



Havering

L O N D O N B O R O U G H

CRIME & DISORDER COMMITTEE AGENDA

7.30 pm

**Wednesday
5 February 2014**

**Town Hall, Main Road,
Romford**

Members 9: Quorum 3

COUNCILLORS:

Osman Dervish (Chairman)
John Wood (Vice-Chair)
David Durant

Linda Van den Hende
Roger Evans
Georgina Galpin

**For information about the meeting please contact:
James Goodwin 01708 432436
james.goodwin@havering.gov.uk**

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 DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY INTEREST

Members are invited to disclose any pecuniary interest in any of the items on the agenda at this point of the meeting.

Members may still disclose any pecuniary interest in an item at any time prior to the consideration of the matter.

4 MINUTES OF THE MEETING (Pages 1 - 4)

To approve as correct the minutes of the meetings held on 21 November 2014 and authorise the Chairman to sign them.

5 REVIEW OF YOUTH OFFENDING SERVICES (Pages 5 - 8)

To receive the attached report.

6 TRANSFORMING REHABILITATION

To receive an oral report from Lucy Satchell-Day, Assistant Chief Officer, London Probation Trust.

7 MOPAC FUNDED PROJECTS -UPDATE

To receive a presentation

8 SAFER NEIGHBOURHOOD BOARDS (Pages 9 - 16)

To receive the attached report.

9 2013/14 ANNUAL REPORT (Pages 17 - 26)

To consider the attached draft report.

10 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.

**Andrew Beesley
Committee Administration
Manager**

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
CRIME & DISORDER COMMITTEE
Committee Room 3A - Town Hall
21 November 2013 (7.30 - 8.55 pm)**

Present:

Councillors Osman Dervish (Chairman), John Wood (Vice-Chair), David Durant, Roger Evans, Georgina Galpin and Linda Van den Hende.

14 MINUTES OF THE MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on 17 October, 2013 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

15 ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR AND HATE CRIME POLICY

At the request of a member a discussion took place on whether or not the term Hate Crime should be used in the revised strategy.

The purpose behind the review was to prepare the Council for the changes to the Anti-Social Behaviour Strategy nationally. We were looking to ensure that anyone with an issue with anti-social behaviour is dealt with consistently wherever the complaint was directed.

Hate Crime can be defined as Crimes committed against someone because of their disability, gender identity, race, religion or belief, or sexual orientation and should be reported to the police.

Hate crimes can include:

- Threatening behaviour
- Assault
- Robbery
- Damage to property
- Inciting others to commit race crimes
- Harassment.

The debate was going beyond the remit of the Committee therefore the Chairman terminated the discussion.

16 BURGLARY

The Borough Commander provided an update on the level of burglary within the borough. He detailed the various initiatives being undertaken by the Metropolitan Police and its partners to tackle the problem. All the work was paying off with burglary across the board down.

For a rolling 12 month period

- Burglary was down by 9.2%
- Residential burglary down by 4.9%
- Non-residential burglary down by 21.6%.
- Detection rates were at 12.4% the second best in London.

The Borough Commander indicated his officers would be liaising with the Bexley Force who had a better detection rate to see what additional steps they were taking.

In response to a question regarding sentencing the Borough Commander commented that in general burglars were sentenced to serve time, the situation with those guilty of theft from Motor Vehicles was not so good.

The Committee **noted** the report.

17 **REVIEW OF LOCALITY GROUPS MODEL**

In 2011/12 the Community Safety Partnership introduced a new operating model for tackling longer-term community safety issues that require a multi-agency planned response, such as burglary, vehicle theft, and anti-social behaviour. The rationale for moving to this model, which replaced 'type of crimes' working groups with three cluster location groups (north, central and south), meant that partners could focus on a variety of issues affecting an area.

The Location groups correspond with the clusters Havering Police use to deploy safer neighbourhood teams. The six wards in each cluster were as follows:

- North – Havering Park, Gooshays, Mawneys, Petits, Heaton and Harold Wood;
- Central – Brooklands, Romford Town, Squirrels Heath, Emerson Park, Hylands and St Andrews;
- South – Elm Park, South Hornchurch, Hacton, Cranham, Upminster and Rainham & Wennington.

Two high priority burglary areas had been chosen per cluster and partners had visited all properties in the area handing out advice, time switches, etc.

We felt that when these activities were going on local councillors should be notified.

Questions were asked regarding how Ward priorities were fed into the process. Officers advised that matters would be formalised once the new Safer Neighbourhood Boards were introduced. Currently input from the Ward Panels is fed through the Cluster Groups which are attended by an officer.

We have **noted** the report.

18 **REVIEW OF PROGRESS ON THE TROUBLED FAMILIES PROJECT**

We received an update on the work of the Troubled Families project.

- 386 families have been identified to date
- Of these 275 meet ASB/Crime criteria
- 33 (representing 75% of known gang members) meet the gang nominal
- 46 fall within housing/welfare reforms/debt problems nominal
- 3 have Child Protection Plans
- 5 were known to MARAC
- 15 attended the PRU
- 5 top post codes are RM3 – 86, RM 5 – 32, RM7 – 30, RM13 – 30, RM12 - 25

An increase in child to adult domestic violence had been identified. Another problem which had become apparent was that potential young offenders were forming their own networks through meeting at the PRU.

The idea was that Council's would be paid for their work on Troubled Families by the government provided they met their targets. The four year overall target was to assist 415 families and officers were confident we would achieve this.

Officers anticipated that the programme would be extended for a further 5 years.

The Council were still struggling to engage with partners especially health professionals. Officers would continue to invite health to participate.

The Committee **noted** the report.

19 **TOWN CENTRE VISITS**

We have reaffirmed our desire to visit Hornchurch Town Centre and re-visit Romford Town Centre before Christmas to see how the Night Time Economy was being managed.

Officers advised that from the 6 December the Triage unit would be operating in Romford Town centre and the police would have the use of a mobile office.

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

REPORT

Subject: Youth Offending Service Update

Date: 27th January 2014

Author: Dan Hales

Job title: GM, Community Safety & Offender Management (B&D)
YOS Manager (Havering)

1. Purpose of Presenting the Report and Decisions Required

- 1.1 This report is brought to the Committee to inform members of the progress of the re-organisation of the service..
- 1.2 Performance information is also included for noting.

2. Summary

- 2.1 This report outlines the progress made on the re-organisation of Havering Youth Offending Service (YOS), and shows progress against recommendations from previous inspection.

2.2 Performance

In September 2013 performance report, the Youth Justice Board identified Havering YOS as 'not a priority' for requiring any extra support from their organisation. This is a positive report and shows that the Youth Justice Board have gained confidence in local systems. They have met regularly with the YOS Management Team to discuss how we have moved forward on the HMIP recommendations and our systemic approach in general and are reassured that the service is moving in the right direction.

This is supported by the majority of the performance indicators and a strong staff team now in place to deliver the service priorities.

2.3 First Time Entrants

Performance over the last 12 months (Apr 12 – Mar 13) indicates 121 fewer young people entering the Youth Justice System. The rate of decrease for Havering FTE is higher than London (25.7%) and the London's region comparator of (24.6%).

2.4 Reoffending

The comparative annual data indicates an increase in the frequency of reoffending and therefore Havering is not currently seeing improvements in this area. This data tracks a cohort of young offenders from 2011-12, and is seen as a product of better partnership working with police but also a trend of a number of offenders being transferred in to the borough. Transfer in and transfer out policies are now in place, resulting in far more knowledge of cases being moved in and the ability to challenge such cases where appropriate.

2.5 Use of Custody

2.6 The data indicates in terms of rates that Havering has shown a reduction in the use of custody. The performance over the last 12 months and the previous 12 months indicates a decrease of 14 to 10 young people, between the periods of Jul 12 – Jun 13. Havering is lower than that achieved by wider London YOTs at (0.91) and the national rate of 0.49 compared to Havering's 0.43.

3. Staffing

3.1 Restructure of Havering Staff

A restructure of Havering YOS staff commenced in October of 2013 and is now almost complete. There have been complications due to ongoing HR issues.

This restructure brings together a permanent team consisting of end to end case managers who are multi-skilled and deliver continuous support and enforcement to young offenders. It also delivers a management structure seen by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation as highly useful for supervision and 'grip' of cases. We are very impressed with the knowledge and skill level of this team and confident in their abilities to deliver a strong and robust Youth Offending Service for Havering.

3.2 Workforce Development

60 Workforce Development surveys have been filled in by staff from across both boroughs, including sessional and volunteer workers. This is currently being analysed and an ongoing training schedule will be developed by end of Q3 2013-2014. Other training for the Havering service has included Pre-Sentence Report writing, court skills, safeguarding and bespoke training tailored to individual development need.

3.3 Partnership Working

Havering YOS has increased partnership working over the last year and this has been seen throughout both social care and crime / community safety. The YOS has presented at the Local Safeguarding Children's Board away day and will be an

agenda item regarding the high level percentage of Looked After Children cases on the caseload.

Work with court has improved and there is now a new rota agreed whereby Havering and Barking & Dagenham will be sharing a court day, bringing further efficiencies, integration and consistency.

4. Premises

- 4.1 In Havering the YOS have been using the Youth Zone and Mercury House as hot desking premises and to see young people. In a two week period in September, 160 appointments were made in the Youth Zone. Havering are currently reviewing the health and safety of this building and ensuring that it is sufficient for this purpose.
- 4.2 The loss of Portman House has been both positive and negative. Positive in that it was not fit for purpose and has driven the service to work from satellites, but negative in that a base for the team to consolidate has been very difficult.
- 4.3 Satellite premises have been and will continue to be used where possible and this has been beneficial in many cases. However, a central base for the team to work from, with bespoke health and safety plans, would benefit the service in the long term.

5. Finance & Funding

- 5.1 The Youth Justice Board requested a fully costed Youth Justice Plan for both Boroughs, which was provided at the end of June 2013. It is expected that the Youth Justice Grant will reduce again next financial year, although the exact amount is not yet known.

6. Operational Policies and Procedures

6.1 Case management

Changes to the delivery of Intensive Supervision and Surveillance in both boroughs, identified by a review conducted into the court order, have been implemented. This includes the development of robust referral systems and allocation of ISS cases to the entire staff team, supporting end-to-end case management.

In the light of new guidance from the Youth Justice Board, a review into the delivery of Referral Orders is in progress. Volunteers have been filling out questionnaires and analysis has begun on their responses. The review is paying particular attention to the Referral Order panels and the recruitment and training of volunteers.

6.2 Quality Assurance

In light of the new ways of managing the service, a new system of Quality Assurance is being put in place, supported by the Youth Justice Board. We are using the findings from the Alex Chard Organisational Learning research re LBBD YOS to inform a new system of QA that encompasses both practice and process. This will assist both boroughs in the move to Asset Plus in the coming year, which

is an upgraded assessment system designed by the YJB. The new system includes the introduction of:

- Risk-management Panels - Fortnightly meeting with Operational manager, Principal Practitioner and relevant case managers to scrutinise risk management for Risk of Self-Harm (ROSH), Risk Management Plans (RMPs), Vulnerability Management Plans (VMPs) & Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPA) threshold;
- Victim Impact and Multi-Agency Panels (VIMAPs) - Multi-agency meeting to discuss cases and facilitate referrals, which are held 4-5 weeks after start of order and include discussions on victim safety; and
- Non-Compliance Panels - Panel held if a young person fails to comply twice to assess issues and prevent breach. Panels are run by principal practitioner and attended by case manager, young person and family member.

7. Reparation

- 7.1 The Reparation Team have received excellent formal feedback from projects in Havering.

8. Interventions Across Both Boroughs

- 8.1 Case Management staff in Barking and Dagenham have devised a 22 week rolling programme constructed from evidence based theory and practice specifically for female young offenders, which includes evaluation methodologies. A 400 page manual has been created and, once initial evaluations take place, this will be shared with Havering and the Youth Justice Board Effective Practice team.

Case Management staff in Havering have been delivering innovative interventions around knife crime and breach panels, and this practice is set to be adopted by the Barking and Dagenham YOS.

CRIME AND DISORDER OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Subject Heading:

Safer Neighbourhood Boards

CMT Lead:

Cynthia Griffin, Group Director, Culture, Community and Economic Development

Report Author and contact details:

Jerry Haley, Community Safety, 01708 434370, jerry.haley@havering.gov.uk

Policy context:

This report relates to the Council's strategic objective of 'A clean, safe and green borough and the key activity of working with partners to maintain low crime rates and make people feel safer.'

SUMMARY

1.1 Safer Neighbourhood Boards (SNBs) will be the means by which the Mayor of London (through the Deputy Mayor and the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime) holds Borough Police Command Units to account for performance, giving Havering Residents and victims a greater voice in setting policing priorities.

1.2 Safer Neighbourhood Boards will sit alongside existing performance management arrangements in the Havering Community Safety Partnership, and scrutiny arrangements through Havering's Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Committee.

1.3 This report sets out the proposal for Havering's first Safer Neighbourhood Board

RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 That members note the report and contribute ideas regarding the introduction of Safer Neighbourhood Boards.

2.2 That the Governance Committee ratify the Lead Member for Community Safety as the Council Member for Safer Neighbourhood Boards

REPORT DETAIL

3. Aims of SNBs as set out by MOPAC

3.1 To have a broad remit to reflect MOPAC's broader responsibilities, respecting the view that local people will know best what is needed at the local level

3.2 To ensure communities are more closely involved in problem solving and crime prevention

3.3 To have greater reach and ensures a more frequent refresh of ideas and views;

3.4 To achieve greater coherence between different engagement mechanisms, e.g. Independent Advisory Groups and Stop and Search Community Monitoring Groups, so as to provide greater public accountability in policing and crime reduction

3.5 to make more efficient use of resources to deliver value for money and target funds at tackling issues of local concern and crime prevention.

4. Role

4.1 The Safer Neighbourhood Board will have a number of specific responsibilities that include:

- Monitoring volumes, trends and types of complaints relevant to Havering borough from victims of crime and complaints from members of the public against police officers
- Monitoring crime performance and community confidence
- Increasing the use of Community Payback in Havering
- Ensuring all wards have a ward panel of residents
- Overseeing the Independent Advisory Group
- Overseeing the Custody Visitors Panel and ensuring the system of custody visiting is delivered
- Supporting the further development of Neighbourhood Watch
- Overseeing the work of the local stop and search monitoring group
- Informing policing priorities in the borough
- Supporting the development of bids for funds from a crime prevention fund.
-

5. Membership of the Safer Neighbourhood Board

5.1 It is intended that SNB Members will:

- Be representative of Havering’s’ communities and participate fully in listening to community concerns and assisting the police and other statutory agencies in tackling crime and disorder, whilst improving confidence and providing reassurance. Selecting the right individuals is essential.
- Be capable of engagement with a wider group of stakeholder forums in the Borough in order to focus on Borough-wide issues whilst leaving local neighbourhood concerns to be addressed through direct dialogue with Neighbourhood Policing Teams.

5.2 It is proposed that the following should be represented in membership:

Member representation	Number
Independent Chair	1
Cabinet Member for Community Safety	1
Ward Panel member representing each of the three Local policing Areas – Central , North and South .	3
Over Fifties Forum	1
Victim Support	1
Youth parliament	1
Faith Representative	1
BME Group	1
Independent Advisory Group	1
Independent Custody Visitors	1
Stop & Search representative	1
Neighbourhood Watch	1
To attend in a support / advisory capacity	
MOPAC (one meeting a year and will provide assistance and input as needed)	1
Borough Commander	1
Head of Community Safety / Community Safety Team Leader	1
Community Safety Team Member (Administration)	1

6. Proposal

6.1 The proposed delivery structure is set out in the flow chart below



Ward Panels

1. Each of the 18 wards in Havering will hold a ward panel meeting every 8 weeks
2. Will provide up to date data on crime and disorder within the ward
3. Identify policing priorities for the ward
4. Provide the public with information of police activity within the ward since the previous meeting
5. Chairs of the ward panels will meet quarterly in cluster meetings chaired by the SN Inspectors to discuss progress against ward priorities
6. Ward panels will be coordinated and facilitated by SN Sergeants. Minutes will be produced and made available on the SNT webpage.
7. Ward Councillors can be members of the ward panel but will not have voting rights.

8. Various public forums /committees/ panels are held around Havering and these will be encouraged to participate in ward panels to make them as representative as possible. There will be publicity around the borough to get the public involved.

Cluster Panels

1. Each cluster will be made up of the six panel ward chairs, the cluster inspector and a representative of the community safety team (if required).
2. Will meet quarterly
3. Key issues that resonate with a majority of the ward panels will be discussed
4. Each Cluster to nominate one ward panel chair to represent them at the Safer Neighbourhood Board; so there will be three ward panel chairs at Board level
5. These will be chaired by cluster inspectors

Safer Neighbourhood Board

1. Will meet quarterly
2. Will receive reports on the following
3. Monitoring volumes, trends and types of complaints relevant to Havering Borough from the Borough Commander
4. Monitoring crime performance and community confidence from the Borough Commander
5. Information on work placements being undertaken in Havering , numbers of offenders on orders, total hours worked and breach rates for non-compliance from SERCO
6. SN Police Inspectors to provide a summary of meetings held in their Local Policing Areas with residents, to include number and frequency of meetings, numbers in attendance and principle matters discussed, including priorities set for the wards
7. The Independent Advisory Group representative on any matters discussed by the IAG in the reporting period and any matters arising; membership and recruitment needs of the IAG;
8. The Custody Visitors Panel representative on a summary of custody visits undertaken during the reporting period and any matters arising
9. Havering Neighbourhood Watch representative on principle activities during the year; number and membership of active neighbourhood watches; new watches starting during the year
10. MOPAC representative to provide information about the funds available, the bidding process and the criteria for selection; the panel to award funding if appropriate

11. Will hold an annual public conference to enable the Safer Neighbourhood Board to inform on public and stakeholder surveys, trends, performance and other relevant criteria on which to base the selection of priorities; the panel to contribute as a stakeholder to the Annual Strategic Assessment undertaken by the Havering Community Safety Partnership; the London Borough of Havering Community Safety Team to assist in this process
12. The Board will be facilitated, coordinated and funds managed by the Havering Community Safety Team
13. The Chair of the SNB will attend the quarterly HCSP to provide and update on the activity of the Board

7. Selection of Independent Chair

7.1 The selection of the independent chair will be decided by members of the Safer Neighbourhood Board.

7.2 Havering are at the moment considering this as a Non-Executive Director role with a small payment attached.

8. Tenure

8.1 The Mayor of London requires that there will be a three year maximum tenure for board members. However, to avoid all the board members ending their term at the same time, it is proposed that initial appointments will be made for one, two or three years.

IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Financial implications and risks: Safer Neighbourhood Boards will be managed within resources that MOPAC have allocated for Safer Neighbourhood Boards; currently £5200 per annum.

Legal implications and risks: Safer Neighbourhood Boards are being set up across London with guidance from MOPAC under powers invested in the Mayor (and Deputy Mayor) by the Government under the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011. The Lead Member for Community Safety should be ratified as the Council representative for this board.

Human Resources implications and risks: Safer Neighbourhood Boards will be co-ordinated by the Community Safety Team within existing resources.

Equalities implications and risks: Equality implications will be contained within the Equality Analysis for Community Safety.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Safer Neighbourhood Board Guidance - MOPAC

This page is intentionally left blank

CRIME AND DISORDER COMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT, 2013/14

SUMMARY

This report is the Annual Report of the Committee, summarising the Committee's activities during the year ending February 2014.

It is planned for this report to stand as a public record of achievement for the year and enable Members and others to compare performance year on year.

There are no direct equalities or environmental implications attached to this covering report. Any financial implications & risks from reviews and work undertaken will be advised as part of the specific reviews.

RECOMMENDATION

1. That the Committee note the 2013/14 Annual Report and authorise the Chairman to agree the final version for Council.
2. That the Committee agree the report be referred to full Council.

Staff Contact: James Goodwin
Committee Officer

Telephone: 01708 432432

Cheryl Coppel
Chief Executive

Background Papers - None.

CRIME & DISORDER COMMITTEE

REPORT

Subject Heading:

Annual Report 2013/2014

Report Author and contact details:

James Goodwin, Committee Officer
01708 432432

Policy context:

To summarise the work of the Council's
Crime & Disorder Committee.

Financial summary:

Not applicable.

SUMMARY

This report is the annual report of the Committee, summarising the Committee's activities during the past Council year. This is the fourth meeting of the Committee and all meetings have been well attended. The year has seen change following a shift in the political balance in the Council in September when three members were removed from the Committee. The service of all three members, Councillors Rebecca Bennett, Denis Breading and Frederick Thompson was acknowledged by the Committee.

It is planned for this report to stand as a public record of achievement for the year and enable members and others to compare performance year to year.

There are no direct equalities or environmental implications attached to this report. Any financial implications from reviews and work undertaken will be advised as part of the specific reviews.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the Committee note the 2013/2014 Annual Report and authorise the Chairman to agree the final version.
2. That the Committee agree the report be referred to full Council on 26 March, 2014.

REPORT DETAIL

During the year under review, we have met as a Committee on 4 occasions, and reviewed the activities of a number of the Council's partners on the Havering Community Safety Partnership.

1. LONDON PROBATION TRUST

1.1 Transforming Rehabilitation

1.1.1 Back in February 2013 we received a presentation from Lucy Satchell-Day from the London Probation Trust on the Government's proposals to transform the Rehabilitation Services. When the Government published their response to the consultation we invited Lucy back to update us to explain how this might impact on probation services in Havering.

1.1.2 The government proposed the creation of a New National Public Probation Service to replace the existing Probation Trusts. The new National Probation Service will be responsible for:

1. All cases assessed as high risk;
2. All case and parole reports;
3. Initial Risk Assessments;
4. All MAPPA cases in the Community;
5. A small number of public interest cases;
6. Cases where risk of harm has escalated to 'high';
7. Breach and Recall decisions;
8. Victim Liaison Unit and Approved Premises; and
9. Commissioning interventions for high risk offenders.

1.1.3 The country would be divided into 21 Contract Package Areas (CPAs). London would be one CPA with approximately 33,000 cases. Each CPA would include the following business:

1. Management of all medium risk and low risk cases, in Custody and the Community, with the development of 'through the gate' services;
2. Currently envisaged that most interventions, including Community Payback, Accredited Programmes and Specified Activity requirements would be included; and

3. The management of 'high risk of harm' and MAPPA cases while in custody.

1.1.4 There was potential for existing Trusts to spin off into staff-led 'Mutuals' and bid for business. The London Probation Trust was looking to establish a 'Mutual' to deal with interventions.

1.1.5 All work and resources identified as being in the 21 CPAs would be established as 21 'going concerns'. These would be called Community Rehabilitation Companies (CRCs). CRCs would be established as private entities which would be overseen by the Ministry of Justice until the CPA were awarded to the new providers. At this point the CRCs would be sold to the successful bidders. The Government would retain a small stake in the CRCs.

1.1.6 The Government was also proposing to:

1. Reconfigure the prison estate to establish 'resettlement prisons' in local areas;
2. Establish a Professional Body for Probation Officers, although there was no guarantee new providers would subscribe.
3. Make arrangements for Her Majesty's Inspector of Prisons to oversee quality across the whole provider network, and
4. Include Community Payback in the CPAs with the exception of London which would be considered separately.

1.1.8 Members expressed concern that the companies who were likely to be bidding for the work were the same companies which had recently received bad press for their mishandling of the electronic tagging contracts.

1.2 Community Payback

1.2.1 The provision of the Community Payback Service had been removed from the London Probation Service and contracted out to SERCO in London. This had led to difficulties in arranging for the use of the Community Payback Scheme as it had proven difficult to contact the appropriate SERCO officer.

1.2.2 However, the Head of StreetCare has since met with SERCO and put in place a formal agreement to utilise Community Payback in the borough.

2. METROPOLITAN POLICE

2.1 The Borough Commander, Chief Superintendent Jason Gwillim had been a regular attendee at all the committee's meetings, and responded to questions from Members on performance and other territorial policing issues.

2.2 Safer Neighbourhood Teams

- 2.2.1 The structure of Safer Neighbourhood Teams were scrutinised in relation to the new Local Policing Model. Back in July, 2013 Members were given an assurance by the Borough Commander that within each ward there would be three named officers, a Sergeant, a PC and a PCSO. This core of officers would receive additional support as and when required.
- 2.2.2 Overall within the borough the total number of officers available for the Safer Neighbourhood Teams remained the same with those not fixed within a particular neighbourhood being available to all wards and 'flexed' to provide the most efficient use of resources.
- 2.2.3 By October 2015 the number of officers available to the Safer Neighbourhood Teams will increase, with an extra 54 officers being available on the streets. There was still some work to be done on shift patterns to ensure areas were covered at the time of most need. Overall the new proposals were working well.

2.3 MOPAC Targets

- 2.3.1 We have received reports on crime within the borough. The targets had been set by the Mayor of London these were
- Burglary,
 - Criminal damage,
 - Robbery,
 - Theft from motor vehicle,
 - Theft/taking of a motor vehicle,
 - Theft from a person, and violence with injury.
- 2.3.2 By October the borough was showing a reduction in crime in all but two areas. The first was robbery where the increase was down to one event, The 'One Love Festival', where a spate of theft from persons had occurred. Work was on-going to refine those figures as on investigation some of the reported losses of mobile phones may not have been robberies. Lessons had been learnt by the police who for future events treated them as crime prevention rather than public safety operations.
- 2.3.3 The other area of concern was Domestic Violence were numbers were up slightly. This might have been caused by a change in the definition, or it could also be due to an increase in reporting, which is to be viewed positively. The definition of DV was now:

'Any incident or pattern of incidents of controlling, coercive or threatening behaviour, violence or abuse between those aged 16 or over who are or have been intimate partners or family members regardless of gender or sexuality. This can encompass but is not

limited to the following types of abuse:

- psychological
- physical
- sexual
- financial
- emotional'

2.3.4 The good news was that in Havering the detection rate for Domestic Violence is very good.

2.4 **Burglary**

2.4.1 Burglary continued to be an area of concern for local residents. The Borough Commander provided an update on the level of burglary in the borough at the Committee's meeting in October.

2.4.2 Members were provided with details of the various initiatives being undertaken by the Police and partners to tackle the problem and raise public awareness. The good news was that these initiatives appeared to be paying off, as burglary across the borough was down on last year.

2.4.3 For a rolling 12 month period the figures were:

- Burglary was down by 9.2%
- Residential burglary down by 4.9%
- Non-residential burglary down by 21.6%.
- Detection rates were at 12.4% the second best in London.

2.4.4 Bexley was the force with a better detection rate and the Borough commander indicated he was speaking to that force to see if there were additional steps which could be taken to improve further what was already a reasonably good situation.

2.4.5 We were pleased to hear that when burglars were sentenced they generally received a custodial sentence. Unfortunately the same was not the case with those found guilty of theft from motor vehicles.

3. **NHS ENGLAND**

3.1 Back in October you invited NHS England to make a presentation on how Prisoners and Ex-Offenders with mental health Issues were provided with services. Hong Tan, Head of Health in the Justice System attended and delivered a very thought provoking presentation.

3.2 He directed the Committee's attention to the need to take preventative measures rather than tackling the problems at too late a stage. He highlighted the disparity in the percentage of both female and male

offenders with mental health issues compared to the general population.

- 3.3 Since 1990 there had been a number of changes to the way health services for people in prison and other places were commissioned. Under the current regime the NHS Commissioning Board is responsible for the 'Commissioning of Health Services for people in prison, etc.'
- 3.4 Clinical Commissioning Groups were responsible for 'Commissioning the majority of health services for offenders managed in the community or released from custody.
- 3.5 The third group responsible for commissioning services are local authorities who are responsible for 'Commissioning public health and care services for offenders managed in the community or released from Custody.' These included drug and alcohol treatment services for offenders not in prison or places of detention.
- 3.6 This multiplicity of commissioning bodies made it easy for offenders to slip through the cracks and emphasised the need for close co-operation between the three agencies.

4. LOCAL AUTHORITY

4.1 Alcohol and Drugs Strategy

- 4.1.1 We were advised by the Director of Public Health, Dr Mary Black, that a new Alcohol and Drug Strategy was being drawn up. In the past the two problems had been treated separately. The new strategy would incorporate both the health and community safety aspects of both drug and alcohol misuse.
- 4.1.2 The aim of the strategy was 'To prevent harm caused by substance misuse in Havering.' It was key to ensure that money spent on drug and alcohol misuse was being spent as effectively as possible.
- 4.1.3 Details of the scale of the problem were provided:
- Estimated 870 Opiate & crack users,
 - Highest proportion of powder cocaine users entering treatment, and
 - Estimated 3,320 'dependent drinkers'.
- 4.1.4 Dr Black suggested two areas not covered in the draft strategy that she would like to see reflected in future drafts, which were the emerging issue of 'legal highs' and abuse of prescription drugs. We recommended that the strategy should include reference to these problems and provide for educational programmes in schools on the use of legal highs.

Crime and Disorder Committee, 5 February 2014

- 4.1.5 The Borough Commander did advise that the police do not have much information on legal highs, but evidence of their use was being seen in the discarded canisters on the street.

4.2 Anti-Social Behaviour and Hate Crime Policy

- 4.2.1 Officers were in the process of reviewing the Council's Anti-Social Behaviour and Hate Crime Policy. This was to ensure that across the council there was a consistent approach to tackling and preventing anti-social behaviour. A further driver behind the need to review the policy was the changes proposed by the government to the way authorities tackle anti-social behaviour.

Officers would bring back further reports to the Committee as work on the review progressed.

4.3 MOPAC Funding

- 4.3.1 We were advised that for 2013/14 the Havering Community Partnership had received £213,400 in funding from MOPAC. In a departure from previous years funding was now associated with a particular project. The following projects had been funded:

1. Street Triage - £30,000;
2. Substance Misuse and Young People - £40,000;
3. Domestic Abuse Perpetrators - £20,000;
4. Improving Support for Domestic Abuse - £35,000;
5. Rent Deposit Scheme for offenders - £32,400; and
6. Drugs and Alcohol Service Provision - £56,000.

- 4.3.2 However, in August MOPAC announced that they reserved the right to reduce the level of funding by up to £20,000 for any borough which did not voluntarily provide this level of support to the maintenance of the Rape Crisis Centre.

- 4.3.3 Havering did not provide this support because there were relatively a low number of referrals to the North East London Rape Crisis Centre, which was based in Hackney. We were advised that the Havering Community Safety Partner was challenging this decision.

- 4.3.4 If the funding was reduced by £20,000 the adjustment of the budgets was left to the HCSP.

4.4 Locality Groups Model

- 4.4.1 In 2012/13 the Havering Community Safety Partnership had introduced a new operating model for tackling longer-term community safety issues that required a multi-agency approach. The new model replaced the previous 'type of crime' working groups with three cluster location groups (north, south and central) which means that partners could concentrate on a variety issues affecting the

area.

4.4.2 These location groups correspond with the clusters the police use to deploy safer neighbourhood teams. Details of the work of the groups were provided which included concentrated work to tackle the issue of burglary in two high priority areas in each cluster. Partners worked together to visit every property in these areas providing advice, handing out time switches, etc.

4.4.3 This was an opportunity for us to comment on how successful the new model was. We expressed concern that ward councillors were not being notified when these activities were taking place and also questioned how ward priorities were being fed into the process. We were advised that matters would be formalised when the new Safer Neighbourhood Boards were introduced.

4.5 Troubled Families Project

4.5.1 We have received an update on the work of the Troubled Families Project.

- 386 families have been identified to date
- Of these 275 meet ASB/Crime criteria
- 33 (representing 75% of known gang members) meet the gang nominal
- 46 fall within housing/welfare reforms/debt problems nominal
- 3 have Child Protection Plans
- 5 were known to MARAC
- 15 attended the PRU
- 5 top post codes are RM3 – 86, RM 5 – 32, RM7 – 30, RM13 – 30, RM12 – 25

4.5.2 As work proceeded an increase in child to adult domestic violence had been identified. Similarly a problem had been identified in identifying networks used by young people. One unforeseen network had been identified with potential young offenders getting together at the PRU.

4.5.3 We were given an assurance that the Council would be able to meet its target of assisting 415 families over the four years of the initial programme.

5. CRIMINAL JUSTICE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE 2013

5.1 In September the Vice-Chairman of the Committee attended the Annual Criminal Justice Management Conference in Central London. Contributors at the conference included:

- Antonia Romeo, Director General, Transforming Justice, Ministry of Justice;
- Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe, Metropolitan Police Commissioner;
- Ian Blakeman, Director, Commissioning and Commercial,

Crime and Disorder Committee, 5 February 2014

National Offender Management Service; Ian Pilling, Assistant Chief Constable, Merseyside Police; and

- Jeremy Wright, MP, Parliamentary Undersecretary of State for Justice.

IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Financial implications and risks:

Narrative report only - not applicable.

Legal implications and risks:

Narrative report only - not applicable.

Human Resources implications and risks:

Narrative report only - not applicable.

Equalities implications and risks:

Narrative report only - not applicable.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

None