

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE SAFER NEIGHBOURHOODS BOARD HELD ON THURSDAY, 4TH FEBRUARY, 2016

Attending:

Tim Fellows (Chair), Harry Landsman (Vice Chair), Janet Marshall (Treasurer), Eddie Fraser, Pat Jackson, Sheila Stacey, Adrian Bishop-Laggett, Bobbie Webster (EYP), James Carroll (London Community Rehabilitation Company), Derek Jay, Acting CI Andy Port, Cllr Nick Dines, Cllr Mary Maguire

Also Attending: 2 members of the public

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

All attendees were welcomed to the meeting.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Mark Rudling, Bradley Few, Carol Shuttle, Craig Dixon, the Borough Commander, Alok Agrawal, Vicky Dungate and Askin Erzokal.

3. COMMUNITY PAYBACK SCHEME

James Carroll from the London Community Rehabilitation Company, introduced the Community Payback Scheme in Enfield as follows:

- The LCRC had been responsible for Community Payback since February 2015.
- James Carroll and Jergen Goud were the Community Payback Managers responsible for the London Boroughs of Barnet, Enfield, Haringey and Harrow.
- Offenders were sentenced to Unpaid Work via a Court Order. The sentence could range from 30-300 hours, depending on the offence.
- Care Manager/Probation Officers would put forward an offender to the London CRC, who would then risk assess the offender and consult with a Community Payback Control Centre to allocate a suitable placement. The Control Centre would also notify the Care Manager/Probation Officer of any absences.
- The nature of the placement would depend upon the offender and the risk assessment undertaken; for example, a sex offender would not be placed for work in a school. Consideration was also given to the proximity of the placement to where the offender was located to minimise travel costs and time.
- Offenders were required to work arrive on time and to work to a given standard. A health and safety induction was given to all offenders at the start of each day of a placement.

SAFER NEIGHBOURHOODS BOARD - 4.2.2016

- Due to the fact that most offenders now also worked during the week, the majority of projects now took place at the weekends.
- Project requirements included:
 - The provision of welfare facilities such as toilets, facilities to make hot drinks and a room to take breaks;
 - The provision of tools and materials needed to undertake the work;
 - Public Liability Insurance.
- London CRC provided any Personal and Protective Equipment (PPE) and a Supervisor for up to 10 offenders.
- The types of projects undertaken in Enfield were:
 - Enfield Mobile - this was a very successful operation that worked closely with the local authority primarily to clear alleyways of illegal dumping of rubbish. Offenders found this placement particularly rewarding as it was varied, targeted work that generated quick, positive results. Residents would also see a very positive and visible effect from this work.
 - Schools – Offenders worked in school grounds assisting with litter picking and sweeping. Schools were also able to provide good welfare facilities, which was a helpful factor in creating successful placements.
 - Allotments – Offenders worked on such activities as laying pathways, removing weeds and digging over ground.
 - Millfield Arts Centre – Offenders assisted in maintain the extensive grounds of the Centre.
 - Agency placements – these were for lower risk offenders and were unsupervised placements, usually working in charity shops.
- Any offender who did not attend a placement when required to do so would be in breach of his Court Order.
- Most offenders were highly motivated to complete their placements as soon as possible and often requested increased hours in order to do so.

The following questions and comments were then taken:

Q: Who decides on where an offender is placed?

A: It would be the Probation Service that decides this.

Q: Who now deals with clearance of leaves in the autumn?

A: Community Payback may be involved in clearance of leaves in alleyways etc. but the local authority is responsible for this on main roads.

Q: What is the current working arrangement with the Council on placements and is there more the Council could do?

A: LCRC has good links with Enfield Council and works closely, in particular, with the Environment and Regeneration Department to source and manage projects. The Council also assist with the provision of certain equipment for some placements. Enfield Mobile is

SAFER NEIGHBOURHOODS BOARD - 4.2.2016

the principal project for placements at the moment in the Borough but we also work with the Council on other projects (at the Millfield Arts Centre for example).

The Chair commented that, under MOPAC guidance, the Board was required to nominate projects for Community Payback and asked how this was best done.

It was **AGREED** that Board Members should contact Jane Juby, who could then pass on nominations to the link officer in the Environment & Regeneration Department.

James Carroll welcomed in particular any project nominations for Sunday work in the North East of the Borough; a school would be especially welcome.

Q: From where does the London CRC receive remuneration?

A: We are contracted to the Home Office.

Q: Is an annual report produced by the London CRC on its projects?

A: Reports are generated by Borough. A list of projects could be obtained for Enfield from the Environment link officer **ACTION: Jane Juby**

Q: Why are there currently only two schools in the Borough involved with projects?

A: Schools do not usually require such help; they have their own staff for grounds maintenance. However, where schools have larger grounds, they may need assistance.

4. CHAIR'S FEEDBACK

The Chair reported that the Executive Committee had not met as planned in the last quarter, however, the Chair and Ruth Ward had met with Acting CI Andy Port to look at:

1. Issues regarding neighbourhood policing, particularly the issue of Wards that were not functioning as they should be;
2. How to improve Public Confidence levels in the Borough police.

A short survey would be sent out shortly to all CAPE Chairs and Dedicated Ward Officers to seek their views on how their Ward was working.

The Chair would be attending the MOPAC Dashboard training on 25 February.

The Chair requested that any volunteers interested in joining the CCTV Monitoring Station Scrutiny Group notify him or Jane Juby.

The Chair had attended a Safer & Strong Communities Board meeting that afternoon. The Board was currently undergoing a review of how it functions in the light of the efficiency savings the partners were seeking to make.

5. EXAMINATION OF CRIME STATISTICS

Acting CI Andy Port gave the following updates:

Recorded Crime

- Enfield had been achieving a reduction rate in MOPAC 7 crimes of just below or above 15%. The MOPAC target was 20%.
- Enfield had achieved a 21% reduction in rolling 12 month figures from year 11/12 to present.
- Theft from the Person had not reduced significantly but the number of offences was very low and consequently, difficult to influence.
- Violence with Injury had experienced a promising reduction in the last 12 months; Enfield was only one of 3 London boroughs to do so.
- Robbery continued to a concern (figures included both personal and commercial robbery). There had been a spate of robberies from bookmakers in the borough over the last 3-4 months but arrests and convictions in this regard had now been made.
- Burglary, despite the reductions, continued to be a challenge particularly in the winter months and in the period just before Christmas.
- Good reductions had been achieved in car crime (Theft of and Theft from Motor Vehicles).
- Criminal Damage covered a variety of offences which made it difficult to influence (for example, graffiti, smashing windows).

An attendee asked if the statistics for Violence with Injury included domestic violence, and asked that these be separated for future reports if this were the case **ACTION: Acting CI Andy Port.**

Acting CI Andy Port confirmed that these were included.

Cllr Maguire also commented that the Board would like to review crimes additional to the MOPAC 7, for example, rape or assault.

Acting CI Andy Port responded that these could be included. It was acknowledged that there might be increased figures for crimes such as rape and domestic violence, due to increased reporting from victims.

Cllr Dines asked if detection rates could also be included in future reports.

Acting CI Andy Port responded that these could be provided, and that there may well be increased focus on outcomes when targets were set for the year in April.

The Chair commented that it was also important to see which offences of domestic violence were repeat offences, but acknowledged that this data was being presented at appropriate forums elsewhere.

SAFER NEIGHBOURHOODS BOARD - 4.2.2016

Acting CI Andy Port acknowledged that crimes such as domestic violence, which posed a real risk to an individual's safety and wellbeing, could receive greater focus. It was noted that domestic violence formed the largest proportion of offences involving violence and was a significant factor in crimes such as murder.

Stop and Search

- There had been a significant reduction in the number of searches undertaken during December 2015 compared to the previous month.
- Of the 459 searches over half were for drugs and approximately a quarter for stolen property.
- A positive outcome rate of 20% had been achieved (stop and search resulting in arrest).
- The predominant age group for stop and searches remained 15-24 year olds.
- Neighbourhood Crime – Enfield remained below the target of 40% for searches undertaken in respect of neighbourhood crime (motor vehicle crime, criminal damage and theft from the person). However, such figures perhaps demonstrated that ultimately, the right people were being stopped for the right reasons.
- Further to the request of the Board at the last meeting, more detailed ethnicity data had been provided with the February report. 56% of those searched during the period defined their ethnicity as White. There was a 5% difference, however, between the arrest rate for individuals who defined themselves as White (18.6%) and those who defined themselves as black (23.7%).
- There had been 5 complaints made in the last 12 months against officers as a result of stop and search. Of these, 1 had been withdrawn and the remainder disproved.

It was **NOTED** that there would be a rollout of body cameras to all officers in September which would assist in such investigations. Body cameras would also be of assistance in investigations for other offences, particularly domestic violence.

- Enfield did not appear to have any current 'prolific searched subjects'.

It was asked why this was the case and should known gang members be targeted?

Acting CI Andy Port responded that, although the Police wished to disrupt gang activity, grounds were still required to carry out any stop and search. He added that, however, the figures provided in the report did not include 'stop and account' and this was a useful tool in this respect.

A Board Member asked if stop and account was monitored in the same way as stop and search. Acting CI Andy Port confirmed that it was.

- The Stop and Search Community Monitoring Group had met on 1 February but there was a need for its reinvigoration. It was mentioned

SAFER NEIGHBOURHOODS BOARD - 4.2.2016

that Vicky Dungate had expressed an interest in joining the Group; Acting CI Andy Port would check as to whether she had/would be invited to meetings **ACTION: CI Andy Port.**

Anti-Social Behaviour

- There had been a slight increase in calls made regarding ASB in December 2015 compared to December 2014.
- Enfield had recently run an 'Autumn and Winter Nights' operation with a focus on ASB reduction. The Police also continued to work with schools and provide extra resourcing during school breaks.

Public Confidence

- Enfield had experienced a fall in public confidence to 59% against an MPS average of 67%, the second lowest in London. The Police were working to address this and were looking to target more resources into engagement, particularly in the Edmonton area.
- It had been recognised that the Police also needed to improve on informing communities on its successes and what it was doing to tackle crime.

It was **AGREED** that the issue be discussed further under Any Other Business.

Victim Satisfaction

- Overall satisfaction in Enfield was at 79% against an 80% MPS average in Quarter 2.
- It was a concern that there was a 5% point gap in satisfaction levels between white and BME victims.

Complaints Against Borough Officers/Staff

- Enfield currently had 31 open cases, which had been open an average of 90 days (this appeared to be a long time, but investigations were quite a complex process and these figures compared favourably with other boroughs).
- Enfield had recorded a total of 502 public complaint allegations over the last 12 months. This was quite high (in the top 3 boroughs in London). It had been difficult to determine why this was the case but it was important to note that, of the 502 allegations made, only 7 had been deemed as having a case to answer.

The following questions were then taken:

Q: Are there stages of complaint?

A: Yes, there is a 'local resolution' stage which looks to resolve complaints quickly and directly with the officer/s concerned for more minor matters. Other than these, some complaints that proceed to

SAFER NEIGHBOURHOODS BOARD - 4.2.2016

investigation will be investigated within the borough, more serious complaints will be investigated off-borough.

Cllr Maguire commented that perhaps improved engagement may help to reduce the numbers of complaints made.

Q: Has there been any particular work done on recruiting locally, or within BME communities to ensure local policing is properly representative of the population in Enfield?

A: The MPS is working hard to address this but is not quite where it wants to be as yet; for example there have been recent campaigns to recruit candidates with more than one language, or who had lived in London for a given period of time. With regard to the latter, it is sometimes difficult to recruit Police Officers into a borough in which they live.

Q: Were the 502 complaint allegations made by separate individuals?

A: No, there were a number of repeat complaints. Also, the category 'Disapplication' in the report refers to those complaints identified as malicious.

6. TARGET ESTABLISHMENT

The Target Establishment for Enfield was **NOTED** as follows:

- The current target strength for police officers is 557;
- The current actual number is 546.74

7. UPDATE ON CURRENT POLICE OPERATIONS

Acting CI Andy Port gave the following update on current operations:

- Operation Omega – this tackled crimes under the MOPAC 7 20% reduction target. Dedicated teams worked in hot-spot areas, targeting wanted offenders and named suspects.
- Operation Teal - this tackled gang crime with enhanced central resources. There had been a significant reduction in knife crime among young people in Enfield, this had been due to the work of Operation Teal, and other initiatives.
- Met Trace – rollout of Smart Water kits continued, particularly in the north of the borough. 7,500 Smart Water kits had been delivered to residents so far, with another 2,000 planned by the end of March. A second phase thereafter would be rolled out.

The following questions were then taken:

Q: Is the Safe as Houses/Smart Water kit rollout displacing burglary to other areas of the borough without such kits?

A: It is acknowledged there may be an element of displacement. The figures are suggesting a general reduction in burglary, however.

SAFER NEIGHBOURHOODS BOARD - 4.2.2016

- Q: Are the numbers of uninsured vehicles (targeted through Operation Cubo) still high?
A: Unfortunately yes, it is an ongoing problem.

8. SNB FUNDING APPLICATIONS

A table updating Board Members on SNB Projects was circulated.

It was **NOTED** that an amount of £2876 remained unallocated; however, it was **AGREED** that there were no current suitable projects to put forward for this funding.

It was **NOTED** that the process of co-ordinating bids would be improved for next year's funding round; particular Board Members would be responsible for co-ordinating and monitoring bids.

9. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 19 NOVEMBER 2015

The Board **AGREED** the Minutes of the Meeting held on 19 November as a correct record.

It was **NOTED** that the issue of Councillor attendance at CAPEs would be addressed via the survey mentioned under the Chair's Feedback.

10. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Improving Public Confidence in the Police

Acting CI Andy Port invited Board Members to suggest ways of improving public confidence in the Police.

An attendee asked who had been sent the survey to determine levels of public confidence.

The Chair responded that it was a standard random sampling taken across the Metropolitan Police area.

Cllr Dines asked if there was a causal link between a younger, more diverse and transient population and lower levels of public confidence.

CI Andy Port responded that these may be factors, and that there could be increased focus on engagement with the community. To date, the primary policing focus had been on tackling crime. It was also acknowledged that such engagement could also have a preventative effect.

The EYP representative thought that the Police could increase visits to schools to more directly engage with young people. An attendee suggested polling school pupils on their perceptions of the Police to get an up-to-date picture.

SAFER NEIGHBOURHOODS BOARD - 4.2.2016

It was also acknowledged that there may be different cultural perceptions of the Police and these may not be altogether positive. Increased engagement and sampling of such communities may help improve public confidence (although it was noted that demographic measures were employed when conducting surveys).

A Board Member commented that it was also the responsibility of residents to work with and support the Police by reporting crime. If crime was not reported, the Police could not then tackle it.

Regarding the use of social media, it was suggested that the Police could, as well as putting out messages, monitor responses/opinions and respond directly to any negative ones to try and challenge these. Acting CI Andy Port thought this was a good suggestion, and would follow this up **ACTION: Acting CI Andy Port.**

Cllrs Dines and Maguire also suggested that great publicising and availability of crime resolution rates may help to address negative viewpoints.

A Board Member then also suggested that greater Police visibility may improve confidence levels. CI Andy Port responded that he encouraged officers wherever possible to patrol on foot but that sometimes necessity meant that cars had to be used.

11. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

The Chair asked Board members to note the provisional date of **25 May 2016** for the next meeting. Dates for 16/17 would be confirmed at the Annual General Council Meeting in May. Eddie Fraser gave his apologies for this meeting.

The Chair confirmed the next meeting of the Executive Committee would be **9 May 2016.**

The meeting ended at 9.15pm.