

**EPPING FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL
NOTES OF A MEETING OF CRIME AND DISORDER TASK AND FINISH SCRUTINY
PANEL
HELD ON MONDAY, 23 APRIL 2007
IN MEMBERS ROOM, CIVIC OFFICES, HIGH STREET, EPPING
AT 7.00 - 8.50 PM**

Members Present:	M Cohen (Chairman), , D Bateman, D Jacobs, R Law, Mrs C Pond, P Spencer, D Stallan and J Wyatt
Other members present:	Ms S Stavrou
Apologies for Absence:	M Woollard, Mrs A Grigg, Mrs A Haigh and R Morgan
Officers Present	J Scott (Joint Chief Executive), C Wiggins (Crime Reduction Coordinator), P Gardner (EFDC Anti - Social Behaviour Co-ordinator), S Strong (Crime Reduction Assistant) and Z Folley (Democratic Services Assistant)
Also in attendance:	Acting Chief Inspector A Ray (Essex Police)

30. SUBSITUTE MEMBERS (COUNCIL MINUTE 39 - 23.7.02)

None reported.

31. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Pursuant to the Council's Code of Member Conduct, Councillor M Cohen declared a general personal interest by virtue of being a Criminal Defence Lawyer. He declared that his interest was not prejudicial and he would remain in the meeting.

32. MINUTES OF LAST MEETING - 15 MARCH 2007

Noted.

33. TERMS OF REFERENCE / WORK PROGRAMME

Agreed that Mr Donovan, an officer of the Box in Epping and the new EFDC Young Persons Officer should be invited to a future meeting of the Panel.

Noted that in the absence of the Chairman, Councillor M Cohen, Councillor D Stallan had presented an interim report to the April 2007 OSC detailing progress made with the Panels work. The Committee acknowledged that the task of considering how the changes to the Crime and Disorder Act should be implemented could not be completed by the end of this year, given the government timetable for the roll out of the changes which indicated the process would not begin until 2008 and could take a few years. In view of this, it agreed that the Panel be reconstituted for 2007/08 to give it sufficient time continue its work. The OSC had agreed that to this and anticipated that a report would be made in June 2007.

34. THE EFDC CRIME AND DISORDER TEAM

The Joint Chief Executive (Community) introduced Caroline Wiggins, the Crime and Disorder Reduction Manager, Paul Gardner, the Crime and Disorder Reduction Co-ordinator and Sarah Strong, the support officer for the section. The officers had only recently joined the EFDC Crime and Disorder Team and were invited to talk about their work and plans for the section.

Ms Wiggins began the discussion by providing some insight into the work of the team. She advised that her role involved developing, coordinating and achieving the local crime reduction strategies and policies with the police and other key statutory agencies involved in crime prevention. EFDC took a lead role in the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership (CDRP), as a result, the team had recently launched the Partnerships handbook explaining its work. A copy was made available to Members at the meeting. She also monitored the CDRP budget. The CDRP was a sub - group of the Local Strategic Partnership (LSP).

The strategic planning for the partnership was carried out at County level by a CDRP Coordinating Group. Ms Wiggins was one of the local representatives on the forum along with elected Members of the County, EFDC and the Chief Executive (Community). Below this was the various CDRP themed action groups and under these, a network of sub – groups which explored specific issues. Paul Gardner chaired the sub – group for Anti – Social Behaviour. This brought together a broad range of services involved in crime and disorder reduction. The CDRP received funding from the Home Office. The CDRP supported other schemes ran by statutory agencies such as the 'Road Runner' Scheme to promote safe driving amongst the 16 – 17 age range and the 'Fire Break' scheme which Members were welcomed to attend. In relation to the prevention of domestic violence, the CDRP funded safety workers and the sanctuary scheme. The EFDC Crime and Disorder Team also developed and undertook action to ensure the removal of graffiti in the District and undertook work with Public relations to publicise this.

Mr Gardner reported that he joined the section in August 2006 having served thirty years service in Essex Police. During which he obtained a considerable amount of training and experience in intelligence related work and problem solving policing. He explained the role of an Anti Social Co-ordinator advising that the EFDC team was a small team which relied on its own negotiating skills to get work done. The team was developing a joint tasking protocol with the Essex Police. Weekly meetings were held to work on this and emerging crime trends and plan multi agency action. As a result of this, the team could approach the partnership with an ASB issue of local concern and get help in dealing with it. Work was continuing to monitor the issues in Limes Farm, Chigwell. Work was being undertaken to develop the scope of the Police and Community Support Officers (PCSOs). Three booklets had been produced to assist their development in relation to dealing with ASB, Home Security and intelligence which were tabled at the meeting.

It was questioned whether all of the agencies involved in the work used the same models and practices for assessing outcomes? No – people brought their own approach to the table. The task of the CDRP was to coordinate their differing methods to ensure an effective outcome. In relation to the involvement of the statutory agencies, the PCT chaired the CDRP actions groups. The Youth Offenders Teams ran graffiti reduction projects with the Partnership. There was a 'restorative justice scheme' for young offenders who had been issued final warnings to show

them first hand examples of the effects of their crime and engage them in community work.

A Member asked about the steps a Member should take when asked by a resident to take action to address an ASB issue in their wards. It was advised that Members should refer the issues to the team in the first instance. Reference was made to graffiti on a telephone box in Ongar. It was noted that the task of clearing this up was a responsibility of the utility company concerned, however letters had been sent to Ongar Parish Council listing the areas of concern and that the issues had been forwarded to the companies. A Member referred to an incident between a Council house tenant and a resident from a private dwelling. It was noted that Housing Services would usually take a lead in such disputes but the CDRP had recently began supporting some mediation services to stop neighbour disputes. In such circumstances involving tenants of both Council/private dwellings there was some confusion over which agency should be contacted to deal with the issues. It could be taken to one of the multi agency network meetings for consideration.

35. THE NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE MODEL

The Panel received a presentation on the National Intelligence from Mr Paul Gardner, the EFDC Anti – Social Behaviour Co-ordinator. A copy of his presentation was attached to the agenda for the meeting.

He advised that intelligence was information, incidents and events which was subject to a system of processing and was used to predict the future allowing personnel to be deployed to the best effect. He referred to the 'Intelligence cycle' outlining the work pattern for processing evidence.

The National Intelligence Model (NIM) covered all areas of policing to ensure information was fully research, developed and analysed. It provided evidence which enabled officers to provide strategic direction, manage risk and make tactical use of resources.

With regards for the timetable for implementing the NIM, arrangements should be set out for this in local policing plans.

NIM could be applied to crime at all levels and antisocial behaviour. It allowed officers and resources to target priority areas, most active offenders, informed business planning, greater links to operational issues and internal partners and consistency of policing. The approach was split into levels: the first was Local/Basic Command Unit (BCU) which focused on criminals that commit crime in one area; Level 2 covered cross border criminal activity ;the third level was serious and organised crime. The work flow for each of these stages was explained.

The control strategy was a six monthly Strategic Intelligence Assessment. This looked at the 'big picture' from this priorities were identified and a Development Force Control Strategy had been developed. Tactical Assessments, Problem profiling (Crime Pattern Analysis) and target profiling was also carried out to identify the scale and pattern of problems and target suspects. The Local Authority could influence these practices. A Crime Patter Analysis was carried out to explore issues at Limes Farm. Information detailing this and the 'NIM products' was circulated at the meeting. Information had been obtained providing the names of those active in the District who had been given ASBOs by the Metropolitan Police so that effort could be targeted at dealing with the most prolific offenders.

The Audit Commission in May 2005 identified that CDRPs should pool information and adopt the principles of NIM. CDRPs, the Local Government and Central governments role in relation to NIM was explained. The process for intelligence recording, source evaluation, intelligence evaluation and the handling of codes was also outlined.

It was explained that there was no data base or mechanisms for recording evidence and intelligence on anti social behaviour collected by front line Council staff. Concern was expressed at the lack of this provision and questioned whether resources were being used to the greatest effect in this area. It was reassured that NIM was a new practice and new work for the CDRP therefore the practices would need to be developed further.

The Panel thanked Mr Gardner for his informative and interesting presentation.

36. UPDATE FROM THE POLICE ON THE COMMUNITY POLICING INITIATIVE

The Panel welcomed the acting District Commander for Essex Police, Alan Ray who was present to update the meeting on the role out of the Community Policing Initiative and the Action Teams and how the Joint Actions Groups (JAGs) and the Neighbourhood Action Panels (NAPs) fitted into the process.

In relation to NIMs, his role was to use the system to identify issues and ensure the Action Teams investigated the areas of concern. He had attended many of the JAG meetings and felt that they had greatly facilitated information sharing. The forum had achieved many positive results, (i.e. - in the areas of graffiti reduction and antisocial behaviour). In his view, such success was mainly due to the work of Paul Gardner who brought to the table expertise and insight gained during his police background. The Police appreciated the importance of Anti-Social Behaviour work and valued their links with the Council in this area. The joint funding had funded smart cars electric scooters and also some new technology preventing anti social behaviour. The number of local ASB incidents had fallen as a result of these steps.

The minutes of the JAG went out with the paper for the Neighbourhood Panels. Current operation in Loughton had halved street crime in that area. This included action to stop and search suspects for weapons and a joint operation on unlicensed taxis. Sergeant Morgan had attended a recent meeting at Loughton Town Council where he undertook to put more officers into Loughton to ensure there was a greater police presence on the streets.

Concern was expressed at police response times to non-emergency enquiries. Yes, this was an area in need of improvement. The Police were good at responding to emergency call outs but, not so good at dealing with non-emergency issues. The service recognised the need for more sergeants for this area. It was asked whether all of the Community Action Teams had been set up and whether their contact details were widely available? Yes, the teams were now all in place. Consideration was being given to ways of facilitating the named officer scheme, which ascribed a named officer to a specific area for a period of time. Initially there were some problems with getting this started but consideration was being given to ways of encouraging officers to stay in these roles to facilitate the scheme.

A Member asked about progress with training front line customer services staff in the new initiatives and to ensure they gave out the contact details for the Community Policing Initiative to the public. Concern was expressed at the services officered in this area. Mr Ray undertook to take back the concerns and make sure systems were

in place to ensure problems were reported and the information made available. More publicity for the scheme could also be arranged.

The meeting considered progress with rolling out the NAPs. These were to be the first stage of the Community Call for Action process. The dates of future meetings of the NAPs were publicised at the bottom of the JAG minutes. **Agreed** that the details of these meetings also be publicised in the Members Bulletin. It was also questioned whether a meeting of a NAP was due to be held this Wednesday (25 April 2007) in Loughton.

It was asked whether NAPs were residents forums? It was felt that whilst elected members and the police should attend the NAP meetings the meetings should be resident lead to encourage their engagement.

37. COMMUNITY CALL FOR ACTION.

The Panel considered the operation of the Community Call for Action and scrutiny plus. Attached was a letter from Gareth Hills the CDRP Reform Lead in the Home Office, which outlined the process. It was agreed that a report would be drafted for consideration by the Panel at the next meeting to be arranged for May 2007 and submission to the OSC in June 2007. The date for the meeting was to be arranged.

The new CDRP handbook was circulated to Members.

38. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

No other business was reported.

39. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

To be agreed.