Public Document Pack SAFER NEIGHBOURHOODS BOARD - 19.11.2015

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE SAFER NEIGHBOURHOODS BOARD HELD ON THURSDAY, 19TH NOVEMBER, 2015

<u>Board Members Attending:</u> Tim Fellows, Ruth Ward, Janet Marshall, Harry Landsman, Pat Jackson, Eddie Fraser, Askin Erzokal, Alok Agrawal, Vicky Dungate, Adrian Bishop-Laggett (FERAA), Willem La Tulip-Troost and Diana Nguimbi (Enfield Youth Parliament)

<u>Also Attending:</u> Acting Chief Inspector Andy Port, Bradley Few (MOPAC), Michelle Larche (Marketing Officer, LB Enfield), Gillian Yeung, Ernest Chinnick, Pravin Varsani, Derek Jay (for David Cockle)

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

All were welcomed to the meeting; in particular representatives from the Enfield Youth Parliament.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Cllrs Dines and Maguire, Carol Shuttle, Sheila Stacey, Jane Richards, David Cockle (Derek Jay substituting) and Superintendent Carl Robinson.

3. ENFIELD COUNCIL CRIME PREVENTION CAMPAIGNS

Michelle Larché, Marketing Officer, introduced the Council's recent crime prevention campaigns as follows:

- The Safer and Stronger Communities Board had tasked the Corporate Communications Team in September 2014 to carry out a co-ordinated crime prevention campaign centred around 3 key objectives. These were:
 - Encouraging young people to avoid criminal activity, stay safe and make positive life choices away from crime.
 - Reducing crime through helping residents to keep themselves safe and raising awareness (particularly with regard to opportunistic crime);
 - Reassuring residents that Enfield was still a safe borough and promoting the positive work within communities to reduce crime (this objective was due to be rolled out in 16/17).
- A variety of channels had been used including local and ethnic press, social media, postcards, targeted mailshots, Our Enfield magazine, bus advertisements and JC Decaux boards.
- Engagement with young people had also involved youth workers and Police officers in schools to help promote key messages.

- Recent and planned campaigns included:
 - 'Pathways to Success' promoting positive role models for young people;
 - Christmas and Winter anti-burglary campaigns raising awareness of increased burglary risk during winter nights and the Christmas period and how to avoid being a victim;
 - Valentine's Day postcard a targeted campaign aimed at gang members to make them think about the impact of their actions on family relationships ('don't break your mother's heart');
 - Campaign to promote registration of mobile phones and the Metropolitan Police's Immobiliser Site
 - Campaign to promote Operation Spyder (vehicle theft). This included outreach work such as handing out promotional key rings in supermarket car parks.
 - Domestic abuse/violence this would be aligned with White Ribbon Day and raised awareness of the fact that anyone could be a victim.
- There had been positive results from the campaigns for example a reduction in robberies outside schools as a result of the 'Daylight Hours' campaign.

The following questions were then taken:

- Q: Will the campaign against Domestic Abuse be rolled out in any other languages than English?
- A: At the moment, there is no plan to do so, however, the team that commissioned the campaign do work with a range of community groups in the Borough.
- Q: Is Domestic Violence more common in any particular community group/s?
- A: I don't have this information to hand however, the campaign images show the diversity of people that can be victims of Domestic Violence.
- CI Andy Port commented that he thought the Valentine's Day campaign had been a positive initiative, particularly for those on the edge of gang life. He added that the Metropolitan Police's Twitter account currently had 7,000 follows and thought that the Police could work more closely with the Council's Communications Team to disseminate some of the campaigns' messages via their Twitter account **ACTION: CI Andy Port/Michelle Larche.**

The Chair commented that campaign images could be added to the back pages of the Ward Newsletters.

Michelle Larche invited attendees to take away copies of the brochure containing campaign images and Board members requested that soft copies be sent to Jane Juby. Any Board members could then email her to request images **ACTION: Michelle Larche/Jane Juby**.

The Board Secretary asked if schools had been consulted prior to any campaigns being developed.

Michelle Larche responded that all schools had been sent copies of the posters and if any schools were interested in further youth engagement work the Communications Team could contact them. It would have proved quite time consuming and complex to consult schools beforehand.

It was then asked if the Police officers working in schools had access to the images. CI Andy Port responded that he would ensure this was the case **ACTION: CI Andy Port.**

It was suggested that some campaign posters could be put up in hospitals (Accident and Emergency). This was acknowledged as a good idea.

It was also asked if there had been any dedicated promotion of the Metropolitan Police's 'Met Trace' initiative; apart from its inclusion in the Winter Burglary campaign. CI Andy Port acknowledged that perhaps more dedicated promotion was needed to raise awareness of the scheme **ACTION: CI Andy Port to feedback.**

4. CHAIR'S FEEDBACK

The Executive Committee had recently met and had agreed that the Board should aim to have a presentation at each meeting on the following suggested areas:

- Hate Crime;
- Gangs;
- Domestic Violence;
- Integrated Offender Management;
- Drug and Alcohol Services

Suggestions for other presentation topics were welcomed.

Board Members had also attended a number of Gold Group meetings recently (these were multi-agency liaison meetings set up to monitor community issues in light of any major incidents occurring in the Borough).

Adrian Bishop-Laggett continued to act as the representative of the Board on the Independent Advisory Group.

5. EXAMINATION OF CRIME STATISTICS

Acting CI Andy Port gave the following update:

- Reduction in MOPAC 7 crimes had remained static for the past 2-3 months at between 15-17%. This was below the 20% target.
- In the last four years (11/12 to 15/16) Burglary had reduced by 21.6% and Theft From Motor Vehicle by 29.3%.

- Violence with Injury remained a challenge. However, it should be noted that the definition of this crime had changed a number of times and this would impact results. Levels of Violence with Injury still compared favourably with other London boroughs.
- Burglary remained a concern over the last 12 months; and this had especially been the case in the last month, as evenings had become darker.
- Theft of Motor Vehicle had decreased by 21.5% in the last 12 months, which was a positive result.
- Incidents of Criminal Damage had risen in the last 12 months. This crime could be sporadic in nature and a number of factors could be involved. Officers were currently being targeted to look at overlaps with this crime and other issues and repeat target venues. Betting shops were particularly vulnerable to Criminal Damage and the Police were working with them on this as it was a licensing condition to help prevent ASB near their premises.
- There had been an overall decrease of 5% in the last 12 months of MOPAC 7 crimes.
- Stop and Search figures for positive outcomes for Stop and Search were good and remained either near to or over the MOPAC target of 20%.
- The Police were now working to increase the proportion of Stop and Search undertaken for weapons (as opposed to drugs).
- Stop and Search ethnicity data helped monitor the proportionality of searches undertaken. At the moment there was a slight disparity between white and BME members of the community. Complaints relating to Stop and Search were low.
- There had been a significant reduction in ASB this year from last year. Much work had been done in order to achieve this. A team of officers had been tasked to look at issues around ASB in order to help further reduction and work was ongoing to tackle particular peak periods (such as Fireworks Night and Halloween) for ASB.
- Confidence Confidence levels in Enfield remained a challenge. It was thought that Police visibility was a key factor in maintaining confidence; recent reduced visibility had therefore impacted on these results. It was planned to roll out a corporately produced Metropolitan Police newsletter to the South Cluster to reassure residents. Uncertainty over the future of PCSOs, who were often the most visible Police presence on the streets, had also affected confidence scores.

Board Members commented that visibility was important but acknowledged that current demands on Police resources meant that they were less so. The need to travel quickly across the Borough to attend to different matters also meant that officers most often travelled by car, rather than on foot, and this also potentially decreased visibility.

 Satisfaction – This was improving and was just below the MPS average. Improving access to the Police and keeping residents updated during investigations had helped achieve this. Complaints – There were currently 33 complaints under investigation, which had been open for an average of 65 days. This compared favourably to neighbouring boroughs. A dedicated Sergeant dealt with Enfield complaints. It should be noted that, of the complaints made, only a handful had been upheld. A number (35) had been 'subject to local resolution' i.e. a full investigation had not been carried out, the complaint had been resolved by other means.

Operations

The following updates were **NOTED**:

Operation Autumn Nights – Tackling the anticipated increase in burglary, robbery and ASB during the autumn/winter. Shift times have been changed so there are more officers proactively policing the borough throughout the evenings.

Operation Omega - tackling the MOPAC 7 20% target. Utilising dedicated teams, working in areas with hot-spots targeting wanted offenders and named suspects. Operation Omega activity has contributed to Edmonton Green falling from the list of top Violence With Injury wards across the MPS.

Operation Teal – tackling gang crime with enhanced central resources such as the Territorial Support Group, Trident and Dog units working with Enfield Gangs Unit officers.

Operation Spyder- tackling motor vehicle crime and criminal damage through proactive patrols, targeting known offenders and target hardening with some investigative responsibilities.

Met Trace (linked to Safe as Houses) - approximately 1,700 premises have been registered with Smart Water out of the target this year of 9,000.

The following questions and comments were taken:

- Q: Has the Stop and Search Community Monitoring Group yet started to meet?
- A: Yes.
- Q: Do we know the ethnic breakdown of known gangs in the Borough and does this impact on the approach taken with Stop and Search?
- A: There could perhaps be a more detailed breakdown of the ethnicity data presented in the Report. We do look at the make-up of gangs.
- Q: The Board needs to be reassured that if particular gangs are known to be made up of members of a particular community; that Stop and Search is not carried out on members of another community unnecessarily in order to ensure ethnicity data is 'equal'.

A: There has been a lot of publicity around this issue. The Metropolitan Police have moved a long way away from using Stop and Search 'for the sake of it' or to influence statistical data. This would be a disciplinary matter if it was found to be happening. Police officers do not have individual targets either any more for Stop and Search and this has also reduced unnecessary Searches.

It was requested that in future Reports, a more detailed ethnicity breakdown be provided **ACTION: CI Andy Port.**

It was also requested that the Stop and Search Community Monitoring Group provide their nominated representative to the Board ACTION: CI Andy Port to take back.

- Q: Referring to page 10 of the Agenda Pack (MOPAC Crime Statistics), Enfield seems to have the highest number of Officer/Staff (complaint) Allegations per 100 workforce. Is this anything to do with our own particular cases?
- A: We do seem to have the highest number, however, I am not able to give a definitive answer on this at present **ACTION: CI Andy Port to follow up.**

It was noted the LB Hackney had achieved a significant reduction in complaint levels and there may be best practice that could be taken from this.

- Q: What were the issues and outcomes for the 6 complaints in Enfield that were upheld?
- A: I do not have the specific outcomes to hand but I would assume that they can range between words of advice, verbal or written warnings and perhaps even dismissal.
- Q: Has there been an increase in burglaries involving violence?
- A: Not that we are aware of. There has been no increase in that particular issue that has been detected by the Police.
- Q: Is there anything that can be done to restrict the selling of fireworks from shops some sellers are irresponsibly selling fireworks to groups of youths which may then be involved in incidents of ASB.
- A: If a business operates within the law and its licensing conditions, then the Police cannot restrict or stop the selling of such fireworks. The Police can, however, look at working with the local authority to raise awareness with such businesses on how to ensure responsible selling of fireworks.

Members of the Board commented that cancellation of the Town's annual firework display may have contributed to the increased personal use (or misuse) of fireworks.

CI Andy Port responded that the decision to cancel the display had been taken by the SAG (Safety Advisory Group) which had had safety concerns that had not been satisfactorily addressed. It was acknowledged that, for next year's display, liaising far enough in advance with partners and with the organisers should prevent the need to do so again.

6. TARGET ESTABLISHMENT

The current target strength for police officers is 561 The current actual number is 552.21

Enfield Borough and other East London area boroughs have been asked to commit officers to SC&O17 which will take place in the near future.

7. UPDATE ON CURRENT POLICE OPERATIONS

See Item 5.

8. SNB FUNDING APPLICATIONS

The update sheet tabled was **NOTED**.

The Chair informed the Board that a recently submitted bid was being revised and would be included in this year's funding round.

The Board would take a more proactive role for the next year's funding cycle in monitoring projects and ensuring they were aligned with the Board's agreed objectives.

9. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 30 JULY 2015

Actions arising from the Meeting of 30 July were **NOTED** as completed. In particular, the following was **NOTED**:

Page 27 – MOPAC Report - there had been a typographical error in the colour coding of the statistical information.

Page 29 – The issue of Councillor participation in CAPEs would be taken forward via the Neighbourhood Panels, rather than the Board.

The Minutes were **AGREED**.

10. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

CCTV Monitoring

The Chair confirmed that the Board had been asked by the CSU for volunteers to form CCTV Monitoring Station Scrutiny Teams.

It was agreed that the monitoring of CCTV was good for public confidence and to ensure the service was held to account.

It was planned to form 3 or 4 teams of 2 persons who would conduct visits one team a month. Initially these visits would be scheduled but eventually, they would be unannounced.

The Chair asked that anyone interested in forming a team notify him. The Chair also confirmed that training and a Police check would need to be undertaken by any volunteer (the training was necessary due to new legislation now in place). The offer was primarily aimed at CAPE Chairs or Vice Chairs, but other suitable volunteers were welcomed.

An attendee asked if the CCTV Centre at Claverings covered transport cameras. The Chair confirmed that the volunteers would not be monitoring these; and in any event would only monitor Council operated cameras (and not those owned and operated by Transport for London). Visiting teams would ensure the correct use of the cameras and correct evidence gathering as well as ensuring non-functioning cameras were identified and repaired as soon as possible.

Attendance at Neighbourhood Panels

It was noted that some Panels were better attended than others and that feedback was quite mixed. Attendance could also be inconsistent.

The Chair asked if there was any correlation between poorer attendance at Neighbourhood Panels and CAPEs that were not fully functioning. This was acknowledged as a possibility. **ACTION: Chair and CI Andy Port to meet to discuss further.**

MPS Disability Steering Group

It was asked if the Group was being reformed (it had been disbanded approximately 18 months previously).

ACTION: CI Andy Port to follow up.

Edmonton Police Station Counter

The Chair commented that he had recently written to the Borough Commander regarding the unavailability of staff at the Edmonton Police Station front counter for a period of 5 hours. He had received an acknowledgement of his letter from the Borough Commander, but no further response or update.

CI Andy Port acknowledged that a further response should have been provided. He was disappointed that the counter had been left unstaffed and steps had been taken to prevent future incidents. Refurbishment of the counter area was being considered.

ACTION: CI Andy Port to follow up.

CAPE Meetings

The Chair of Bowes CAPE reported that the times of meetings had changed and it was proving more difficult for members to attend.

ACTION: Chair/CAPE Chair to discuss further.

Councillor Attendance at CAPEs

The exact position of Councillor attendance at CAPEs was unclear. It was acknowledged that this should be looked at further.

Radicalisation

It was asked if there would be any shift or change in Police policy regarding tackling radicalisation, further to recent events in Paris?

CI Andy Port responded that they wished to avoid a 'knee jerk' reaction and the Police was, in any event, undertaking a lot of work to address the issue (for example, the Prevent programme). Their approach may be enhanced or improved, but there would be no change to current policy.

11. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

The date of the next meeting was **NOTED** as being 7pm, Thursday 4 February 2016.

This page is intentionally left blank