

REPORT OF REGENERATION AND SOCIAL INCLUSION SCRUTINY COMMISSION

Safer Neighbourhoods	Classification Public	Enclosures Appendix 1
	Ward(s) affected All	

1 **FOREWORD BY THE CHAIR OF THE REGENERATION AND SOCIAL INCLUSION SCRUTINY COMMISSION: COUNCILLOR SOPHIE LINDEN**

Developing and supporting sustainable and strong communities is one of the most important roles of a local authority. The ability of the local authority to tackle crime, anti-social behaviour, graffiti and other environmental crime can be one of the key factors that determines whether it is successful. Hackney Council and Hackney Police have already made great strides in making Hackney a cleaner and safer borough. Hackney has succeeded its crime reduction targets ahead of every other London borough.

However, residents still place crime and anti-social behaviour high in their list of concerns and priorities for the council to tackle. The recent survey of residents on what they would like to scrutiny to look at found that 58.6% wanted a deeper look at crime and anti-social behaviour. Clearly tackling crime and anti-social behaviour is not the remit of one directorate of the Council or indeed the Council alone – Hackney Police play a central role. And it was with this in mind Members of the Commission started this review of how enforcement was working within the borough.

During the course of the review we have found much to praise – from the dedication of police officers, wardens and officers within the Council to the reduction of crime and anti-social behaviour. We have found goodwill and good partnership working across the Council and Hackney Police. This report aims to build on this and to add to the ability of the Council and Hackney Police to make further progress through ensuring that the structures for partnership working are right and that those who work to improve Hackney for its residents are supported with the right information and the right governance arrangements.

The review has looked at community and democratic involvement in priority setting and has made recommendations on councillor and community participation. This report also aims to strengthen the

partnership working at neighbourhood level by making recommendations on the working of the Safer Neighbourhood Action Panels so that they are able to agree tasks on the basis of up-to-date information and agreement with the appropriate personnel around the table. It also aims to link the neighbourhood level with the borough level by making recommendations for strengthening tasking and data sharing.

The commission has taken a keen interest in the development of the Orsman Road pilot and has made recommendations on its development and the capacity of Legal Services to support an increase in enforcement. We have been very encouraged by the pioneering partnership working involved. Tackling crime, anti-social behaviour and environmental crime is vital. This report aims to build on the progress already made and to support and improve the partnership working already undertaken.

I commend this report to Cabinet and Council.

2 BACKGROUND

2.1 Review Rationale

The aim of the scrutiny review was to continue to promote a joined-up approach to enforcement between the key partner organisations in Hackney; and ensure a central position for the community in influencing enforcement priorities.

The development of positive working relationships between Hackney Police, the London Borough of Hackney (LBH) and other partner organisations in recent years is likely to have contributed to the achievement of the highest reduction in crime figures in the Metropolitan Police area in 2005/06. However Hackney is still a high-crime area, and as such, crime and anti-social behaviour are frequently cited by Hackney residents as prime concerns.

Thus one of the Major Project's identified for LBH to address in 2006-2010 is the implementation of Hackney's Enforcement Strategy, with particular emphasis on a 'One Council' approach and development of strong links with Safer Neighbourhood Teams (SNTs).

The Commission wished to monitor and make recommendations towards achieving these goals, and to focus on a number of new developments in this area including the introduction of ward Community Advisory Panels corresponding to the SNTs, the neighbourhood enforcement agenda, the restructure of Hackney's Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership (CDRP) and a co-location pilot for Shoreditch Neighbourhood.

The focus of the review was on environmental crime, street crime and anti-social behaviour.

2.2 Terms of Reference

The terms of reference for the review were agreed as follows:

- To identify current policy and practice with regards to enforcement in the borough and the different roles played by Council departments and partner organisations including the police in order to identify enforcement capacity at ward level.
- To explore means of ensuring there is appropriate and effective co-ordination between the identified bodies by analysing current proposals, identifying good practice from other local authorities or specialist guidance, and consulting with relevant stakeholders;
- To explore means for effective communication back to the Council Service Centre to report when works need to be done and to explore the effectiveness of joint working between all enforcement agencies within the borough;
- To ensure the needs of Hackney's communities are reflected in proposals through consultation with relevant stakeholders and explore the ongoing mechanisms that will safeguard community involvement;
- To make recommendations for consideration in the further development and implementation of Hackney's Enforcement Strategy.

During the early stages of the review, Members adopted an additional suggestion from Officers that they would take a view as to a standardised role for wardens in Hackney.

2.3 Methods

The Commission appointed Councillors Sophie Linden (Chair), Dan Kemp and Tom Price to form a Working Group to gather evidence for the review. The review was conducted between July 2006 and March 2007 by the following methods:

Evidence presented at formal Commission meetings:

- 11 July 2006 – Enforcement Roles and Responsibilities.
- 12 September 2006 – Safer Neighbourhoods Issues Paper.
- 11 October 2006 – New Multi-Agency Projects in Hackney.
- 9 November 2006 - Roundtable discussion with CDRP representatives.

- 9 January 2007 – Co-location pilot at Orsman Road.
- 12 February 2007 – London Warden Training and Resource Centre.

Informal meetings with agency representatives:

- LBH Environmental Enforcement, 2 August 2006
- LBH Safer Communities Services, 2 August 2006, 8 January 2007
- Hackney Police Safer Neighbourhoods, 8 September 2006
- Hackney Homes Estates Environment, 11 September 2006
- Drug Action Team, 2 October 2006
- LBH Legal Services, 2 October 2006
- LBH Safer Neighbourhoods, 12 October 2006
- Team Hackney, 8 January 2007
- Safer Schools Partnership, 22 January 2007
- Hackney and City of London Victim Support, 21 February 2007
- Stamford Hill Wardens, 1 March 2007
- Hackney Mediation Service, 2 March 2007

Observing multi-agency and community meetings:

- Dalston and Cazenove Community Advisory Panels
- Stoke Newington ASB Case Conference and Safer Neighbourhood Action Panel, 22 November 2006
- Safer Cleaner Partnership Board, 15 November 2006
- Property Crime Reduction Group, 31 January 2007
- Borough Crime Tasking Group, 28 February 2007

Visits to good practice authorities:

- LB Southwark Partnership Operations Group, 19 October 2006
- LB Sutton Beacon Authority Partnerships Open Day, 9 November 2006
- LB Enfield Street Action for Enfield, 5 December 2006

Review of key policy, guidance and research documents.

Evidence from Living in Hackney Review of Registered Social Landlords.

3 SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1 Throughout the review, Members were greatly encouraged by the will to enhance working practices, work in partnership and involve the community demonstrated by all representatives with whom the Commission met. The Commission heard many examples of good practice and particularly wished to commend:

- The fact that Hackney has exceeded its crime reduction targets ahead of every other London borough;
- The launch of the Safer Neighbourhood Teams and their Community Advisory Panels in every ward in the borough ahead of the Home Office schedule;
- The innovative aims of the Orsman Road co-location scheme;
- The appointment of Area Champions for Dalston, Hackney Central and Shoreditch;
- The efforts on the part of the Safer Cleaner Partnership Board to improve its accountability;
- The structure of the Anti-Social Behaviour Case Conferences;
- The work of the Hackney Homes Estates Safety Team, in particular the achievements of the Crackdown project;
- The structure and partnership-working demonstrated by the Safer Schools Partnership.

3.2 Members also heard a range of concerns and differences of opinion about the future direction that enforcement in Hackney should take. After hearing the evidence as outlined in this report, the Commission makes the following summary and recommendations, which are elaborated in Section 6 of the report:

Recommendation One

Members heard that the extent of the drug problem in Hackney means that call outs and procedures against perpetrators are prioritised as resources allow, therefore while the Crackdown project has been highly successful, low-level abuse is not always tackled.

Members welcomed an increased focus on the part of Hackney Police to enforce drug-abuse at Kingsland Waste and, given the links between low-

level abuse and more serious crime and neighbourhood decline, would encourage this focus to be widened elsewhere.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends that Hackney Police prioritises the arrest and prosecution of individuals partaking in low-level street drug abuse at identified hotspots for this activity, if not borough-wide, in 2007/08 with full support from Safer, Cleaner Partnership Board (SCPB) partners. The Commission requests that the outcomes are reported back to the SCPB and the Commission.

Recommendation Two

LBH Legal Services acknowledged they may have insufficient capacity to take up all prosecution cases if enforcement of a particular area was to be significantly increased. The Enforcement Strategy report to Cabinet 19 December 2005 recognised this potential and made recommendations for Legal Services to appoint an additional enforcement lawyer.

On a related issue, Legal Services are not always made aware sufficiently early if a service area is undertaking a targeted enforcement campaign which could also cause problems in capacity.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends that the Directorate of Customer and Corporate Services reviews the capacity of Legal Services to prosecute environmental crime and anti-social behaviour. Appropriate notice periods should also be agreed for client services to inform Legal Services of individual enforcement cases and targeted campaigns to allow for service planning. The Commission requests a report on how this will be achieved by October 2007.

Recommendation Three

A Local Strategic Partnership should ensure clear delegation of responsibility and hold agencies to account for delivering on joint priorities but Members encountered a problem that this has not always happened in Hackney in the past.

Members were supportive of the aims of the SCPB review and welcomed the changes that have been put in place to improve accountability. They wished to make the following recommendation in the spirit of these changes.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends that the SCPB ensures that responsibility for delivery of performance targets is clearly delegated and responsible agencies held to account at SCPB meetings.

Recommendation Four

Members were advised of a new project to trial partnership working between LBH Waste Services and Environmental Enforcement along the A10 project for six months from January 2007. Members hoped that the lessons learnt from this project could be shared and implemented borough-wide, in terms of partnership working and effective use of resources.

Recommendation

The Commission wishes to be advised by the Directorate of Neighbourhoods and Regeneration in October 2007 of the results of the A10 trial of joint working between Waste Services and Environmental Enforcement and how any lessons learn from the project will be implemented elsewhere in the borough.

Recommendation Five

Members encountered a desire on the part of representatives from various organisations for a better understanding of where decisions are taken about funding, better communication about these decisions and greater transparency of how partnership money is spent.

Members also encountered a degree of uncertainty about the transition from Neighbourhood Renewal Funding (NRF) to commissioned services through the Local Area Agreement (LAA) in April 2007.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends that the SCPB promotes greater transparency of how partnership funding is spent, including requiring funding recipients to make budgetary reports detailing spend back to the SCPB. The Performance Co-ordinating Sub Group of the SCPB should also ensure LAA commissioning processes are clearly communicated to all agencies affected.

Recommendation Six

A further issue was raised regarding the potential for Human Resources processes to delay funded appointments to the extent that funding has been withdrawn due to non-recruitment.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends that the Directorate of Customer and Corporate Services reviews the efficiency of Human Resources processes regarding funded posts to ensure they are filled within the required timescales and appointments are not delayed. The Commission wishes to be advised of progress on this issue by October 2007.

Recommendation Seven

Poor attendance on the part of some agencies at Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB) Case Conferences is related to the proliferation of ASB-related groups. Although these groups and agencies work to a similar agenda, Members would encourage the SCPB to develop a better co-ordinated approach to tackling ASB in Hackney.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends that the SCPB considers a means to rationalise the proliferation of multi-agency ASB-related groups and its partners adopt and adhere to a common protocol for dealing with ASB.

Recommendation Eight

The Commission came to the conclusion that the Safer Neighbourhood Action Panels (SNAPS) should be enhanced to provide a basis for co-ordination of joint working on a neighbourhood-basis, subsuming any ad-hoc groups set up to deal with crime and ASB-related issues in the neighbourhood where possible.

The SNAPS should receive crime data analysis reports for their neighbourhood from the Council and Hackney Police and allocate tasks to each agency on the basis of this data. It is important to ensure the right agencies are present and that attendance is at the right level.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends that the SCPB pilots the Shoreditch Safer Neighbourhood Action Panel as a forum for data analysis and operational

tasking on a neighbourhood basis, with the view to replicating the model in the borough's other three neighbourhoods if successful.

The SCPB should identify the appropriate agencies to attend the SNAP including the LBH Safer Communities Neighbourhood Co-ordinator, LBH Neighbourhood Enforcement Officers, Hackney Police Neighbourhood Inspector, Hackney Homes Neighbourhood Relations Manager, a representative of the Youth Offending Team or Youth Services and others as appropriate.

The SNAP should report up to the Performance Co-ordinating Sub Group of the SCPB or other appropriate body as a standing item, with issues of major concern reported up to the SCPB.

Recommendation Nine

Members consider there is also a need for one group to oversee the SNAPs and task resources and operations which are not neighbourhood-based, which is broader than the biweekly police tasking group.

Prior to the SCPB restructure, analysis of crime data on a borough-level was presented to the Safer Communities Implementation Group (SCIG), with partners making decisions on the basis of the data. Members propose the SCPB replaces this group with a forum comparable with those they observed in Southwark and Enfield boroughs, meeting on a monthly basis.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends that the SCPB identifies an appropriate forum at borough-level, suggesting the Performance Co-ordinating Sub Group, to task borough-wide partnership resources based on intelligence profiling.

Recommendation Ten

A lack of effective coordination can lead to duplication. Members heard there are currently a range of officers employed to undertake broadly comparable work on the same streets and job descriptions should be reviewed to prevent overlap. Members were also advised that the potential for a protocol regarding the working relationship between police officers and LBH Environmental Enforcement officers has been discussed but no such protocol has been adopted.

Members also considered there should be more training and education about roles and responsibilities and occasional opportunities for staff from

different agencies to interact and suggests each Safer Neighbourhood Action Panel runs a training session once a year to this end.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends that the Directorate of Neighbourhoods and Regeneration and Hackney Homes review the job descriptions of all staff working in the areas of waste and environmental crime with the aim of minimising any duplication of resources. A protocol of joint working between these officers, neighbourhood wardens and police officers should then be agreed by spring 2008. This should be supported by appropriate training and education for staff about each others' roles and processes, including Hackney Mediation Service.

Recommendation Eleven

Members are also aware of online discussions between the partners at Orsman Road about how targets will be set, who will manage the process to ensure there is no conflict and how the community will be involved in setting these targets. They have requested further clarification once they have been discussed by the partners.

Recommendation

The Commission has already informally recommended that the Directorate of Neighbourhoods and Regeneration and Hackney Police agree a clear management structure and processes for target-setting for the Orsman Road scheme prior to its launch in April 2007. The Commission requests that the details of how this has been achieved are reported back to its first meeting of 2007/08.

Recommendation Twelve

Members also had some concerns that if the Orsman Road pilot is successful as anticipated, the partners may not be able to easily replicate the scheme in the borough's other three neighbourhoods on a practical basis and wished to be advised of progress on this issue.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends that the Directorate of Neighbourhoods and Regeneration and Hackney Police give urgent consideration to the practicalities of replicating co-location in the borough's remaining three neighbourhoods, in anticipation of the success of the Orsman Road scheme for Shoreditch neighbourhood, and reports back to the Commission's first meeting of 2007/08.

Recommendation Thirteen

The Commission was pleased to learn that a communications protocol is being drawn up to enable the ready transfer of information between the agencies involved in the Orsman Road scheme. The Commission hopes this can be developed for wider use by all SCPB partners.

Members also considered that there should be a means for information sharing outside of meetings, which would ensure there could be ongoing communication between partners at a neighbourhood-level without necessitating an excess of meetings. They understand a shared intranet resource is being developed for use at Orsman Road.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends that the SCPB agrees and adopts a formal protocol for intelligence sharing between its partners by spring 2008, and considers in the longer-term sponsoring the development of a secure intranet resource to allow for information sharing between SNAP colleagues on a neighbourhood-basis.

Recommendation Fourteen

During the course of the investigation, Members came to the conclusion that data-collection systems for environmental crime are not as advanced as for community safety. Data for environmental crime is therefore also less specific and more difficult to analyse.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends that the Directorate of Neighbourhoods and Regeneration improves its systems for recording data relating to environmental crime, including ensuring reports made through the Hackney Service Centre are recorded by ward to enable more detailed analysis of crime patterns. The Commission expects to be advised in advance of the 2008/09 budget-setting cycle whether the Directorate considers sufficient resources are dedicated to analysis of this data.

Recommendation Fifteen

Research has shown that the most valuable consultation results are seen when partners' consultation strategies are aligned. Members considered the SCPB should make more use of LBH's corporate consultation function to help to ensure that responses are maximised, that consultations are joined up and therefore more effective, and to mitigate against

consultation fatigue. Members also considered that more thought should be given by partners as to how they can co-ordinate the information they disseminate to the public, such as including Hackney Police contact details where Council details are publicised and vice versa.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends that the SCPB and its partners ensure that their communication and consultation processes are joined up as much as possible. It specifically recommends that LBH is represented at 'Meet the People' sessions and requests to be advised by the start of 2008 as to how this process will be managed.

Recommendation Sixteen

There is a lack of publicity, and therefore transparency, about the work of the SCPB and its sub-groups. The lack of public involvement has been recognised by Team Hackney, and by the Government in relation to CDRPs nationwide, and Members support plans to remedy this.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends that Team Hackney promotes greater transparency of the work of the Safer Cleaner Partnership Board and considers a mechanism to ensure community involvement on a borough-wide level; either through a Safer Cleaner Consultation Forum or through Community Call to Action arrangements as set out in the Police and Justice Act to be implemented in April 2008.

Recommendation Seventeen

Ward councillors are a conduit to the local community. Members would encourage a democratic input into the Safer Neighbourhood Action Panels and also greater interaction between Councillors and staff working in this area.

Members were also concerned about what appeared to be low attendance and also the decision of some SNTs not to invite ward Councillors, as the Commission believes Councillors provide a more representative sample of community views.

To ensure they are more representative, the Commission also suggests SNTs explore existing networks such as the voluntary and business sectors, and the results of LBH's participation mapping exercise, when completed.

Recommendation

a) The Commission recommends that the SCPB agrees to allow each Neighbourhood Forum/Committee to select 1 Councillor to sit on the reformed SNAPs, and that they also actively promote more regular communication between ward Councillors and front-line staff including neighbourhoods wardens and Hackney Mediation Service.

b) The Commission recommends that Hackney Police ensures all Councillors are invited to attend the Community Advisory Panel (CAP) meetings in their ward and that all should CAPs meet on a monthly basis.

Recommendation Eighteen

In order to encourage individuals to report crime, there have to be incentives to do so in terms of expected outcomes.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends that the Directorate of Neighbourhoods and Regeneration and Hackney Homes deals swiftly with reported incidents of environmental crime and ASB, and informs the community of the results including action taken against offenders. The Commission suggests carrying out targeted enforcement in an area where confidence in Hackney Police and LBH may be considered to be particularly low and reports the results back to the SCPB and the Commission.

Recommendation Nineteen

Low social capital in London means that people are often unable to solve problems themselves and therefore an unrealistic pressure is placed on the police and local authority. A change of culture is required with residents encouraged to own communities. Employing members of the local community in positions of responsibility in the community can also increase community ownership.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends that the Directorate of Neighbourhood and Regeneration and Hackney Homes encourage greater community ownership through recruitment of local people to enforcement-related positions and through proactive support of the Neighbourhood Watch, Street Leader, and other similar schemes. The Commission wishes to be advised of how this will be achieved.

Recommendation Twenty

Members encountered varying opinions about whether the role of wardens in Hackney should include an enforcement aspect. The Orsman Road wardens will not initially have enforcement powers but the potential for this has been included in their job description.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends that the Directorate of Neighbourhoods and Regeneration reviews the warden job description in a year's time, with input from the relevant partners, with a view to giving wardens powers to enforce against environmental crime.

Recommendation Twenty-One

One of the key roles of wardens is to build trust with local residents and encourage community development. To this end, the public must be kept informed about who the wardens are, what they do, and their successes.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends that the Directorate of Neighbourhoods and Regeneration extensively publicises the wardens' role. This should include greater use of the LBH website and building a database of community contacts which can be used to disseminate information from the wardens and other relevant sources such as the SNAPs.

Recommendation Twenty-Two

Wardens can improve the efficiency of other services with a remit to keep Hackney's streets clean and safe by reporting and monitoring incidents, allowing these services to focus on resolving the incidents. However it should be ensured that the potential for an increase in incident-reporting generated by the Orsman Road warden scheme is supported by sufficient capacity to deal with these incidents.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends that the Directorate of Neighbourhoods and Regeneration, Hackney Homes and Hackney Police consider the likely implications of warden activity for the capacity of their officers working in Hackney's streets and estates prior to the start of the Orsman Road scheme, and advises the Commission of its findings at their first meeting of 2007/08.

4 FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 4.1 The Warden Scheme has been fully provided for within the budget.
- 4.2 There were separate growth bids of £350k and £389k for 06/07 and 07/08 respectively as priority bids. The 06/07 budget is currently reporting a saving of about £100k largely due to the delay in implementing full warden scheme. Subject to the approval of the finance director, this could be used to fit the new office for the Neighbourhood Wardens, if the current financial position for the department is sustained.

5 COMMENTS OF THE MONITORING OFFICER

- 5.1 The report itself (at paragraph 6) lists the raft of legislative powers the Council utilises in pursuing its enforcement strategy. While there will inevitably be legal issues arising on day to day implementation of enforcement under those legislative provisions referred to, there are no other legal comments for the purposes of this report.

6 FINDINGS

6.1 Enforcement Capacity

6.1.1 *Roles and Responsibilities*

Ward councillors frequently encounter the difficulties members of the public face in finding out how to report, and who is responsible for resolving, issues relating to environmental crime and anti-social behaviour. This is partly a result of legislative complexity, partly a historical failure on the part of the Council to communicate this information to residents and between departments, and partly to prevalence of a blame culture that grew up between different departments and partners.

Therefore the first stage of the review was to identify the different enforcement powers and responsibilities held by agencies in Hackney.

- ***Arrestable Offences***

The Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 gives police officers powers to arrest without warrant anyone whom they have reasonable grounds for suspecting to be about to commit or in the act of committing an offence. If an officer has reasonable grounds for suspecting an offence has been committed they may arrest anyone whom they have reasonable grounds to suspect of being guilty of it. If an offence has been committed a constable may arrest anyone guilty of, or whom they have reasonable grounds for suspecting to be guilty of, the offence.

- *Graffiti*

Under Section 43 of the Anti-Social Behaviour Act 2003, a Fixed Penalty Notice (FPN) can be served upon offenders if caught in the act. Currently FPNs can be served by LBH officers but neither Police Community Support Officers nor wardens in Hackney have enforcement powers.

Alternatively, a Statutory Notice can be served under Section 48 of the Anti-Social Behaviour Act 2003 upon the owner of a property requiring them to remove graffiti from it, and if contravened, the Council can carry out the work in default and charge the owner. If the owner fails to pay, the Council can take the person to County Court to seek recovery of the expenditure they incurred.

- *Fly-posting*

FPNs under Section 43 the Anti-Social Behaviour Act 2003 can be served upon offenders if caught in the act. Alternatively a Statutory Notice can be served under Section 215 of the Town and Country Act 1990 instructing persons to remove posters from their premises which if contravened would result in prosecution or the Council undertaking the work in default. Cost recovery would be sought by taking the land owner to County Court.

- *Littering*

A Litter Clearance Notice can be served under Section 92 of the Environmental Protection Act 1990, as amended by the Clean Neighbourhoods and the Environment Act 2005, which requires the owner of affected land to clear it of litter within a specified time and take reasonable steps to maintain it in a clean condition. Alternatively FPNs can be served under Section 87 of the Environmental Protection Act 1990, upon persons who drop litter on any land.

- *Fly-tipping*

A Statutory Notice can be served under Section 34 of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 for failure to provide documentary evidence of proper waste collection arrangements (waste transfer note). Further, an FPN can be issued under the Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005 for failure to produce this note. Offenders can be prosecuted for fly-tipping under Section 33 of the Environmental Protection Act 1990.

- *Dog Fouling*

Local authority officers can issue FPNs or prosecute under the Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005.

- *Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB)*¹

The police, local authority and the landlord are responsible for enforcing against ASB by the award of Anti-Social Behaviour Orders (ASBOs) under the terms of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 and the Police Reform Act 2002. In Hackney, this places responsibility on Hackney Homes and the numerous Registered Social Landlords as well as Hackney Council and Hackney Police. LBH Safer Communities Services is responsible for managing the development and implementation of ASBOs.

LBH Markets Team also work in conjunction with Hackney Police and LBH Trading Standards to enforce against a range of criminal and ASB issues in Hackney's markets including theft, drug sales and use and prostitution.

- *Prosecution*

LBH Legal Services' Litigation and ASB solicitors handle prosecution cases for clients including Environment Enforcement and Hackney Homes. The Crown Prosecution Service handles all prosecutions on behalf of the police.

There are also a range of agencies that are not enforcement-oriented but provide the following support for enforcement in addition to their core activities:

- *'Eyes and Ears' Intelligence Sharing*

CCTV Services based in Stoke Newington and Hackney Homes Estate Safety's mobile surveillance unit provide information to assist with enforcement.

Agencies routinely working on streets and estates can also pass on vital intelligence to facilitate enforcement activities and act as professional witnesses. There include the three neighbourhood warden schemes currently operating in the borough, and Hackney Homes Neighbourhood Relations Managers.

Safer Neighbourhood Teams (SNTs) are the most recent addition to this street presence. Comprising a minimum of 1 Sergeant, 2 Police Constables and 3 Police Community Support Officers, every ward in

¹ The Safer, Cleaner Place to Live Partnership defines anti-social behaviour as 'behaviour, whether or not in itself criminal, which causes or is likely to cause harassment, alarm or distress to other people including behaviour which puts people in fear of crime'. It includes vandalism, graffiti, noise nuisance, abandoned vehicles, prostitution, disorder, drunkenness, disputes and disturbances.

Hackney has had an SNT since October 2005, well ahead of the Home Office schedule. In addition to their remit to provide reassurance, a highly visible presence and deal with priority crimes highlighted on their wards, SNTs also pass on intelligence from the ground.

- *Support Services*

A range of support services link in with enforcement, for example the Drug Action Team's work with the Crackdown project and Prolific and Priority Offenders, the Safer Schools Partnership assistance with negotiating arrests in schools, the Youth Offending Team and LBH Children's Services and Adult and Older People's Provision.

6.1.2 Capacity

Members recognised that levels of enforcement have increased in recent years. They welcomed steps to address some historical issues of under-enforcement, for example joint meetings that have started between Hackney Police and Environmental Enforcement to address crime in Ridley Road market.

However they were concerned that there is still significant under-enforcement, particularly to tackle waste offences, street drug and alcohol misuse, and ASB.

Members heard that there is not a need for mass enforcement, but rather finding solutions that are enforceable and undertaking high-profile and targeted enforcements, for example with regards to waste offences.

Members found it difficult to get a comprehensive breakdown of reports of environmental crime as not all services have yet transferred to Hackney Service Centre² but they were informed of 99 reports of graffiti, 1691 reports of illegal dumping and 484 reports of anti-social behaviour that were reported to Hackney Service Centre during April-September 2006. As of 30 April 2006, LBH Legal Services only had 5 live environmental enforcement cases and 46 as of 30 October 2006. The figures for anti-social behaviour were 24 as of 30 April 2006 and 72 as of 30 October 2006. This would appear to indicate that agencies are not taking action against offenders.

Members heard from their colleagues on the Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission and across the wider Member cohort of the difficulty of getting Registered Social Landlord (RSLs) to tackle anti-social behaviour. While all RSLs have adopted Anti Social Behaviour Strategies and most have signed up to the Respect Standard, there has only been 1 recorded

² Members were advised that the remaining services would be transferred on 22 March 2007.

case of an ASBO awarded as a direct result of RSL action. Members heard that RSLs tend to let low level crime continue without redress, and do not always comply with agreed procedures or indeed appear to know what they are. Members have encouraged the Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission's RSL Review to make appropriate recommendations to deal with RSL non-compliance.

While they were advised that Hackney Police has a good record for prosecuting individuals for drug-related offences, Members heard that the extent of the drug problem in Hackney means that call outs and procedures against perpetrators are prioritised as resources allow, therefore while the Crackdown project has been highly successful, low-level abuse is not always tackled.

Members considered if such a conclusion is presumed to be accurate, a change in policy should be considered in the light of evidence showing the proportion of crime that has some drug-related element to it (many police forces estimate that around half of all recorded crime has some drug related element to it), the proportion of suspect offenders who test positive for illegal drug and links between drugs and neighbourhood decline.³

Members welcomed an increased focus on the part of Hackney Police and partners to enforce drug-abuse at Kingsland Waste and would encourage this focus to be widened to areas in other parts of the borough where drug-abuse on the streets is an issue.

Recommendation One

The Commission recommends that Hackney Police prioritises the arrest and prosecution of individuals partaking in low-level street drug abuse at identified hotspots for this activity, if not borough-wide, in 2007/08 with full support from SCPB partners. The Commission requests that the outcomes are reported back to the SCPB and the Commission.

Members had also heard anecdotal evidence of an enforcement backlog and questions about the capacity of LBH Legal Services to handle enforcement cases. They subsequently learnt that 1 member of staff has handled all criminal enforcement cases, although capacity would increase in the new structure for Legal Services. However Legal Services have accepted all requests to take on cases and have no backlog of cases. There is also 1 ASB solicitor working almost at full capacity handling civil ASB cases but again there is no backlog and they have pursued every ASB order other than one.

³ National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal, 2000

As of October 2006, the Litigation Team had 95 live cases, about 50% of which were relevant to the review. They operate with a success rate of approximately 90%.

Legal Services acknowledged however that they may have insufficient capacity to take up all prosecution cases if enforcement of a particular area was to be significantly increased. The Enforcement Strategy report to Cabinet 19 December 2005 recognised this potential and made recommendations for Legal Services to appoint an additional enforcement lawyer.

On a related issue, Legal Services are not always made aware sufficiently early if a service area is undertaking a targeted enforcement campaign which could also cause problems in capacity.

Recommendation Two

The Commission recommends that the Directorate of Customer and Corporate Services reviews the capacity of Legal Services to prosecute environmental crime and anti-social behaviour. Appropriate notice periods should also be agreed for client services to inform Legal Services of individual enforcement cases and targeted campaigns to allow for service planning. The Commission requests a report on how this will be achieved by September 2007.

Perhaps most significantly capacity for action is stunted by a lack of co-ordination between agencies, which is explored further in the next section.

6.2 Co-ordination

6.2.1 *Policy Context*

A multi-agency approach to tackling crime was largely informed by the Morgan Report, which identified the six crucial elements of multi-agency working as structure, leadership, information, identity, durability and resources.⁴ The Crime and Disorder Act 1998 subsequently provided a legislative framework to maximise the contribution of all the major partners to crime prevention and community safety and give local people an opportunity to contribute to the process.

The Crime and Disorder Act brought together for the first time all the key players at a local level to work together in a Crime and Disorder Reduction

⁴ Crime Reduction Website <http://www.crimereduction.gov.uk>

Partnership (CDRP). The police and the local authority were designated as responsible authorities within the CDRP, with the Police Authority, Probation Committee and Health Authority named as co-operating bodies and other public bodies invitees to participate. The focus of CDRPs is on community safety and crime prevention, but enforcement is obviously a crucial element of this work.

The Police Reform Act 2002 amended the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 to add the Police Authorities, Fire Authority and Primary Care Trust to the list of responsible authorities.

CDRPs are required to carry out a review of the levels and patterns of crime and disorder in their area, taking due account of the knowledge and experience of persons in that area. They must prepare an analysis of the results of that review, publish locally a report of that analysis and obtain the views of the public on the report.

They are then required to formulate and publish a strategy taking account of the analysis and the responses to it setting out agreed objectives of the responsible authorities, co-operating bodies and invitees to participate and who is responsible for achieving the objectives, and short and long term performance targets

6.22 *Strategic Coordination*

Hackney's CDRP meets in the form of the Safer Cleaner Partnership Board (SCPB), which is a sub board of Team Hackney, Hackney's local strategic partnership. Team Hackney has recently reviewed the membership and structure of the SCPB in recognition of a lack of formal accountability to the Team Hackney Board, the need to make explicit that the SCPB is the CDRP and carries out CDRP functions, and to make a clear split between strategic and operational aspects of the partnership. The group began to meet in its new form in early 2007.

The SCPB has been reduced from 21 to 16 members to promote greater efficiency, and membership was also revised to reflect changes to the Council's structure. The SCPB continues to be chaired by LBH's Chief Executive and Hackney Police, the Fire Brigade, Police Authority, Primary Care Trust, Probation Service, Children and Young People's Services, LBH Safer Communities, Environmental Enforcement, relevant Cabinet portfolio holder and two community representatives will continue to be represented. LBH Legal Services, Crown Prosecution Services, Hackney Homes and the Director of Team Hackney will no longer sit on the board but Adults and Older People Provision and the Better Homes Home Partnership will be specifically represented for the first time.

Amended terms of reference for the SCPB were agreed as follows:

- Making strategy and policy decisions relating to both the safer and liveability elements of the Local Area Agreement and Hackney's Crime and Disorder and Combating Drug Misuse Strategy.
- Managing performance against a suite of Local Area Agreement performance indicators and other local indicators which address the outcomes set out in Hackney's Crime and Disorder and Combating Drug Misuse Strategy.
- Each sub group has lead responsibility for managing performance against a themed sub set of the suite of performance indicators for which the Safer Cleaner Partnership Board has overall responsibility.
- Each sub group has lead responsibility for managing performance against a themed sub set of Hackney's Crime and Disorder and Combating Drug Misuse Strategy performance indicators for which the Safer Cleaner Partnership Board has overall responsibility.
- Making decisions on commissioning priorities and managing the strategic commissioning process for the delivery of the Safer Cleaner outcomes of the Local Area Agreement.
- Ensuring that links and relationships with other thematic partnerships are strong and effective and that cross cutting themes are addressed jointly.

Members heard that many of the problems referred to on the ground concerning unwillingness to take responsibility and to co-operate stem from governance arrangements at a higher level. A Local Strategic Partnership should ensure clear delegation of responsibility and hold agencies to account for delivering on joint priorities but Members encountered a problem that this has not always happened in Hackney in the past.

Members were supportive of the aims of the SCPB review and welcomed the changes that have been put in place to improve accountability. They wished to make the following recommendation in the spirit of these changes.

Recommendation Three

The Commission recommends that the SCPB ensures that responsibility for delivery of performance targets is clearly delegated and responsible agencies held to account at SCPB meetings.

Members learnt that the SCPB historically managed its ever-increasing statutory responsibilities by setting up a new sub-group to deal with each issue and so the structure had become very complex. The new system has been simplified with the following sub-groups now falling under the SCPB:

- Performance Co-ordinating Group
- Youth Crime Reduction
- Domestic Violence
- Drugs and Alcohol
- ASB and Respect
- Liveability

However, Members heard some doubts as to whether officers no longer represented on these groups will be able to deliver what is expected of them and whether it is possible to simplify the structure and still ensure comprehensive coverage. Concerns were also expressed that while the new structure may fit better with LBH priorities, this is not the case for all partner agencies.

As indicated above, CDRP statutory agencies have some shared priorities through the Crime and Disorder Reduction Strategy. Hackney's CDRP partners will also share priorities through the Local Area Agreement, most notably the priority outcome of reducing the rate of violent crime and criminal gang culture⁵. There are a variety of shared national targets stemming from the Community Safety Plan, the Respect Agenda, the Ten Year Drug Strategy and the Youth Justice Plan for example, and the Public Sector Agreement Target to reduce all crime by 20% between 2005 and 2008.

However this only extends so far. Agencies working in this area seldom share the same priorities, working practices, definitions of the problem, power or resource base. Partners acknowledged that Hackney Police and LBH priorities are not always aligned, for example.

There are disparities in priorities not only between partners but within organizations, for example, the Community Advisory Panels drives a lot of the ward priorities for the police but there is also a creative tension with initiatives driven by the Government and the Metropolitan Police Service.

Members attended an Open Day at the Safer Sutton Partnership relating to their Beacon Status awarded for Transforming Public Services Through Partnership. Whilst Sutton has much lower crime rates than Hackney, it

⁵ Team Hackney LAA Submission to Government Office for London, December 2006

was interesting to see an example of multi-agency working being taken to such an extent in this area.

The Safer Sutton Partnership has a single management structure for the police and local authority Community Safety Team. The structure also physically co-locates Drug Misuse Services, Police and Council Licensing Teams, Crime Prevention Advisers, Prolific and Priority Offender work, CCTV and IBO, Hidden Harm, ASB, the Fire Brigade, Probation Services, Schools and Youth Crime Unit, Alcohol Misuse Services, Neighbourhood Wardens, Parks Police, Domestic Violence Services, Police Safer Neighbourhood Teams, Police Volunteers, Special Constables and Emergency Planning. It includes a Management Information Unit that is responsible for collating crime statistics on behalf of the police and local authority.

The Commission does not consider that this model is necessarily appropriate for Hackney but was interested to note its benefits in terms of joined-up budgets, resulting in joined-up strategic planning, rationalized meetings rather than duplication and silo-working and significant cost savings. They do still experience issues concerning different planning cycles and uncertain budgets however.

6.23 *Shared Funding*

During the course of the review, Members were informed that little pooling of resources between partners takes place; rather each agency has their own separate budgetary processes for enforcement.

Members heard from LBH representatives that their primary concern is to look at how effectively they use current resources rather than making specific demands for more funds.

They were informed of a new project to trial partnership working between LBH Waste Services and Environmental Enforcement along the A10 project for six months from January 2007. Waste Collection Operatives will be instructed to remove red sacks only, leaving all other sacks to be investigated by Enforcement prior to removal. Enforcement will be required to identify sacks that contain residents' waste and those that contain trade waste as well as issues with waste being put out at the wrong time, and take appropriate enforcement action where possible.

Members hoped that the lessons learnt from this project could be shared and implemented borough-wide, in terms of partnership working between these services and effective use of resources.

Recommendation Four

The Commission wishes to be advised by the Directorate of Neighbourhoods and Regeneration in October 2007 of the results of the A10 trial of joint working between Waste Services and Environmental Enforcement and how any lessons learned from the project will be implemented elsewhere in the borough.

Partners do make collective decisions through Team Hackney about how Neighbourhood Renewal Funding from the Government is spent on crime-related posts and projects. Members encountered a desire on the part of representatives from various organisations for a better understanding of where decisions are taken about funding, better communication about these decisions and greater transparency of how partnership money is spent.

The often short-term nature of funding means that staff can experience uncertainty from one year to the next over whether their posts will continue to exist. Members met with various staff members who were in this position.

From April 2007, Neighbourhood Renewal Funding will end in its current form and instead Government funding will be used to commission services through the LAA. Members heard that the pooling of resources will happen more often as a result of moving to the LAA. However they also encountered a fair amount of uncertainty about the transition to the LAA and how funding will be allocated. Members considered the Safer Neighbourhood Action Panels could be one forum in which this information could be disseminated to staff.

Recommendation Five

The Commission recommends that the SCPB promotes greater transparency of how partnership funding is spent, including requiring funding recipients to make budgetary reports detailing spend back to the SCPB. The Performance Co-ordinating Sub Group of the SCPB should also ensure LAA commissioning processes are clearly communicated to all agencies affected.

A further issue was raised regarding the potential for Human Resources processes, in particular the various layers of approval required, to delay funded appointments to the extent that funding has been withdrawn due to non-recruitment.

Recommendation Six

The Commission recommends that the Directorate of Customer and Corporate Services reviews the efficiency of Human Resources processes regarding funded posts to ensure they are filled within the required timescales and appointments are not delayed. The Commission wishes to be advised of progress on this issue by October 2007.

6.24 Operational Co-ordination

Members were encouraged that one priority of the Hackney Crime and Disorder Strategy is to improve coordination of joint working⁶ and came across many instances of good partnership working.

These included the Safer Schools Partnership model, in which a team of 9 police officers work in all secondary schools in the borough in partnership with the schools, and which has strong links with Safer Neighbourhood Teams and Safer Communities Services.

However Members were unsure where the interface between overall strategic and operational co-ordination to tackle crime and ASB in the borough is located. They were advised by Team Hackney this should come through the relationship between the SCPB and its sub-groups as the new structure will have clearer lines of accountability and be more outcome-based, but at the moment operational multi-agency work appeared to be largely led by Hackney Police.

The level of partnership working sought by the police would be greatly beneficial, but the issue is where and how it takes place.

At borough-level, short-term priorities for policing and street crime issues are set by the Borough Crime Tasking Group, which is a police group but is also attended by LBH Safer Communities Services officers. Hackney Police have also encouraged Environmental Enforcement, Planning and Streetscene to become involved in their Property Crime Reduction Group though they have not yet attended.

⁶ Hackney Crime and Disorder Reduction and Combating Substance Misuse Strategy 1st Year Progress Report 2005-06

The SNAPs, which are chaired by the police neighbourhood inspector, are a forum for intelligence sharing and tasking at neighbourhood level. However when Members observed the Stoke Newington SNAP they did not find it an altogether productive meeting, partly because it followed a long ASB Case Conference meaning there was little time for business to be conducted; and attendees were predominantly housing and ASB-related representatives whereas other key agencies, such as Environmental Enforcement were not represented.

The format of the ASB Case Conference, on the other hand, in which individual cases of ASB are discussed and resolutions sought, appeared to Members to work very well and they were informed that it has been recognized as good practice. Attendance also seemed to be at the right level so that decisions can be taken at the meetings rather than referred upwards.

There are a range of other multi-agency groups set up to deal with anti-social behaviour. ASBO applications are considered through the borough-wide ASB Reduction Management Group, which will be replaced by the ASB and Respect Sub Group in the new SCPB structure. The group also monitors ASBOS and Acceptable Behaviour Contracts (ABCs) as well as co-ordinating the overall management of ASB work and the collation of ASB data.

The Hackney Community Safety Communities Partnership's Anti-Social Behaviour Policy and Strategy also makes reference to an ASB Co-ordination Group, the ASB Multi-Agency Commissioning Group and an Anti-Social Behaviour Forum for the exchange of best practice⁷.

There appeared to be however an issue regarding non-attendance of certain key officers at meetings. While Hackney Police and Neighbourhood Relations Managers are regular attendees at case conferences, Adult and Children's Services, the Learning Trust and Youth Services were reported as not. The educational representative on the SCPB advised Members she has raised her concerns about gaps in educational representation on SNAPs and the ASB Case Conferences.

Some Registered Social Landlords only send representatives where there is a case involving one of their tenants, which means they potentially miss hearing intelligence which could assist them if the perpetrators are displaced onto their tenure. On a related-point, there is poor co-ordination between RSL areas regarding dispersal zones and tackling low-level disorder when caused by individuals from housing areas outside the jurisdiction of the relevant RSL.

⁷ Hackney Community Safety Communities Partnership's Anti-Social Behaviour Policy and Strategy, 2005

Poor attendance on the part of some agencies at Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB) Case Conferences is related to the proliferation of ASB-related groups. Although these groups and agencies work to a similar agenda, Members would encourage the SCPB to develop a more co-ordinated approach to tackling ASB in Hackney.

One Member of the Commission attended the Hackney Anti-Social Behaviour Conference in November 2006 and was greatly encouraged by the outcomes in terms of moving towards better co-ordination. Members therefore recognise the motivation is there to consider how the following recommendation can best be implemented.

Recommendation Seven

The Commission recommends that the SCPB considers a means to rationalise the proliferation of multi-agency ASB-related groups and partners adopt and adhere to a common protocol for all agencies dealing with ASB.

The Commission visited two authorities that have been independently recognised as having effective structures for operational multi-agency crime prevention and enforcement. Both noted the crucial importance of a driving commitment to joint working at Executive Member and senior officer-level.

Southwark has Beacon Authority-status for its CDRP. Members observed Southwark's Partnership Operations Group (POG), which is a biweekly forum for intelligence sharing and joint tasking between representatives from a range of agencies including the Police, Youth Offending Team, Youth Services, Wardens, Drug Action Team, CCTV and the local authority's Trading Standards, Licensing, and Environmental Enforcement. The POG is chaired by the Council's Head of Community Safety and co-chaired by the Environmental Enforcement Team Manager.

The group uses data prepared by Community Safety Data Analyst, who is employed by the local authority but based in the police station, on hotspots for various crime-types; a statistical breakdown of calls received on ASB It's Your Call line; and upcoming events and issues.

Agencies then share intelligence regarding causes, perpetrators and potential means of enforcement and the Chair clearly delegates tasks indicating the lead 'owner' agency. The forum is also used to share

information about problems arising between the agencies, agree cross-agency training and make decisions around joint agency projects.

Members also observed a meeting of Street Action for Enfield (SAFE), a similar biweekly intelligence-sharing and tasking meeting at borough-level. The Chair alternates between the Police Chief Inspector and the Council Assistant Director with responsibility for environmental enforcement.

Members heard that initial barriers to instigating such a process in Enfield had included fear of data sharing between agencies, and differences of opinion as to areas of responsibility, but this has changed so that while the level of joint working is not the same between all agencies, there are no major issues or disagreements over priorities. Joint-working with regards to the Licensing Act was a good basis for co-operation.

SAFE is a mechanism to task resources that are already in place rather than withdrawing resources from some areas to tackle hotspots. Projects coming out of SAFE are paid for with mainstream resources. The only top-sliced funding is for the Partnership Analysts. Leadership and direction, rather than extra resources, are considered to be the key to success in Enfield.

A key discussion during the scrutiny review concerned whether multi-agency working is best coordinated at borough or neighbourhood level.

LBH is currently piloting a neighbourhood model to tackle enforcement. Three senior managers have been identified as 'area champions' to be responsible for environment issues across Dalston, Hackney Central and Shoreditch centres respectively. They will ensure that the various service areas tasked to deliver a cleaner Hackney are directed in the most effective way and will have the authority to engage with all service areas and other stakeholders to direct and join up services.

Team Hackney does not currently have a local level but aims to remedy this in the future. Members heard varying opinions from other agencies about whether operational co-ordination should take place at neighbourhood or borough-level. On the one hand, neighbourhood-working is consistent with the Government's general move towards promoting localism and can allow for more detailed consideration of local issues, but on the other, oversight at borough-level allows for solutions to be shared and resources directed more effectively.

The Commission came to the conclusion that operational co-ordination should occur on a neighbourhood-basis, with clear reporting up to allow for oversight and synergy, and should be supported at the borough level through similar arrangements.

The Commission was keen to promote fewer, but more effective bodies, and was aware that the restructure of the SCPB has already reduced the number of sub groups in operation.

Members consider the Safer Neighbourhood Action Panels (SNAPS) should be enhanced to provide a basis for co-ordination of joint working on a neighbourhood-basis, subsuming any ad-hoc groups set up to deal with crime and ASB-related issues in the neighbourhood where possible.

The SNAPS should receive crime data analysis reports for their neighbourhood from LBH and Hackney Police and allocate tasks to each agency on the basis of this data.

Who attends these groups is also important. Home Office research suggests that while membership of multi-agency groups should be broad enough to facilitate the intended goals, broadening membership beyond this point can reduce effectiveness by slowing down discussion and decision-making unnecessarily and causing individual representatives to lose interest. This obviously affects levels of support for the group which can come to be regarded as 'talking shops'.⁸

Levels of representation should also be as uniform and senior as conditions allow as an imbalance of seniority can lead to tensions within the groups.

Recommendation Eight

The Commission recommends that the SCPB pilots the Shoreditch Safer Neighbourhood Action Panel as a forum for data analysis and operational tasking on a neighbourhood basis, with the view to replicating the model in the borough's other three neighbourhoods if successful.

The SCPB should identify the appropriate agencies to attend the SNAP including the LBH Safer Communities Neighbourhood Co-ordinator, LBH Neighbourhood Enforcement Officers, LBH Area Champions, the Police Neighbourhood Inspector, Hackney Homes Neighbourhood Relations Manager, a representative of the Youth Offending Team or Youth Services and others as appropriate.

The SNAP should report up to the Performance Co-ordinating Sub Group of the SCPB or other appropriate body as a standing item, with issues of major concern reported up to the SCPB.

⁸ 'Crime Prevention and Inter-Agency Cooperation', Liddle & Gelsthorpe, Home Office Police Research Group, 1994

Prior to the SCPB restructure, analysis of crime data on a borough-level was presented to the Safer Communities Implementation Group, with partners making decisions on the basis of the data. Members heard concern expressed in some quarters about where this would happen in the new structure.

Members propose the SCPB replaces this group with a forum comparable with those they observed in Southwark and Enfield boroughs, meeting on a monthly basis. They considered that the SCPB's Performance Co-ordinating Sub Group would be appropriate for this as it is already in existence and the membership is at the appropriate level, in other words, LBH Assistant Directors, Police Superintendent and service heads.

Recommendation Nine

The Commission recommends that the SCPB identifies an appropriate forum at borough-level, suggesting the Performance Co-ordinating Sub Group, to task borough-wide partnership resources based on intelligence profiling.

6.25 *Breaking Culture of Silo-Working*

A lack of co-ordination can lead to duplication. Members heard there are currently a range of officers employed to doing only slightly different things on the same streets, for example the roles of Estates Environment officers, LBH Environmental Enforcement and LBH Waste officers can sometimes overlap.

Members welcomed initial attempts to pilot closer working between Environmental Enforcement, Hackney Homes and Hackney Police regarding environmental enforcement in the form of Enforcement Action Days held in Hoxton in April 2005, Dalston in October 2005 and Hackney Central in February 2006. They also supported the move towards co-operation between Hackney Police and LBH to tackle crime at Ridley Road Market.

Aside from creating appropriate forums for multi-agency co-ordination, more effective joint-working can be facilitated by breaking a culture of silo-working. It was proposed that job descriptions should be reviewed and broadened to encourage officers to report a wider range of issues and ensure they feed these issues back to the right people.

Another concern shared by Members and the representatives they met is that partnerships unsupported by formal processes are dependent on individual personalities to succeed. In most cases personal relationships appeared to be currently such that there is a good level of communication, but without the formal structures in place such relationships can be at risk with turnover in personnel.

There is now a formal protocol in place between Hackney Homes Estates Safety and Hackney Police whereby the Estates Safety Team pass on calls to the police where they pertain to police business.

It was noted however that Environmental Enforcement does not link in with Hackney Police to the same extent as the Estates Safety Team and LBH Safer Communities Services, for example. Members were advised that a protocol regarding the relationship between Hackney Police and LBH Environmental Enforcement has been in development for a while but has not yet been adopted.

Furthermore, staff working in the partnership agencies need to have a clear understanding of each other's roles so that they can direct issues which they cannot resolve themselves to the correct place.

Knowledge of each other's roles undoubtedly improves as agencies work together more closely in the CDRP. However, while observing meetings Members came across several instances of staff being unaware of who to contact in a partner agency.

Members heard that since the introduction of ward SNTs there has actually been less liaison between Hackney Police and the wardens in the North-East neighbourhood than when policing was structured on a neighbourhood basis. Members were advised of various attempts to remedy this, for example Hackney Police are trying to educate SNT officers as to appropriate points of contact.

Members spoke to representatives from Hackney Mediation Service and Victim Support about referrals they receive from Hackney Police, Hackney Homes and RSLs. Victim Support does not currently receive many referrals from staff in Hackney Council. The introduction of the SNTs has also not resulted in an increase in Mediation referrals, as the service expected. Members heard that relationships could be improved between these two agencies and enforcement staff, with more training needed around referral processes.

Members considered there should be more training and education about roles and responsibilities and occasional opportunities for staff from different agencies to interact. As multi-agency meetings tend to take

place at management level there is little opportunity for those working on the ground to meet each other.

Recommendation Ten

The Commission recommends that the Directorate of Neighbourhoods and Regeneration and Hackney Homes review the job descriptions of all staff working in the areas of waste and environmental crime with the aim of minimising any duplication of resources. A protocol of joint working between these officers, neighbourhood wardens and police officers should then be agreed by spring 2008. This should be supported by appropriate training and education for staff about each others' roles and processes, including Hackney Mediation Service.

6.26 Orsman Road

The Orsman Road scheme is the first of its kind. The scheme will co-locate a new patrol-based Warden Service for the Shoreditch neighbourhood with the Safer Neighbourhood Teams for De Beauvoir and Hoxton wards, the Community Safety Service Co-ordinator for the Shoreditch area, and local Environment Enforcement Officers. The scheme's management will also be based at Orsman Road which will facilitate a joint approach more easily. The overall lead will be taken by the Neighbourhood Enforcement Officer. The service is due to begin operation in March 2007, moving into the Orsman Road premises in May 2007.

Members commended the aims of this innovative scheme. Members are also aware of online discussions between the partners at Orsman Road about how targets will be set, who will manage the process to ensure there is no conflict and how the community will be involved in setting these targets. They have requested further clarification once they have been discussed by the partners.

Recommendation Eleven

The Commission has already informally recommended that the Directorate of Neighbourhoods and Regeneration and Hackney Police agree a clear management structure and processes for target-setting for the Orsman Road scheme prior to its launch in April 2007. The Commission requests that the details of how this has been achieved are reported back to its first meeting of 2007/08.

Members also had some concerns that if the pilot is successful as anticipated, the partners will not be able to easily replicate the scheme in the borough's other three neighbourhoods on a practical basis. They were advised there is a potential facility in Homerton neighbourhood but not currently in North-East or Stoke Newington, although plans for Woodberry Down regeneration incorporate suitable premises. In addition, the Safer Neighbourhoods Teams are either already, or are in the process of being, successfully located in their own premises.

Recommendation Twelve

The Commission recommends that the Directorate of Neighbourhoods and Regeneration and Hackney Police give urgent consideration to the practicalities of replicating co-location in the borough's remaining three neighbourhoods, in anticipation of the success of the Orsman Road scheme for Shoreditch neighbourhood, and reports back to the Commission's first meeting of 2007/08.

Members' views on the new warden scheme are covered in section 6.6.

6.3 Data Collection and Information Sharing

6.3.1 *Policy Context*

The key issues considered in this part of the review related to intelligence-sharing between partners to facilitate enforcement of individual cases and analysis of crime data to enable enforcement tasking and priority-setting.

Section 115 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 provides public bodies with a power to exchange information where disclosure is necessary to support the local Crime and Disorder Strategy or objectives outlined within it. (Public bodies can only disclose information if they have the power to do so).

Such information can be used to assist with enforcement on a day-to-day basis. It can also be used to inform strategic objectives, for example information shared in the CRDP crime audits alluded to above. A Crime Reduction Unit review found the most commonly-used data by partnerships in crime audits were:

- Police: Recorded/Reported Crime, Calls for Service Incident Data, Detections/Arrest, Racist Incidents

- Local authority: Exclusions, Truancy, Noise Complaints, ASB complaints, Social Services offender data
- Probation: offender data
- Health Services: drug treatment
- Fire Service: arson, hoax calls
- Voluntary organizations: Domestic violence data, attitudes to crime survey responses, fear of crime survey responses.⁹

Barriers to information sharing can be cultural, technological and legal. Uncertainty remains as to when personal and non-personal information can and cannot be shared in the light of the various prescriptions of the Data Protection Act 1998, Human Rights Act 1998 and Children's Act 2004. Some authorities have developed an Information Sharing Protocol to help officers in making these difficult decisions, and train designated officers to handle requests for information.¹⁰

Nationally, agencies that have typically had difficulties adapting to this new way of working include social services and the health sector as they have a different culture to the police, and crime and disorder is not at the heart of their work. Professionals warn that partnerships should be wary of using the Crime and Disorder Act as a heavy-handed way of committing agencies to engage with community safety partnerships, as this can undermine relationships. Instead, partnerships should focus on educating staff about how the data will be used.

Another problem faced by a number of partnerships is that the data being exchanged is too vague and dirty to deliver crime information to the detail required for targeting resources and analysis and the sheer volume of information involved.¹¹

One example of good practice in this area, from another Beacon Authority for CDRPs, is West Sussex's Crime and Disorder Data Information Exchange (CADDIE), which uses GIS techniques to plot and analyse overlaid data sets from various agencies, thus allowing for targets and focused actions to be identified.¹²

6.3.2 *Intelligence Sharing*

Members were made aware of various instances of intelligence sharing between partners, for example at the ASB Case Conferences as noted above; the relationship between Hackney Police and LBH Safer

⁹ 'A Review of Audits and Strategies produced by Crime and Disorder Partnerships in 1999', Crime Reduction Unit

¹⁰ Crime Reduction Toolkits: Using Intelligence and Information, www.crimereduction.gov.uk

¹¹ Information Sharing Conference 2001, www.crimereduction.gov.uk

¹² Improvement and Development Agency website, www.idea.gov.uk

Community Services; and primary schools advising the Safer Schools Partnership about difficult pupils moving up to secondary schools.

Members heard that Hackney Police are very quick to share intelligence, for example their Borough Intelligence Unit feed information to and from the Safer Neighbourhoods Teams, other police teams and Hackney Homes Estates Safety Team.

However it is sometimes difficult to persuade some other agencies to do so, particularly where young people are concerned. There is partly due to confidentiality issues, but also the absence of formal protocols. The proliferation of groups referred to above also means that information is not always filtered through to the right people.

Members were advised that intelligence-sharing ought to be part of the job description of all officers working in this area as resources can only be allocated to support partners' activities where there is excellent intelligence.

Discussions relating to the Local Area Agreement will include consideration of how partners will share data and the need to draw up protocols and formalise processes in some circumstances, but also keep processes informal when they need to be. There is a fine balance between implementing mechanisms that ensure information is passed on, and understanding that sometimes more information can be shared when it takes place off the record and relationships are informal.

The Commission was pleased to learn that a communications protocol is being drawn up to enable the ready transfer of information between the agencies involved in the Orsman Road scheme. The Commission hopes this can be developed for wider use.

Members also considered that there should be a forum for information sharing outside of meetings, which would ensure there could be ongoing communication between partners at a neighbourhood-level without necessitating an excess of meetings. They understand a shared intranet resource is being developed for use at Orsman Road.

Recommendation Thirteen

The Commission recommends that the SCPB agrees and adopts a formal protocol for intelligence sharing between its partners by spring 2008, and considers in the longer-term sponsoring the development of a secure intranet resource to allow for information sharing between SNAP colleagues on a neighbourhood-basis.

6.3.3 Data Analysis

In terms of analysis of data pertaining to crime, Hackney Police employs a team of 7 or 8 analysts, with responsibility for different crime types. LBH employs 1 analyst, based in Safer Community Services. Members were advised he is the only local authority-based analyst in London who has near unlimited access to CRIS (Crime Reporting Information System) data held by the police. He downloads data relating to all allegations of crime in Hackney every month which can be used to map peak times and areas. He can also run bespoke queries without having to wait for requests to be processed by the police.

Data regarding anti-social behaviour can be more problematic to analyse as it is more difficult to run datasets from the CRIS system. Call data can be nebulous and is not recorded in specific fields in the same way as CRIS records, for example, it is not currently possible to tell whether calls relating to an estate are made by the same or various individuals. Members were advised that phone line usage monitoring and ASB Database Partnership arrangements are currently under review.

The LBH Crime Analyst receives data from Environmental Enforcement for the crime audit and occasionally requests additional data from them. However data-collection systems for environmental crime are not as advanced as for community safety. Data for environmental crime is therefore also less specific and more difficult to analyse. The Hackney Service Centre was not able to provide Members with a breakdown of reported environmental crime by ward, which they considered would be useful to facilitate crime pattern analysis.

The Partnership Analyst considered it would be useful to have more regular interaction with Environmental Enforcement and that structures should be put in place to support this.

Recommendation Fourteen

The Commission recommends that the Directorate of Neighbourhoods and Regeneration improves its systems for recording data relating to environmental crime, including ensuring reports made through the Hackney Service Centre are recorded by ward to enable more detailed analysis of crime patterns. The Commission expects to be advised in advance of the 2008/09 budget-setting cycle whether the Directorate considers sufficient resources are dedicated to analysis of this data.

6.4 Communities

6.4.1 *Policy Context*

Community involvement in enforcement is important for a number of reasons. It ensures that local people's experiences of crime and anti-social behaviour reaches those in charge of setting priorities, and that the most important issues for local people are addressed. Community engagement can also lead to greater ownership of communities which will over time have a preventative effect.

One of the priorities of the National Community Safety Plan is to enable individuals and the wider community to take greater responsibility for their own safety, and encourage and empower them to exert pressure for improved performance and greater accountability in local services.¹³

Local people obviously have some say in enforcement priorities when they elect local councillors to make decisions on their behalf, in the remit of the local authority.

Local communities can also influence enforcement agendas of the through taking part in consultation exercises carried out by CDRPs and the individual partners, through formal representation on bodies taking decisions about enforcement, and by reporting criminal activity.

Statutory responsibilities for crime-related consultation include:

- The Crime and Disorder Act 1998 requires CDRPs to consult with local people to inform their crime and disorder audits and strategies.
- The Police Act 1996 requires police authorities to make arrangements for obtaining the views of people in the area covered by their police force about matters concerning the policing of the area and for obtaining their co-operation with the police in preventing crime in the area.
- The Serious Organised Crime and Police Act 2005 introduced engagement considerations relating to local policing summaries.

In terms of membership of groups, the Metropolitan Police Authority set up Community Police Consultative Groups (CPCGs) in London boroughs to establish formal links between the police and the community.

More recently the introduction of neighbourhood policing brought SNT-run Community Advisory Panels to every ward.

¹³ National Community Safety Plan 2006-09

6.4.2 Influence through Consultation Mechanisms

Consultation on the Hackney Crime and Disorder Reduction and Combating Drug Misuse Strategy 2005-8 was carried out using a combination of focus groups with targeted communities and vulnerable groups; one to one interviews; presentations to local forums, community voluntary and statutory organisations, and tenants and residents groups; and questionnaires. Responses were received through completion of questionnaires or through verbal representation at these meetings.

Overall the greatest concern expressed for a single crime category was for violent crime. Property crime was also identified as a significant category of crime for over a quarter of responses. In response to specific questions, the issue that caused most concern was street robbery and snatch theft, followed by assaults and burglary. These responses were reflected in the inclusion of Violent Crime and Property Crime as strategic priorities for 2005-08. (Other priorities are Young People and Crime, Drug and Alcohol Misuse, ASB and Environmental Crime and Working for a Safer Hackney.)¹⁴

CDRP Beacon Authorities that have been particularly commended for their engagement with the public include the Safer Stockton Partnership and the London Borough of Bexley.

Stockton's Crime & Disorder Audit has a post-paid response form and is delivered to every door, is on the website and has also generated responses using local radio.

The London Borough of Bexley focuses on consultation through 'Have A Say Days', use of Community Safety Action Zone residents' panels and monthly police surgeries by ward. These and a well-developed communication and media strategy have resulted in a 40% return rate of questionnaires for their crime audit.¹⁵

Other authorities run their own consultations that feed into their priorities in this area, for example the Council's annual MORI survey and RSL annual satisfaction surveys. The Learning Trust is facilitating a survey in all Hackney schools in early 2007 on behalf of the SNTs, asking students to input their concerns along with their postcodes as one means of identifying issues at a local level.

The Community Engagement in Policing project tested different approaches to community engagement in three demonstration sites,

¹⁴ Hackney Crime and Disorder Reduction and Combating Substance Misuse Strategy 2005-2008

¹⁵ Improvement and Development Agency website, www.idea.gov.uk

Cheshire, Merseyside and Northumbria, by placing a new member of staff dedicated to community engagement in each area. The project found that the most valuable results were seen when partners' consultation strategies were aligned and when partners were involved in all stages of consultation processes.¹⁶

Members heard that the SCPB has not always made use of LBH's corporate consultation function, and considered this should be rectified to help to ensure that responses are maximised, that consultations are joined up and therefore more effective, and to mitigate against consultation fatigue. Members also considered that more thought should be given by partners as to how they can co-ordinate the information they disseminate to the public to avoid confusion and overloading the public with documentation, such as including Hackney Police contact details where Council details are publicised and vice versa.

Members are aware that the Police and Justice Act 2006 will shortly require police forces to hold 'Meet the People' sessions as a means of community engagement. They considered this was one instance in which partners could present a united front to the community with LBH and other appropriate representation also being present to answer any questions the public may have.

Recommendation Fifteen

The Commission recommends that the SCPB and its partners ensure that their communication and consultation processes are joined up as much as possible. It specifically recommends that LBH is represented at 'Meet the People' sessions and requests to be advised by the start of 2008 as to how this process will be managed.

6.4.3 Influence through Membership of Community Forums

In general, there appeared to be a democratic deficit in terms of influence from Councillors and the local community.

Until December 2005, the main means of formal standing community input was provided by Hackney's CPCG, made up of about 80 individuals and representatives of community groups who met with Hackney Police on a monthly basis to pose questions. A successor body has not yet been set up.

¹⁶ 'The Future Role of Police Authorities in Community Engagement: Learning from Three Demonstration Projects', Myhill, Millin and Eagle, 2006

There is a lack of publicity, and therefore transparency, about the work of the SCPB and its sub-groups. Members heard that Team Hackney is considering how it can involve local people better, and that one idea is to hold an annual conference. Team Hackney has recently appointed an engagement lead who will work with support from LBH's Consultation Team. This was supported by Members.

The SCPB is currently recruiting to its 2 voluntary and community sector posts, currently held on an interim basis and consideration should be given to how best to ensure they are representative of the community.

Team Hackney currently plans to replace the CPCG with a Safer Cleaner Consultation Forum, proposals for which will follow the conclusion of work on community engagement currently being undertaken by LBH.

The Government has also acknowledged a lack of CDRP accountability nationwide and aims to remedy this through the terms of the Police and Justice Act 2006. The Act places a duty on CDRP responsible authorities to respond to Community Calls for Action raised by ward councillors or overview and scrutiny bodies on behalf of local people¹⁷; and extends the remit of local authority overview and scrutiny committees to scrutinise CDRPs. Members look forward to engaging in dialogue with the SCPB as to how these arrangements should be implemented.

Recommendation Sixteen

The Commission recommends that Team Hackney promotes greater transparency of the work of the Safer Cleaner Partnership Board and considers a mechanism to ensure community involvement on a borough-wide level; either through a Safer Cleaner Consultation Forum, or through Community Call to Action arrangements as set out in the Police and Justice Act to be implemented in April 2008.

Ward Councillors are a conduit to the local community and can both provide valuable information to officers and also signpost residents to the right place. While Members came across instances where officers working in enforcement-related areas do have relationships with Councillors, this interaction between Councillors and staff should happen on a more regular basis. This was particularly raised in the context of neighbourhood wardens and referrals to Hackney Mediation Service.

¹⁷ House of Commons Research paper 06/11

Members would also like to see some democratic input into the SNAPs. Owing to the nature of information discussed, it would not be appropriate for members of the public to attend, but Members propose that 1 Councillor for each neighbourhood with a particular interest in the issue be appointed to be a member of each of the SNAPs.

Local residents and businesses can participate in their ward Community Advisory Panels (CAPs), which have been set up ahead of schedule. Each CAP meets on a monthly basis to set priorities for action for its respective SNT. Currently chaired by the SNT sergeant, the aim is that each panel will eventually be chaired by a local representative.

Members heard that community engagement is a priority for SNTs, with publicity in the local papers, on public transport, posters and so forth. They have had stalls at local events and also introduced themselves to residents by knocking on doors.

Members approached each SNT for information about numbers of attendees, how they were invited to attend and the priorities they set.

They found that in general a number of community contacts were specifically invited to attend, and meetings were also advertised to the community through posters, leaflets in local shops, mail-drops and talking to people on the street or at incidents. In some cases ward councillors were invited to attend, in other cases they were deliberately not invited.

Attendance has varied between a few attendees at each meeting to a maximum of 20. Sergeants have attempted to ensure a representative mix in terms of area and diversity but inevitably this has not always been possible. It is proving difficult in particular to attract young people.

The priorities identified tend to focus on youth ASB, drugs and graffiti/litter.

Whilst very supportive of the concept of neighbourhood policing and commending Hackney Police for setting up all SNTs and corresponding CAPs ahead of schedule, Members were concerned about what appeared to be low attendance and also the decision of some SNTs not to invite councillors.

To promote greater attendance at CAPs, the Commission also suggests SNTs explore existing networks such as the voluntary and business sectors, and the results of LBH's participation mapping exercise, when completed.

While Members acknowledge the rationale is to avoid Councillors dominating meetings, local Councillors can provide a more representative sample of community views, as this is a key part of their role.

This has been echoed by Councillors across London. As one noted, 'Although Councillors are by no means perfect they provide a conduit to the wider community. The immediacy of the action instilled by electoral accountability does not exist in these new policing arrangements and whilst partnership workings are encouraged, they are not rigorously compelled. The silent majority remain untouched by the new policing structures.'¹⁸

Recommendation Seventeen

- a) The Commission recommends that the SCPB agrees to allow each Neighbourhood Forum/Committee to select 1 Councillor to sit on the reformed SNAPs, and that they also actively promote more regular communication between ward Councillors and front-line staff including neighbourhoods wardens and Hackney Mediation Service.
 - b) The Commission recommends that Hackney Police ensures all Councillors are invited to attend the Community Advisory Panel (CAP) meetings in their ward and that all should CAPs meet on a monthly basis.
-

Members also learnt that residents are also involved in neighbourhood-based Substance Misuse Action Groups (SMAGs), established by Hackney Drug Action Team in 2001 to support efforts to tackle substance misuse and related crime and anti-social behaviour in the local community. Each group meets on a bi-monthly basis and works with a range of local partners including Hackney Police, Substance Misuse Services, LBH Youth Services, regeneration bodies, street wardens, housing staff and residents.

Initially based in problem estates, they were expanded in 2006 to provide a wider neighbourhood focus, to work more effectively with the SNTs and to respond to new and emerging hotspots. There are 4 SMAGs based in Homerton, Shoreditch, Woodberry Down and Stamford Hill, and Upper Clapton.

Recent work has included outreach to support action to tackle street drinking at Clapton Common and at Stamford Hill, support for police action to tackle drug dealing on Kingsland Waste, and a joint project with Hackney Police and the Safer Communities Services to tackle youth ASB and drug dealing in Chatham ward.

¹⁸ 'Safer Neighbourhoods?', Cllr Nick Cuff, LGIU comment, August 2006

Young people can have a say through participation in the borough's Youth Independent Advisory Group, which holds fortnightly meetings.

6.4.4 Influence through Reporting Crime

The public are also indirectly involved in priority-setting processes by reporting criminal incidents to the police or other relevant authority. Monitoring crime reporting is obviously essential in order to allocate resources.

While it is difficult to know the full extent of under-reporting, Members were made aware by several ward Councillors of examples from their casework where residents have become frustrated with a slow or non-existent response to their reports of environmental crime or low-level ASB, to the extent that they give up. A specific example was given in relation to dumping on Mountford Estate, which no-one had been fined for despite persistent complaints. Members met with two wardens working in Stamford Hill who agreed there is sometimes a slow response to complaints.

The Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission's RSL Review also heard that there is substantial under-reporting of low level ASB on estates, at least partly because people are afraid to come forward.

In order to encourage individuals to report crime, there have to be incentives to do so in terms of expected outcomes. Members considered that well-publicised targeted enforcements, as well as having a preventative effect as indicated previously, would also be a useful exercise to raise confidence levels in local communities.

Recommendation Eighteen

The Commission recommends that the Directorate of Neighbourhoods and Regeneration and Hackney Homes deals swiftly with reported incidents of environmental crime and ASB, and informs the community of the results including action taken against offenders. The Commission suggests carrying out targeted enforcement in an area where confidence in Hackney Police and LBH may be considered to be particularly low and reports the results back to the SCPB and the Commission.

Members of the public must also be aware of how to report incidents and it must be easy for them to do so. Members were also shown examples of publicity materials for the Safer Neighbourhood numbers, the It's Your Call Anti-Social Behaviour Hotline, and the Hackney A-Z Guide.

The Hackney A-Z Guide 2006/07 was delivered to every home in the borough and widely publicized. It lists contact telephone numbers, email addresses and brief descriptions for the following relevant services: Abandoned Vehicles; Alcohol and Drug Abuse; Anti-Social Behaviour; CCTV; City and Hackney Primary Care Trust; Crime Prevention; Dog Fouling; Domestic Violence and Hate Crime; Dumped Rubbish; Environmental Enforcement; Flyposting; Graffiti; Housing – Estates Safety; Lighting on Estates; Litter; Police (Emergency); Police (Non-urgent); Street Cleaning and Litter Removal; and Youth Crime Reduction Service. The contact numbers for all the Safer Neighbourhood Teams are listed on the back. The 2007/08 version is currently being updated and will be delivered with the Council Tax booklet.

While it is helpful to have all the numbers in the same document, Members were concerned about the multitude of contact numbers. This will however be reduced as the Hackney Service Centre increases the services for which it handles calls, and could be partially addressed through implementation of Recommendation Fifteen, as above.

6.4.5 Community Ownership

A change of culture is also required of members of the public, with consideration given to how partners communicate to the public about their role. Members heard that in general there is low social capital in London, which means that people are unable to solve problems themselves and so puts an unrealistic pressure on the police and the local authority. Residents need to be encouraged to own their communities.

There are various ways in which the public can currently be more involved in solving problems themselves. The Street Leader programme trains and supports residents, businesses or organisations who are concerned about their local environment and want to work with the Council to make improvements, and encourages them to keep an eye on their area and report problems such as graffiti, abandoned vehicles and so forth by phoning the Service Centre, mailing free postcards or via the website.

Neighbourhood Watch schemes aim to encourage members of the local community to work together to build social cohesion and reduce crime and fear of crime, and strengthen links with the police and the local authority. Members learnt that there was a plan to set up a Borough Wide Neighbourhood Watch System to support development of local schemes but this has not yet materialised; and there are not currently many schemes in operation in Hackney.

Employing members of the local community in positions of responsibility in the community can also increase community ownership.

Recommendation Nineteen

The Commission recommends that the Directorate of Neighbourhood and Regeneration and Hackney Homes encourage greater community ownership through recruitment of local people to enforcement-related positions, through proactive support of the Neighbourhood Watch, Street Leader and other similar schemes, and through increased partnership working with voluntary and community groups. The Commission wishes to be advised of how this will be achieved.

On a related note, the Government announced on 9 January 2007 that Council estate resident groups in England will be able to apply for anti-social behaviour orders to be awarded. Resident groups will be assessed before being allowed such powers, with safeguards in place to make sure they are not abused. Clearly, given the large number of tenancy associations in Hackney, there is a need for the relevant parties to monitor this potential development.

6.5 Warden schemes

6.5.1 *Policy Context*

The ODPM and the Government Office for London devised neighbourhood warden schemes 6 years ago but were not prescriptive as to what wardens can or cannot do. The role of warden can range from caretaker to enforcer, dependent on the aims of the scheme.

Wardens are based in and about the streets or estates in which they work. They are accessible to people, which allows them to gather information about problems on the ground whilst also listening to and reassuring residents about their concerns and sharing information about solutions. Wardens are a soft interface between people and agencies.

Warden schemes can contribute to joined-up working and usually involve partnership working in their planning and implementation. Wardens can be funded wholly or partially by local authorities, or by housing associations, tenant charges, or external funding sources such as Single Regeneration Budget or the Neighbourhood Renewal Unit.

The most common objectives of warden schemes can be summarised as:

- Crime prevention
- Environmental improvements
- Community development.¹⁹

Wardens typically undertake the following kinds of activities:

- Community safety functions, including patrolling, carrying out home security surveys and fitting basic security devices
- Improving the flow of information between agencies
- Reporting environmental issues and maintenance problems to relevant authorities
- Responding to minor incidents of anti-social behaviour and neighbour disputes
- Checking empty properties
- Visiting vulnerable tenants
- Organising or supporting social events
- Escorting vulnerable residents and/or people with disabilities to social events
- Encouraging positive citizenship among young people through presentations in schools and/or creation of junior warden schemes

Wardens can also award fixed penalty notices for environmental offences, if given this power by their local authority.

It is hard to make a direct correlation between the use of wardens and crime figures, however crime in warden areas fell by 28% in an 18 month period during 2003 and 2004²⁰. Members heard from the London Resource Network that another way of measuring success is in terms of public satisfaction. One Council planned to remove £850,000 from their £4.5 million budget for wardens but the community outcry was strong they abandoned the policy.

In terms of scheme coverage, Members heard it is generally unaffordable to have schemes covering the whole of a borough and there are sometimes complaints when areas of coverage are widened, as people see their wardens less often. Small schemes of 15-20 wardens covering a hotspot (corresponding to a ward or part of a ward) can be very successful.

6.5.2 *Warden schemes in Hackney*

As indicated above, there are currently 3 warden schemes in Hackney: 1 run by Pinnacle Housing in Shoreditch; and two schemes covering streets and estates in Clapton and Stamford Hill and managed by Paddington

¹⁹ 'Neighbourhood Warden Schemes: An Overview', Home Office, Jacobson and Saville, 1999

²⁰ National Community Safety Plan 2006-2009

Churches Housing Association on behalf of LBH. However there is uncertainty around whether funding for these will be renewed after April 2007.

The role of these wardens is to pick up information that the police miss and feed it back to them, gain the trust of the community and do things to improve their quality of life, help vulnerable people, organise activities and excursions, log incidents of graffiti, street lighting and so forth, and in some cases actually clean up the street environment with the help of local residents.

Hackney Homes officers noted that wardens on their jurisdiction have become well-known on estates. They do valuable work, for example diversionary activities with young people, and are 'eyes and ears' for the estate workers.

LBH's Directorate of Neighbourhoods and Regeneration has been allocated funding from the LBH budget to run its own warden scheme out of the Orsman Road premises. The scheme will comprise 1 manager, 2 supervisors and 8 wardens, who will be paid on a salary comparable with other warden schemes. The Directorate aims to develop a standardised role for all future schemes in the borough.

The Orsman Road wardens will provide a visible patrol, wearing a bright red uniform, to deter criminal activities and challenge bad behaviour on the highway and in estates. They will work in pairs and report instances of vandalism and anti-social behaviour to be dealt with by the relevant authority. They will also have a strong community development role.

The wardens will not initially play an enforcement role. LBH is concerned about giving wardens these powers without the power of arrest as they will be unable to deal with an individual who refuses to divulge their details. Furthermore, enforcement involves a considerable amount of desk work thereby taking away from visible presence on the streets.

Wardens act as a bridge between the police and the community as they are less confrontational and regarded as part of the community, which could be compromised if they took on a more authoritarian role.

The potential for undertaking enforcement activities has been included in the potential job description for the Orsman Road wardens, should this be deemed necessary following initial review. While recognising the validity of the concerns outlined above, Members considered that many residents would welcome wardens being able to tackle environmental problems themselves and therefore it may promote rather than damage community relations.

Recommendation Twenty

The Commission recommends that the Directorate of Neighbourhoods and Regeneration reviews the warden job description in a year's time, with input from the relevant partners, with a view to giving wardens powers to enforce against environmental crime.

The Neighbourhood Renewal Unit's Quality Standard for warden schemes indicates a range of practices and competencies that schemes should aim to achieve.

One set is around involving local people: having a well developed approach for communicating with the local community and media, including publicising successes; holding initial and ongoing consultation across the whole community; and establishing links to local tenants', residents' and other community groups, schools, and so forth and meet them on a regular basis.

As one of the key roles of wardens is to build trust with local residents and encourage community development, the public must be kept informed about who the wardens are, what they do, and their successes.

Recommendation Twenty-One

The Commission recommends that the Directorate of Neighbourhoods and Regeneration extensively publicises the wardens' role. This should include greater use of the LBH website and building a database of community contacts which can be used to disseminate information from the wardens and other relevant sources such as the SNAPs.

Another set of practices and competencies concerns working with other organizations: having clear knowledge of all other relevant organisations active in their area; building upon and complementing the work of other agencies and organisations working in the area; establishing effective systems to allow wardens to communicate with each other, their supervision and other relevant organisations and agencies; and creating clear understandings with key agencies, through for example written protocols or Service Level Agreements, membership of steering groups and memorandums of understanding.²¹ (See Recommendation Ten.)

²¹ Neighbourhood Renewal Unit website <http://www.neighbourhood.gov.uk>

The presentation from the London Warden Network highlighted the need for effective management, recruiting the right people, and putting in place quality training and making it a priority. Members were advised that schemes should budget to spend £500 per warden for 10 days training a year and that local authorities receive discounted training from the London Warden Resource Centre. Local authorities can also run cheap in-house training themselves, for example asking the Youth Offending Team to train wardens on anti-social behaviour.

Careful thought needs to be given to avoid duplication of services, particularly services that are working well already without wardens. Wardens can improve the efficiency of other services with a remit to keep Hackney's streets clean and safe by reporting and monitoring incidents, allowing these services to focus on resolving the issues, for example street cleaners responding to warden's graffiti reports. However it should be ensured that the potential for an increase in incident-reporting generated by the Orsman Road warden scheme is supported by sufficient capacity to deal with these incidents.

Recommendation Twenty-Two

The Commission recommends that the Directorate of Neighbourhoods and Regeneration, Hackney Homes and Hackney Police consider the likely implications of warden activity for the capacity of their officers working in Hackney's streets and estates prior to the start of the Orsman Road scheme, and advises the Commission of its findings at their first meeting of 2007/08.

7 CONCLUSIONS

- 7.1 This has been the first investigation conducted by the Regeneration and Social Inclusion Scrutiny Commission since the 2006 Local Government Elections. The Commission decided to extend its original timescales so as to ensure exploration of all appropriate avenues. The Commission's perception of the challenges currently being faced has been increased and the recommendations have been made bearing these in mind.
- 7.2 As already noted, Members encountered a wealth of good practice in the areas under review, and the recommendations seek to build on the partnership working already taking place by making recommendations on the structures and data that can underpin and maintain partnership working through changes in personnel.

- 7.3 The Commission also welcomed new legislation, in addition to that already addressed in the report, which should have positive implications for the issues in question.

The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Bill 2006, currently going through the House of Commons, proposes a new performance assessment framework called Assessment of Policing and Community Safety which will be aligned with the national indicator, which should enable local authorities, police and other partners all to work to the same priorities.²²

The Police and Justice Act 2006, which will be implemented during 2007 and 2008, makes amendments to the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 based on a review of CDRPs undertaken in 2004 and 2005.

In particular, CDRP responsibilities are broadened to include anti-social behaviour, behaviour adversely affecting the environment and substance misuse. CDRPs will be required to undertake Strategic Assessments on a six-monthly basis at least, to lead into Annual Three-Year Rolling Plans. Section 115 of the Crime and Disorder Act is strengthened by placing a duty on responsible authorities to share depersonalised data which is relevant for community safety purposes and already held in a depersonalised format.

- 7.4 Members have been encouraged by the willingness of CDRP partners to engage in this scrutiny review despite not currently being obliged to by statute. They look forward to engaging in dialogue with CDRP partners regarding how to develop effective processes for the Community Call to Action and CDRP scrutiny.

Many of the report's recommendations require partnership working between the local authority and other relevant organisations within the context of the Safer Cleaner Partnership Board and the Commission intends to hold ongoing dialogue with those on whom the recommendations have an impact.

Lead Councillor: Councillor Sophie Linden

Scrutiny Officer: Sarah Harrison

Monitoring Officer Comments: Winston Brown

Financial Considerations: Tim Sylvester

²² LGIU Briefing: White Paper Strong and Prosperous Communities

8 CONTRIBUTORS

8.1 The following gave evidence at meetings of the Commission:

Councillor Alan Laing, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods

Superintendent Leroy Logan, Partnership Superintendent, Hackney Police

Fiona Fletcher-Smith, Corporate Director, Neighbourhoods and Regeneration, LBH

Neville Baldwin, Interim AD, Safer Neighbourhoods, LBH

Bernard Clarke, Acting AD Resources, Neighbourhoods and Regeneration, LBH

Martin Davis, Head of Safer Communities Services, LBH

Peter Snow, Community Safety Co-ordinator for Stamford Hill, LBH

David Williams, Interim Head of Environmental Enforcement, LBH

Tom Hunt, Head of Estates Environment, Hackney Homes

Wayne Hylton, Head of Estates Safety, Hackney Homes

Nicola Baboneau, Community and Partnerships, The Learning Trust

Chris McCracken, London Warden Resource Centre

8.2 The following additional people provided information on other occasions or by correspondence:

Councillor Christine Boyd, Wick

Councillor Chris Kennedy, Wick

Councillor Julius Nkafu, Kings Park and Cabinet Advisor for Crime and Community Safety

Chief Inspector Cheryl Burden, Safer Neighbourhood Teams, Hackney Police

Detective Superintendent Alan Goode, Hackney Police

Sergeant Jon Booth, Wick SNT

Sergeant Brian Gordon, Haggerston SNT

PCSO Kez Hassan, Hackney Downs SNT

Sergeant Rob House, King's Park SNT

Sergeant Maurice Hutchinson, Cazenove SNT

PCSO Claire Lucas, Clissold SNT

Sergeant Paul Newman, Dalston SNT

Sergeant Jon Norton, New River SNT

Sergeant Robin Robertson, Stoke Newington Central SNT

Sergeant Nick Smith, Queensbridge SNT

Sergeant Alex Wick, Lordship SNT

Sergeant Ralph Lawton, Hackney Police Safer Schools Partnership

Janet Johnson, Street Markets, Neighbourhoods and Regeneration, LBH

Steve Lomas, Head of Litigation Team, Legal Services, LBH

Carl Parker, Partnership Analyst, Safer Communities Services, LBH

Marie Price, Head of Consultation, LBH

Humara Qayyum, Hackney Service Centre & Translations Manager, LBH

Mofoluke Robson, Mediation Service Co-ordinator, LBH

Ian Lewis, Director, Team Hackney

Jason Davis, Partnership Support Officer, Team Hackney

Brian Doran, Well Street, Neighbourhood Relations Manager, Hackney Homes

Seamus Kennedy, Hackney and City of London Victim Support

Jim Yeend, North-East Neighbourhood Warden Scheme Manager,
Hackney Homes

Nigel Lambett, PCHA Warden, Stamford Hill

Ebenezer Turkson, PCHA Warden, Stamford Hill

Ray Brewer, Assistant Director, Public Protection, London Borough of
Enfield

Jonathan Toy, Head of Community Safety, London Borough of Enfield

Laurence Wrenne, Drug Action Team

9 MEMBERSHIP OF THE SCRUTINY COMMISSION

- Councillor Sophie Linden (Chair)
- Councillor Deniz Oguzkanli
- Councillor Daniel Kemp
- Councillor Jacob Landau
- Councillor Tom Price
- Councillor Vincent Stops
- Councillor Patrick Vernon

- Scrutiny Officer: Sarah Harrison

10 BACKGROUND PAPERS

The following documents have been relied on in the preparation of this report and were either presented to the Scrutiny Commission or referred to during the meetings:

Hackney's Crime and Disorder Reduction and Combating Substance Misuse Strategy 2005-2008

Hackney's Crime and Disorder Reduction and Combating Substance Misuse Strategy, 1st Year Progress Report 2005-06

Hackney Safer Community Partnership's Anti-Social Behaviour Policy and Strategy 2005

Report on the Hackney Enforcement Strategy presented to Cabinet 22 November 2004

Report on the Hackney Enforcement Strategy presented to Cabinet 19 December 2005

Team Hackney LAA Submission to Government Office for London, December 2006

Regeneration and Social Inclusion Scrutiny Commission Agendas and Minutes 11 July 2006, 12 September 2006, 11 October 2006, 9 November 2006, 9 January 2007 and 12 February 2007.

Anti-Social Behaviour Act 2003

Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005

House of Commons Research paper 06/11

LGIU Briefing White Paper Strong and Prosperous Communities

LGIU Briefing Police and Justice Act 2006

National Community Safety Plan 2006-2009

National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal, 2000

Crime Reduction Unit Toolkits

Crime Reduction Unit Information Sharing Conference 2001

'Review of Audits and Strategies produced by Crime and Disorder Partnerships in 1999', Crime Reduction Unit

'Safer Neighbourhoods?', Cllr Nick Cuff, LGIU comment, August 2006

'Feel the Force', *Local Government Chronicle*, 7 September 2006

'Crime Prevention and Inter-Agency Co-operation', Liddle & Gelsthorpe, Police Research Group, 1994

'The Future Role of Police Authorities in Community Engagement: Learning from Three Demonstration Projects', Myhill, Millin and Eagle, 2006

'Neighbourhood Warden Schemes: An Overview', Home Office, Jacobson and Saville, 1999

ABBREVIATIONS AND GLOSSARY

- ASB** Anti-social behaviour - behaviour, whether or not in itself criminal, which causes or is likely to cause harassment, alarm or distress to other people.
- ASBO** Anti-Social Behaviour Order - a way of tackling persistent anti-social behaviour.
- CAP** Community Advisory Panel - a ward-based meeting organised by the Safer Neighbourhood Team with members of the local community.
- CDRP** Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership - a partnership of organisations required by statute to generate strategies and policies and implement actions and interventions concerning crime and disorder within their partnership area.
- CRIS** Crime Recording Information System – a recording system used by police forces.
- FPN** Fixed Penalty Notice – a one-off penalty issued to anti-social behaviour offenders.
- LAA** Local Area Agreement – an agreement struck between government, the local authority and its partners in an area (working through the local strategic partnerships) to improve public services.
- NRF** Neighbourhood Renewal Funding – funding awarded by the government to the most deprived authorities to help them improve services in their most deprived neighbourhoods.
- RSL** Registered Social Landlord – a housing association or not for profit company registered by the Housing Corporation to provide social housing.
- SCPB** Safer, Cleaner Partnership Board - Hackney's CDRP and a sub-board of Team Hackney.
- SMAG** Substance Misuse Action Group – a group set up by the Drug Action Team to support efforts to tackle substance misuse and related crime and anti social behaviour at a local community level.
- SNAP** Safer Neighbourhood Action Panel – multi-agency groups meeting in Hackney on a neighbourhood basis.
- SNT** Safer Neighbourhood Team – a police team organised on a ward-basis.