normally define the matter as ‘anti-social’ within the public arena.

At present, the Havering Community Safety Partnership (HCSP) have identified tackling ASB as being one of the key objectives for 2010/11. This mirrors the fact that tackling ASB continues to be one of the five key objectives for the Home Office under the new government.

The LBH Community Safety Service have the lead role in developing preventative strategies to reduce offending and the opportunities to do so. This includes commissioning services such as youth intervention projects around the Hilldene area of Harold Hill and Romford (Cottons Park); diversionary activities such as sporting activities in Rainham and Harold Hill; referrals to the London Fire and
Emergency Planning Authority LIFE program; personal safety awareness sessions; Halloween diversionary activities across the borough; a self help IT solution for young school aged children to report incidents and seek advice around their anti social behaviour and personal safety; and the development of a self-help Watch scheme for users of Havering Country Park.

Additionally, where incidents do occur, the LBH Community Safety Service performs the role of 'citizens champion' to maintain high standards of service and to hold other services to account. Thus, as well as actually leading and managing casework the LBH officers provide a coordination and oversight role of all cases and, further, manage a cross agency and cross service action plan that seeks to provide some degree of 'additionality' to combined efforts.

Whilst the police do, as anticipated, have the majority of cases reported to them, other cases are referred direct to the LBH Community Safety Service as well as the ASB team within Homes in Havering (HiH). Following the recent HMIC report, the police are seeking a corporate solution to capturing and managing their reports of ASB and are planning to use their Crime Reporting and Information System (CRIS) to do so. However, without creating duplication, this approach will preclude any other agency from examining or contributing to their investigation record. The Community Safety Service investigate those cases reported on the borough wide ASB reporting line (01708 726060) or the ASB e-mail address (ASBHavering@havering.gov.uk). This service, based around an answerphone and e-mail box monitored and managed by a dedicated case worker, receives some 15 calls per month on average. Up until recently these cases were managed on a paper file based system but, since August 2010, cases have been managed on a simple Word and Excel based IT system. Homes in Havering have a dedicated ASB team who manage their own cases on an Anite IT system that is linked to their wider tenant management system.

Consequently, creating consistency of reporting/investigating and consistency of service (and, therefore, public expectation) is a key priority for the Community Safety Service. In order to achieve this training for all partner agencies on the powers and arrangements available under the Anti-Social Behaviour Act 2003 has been commissioned and delivered alongside training on specific case management led by Crown Prosecution Service expert lawyers.

Furthermore, the LBH Community Safety Service lead the Problem Oriented Partnership (POP) process by convening and leading/chairing bespoke multi agency teams that are drawn together to resolve identified problems. This approach seeks to get agencies and individuals to address the actual problem rather than the symptoms of an issue in order to achieve sustained change and improvement. Examples of this are the recent Hornchurch and Harrow Lodge Park POP which has resulted in a reduction in violence and ASB without the need for the repeated posting of additional uniformed police officers in the area; and the Rainham POP which has managed a number of troublesome young people by encouraging them to change their offending behaviour thus reducing disorder in the village centre.
Future Developments

The change to a coalition government has created an entirely new landscape around ASB and, taken together with the recent HMIC report into ASB, this has provided an opportunity to develop new and innovative approaches to addressing this behaviour.

The HMIC report has focused attention on our collective ability to effectively identify and manage repeat callers or victims whilst the government approach is to alter our focus away from the offender and more towards supporting victims and witnesses. It exhorts us to collectively consider the damage being done to victims and communities rather than the sole focus being upon punishing the offender.

The LBH Community Safety ASB team are monitoring developments and influencing change locally in response to the changing landscape, and officers are developing a new approach to prioritising and managing those ASB cases of greatest risk in terms of the vulnerability of the victims/communities. With such a wide ranging definition of what constitutes ASB, it is clear that the impact of what might, on the surface, appear to be minor incidents, do have an impact upon some more vulnerable residents. It is very much an issue of the extent to which a community will accept or tolerate certain behaviour. For example, an elderly resident is more likely to complain about foul language than a younger resident. In response to the increased focus upon the needs of victims and communities it is proposed to adopt a similar approach to that used in the management of risk around domestic violence and the LBH Community Safety Service are leading the discussions across a range of agencies to create an Anti-Social Behaviour Risk Assessment Conference (ASBRAC) based upon the adoption of a common risk assessment matrix. This will allow all relevant agencies to focus attention and activity based upon the agreed risk and impact upon the individual or community as a whole.

Additionally, the local partnership analyst collects data from each agency to whom ASB might be reported (primarily, police; LBH; Homes in Havering) and it is now scrutinised to identify repeat callers in order to cross check agency involvement with these people. This is achieved by each agency examining and sharing their data and through the police Community Intelligence Meeting (CIM) process.

Running in parallel to these developments, the indications coming from central government at present appear to encourage the adoption of a common case management tool. However, this might be difficult to achieve without creating duplication of effort as the police are currently developing their case management principles and methods using their corporate IT. This precludes other agencies from using this system and, without asking police officers to duplicate their reporting, it is unclear how this might work, especially given the Home Office drive to reduce bureaucracy in delivering ASB services.

However, it is equally important that assumptions about what appears to be working are challenged and regional forums such as the pan London ASB Managers Forum where the 'customer experience' is being examined provide useful information which is translated into local learning and action.
Furthermore, it is understood that the government will be seeking a full public consultation exercise in February or March 2011 around the powers and functionality of the current ASB legislation. Current professional opinion across London is that the powers are generally effective and supported but the functionality of the processes is too complex. Locally the LBH Community Safety Service is seeking to empower the community to be able to influence and ‘trigger’ certain actions where the current systems preclude this. Therefore, the service is currently leading a project on the Briar Road estate whereby the community will be empowered, supported and confident to not only resolve some of their own problems but also to fully understand the powers available to us and how they can influence/trigger them.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the LBH Community Safety Service are at the centre of the preventative and developmental agenda for ASB in the Borough and are actively involved in creating consistency across a range of agencies to whom this behaviour might be reported. Whilst the landscape around ASB legislation is going to change next year this is more likely to involve changes that will enhance activity based upon harm and risk and the needs of victims rather than a complete change of legislation. Certainly the coalition government continue to recognise and prioritise the importance of tackling ASB and this continues to be a key theme for the Havering Community Safety Partnership and an issue that remains a priority for Havering.

IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

There is a corporate requirement to set out the implications and risks of the decision sought, in the following areas

Financial implications and risks: There are no financial implications contained within this report

Legal implications and risks: There are no legal implications contained within this report

Human Resources implications and risks: There are no HR implications contained within this report

Equalities implications and risks: To be circulated
References:

‘Respect and Responsibility – taking a stand against antisocial behaviour’

Havering Community Communicators – Havering Intelligence Report 4 – public perceptions of community safety – Oct ‘10

Anti-Social Behaviour – Stop the Rot - HMIC
**APPENDIX A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGREED ASB CODES (Police/LBH)</th>
<th>Nov 09 to Oct 10</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rowdy/Inconsiderate behaviour</td>
<td>4411</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Misuse</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowdy/Nuisance Neighbours</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veh Nuisance/Inappropriate Use</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Drinking</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trespass</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hate Incident</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensing</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begging/Vagrancy</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fireworks</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostitution Related Activity</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Damage/Litter</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7620</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICE CAD DISORDER CODES</th>
<th>Nov 09 to Oct 10</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rowdy/Inconsiderate behaviour</td>
<td>4411</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Incident</td>
<td>2168</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandoned Phone calls</td>
<td>1372</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandoned Vehicles</td>
<td>1028</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Dispute</td>
<td>1004</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Problems</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Misuse</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowdy/Nuisance Neighbours</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veh Nuisance/Inappropriate Use</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malicious/Nuisance Comms</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Drinking</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trespass</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hate Incident</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensing</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begging/Vagrancy</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoax Call to Emer Services</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fireworks</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostitution Related Activity</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Damage/Litter</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>14286</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUMMARY

This report presents a police consultation on the future of police Safer Neighbourhood Teams in Havering being brought to the attention of the Committee for information.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That Members note the content of the report

REPORT DETAIL

About Safer Neighbourhoods

Police Safer Neighbourhood teams (SNTs) adopt a truly local style of policing with local people working with local police and partners to identify and tackle issues of concern in their neighbourhood. The ward based SNTs are additional to other policing teams and units in Havering and are dedicated to their operating area. SNTs consist of one sergeant, two constables and three police community support...
officers (PCSOs). However where there is a higher residential population teams will consist of a higher number of PCSOs.

Safer Neighbourhoods teams pan London are assigned, in most cases, according to the boundaries of each of London’s 624 electoral wards. Within Havering that there are a total of 18 wards based SNTs.

Nearly all the SNTs within Havering are located in easily accessible places, close to the communities that the team serves and within (or as close as practicable), to the relevant electoral ward. Most of the premises have facilities to provide local ‘surgeries’.

SNTs in Havering are now also supported by Safer Transport Teams whose role is to not only tackle crime and disorder but also to provide a reassuring presence on public transport routes ensuring that residents feel safer when they travel around Havering. In addition Havering’s SNTs are also supported by a Safer Town Centre Team whose primary role is to tackle crime and disorder within Romford Town Centre.

Are Safer Neighbourhoods teams effective?

Within the present fiscal climate the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) is obligated to examine whether best use is being made of its resources including the provision of SNTs. Currently the SNTs are dedicated to electoral ward boundaries. Havering Police, along with the MPS want to ensure this model continues to meet the need of partners and importantly, the needs of the community. Ensuring the Borough’s SNTs continue to deliver an effective and relevant service in the right place at the right time is crucial not only for policing, but for all public services.

As part of this there is a need to examine whether the structure of the teams and how they are supervised makes the best use of staff skills and resources, ensuring local demand is met effectively.

The significant contribution SNTs have made to safety and confidence across the borough is recognised and it is important that this contribution should not be undermined.

Review of Safer Neighbourhoods

As part of a wider MPS Programme and in consultation with the MPA, a review of SNTs will be undertaken by Havering Borough Police. It is intended that the review will focus on the following key areas:

Location of teams: Currently each team is dedicated to electoral wards. It is intended to explore if this is the most effective model of deployment and whether it allows for the capture of the needs of neighbourhoods which may cross ward or borough boundaries (e.g. town centre teams). Where consideration is given to potential boundary changes, the potential impact and consequences of this will be discussed with local partners and the public.
What the teams deliver: Havering Police will review the scope and remit of what the SNTs provide. This will enable the role of the different teams in the wider ‘safer’ family to be addressed, such as safer schools officers, safer transport teams and town centre teams to ensure there is no duplication but a clear focus on delivering local priorities for crime reduction and ASB. This will ensure that local teams are focussed on increasing public confidence and that their delivery is aligned to other changes to the policing model.

Structure of the teams: The review will consider:

1. That the management structure for teams is appropriate and makes best use of sergeants and their skills

2. That there is clarity on the differing role of the PC and PCSOs in neighbourhood teams in terms of providing enforcement and delivering engagement

As part of the review will also consider the principle of meeting demand. Currently a ‘one-size fits all’ model does not take account of demand experienced in each area. It is intended to explore what constitutes a super ward (currently based on population) which warrants an increase in resources, ensuring the right factors are taken into account so that the right resources are in the right place.

Consultation

In line with Havering Borough Police Community Engagement the consultation process will seek to ensure that

- All communities are involved in the decisions that affect them;
- All communities are provided with high quality policing, shaped around their needs; and
- Police policies and strategies should reflect local priorities, requirements and aspirations.

In addition, in consultation with the Havering Strategic Partnership, this approach will seek to identify opportunities to develop a multi agency neighbourhood management team that support existing transformational programmes aimed at service delivery improvements across the partnership.

The areas with which Havering police are specifically keen to seek views upon are detailed within a survey at the rear of this document.
IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Financial implications and risks: None

Legal implications and risks: None

Human Resources implications and risks: None

Equalities implications and risks:
It is recommended that the reviews proposed in this paper incorporate specific steps to demonstrate that the range of Havering’s communities are actively participating, in a proportionate manner given the overall size and scope of the proposed reviews.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

None
**Safer Neighbourhood Review**  
**Local Survey**  
*(Please indicate Yes or No by marking with a ‘X’ or add comments where appropriate)*

---

### LOCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1. Do you know where your local SNT is located?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q2. How satisfied are you with the location of your SNT?</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*If dissatisfied or very dissatisfied please comment as to why:*

---

### DELIVERY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q3. Do you know what your SNTs currently deliver?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q4. How satisfied are you with what your local SNT delivers?</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*If dissatisfied or very dissatisfied please comment as to why:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q5. If given the choice is there anything else that you would like your SNTs to deliver?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

### STRUCTURE

*(Most SNTs currently have one Sergeant, who manages/supervises two PCs and three PCSOs)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q6. Do you know the role of a Sergeant, PCs and a PCSO?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q7. Police Sergeants are highly skilled officers, do you think it is appropriate that they manage/supervises this number of resources?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### Q8. Some wards have a greater number of PCSOs due to the size of the residential population – do you think this is appropriate?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Q9. Are there any other factors that you think should determine the size of a SNT?

### Q10. Data shows that different wards have significantly different levels of crime and disorder – do you think that based on this picture that differing wards should have differing staffing levels?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*For example out of 624 SNT wards within London data shows Cranham Ward ranks 611\textsuperscript{th} for crime and disorder yet Gooshays Ward ranks 156\textsuperscript{th}. Within Havering’s 18 SNT wards Cranham Ward ranks 18\textsuperscript{th} and Gooshays Ward ranks 2\textsuperscript{nd}.

### Q11. Do you have any other comments about Q10?

### Q13. SNTs within Havering are currently supported by Safer Schools Officers, Safer Transport Teams and a Safer Town centre Team – do you think that this is effective use of resources and/or duplication?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duplication</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effective Use of Resources</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Q14. Are there any other comments you wish to make about the geographical boundaries of your SNT?

### Q15. Are there any other comments you wish to make in relation to the Havering Safer Neighbourhood Review?