

Public Document Pack

CRIME SCRUTINY WORKSTREAM - 3.12.2014

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CRIME SCRUTINY WORKSTREAM HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 3 DECEMBER 2014

COUNCILLORS

PRESENT Krystle Fonyonga, Lee David-Sanders, Christine Hamilton and Ahmet Hasan

ABSENT Eric Jukes and Bernie Lappage

**STATUTORY
CO-OPTTEES:** Janet Marshall

OFFICERS: Andrea Clemons, Head of Community Safety
Sandeep Broca, Youth Crime Analyst
Kaunchita Maudhub, Anti-Social Behaviour Co-ordinator
Sue Payne (Secretary)

Also Attending: Chief Inspector Taylor Wilson

279

WELCOME AND APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Juke and Lappage.

280

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were received.

281

SSCB PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT

RECEIVED an update on the Enfield Crime and Anti-Social Behaviour Performance Data from Sandeep Broca, Youth Crime Analyst.

NOTED:

- (i) ASB calls, Burglary, Theft from Person, Robbery, Theft from Motor vehicles, Theft of Motor Vehicles and overall Serious Acquisitive Crime were all experiencing reductions in the rolling 12 months to 13th November 2014;
- (ii) There had been a large increase in Police referrals to MARAC (Multi Agency Risk Assessment Conference). This had been partially due to improvements to the systems through which referrals were made;
- (iii) A significant increase in knife injuries had been noted across the borough in recent months;
- (iv) Two of the seven MOPAC (Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime) indicators were currently experiencing increases in the 12 months

CRIME SCRUTINY WORKSTREAM - 3.12.2014

- rolling (Criminal Damage +3.6% and Violence with Injury +24.1%). Overall, MOPAC seven crime types were experiencing a -8.5% decrease in the rolling 12 months to date;
- (v) For the 12 months to November 2014, Enfield was one of only seven London boroughs experiencing an increase in Total Notifiable Offences (+0.2%). London overall had experienced a decrease in crime over this same period of approximately -4.2%;
 - (vi) Sandeep then provided Performance Overview Data for the MOPAC 7 and SSCB priorities. He also went through the London Borough Ranking Tables for MOPAC 7 & Total Notifiable Offences which detailed percentage changes. He was pleased to report that Enfield were slowly but surely creeping up both tables and these increases had happened at the same time as extra resources had been received to tackle problems in the borough;
 - (vii) Members were then provided with detailed information and figures for Serious Acquisitive Crime (SAC) which included Robbery, Vehicle Crime and Burglary Dwelling. Sandeep also provided information on Violence Against Women & Girls (VAWG) and Serious Youth Violence;
 - (viii) Reported Domestic Abuse Violence with Injury offences had risen by +31.3% over the past 12 months (210 additional reports to police). There had also been a significant increase in the number of MARAC referrals made by police and partnership agencies over the past year;
 - (ix) With regards to Serious Youth Violence this continued to be a very challenging piece of work. Enfield was currently experiencing a +21.4% increase in the rolling 12-months and a -13.0% reduction compared to 2011/12. London had experienced an overall increase of 9.5% in the past 12-months;
 - (x) Enfield was one of the top 10 highest percentage increase boroughs for Serious Youth Violence (SYV) over the past 12 months. Neighbouring boroughs Haringey and Waltham Forest were experiencing large increases, as well as most other North and Central London boroughs.

Following Sandeep's update the following comments/questions were raised:

- (a) Councillor Hamilton was concerned by the Violence with Injury figures. She felt it would be useful to see a separation of figures for Domestic Violence with Injury. Sandeep agreed to provide this.
Action: Sandeep Broca
- (b) Questions were raised as to how Waltham Forest, an adjoining borough, was doing so much better than Enfield in the MOPAC 7 Crime Table and way better in the Total Notifiable Offences Table. Discussions also took place regarding the Serious Youth Violence Volume Change Map;
- (c) The Chair was keen to understand how boroughs such as Southwark, Lambeth and Lewisham were producing much better results than Enfield;
- (d) Andrea Clemons responded by explaining that there was a fair amount of work taking place with partners (such as Public Health partners) and other agencies to look at these issues. The fortnightly Gang

CRIME SCRUTINY WORKSTREAM - 3.12.2014

Partnership Group was carrying out a piece of work to look and how/why boroughs such as Lambeth, Lewisham etc were achieving much better results than Enfield. Andrea would feedback the findings of this piece of work to the Panel once it had been completed.

Action: Andrea Clemons

- (e) Andrea went on to say that Enfield now had good links with the NHS National Commissioners and were making good strides in addressing the above issues;
- (f) Councillor Hasan asked if any research was carried out to ascertain why the crimes took place in the first place. Andrea advised that various partnership work was taking place to unravel these sorts of questions and a lot of additional work was taking place in schools to educate young people at the earliest opportunity possible;
- (g) Councillor David-Sanders asked whether any trends were being recognised around hate crimes and were these coming from younger people, certain areas etc. Sandeep said that work was ongoing to encourage victims to report this type of hate crime. There had been quite an assertive approach to address this issue particularly around young people and the education perspective. It was however another challenging piece of work;
- (h) Councillor Hamilton was concerned that in Wards such as Enfield Lock and Highway from what she heard and witnessed crime appeared to be on the increase. She was therefore interested to know how this was being addressed;
- (i) Andrea Clemons responded that it could be very hard to address certain issues as, if people did not report the crime then there were no figures/evidence to refer to when sitting with the Borough Commander in an attempt to request additional funding. Andrea asked that Councillors strongly encouraged the residents of their Wards to report crime.
- (j) Councillor Hamilton said that she would be interested to see figures per Ward on Violence with Injury.

Action: Andrea/Sandeep

The Chair thanked Andrea and Sandeep for the information provided and looked forward to receiving further updates at future meetings.

282

ANTI SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR, CRIME AND POLICING ACT 2014

RECEIVED an update on the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 from Kaunchita Maudhub.

NOTED:

- (i) The Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 received Royal assent on 13 March 2014. This new piece of legislation was still being implemented by partners in the borough;

CRIME SCRUTINY WORKSTREAM - 3.12.2014

- (ii) The majority of the powers within the Act came into force as at 20th October 2014, except Civil Injunctions which was still awaiting a commencement date;
- (iii) The overarching aim of the Act was to provide more effective powers to tackle Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB), protect victims and communities, and treat the underlying behaviour of perpetrators;
- (iv) The Act replaces 19 existing powers dealing with anti-social behaviour with 6 broader powers, streamlining procedures to allow a quicker response. The Government envisages that these powers will make it easier for agencies, victims and communities to take action against ASB and reduce repeat offending;
- (v) The Act introduces two new measures which are designed to give victims and communities a say in the way ASB is dealt with (Community Trigger and Community Remedy)
- (vi) The Act deals with many different issues, some of which did not concern the management of anti-social behaviour. There are 14 parts to the Act but for the purpose of this report to the Panel parts 1-7 (ASB and Dangerous Dogs) was covered;
- (vii) Kaunchita then went through the report and updated Members and residents on the updated powers, explaining in detail the old power and new power/responsibility of Authority.

Following Kaunchita's update the following comments/questions were raised;

- (a) Councillor David-Sanders asked if the process for Anti-Social Behaviour Orders (ASBO) and Criminal Behaviour Order (CBO) were similar. Kaunchita confirmed that the CBO process was very similar to the post-conviction ASBOs previously used;
- (b) Councillor Hamilton welcomed the Act however, she could envisage additional work for the Council ASB Team and questioned whether there would be extra resources to deal with this;
- (c) Andrea Clemons advised that there would not be additional resources available within the team. However they would be working very closely with the Police as it was very much a collaborative effort. Andrea did point out that some areas of the new Act would in fact result in less work for the Team. For example, Dispersal Orders previously involved a fair amount of paperwork/formal consultation. This volume of work would not be required under the new Act as the Police could now literally tell the perpetrator/s to leave an area;
- (d) The Chair enquired about whether any of the new powers had been used already. Kaunchita outlined the single situation where they had been used to date;
- (e) Councillor Hamilton was somewhat concerned over these new Dispersal Order powers being that the Police no longer needed to consult with the Local Authority or Community. Andrea advised that although it was not a requirement for Police to consult with the LA, there was an agreement that this would continue. This however was based on the fact that the Enfield Council ASB Team have a good strong partnership with the Police in Enfield;

- (f) A resident also raised concerns about the new Dispersal Zone Act as he said that it only operates for 48 hours therefore the Police Inspector would have to pre-empt a problem occurring. He felt that this was a major tool that had been removed from the Police in Enfield Town and felt that it was a very risky situation to be in;
- (g) In reply to a resident's question Kaunchita confirmed that some of the new powers could be used where there was an issue of begging or vagrancy in the borough.

The Chair thanked Kaunchita for her interesting and informative update.

283

UPDATE ON POLICE NUMBERS

RECEIVED an update on Police numbers from Chief Inspector Taylor Wilson.

NOTED:

- (i) Chief Inspector Taylor Wilson provided an update on Police numbers in the Borough. He advised that prior to the implementation of the Local Policing Model, Police numbers in the Borough had sat at 524. This had subsequently increased in September 2013 to 609. Current numbers under the LPM allowed for 673 in total for all ranks, of which 625 posts were currently filled as at November 2014,
- (ii) CI Wilson then provided a breakdown of how the 625 posts were made up. This number included 50 PCSOs, a short fall of 40 as the allowed number was 90. However there were 406 Constables in post which was positive for the Borough in terms of policing on the streets;
- (iii) Members of the Panel were then updated on how the structure worked. CI Wilson explained that in essence there were three main areas of business, these were CID (Criminal Investigation Department), ERT (Emergency Response Team) and NPT (Neighbourhood Policing Team). A Briefing overview was then provided on the responsibilities and role of each of these business areas

Following Chief Inspector Wilson's update the following comments/questions were raised:

- (a) Councillor Hamilton raised concerns that although the actual Police numbers for Enfield were now higher than before the LPM she didn't feel this was reflected by more Police presence on the ground. For example with regards to the Safer Neighbourhood Teams in Edmonton Green, Upper Edmonton and Haselbury it would appear that there had been a reduction in numbers. She was also concerned that these teams were working under much more pressure on a daily basis and often got moved between wards;
- (b) CI Wilson explained how the new model worked and advised that the Safer Neighbourhood Teams sat within three clusters in the Borough. He agreed to provide Members with information on the cluster breakdowns to assist them in their understanding;

Action: Chief Inspector Wilson

- (c) He went on to say that it was recognised that teams were much more stretched than before and there was very much a more for less approach. However he advised the Panel that there was currently a MET wide review in place to address these sorts of issues which would include streamlining managers and investing more into putting additional Police back on the streets. The drive for the MET and Enfield Police was very much to have more Police patrolling the streets;
- (d) The Chair asked when we could expect the shortfall in the number of police to be rectified, and when the next recruitment drive would be occurring;
- (e) CI Wilson explained that the recruitment takes place quarterly with the next round likely to be in January 2015;
- (f) Councillor Hamilton was interested to see how Enfield's Police numbers compared with other local inner city authorities. CI Wilson replied that it was acknowledged that Enfield were overstretched, however there were other boroughs sitting in a similar position. He explained that in boroughs with higher numbers of vacancies staff were not allowed to transfer out. Additionally those boroughs with the most vacancies were classed as priority boroughs and therefore would be the first to have staff drafted in. He said that Enfield would usually draw comparison of numbers with its neighbouring authorities Haringey, Barnet and Waltham Forest, and he would be happy to provide Members with this comparison data.

Action: CI Wilson

- (g) A resident asked how Police numbers for each borough were calculated. For example was it based on population/crime figures etc? CI Wilson advised that previously the formula used was based on the 2001 Census Data. However he was not sure if it was still calculated in this way, but would clarify this and feedback to Members at the next meeting.

Action: CI Wilson

- (h) In conclusion CI Wilson updated Members on the current recruitment process and explained that this was now a much quicker process as a Certificate of Policing Knowledge was obtained at college prior to coming into the Force, followed by much of the training then being carried out on the job as opposed to spending 20 weeks in residential training. In view of this there had been approximately 50/60 new recruits in the past six months.

The Chair thanked CI Wilson for his interesting and informative update.

284

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

A resident raised concerns about the number of prescription drugs being discarded in the streets of Bowes Ward. Andrea said that she had mentioned this issue to the Police but they had no knowledge of this problem. She would however raise this matter at the next Tasking meeting to see if any other services had picked up on this.

285

DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

NOTED the date of the next meeting as Wednesday 18 March 2015 @ 7:00pm.

This page is intentionally left blank