



Epping Forest District Council



SCRUTINY

**REPORT OF CRIME AND DISORDER TASK AND
FINISH PANEL**

June 2007

**Contact for Enquiries:
Lead Officer - John Scott
Joint Chief Executive
Epping Forest District Council
Civic Offices
Epping CM16 4BZ
jscott@eppingforestdc.gov.uk**

Tel: 01992 - 564050

CONTENTS

1.	Chairman’s Foreword	Page 3
2.	Panel Composition	Page 4
3.	Introduction and Overview.....	Page 5
	• Summary of Issues Scrutinised	
	• Public Interest Justification	
	• Terms of Reference	
	• Aims and Objectives of the Review	
	• How we went about the task	
4.	Recommendations	Page 7
5	Report.....	Page 8
6.	Conclusions.....	Page 19
7.	Acknowledgements.....	Page 22
8.	Glossary.....	Page 23

1. CHAIRMAN'S FOREWORD

Foreword by Councillor Mitchell Cohen – Chairman of Panel



This Task and Finish Panel was set up to deal with a specific piece of legislation, which came into force whilst the Panel were in the course of considering the proposals. Unfortunately, the Act, when it came, turned out to be more an enabling framework than a prescription for the future running for the Crime and Disorder Partnerships. Whilst this gives more time to allow committees such as ours to influence the practical aspects of the regulations that will be made by order, we still await the regulations even in draft form and the indication is that these will be rolled out over a number of years rather than months.

There are important principles being considered and although I firmly believe that our Authority is in the vanguard of best practice in this area of interagency co-operation and has already organised itself with a new Crime and Disorder team, in much the manner envisaged by the authors of the Act, there is much for individual Councillors to take on board, with individual responsibility for ward Councillors to push upwards the concerns of their ward residents and possible sanctions for failing to do so.

Of necessity this is an interim report and there might need to be others before the final report can be written. Much will depend on the speed (or lack of it) with which the regulations to be made by various Secretaries of State are published but I would like to take a moment to thank the Officers who have worked so hard to bring together guests and witnesses of sufficient seniority in the respective agencies to ensure that the evidence we received was of the highest order. I trust the other officers will forgive me if I single out John Scott for particular praise and thanks as I am sure that it was his skill and diplomacy which secured such excellent witnesses from the Police, the Probation Service, the Youth Offending Team, the Fire service and NHS trusts as well as our own team.

Thank you also to all members of the committee who gave such close attention and, of course, other Members who came along and participated with such effectiveness. Thank you to Councillor Woollard for his sterling support as my Vice-Chairman.

I heartily recommend this report to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and ask that this Task and Finish Panel be allowed to continue its work as suggested.

Councillor Mitchell Cohen
June 2007

2. PANEL COMPOSITION

The Panel comprised the following Members:

Councillors M. Cohen (Chairman), M. Woollard (Vice-Chairman), D. Bateman, P. Gode, Mrs A. Grigg, Mrs A. Haigh, D. Jacobs, R. Law, R. Morgan, Mrs C. Pond, P. Spencer, D. Stallan and J. Wyatt.

The Panel has met on six occasions.



3. INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

Summary of issues scrutinised

Our Panel was set up by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in June 2006. Our primary objective was to study the possible effects for the District Council, which may arise from the Crime and Disorder Act Review which had been published by the Home Office.



Under the terms of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, the District Council has a duty to participate in the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership (CDRP). It is one of six responsible authorities specified by the Act, the others being Essex County Council, Essex Police, Essex Police Authority, the West Essex Primary Care Trust and the Essex Fire and Rescue Service. The Crime and Disorder Act Review contains important proposals about the strategic functions of the CDRP, particularly in two tier areas. These create greater responsibilities for the District Council itself with implications for

both executive and ward Councillors.

We were tasked to review the document, meet with other members of the CDRP and advise on how the Council might best respond to the issues raised.

Public Interest Justification

Crime and fear of crime (including anti-social behaviour) affect the lives of everyone in our Community. The proposals in the review document seek to ensure that CDRP's consult and engage with their communities on a regular and ongoing basis. The proposals seek to enhance the role of both Overview and Scrutiny and Ward Members.

Terms of Reference

1. To consider the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership (CDRP) and its effect on Scrutiny in EFDC and how it could be improved.
2. To consider the involvement of Overview and Scrutiny in the new 'Scrutiny Plus' arrangements to be conducted with other partner agencies.
3. To consider the proposal for a 'Community Call for Action' and its implications for EFDC Scrutiny.
4. To consider the role of EFDCs Crime Reduction Team and the resources available to it.

Aims and Objectives of Review:

1. A meeting of the panel would be set aside to question the Police, where using the National Intelligence Model they would hope to pinpoint areas causing concerns;

2. A meeting should be devoted to the PCT with a view to questioning about the link between mental health and crime;
3. A joint meeting should be held with the Probation Service and the Fire Brigade and Transport for London;
4. A separate meeting should also be devoted to EFDC specialist officers such as the Anti Social Behaviour Officer and the officer responsible for CCTV coverage and the Youth Services Officer.
5. The Task and Finish Panel will also consider the role of EFDC Crime Reduction Team and the resources available to it.

Following these meeting the Panel will need to collate the information gathered and relate it to the CDRP and how EFDC could help improve on it.

How we went about the task

The Panel has met on six occasions and ahead of our first meeting we were supplied with a pack of papers, which included:

- A copy of the Home Office report “Review of the Partnership Provisions of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 – Report of findings”.
- A Summary of the Key Findings from the CDRP Review.
- A Summary of frequently asked questions produced by the Community Safety and Local Government Unit of the Home Office.

We then set up a series of meetings with representatives from other agencies involved in the Crime and Disorder agenda. Some were Responsible Authorities and others were not but all were able to add to our knowledge and understanding of the issues around the task we had been asked to address.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. To note that we regard this as an interim report of the Panel since we were unable to fully complete the task for the reasons set out in the report.
2. That the Panel be re-established to enable completion of the tasks it has been given particularly in relation to regulations yet to be issued under the provisions of the Police and Justice Act 2006.
3. That if recommendation (2) is agreed, it would be helpful to have the same membership in so far as is possible in the light of the work already done and the benefits of applying that knowledge to the tasks still outstanding.
4. To note that since the Council is defined as a responsible authority under the provisions of the law, it has no choice other than to play its part in the CDRP. How that will change depends on regulations still to be issued.
5. To note that the Council is regarded by other partners in the CDRP process as a key player and its participation to date at both Member and officer level is greatly valued.
6. To note that the proposed changes create a greater role for the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in the CDRP process and that in preparation for that we recommend that provisions should be made in the annual work programme for a review of the activities of the CDRP and the outcomes it achieves through scrutiny of the CDRP Chair and the Council's representatives, both Member and Officer, in that body.
7. To note that an obligation is to be placed on individual Ward Members to secure a response to constituents' concerns on community safety issues and the need to agree arrangements for how that is to happen once the regulations are issued.
8. To note and support the development of Neighbourhood Action Panels and Joint Action Groups. That the details of future meetings of Neighbourhood Action Panels be published in the Council Bulletin.
9. That Ward Members be encouraged to attend meetings of the Neighbourhood Action panels insofar as they are able.

5. REPORT

“The story so far”

This is very much in the nature of an interim report we have not been able to complete the task we have been given to the satisfaction of the Members of the Panel. There are a number of reasons for this, which in the main focus around time issues. There were difficulties in agreeing dates with people and organisations that we wished to meet within the limited availability with the Council's own meeting schedules and other demands on Members' time.

At the same time there is the dynamic nature of the study itself in that whilst we were doing our work, the Government were pressing on both with their own review but also the legislative changes necessary to put their proposals into effect. That in itself causes a difficulty and is partly the reason why we were unable to finish the task we were given. We therefore believe that the Panel needs to be re-established in order to continue its work as part of the 2007/08 work programme.

The Government's proposals for change are contained within the Police and Justice Act 2006. However, this is an enabling Act, which means it is light on detail. It clearly sets out the Government's proposals and a draft timetable but then prescribes for the detail to be issued via regulations, which have yet to emerge. The Panel feels strongly that it cannot complete the task it has been given until such time as it is able to see those regulations and consider what the implications are for the Council both in policy and operational terms.

“Scoping the Review”

At our first meeting we considered the issues involved in reviewing the partnership provisions of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998. We recognised the need to understand how the partnership works in the Epping Forest District and the need to understand the roles and views of partner organisations especially those with “responsible authority” status since they have a statutory duty to be part of the partnership.

This seemed especially important in the light of the Home Office proposal that there would be an increased role for scrutiny in a form that was being described as “Scrutiny Plus” and which would of necessity involve them in the process. The Home Office suggest that such involvement will better reflect the multi-agency nature of community safety work.

We noted the structural arrangements of the CDRP, which comprises a top-level strategy panel comprising elected Members, Directors and Chief Officers from the respective partner organisations. (Our Council is represented by the Portfolio Holder for Community Wellbeing and a Joint Chief Executive). Reporting to the Strategy Group there is a Co-ordinating Group, which mainly comprises Senior Officers from the various agencies who generally speaking Chair the operational Action Groups. The Co-ordinating Group is required to ensure that the aims and objectives of the Strategy Panel are delivered, to performance manage the Action Groups, to identify and consider issues of concern and to allocate responsibility for cross-cutting themes and actions. Finally there are the Action Groups themselves each of which exists to deal with a particular aspect of Crime and Disorder and who in turn may establish “problem solving groups” to target crime “hot spots”. The Action Groups are not simply a matter for local determination since Government Guidance requires some

groups to be established. Anti-social Behaviour and Prolific and Priority Offender Groups being two such examples.

We proposed to meet with each of the agencies involved in the CDRP agenda giving priority to those with “Responsible Authority” status in order to explore their views and perceptions on the CDRP review, how the system works at present and what more we each could do to achieve better outcome in making our district a safer place for the benefit of our community. We address the results of our studies so far in the Chapters that follow.

Essex Police

We all agreed that the Police were probably the most important player in the CDRP agenda and we have met with them on two occasions. At our second meeting we were pleased to welcome Chief Superintendent Andy Adams, the then Divisional Commander for the Western Division, Superintendent Graham Carey, the Neighbourhood/Community Policing Lead and the Chair of the Epping Forest CDRP and Chief Inspector Jon Hill, the District Commander for the Epping Forest District.

Western Division is one of five Police Divisions across Essex and covers the three District Council areas of Harlow, Epping Forest and Brentwood. The Division is then subdivided into five neighbourhood areas each headed by a Police Inspector. Three of these sub-divisions are within the Epping Forest District being Epping, Loughton and Waltham Abbey.



The Chief Superintendent showed us a diagrammatic representation of the relationship between the various LSP panels and indicated that Epping Forest was in a good position to scrutinise the CDRP, with EFDC having representatives in many of the sub panels looking at various aspects of crime and community safety in this area. He also went through the performance figures of the police and compared them with the neighbouring police districts. At present Epping Forest is in the mid range of crimes per 1000 residents. We noted that the CDRP group monitored these figures at each of their meetings and that EFDC was in a difficult geographical position as it bordered 10 other CDRP's, 4 of which were Metropolitan Police areas; no other CDRP is in this predicament. There are also a lot of routes into EFDC London Underground mainline trains, M25 and M11 and A roads. If the police could crack down on these routes they could start to make a difference, i.e with the use of CCTV and car number plate recognition systems. The National Intelligence Model will be used for the delivery for the strategic assessment for the partnership, along with six-monthly strategic assessments and rolling three-year community safety plans, it was noted that detailed guidance was still awaited on the Police and Justice Bill from the Government. The CDRP's were to report to their communities, as there was no longer a requirement for an annual report to the Home Secretary.

It was noted that the Overview and Scrutiny role is already quite well established in EFDC, the LSP Board is already in existence and that the CDRP will weave into an already established local structure. The Chief Superintendent indicated that the challenge for the Panel was to work out details on how EFDC could influence the CDRP structure. Councillors will hold a key role under the new system, under the “call for action”. Members of the public will be able to approach their Ward Members with specific complaints, the Members will then have to say what they are going to do about it and who they would tell, e.g. the Police, the County or District Council etc.

Problems reported into a CDRP can be reported to the most appropriate partner for a solution.

Asked how the Police monitors reported cases that need following up, the Chief Superintendent replied that requests and actions are minuted at meetings, are then followed through and any subsequent results are reported back to the next meeting.

We noted that the 12-month comparator crime figures are moving parallel to, if not away from the target. The Chief Superintendent replied that the long-term figures suffered in March, April and May of 2006. Our near neighbours in London showed a spike followed by a drop and EDFC showed a drop followed by a spike. Police tend to flood an area and the criminals tend to move out to another area and as stated before, EDFC has a lot of borders. The Metropolitan Police tend not to care about the areas where they move their criminals to. Since June, there has been a four-month reduction in crime. The targets were set by the Government and are very demanding, but as a County we have seen an overall decrease in crime.

When asked how the Police work with their partners under the CDRP we were told that each partnership had its own action plan, the chairs for each group then met under the umbrella of a co-ordinating group, to help co-ordinate the CDRP as a whole.

We clarified the route for problems, that scrutiny identifies a problem, gives it to the CDRP who provides a solution and then reports back to Overview and Scrutiny.

Superintendent Carey indicated that:

- The Police Reform programme was working towards a different style of policing, more towards ward policing on the ground.
- If a problem can't be handled at a low level then the CDRP will push it up to a more senior level to see if they could deal more appropriately with it.
- Neighbourhood policing was introduced in April 2006, they are still rolling out and improving the scheme, although this did not have to be implemented until 2007.

We were minded to support the general principal that wherever possible we should work within existing structures and avoid duplication. The roll out of the neighbourhood policing initiative would possibly introduce new structures into which we could build the community call for action and the greater role for Overview and Scrutiny.

At a later meeting we met with the Police a second time. By this time there had been a complete change of personnel in the Command Structure of Western Division and Acting Chief Inspector Alan Ray, the Acting District Commander for the Epping Forest District attended our meeting to give an up-date on the roll out of the Community (Neighbourhood) policing initiative, the development of Neighbourhood Action Panels (NAPs) and Joint Action Groups (JAG's).

Earlier in the meeting we had received a presentation on the National Intelligence Model (NIM) about which we give some details later. Referring to the NIM, Acting Chief Inspector Ray explained that 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 anti-social behaviour). In his view, such success was mainly due to the work of Paul Gardener 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 paid for 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 will go out with the papers for the Neighbourhood Panels when set up. A 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. Chief Superintendent Mauger 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.

Members expressed concern at police response times to non-emergency enquiries. Mr Ray agreed 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. Mr Ray said 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.

We asked about progress with training frontline 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 offered 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 Panel 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. We requested that the details of these meetings also be publicised in the Members' Bulletin.

We queried whether in fact NAPs were residents' forums? It was felt that whilst elected Members and the Police should attend NAP meetings they should only play a supporting role. The meetings should be resident lead to encourage their engagement.

We were of the opinion that NAP's could prove to be a useful part of the Community Call for Action process in that they would enable local issues to be brought to the table and for a consensus to be reached as to which were the really important issues on which that particular community would like to see limited resources used and directed. We tended to the view that wherever possible Ward Members should seek to be involved in the work of these Panels.

West Essex Primary Care Trust and North Essex Mental Health Partnership Trust

Alison Cowie, the Director of Public Health and Mike O'Keefe the Lead Commissioner for Mental Health from the West Essex Primary Care Trust together with Steve Cook an Associated Director from the North Essex Mental Health Partnership Trust who specialises in the criminal aspects of Mental Health attended our meeting for this discussion.

We were keen to learn more about the role of these two organisations in the CDRP arena and to explore the links between the Criminal Justice System and Mental Health.

Alison Cowie explained to us the PCT involvement in the CDRP. She reminded us that the PCT had been a responsible authority since 2003 and outlined the benefits for the PCT from that involvement. She explained the links between victims of crime and the need for hospital treatment, the benefits for NHS employees and the impact fear of crime had on people's willingness to go out and engage in activities such as leisure opportunities, which contributed to emotional wellbeing. She referred in particular to issues which had been defined as "preventative health burdens" and which included alcoholism, drug use and the consequences of anti-social behaviour.

The PCT contributed resources, funding, staffing support to the CDRP and attended and chaired the network meetings. It also supported the 'Crucial Crew' initiative and participated in the scenarios for crime awareness. As a result, the Trust obtained information on health trends and support for their own projects and had taken steps to address Hate Crime in the Health Service. A public health lead would be appointed to take forward health issues on the CDRP and the LSP.

We noted the PCTs intention to continue with existing work and information sharing having regard to patient confidentiality. We noted current work between the Princess Alexandra Hospital and the Police to gather evidence on alcohol related crime to identify action. This being a key priority area and that the National Treatment Agency for Drugs had driven some of their targets. Ms Cowie said that the PCT valued their involvement in the CDRP and, in her view, would be a partner even if this were not a statutory obligation.

We expressed concern about alcohol related anti-social behaviour and questioned whether such incidences could be related to the closure of hospital wards. We sought assurances about the care that would be available for those patients moved back into the community as a result of the closures and the resources and future plans to support CDRPs with this work.

We asked what support would be available to assist Members facilitate the 'community call for action' through raising local concerns with key agencies such as health.

Steve Cook of the North Essex Mental Health Partnership Trust advised that his section provided specialist services for people with mental health issues in the criminal justice system and also received information from the Essex Drug Action Team which the PCT sat on and was a sub group of the CDRP. A Criminal Justice Liaison Service had been established to, amongst other things, deliver training for parole officers and share information. Strong links had also been established between the service, the police and magistrate courts.

Mr Cook said that the Criminal Justice Mental Health Teams had a strong relationship with the Police. Their role was to identify offenders with mental health issues in the prison system, provide advice to the police and link them back into mainstream services. The process for this was explained. There was communication between the team and the prison services to facilitate care. There was also a close relationship between the Mental Health Team and Hospital A&E who shared information about patients with criminal behaviour and covered the totality of the District in terms of mental health provision.

We asked if any cases could be called untreatable and if so how such cases were dealt with? It was noted that only those who had expressed an unwillingness to engage in the services fell into this category.

We noted treatment for offenders with a personality disorder and non-alcohol and drug related issues. We expressed concern that there appeared to be no representation on the CDRP or mechanisms within it for gathering information on wider mental health issues. We asked how this perceived gap in representation could be addressed and about plans to integrate the local Mental Health services into the work.

The representatives undertook to liaise with the CDRP to consider the concerns raised by the meeting about the involvement of mental health services in the CDRP.

The Essex Fire and Rescue Service

Assistant Divisional Officer Peter Ashby came to talk to us about the work of his service within the Epping Forest District and how in his view this was enriched by its relationship with the CDRP.

The Essex Fire and Rescue Service had been a partner of the CDRP since 2003. The service operated a mix of part manned and fully manned stations in the District and had a prevention and early intervention role with the CDRP to turn young people away from crime. A briefing paper on this was put before us.

In relation to specific schemes, it was reported that the service ran local 'Fire Break' weeks twice a year for 12 young offenders and potential young offenders. The scheme provided training on equipment and demonstrated the importance of teamwork. It also involved a 'card system' for controlling behaviour which carried a penalty of exclusion from activities and an end of course presentation to mark progress which was monitored over the longer term indicating very encouraging results. Usually only about 1-2 students failed to complete the course.

We briefly explored the 'Crucial Crew' scheme, which we thought is very effective and thanked those involved for supporting it.



In terms of everyday work, reference was made to a case where there was a need for multi agency work and how the CDRP had facilitated such provision. The service was far more able to coordinate work in this area through working with the CDRP.

Attention was drawn to measures to deal with 'Fire Setting'. This involved the provision of awareness sessions, talking to fire starters families and referring them on

to other agencies as required. The aim was to provide early prevention to stop problems escalating and young people going on to commit offences in their late teens. We asked about press articles suggesting that that the service had become a target for violence. Mr Ashby reported that he was not aware of such incidences and that this was not a problem locally. We asked about the number of hoax calls received by the service. This is not a prevalent issue although there had been a campaign to raise awareness of this in view of the incidences of false alarms caused by malfunctioning electrical equipment.

Essex Youth Offending Team

Paulette Burrell, the Manager of the West Essex Branch of the Youth Offending Team came to share with us the work of her team and its relationship to the CDRP. She explained that the Youth Offending Team is a service that exists to work with kids from ten to seventeen years of age. Ten is when you are legally considered liable for your actions. Seventeen is the cut off point as you are deemed to have reached adulthood at eighteen. They link into the Youth Justice Board and work with the local Criminal Justice Board. They carry out the orders of Magistrates and Judges and work closely with the Police, Probation, Education, Social and Health Services.

Paulette advised that hers is a small team that covers a big area. On the team are a Police Officer, Welfare Worker, Social Officer and a Probation Officer who monitor young offenders and help reduce offending.

The team report through their Local Area Board and link into ASBO Co-ordinators for the local areas, they also link into the Prolific and Priority Offender Strategy.

There are a lot of different orders that they can use, such as supervision order or a child safety order (for under 10's). They can also reprimand a child who has admitted an offence but not been taken to court, depending on how serious the offence is. A Panel would decide on the seriousness of the offence, they would also look at the history and background of the child. The child would then get a final warning.

If charged and taken to court, and they pleaded guilty and custody is not warranted they could impose a referral order (the length of the order would be set by a magistrate). A Community Volunteer would sit with the young person and any other agency necessary and draw up a contract. They would have 20 days to do this. Once completed successfully, it would be a spent offence. If not, a youth panel would have discretion to continue with the contract or send them back to court.

Asked whether parents, teachers and youths could refer themselves to her team before any crime has been committed, Paulette said that was the case. They have a legal mandate to carry out these services, but have limited resources. The team also work with parents under parenting orders, which courts could make.

The Youth Offending Team have to meet Key Performance Indicators that are set by the Youth Justice Board to whom they provide quarterly figures. They measure their successes by the number not re-offending. Presently they have about a 79% success rate.

They work closely with the CDRP particularly in relation to profile offenders on the 'prevent and deter' strand.

Essex Probation Service

Richard Meads is the Unpaid Work Manager for the Essex Probation Service. He had only been in post since January 2007 but was happy to come along and discuss his service with us.

Mr Meads introduced the probation service by saying that it was split into 42 areas in England and Wales. They work with adults only but have similar terms of reference to the Youth Offending Team. They work out risks and make proposals to the court, who are not bound to accept them.



They no longer have probation orders but community orders and a community order with supervision could last anywhere from three months to three years. Part of community service could be "unpaid work" which used to be called community service and this could be between forty to three hundred hours.

They have around 6,000 offenders per year and each officer can have anywhere from 60 to 90 cases each. About 2,000 of the 6,000 undertake work in the community and last year they averaged about 80 hours per offender. Individual placements could range from charity shops and churches, to working in groups and hospitals, schools and building projects and also workshops for building garden furniture etc. which could be sold with any profits going to charity.

It was noted that unpaid work is popular with the courts, public and politicians. It is more than just punishment as about 65% of offenders have employment and training needs, the type of work undertaken is key to the value it imparts along with the supervisor's role. It is also an effective way to stop re-offending and to teach offenders useful skills.

Mr Meads explained that employers are put through CRB checks. The beneficiary has a clear list of rules that they must enforce, one of the strictest being attendance. Two unacceptable absences can return the offender to court. Nationally, around 15% of orders are breached.



We noted that employers do not pay for getting these people as they are usually from voluntary organisations (charity shops or hospices). They would not use private industry, as they are not allowed to replace paid workers.

We asked how organisations know what is available and on the education side how do they ascertain that the offender has an educational need. Mr Meads replied that they presently do not have much community interactivity, but have just set up a website with relevant information at:

www.essexprobation.org.uk/communitypaybackgeneral.htm

As for their educational needs these are assessed at the pre-report stage. It is compulsory and if it is added as a requirement by a court the offender will have to take it up or they would be in breach of the court order. Tutors are brought to the offenders, they do not go out to colleges.

The Probation Service is not a “responsible authority” but participating in the CDRP on a voluntary basis.

Epping Forest Community Safety Team

Right from the start of our Panel's work, we were supported by the Council's Community Safety Team and Simon Ford the Council's Safer Communities Co-ordinator was a regular attendee at our meetings. However, in the latter part of 2006 Simon successfully gained employment with another Essex Authority and the other two members of the Team also left the Council's employment. One now works in Hertfordshire and the other with the Police Complaints Authority.

As a result a new team was appointed and at our meeting in April 2007 we were introduced to that team.

Caroline Wiggins is the new Safer Communities Co-ordinator (and Team Leader), Paul Gardener the Anti-Social Behaviour Co-ordinator and Sarah Strong, the Safer Communities Assistant. We were impressed with their enthusiasm, their knowledge of the issues faced within the district and their fresh approach to Crime and Disorder matters which already seemed to be making a difference.

National Intelligence Model (NIM)

One of the requirements in the Review of the Partnership provisions of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 is based on the premise that “Intelligence led decision making lies at the heart of effective delivery”. It goes on to say that the Government believes “the police National Intelligence Model provides a good practice framework for routinely analysing data and intelligence to inform strategic direction, accurately direct resources and manage risk. We will be adopting many of the principles and practices behind NIM to a partnership setting”. We have referred to the use of NIM throughout this report but the question is what is NIM and how does it work?

Paul Gardener, our Anti Social Behaviour Co-ordinator is a former Police Officer with extensive knowledge and experience of the workings of the NIM. Indeed in his former career he trained Police Officers in the use of the Model. We were therefore pleased to take up his offer of a presentation on how the model works. The view-foils Paul used for his presentation are attached as an annex to this report and need little further comment here. We noted however, that there is currently no database within the Council or mechanisms for recording evidence and intelligence on anti-social behaviour collected by frontline officers. We expressed our concerns at the lack of such provision and questioned whether resources were being used to the greatest effect in this area. Mr Gardener recognised our concerns but reminded us that NIM is a new practice and new work for the CDRP and therefore the practices would need to be developed further.

We found the presentation on the NIM both informative and thought provoking.

Crucial Crew

Crucial Crew is an annual event. In 2007 it is taking place from Monday 11 June to Thursday 21 June. Every Year 6 pupil in Epping Forest District – over 1300 in total - will be visiting Gilwell Park to take part in the Crucial Crew event.

Crucial Crew is an interactive safety initiative based around key life skills that targets 10 -11 year old children. Crucial Crew teaches children how to tackle the dangers they may encounter in everyday life and helps prevent them becoming involved in crime in a very interactive way. It is designed to help the children to:



acquired knowledge

- Cope with dangerous situations
- Accept responsibility for their own safety
- Learn social responsibility
- Make sensible decisions based on

Crucial Crew is based very firmly on four principles:

- Children learn by doing
- Crime prevention and personal safety education can be challenging and exciting
- Everyone is concerned about crime prevention and personal safety
- The most effective way of tackling the problem is a partnership approach

The agencies working together this year include Epping Forest District Council, Essex Police, Essex Fire and Rescue, Trading Standards, Essex Ambulance Service, Essex County Council and Lea Valley Park.

Crime and Disorder Act Review – Implementation in England

At our meeting in April 2007 we received and noted the contents of a letter dated 23 March 2007 from Gareth Hills of the Performance and Partnership Policy Unit of the Home Office. The letter which we reproduce as an annex hereto sets out to provide an update on the current situation in relation to a number of the developments which will have a bearing on the working of CDRPs. This letter provides both a useful commentary on both those developments, the legislative changes and the timetable. We believe it also supports our view that the work of this particular Task and Finish Panel should continue in the new Council Year, with the same membership so far as that is possible.

TO BE CONTINUED

We have already mentioned the legislative process and the provisional regulations which we believe we need to see and study before we can conclude our work. We also planned to meet representatives of youth organisations both statutory and voluntary (such as “The Box” in Epping) and the Council’s Young Persons’ Officer, Transport for London/London Underground and to look at the arrangements for CCTV coverage and management within the district. We also need to clarify with the County Council how they see their role in scrutiny of crime and disorder since we wish to avoid any overlaps. We are of the view that as we are the lead authority locally, we should lead in this area. None of which has proved possible in the time available to us. We believe all these areas are important to help understand the complete picture in relation to CDRP matters and we would greatly appreciate the opportunity to complete with task.



6. CONCLUSIONS

1. We have found a tremendous enthusiasm amongst the various agencies in the Epping Forest District who came together to form the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership.
2. They all recognise the benefits that can be achieved through the Partnership are greater than they could achieve working alone and express a clear willingness to see that carry on in the future.
3. They all recognise that changes will be necessary to meet the Government's objectives as developed through the process of the Review of the Partnership Provisions of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 and as set out in legislation although like us they await the publication of the regulations also.
4. The District Council plays an important role in this process both at Member level through its representation on the CDRP itself by the Portfolio Holder for Community Wellbeing and at officer level through the Joint Chief Executive (Community Services), the Community Safety Team and service level inputs.
5. There will be a greater role for Overview and Scrutiny in the process which will need to be developed once the regulations are available and make clear what is expected of us. However, in the meantime we believe that the work programme should include provision for at least an annual meeting with the Chair of the CDRP, and the Council's representatives in order to provide Members with the opportunity to understand and question what is being achieved.
6. Crucial Crew is a much valued experience on Community Safety issues which is delivered to all Year 6 pupils in the district. The District Council should continue to be involved in this process which independent research has proved to have made a lasting impact on the children who participate.
7. We set out below the main themes in the Review of the Partnership arrangements of the Crime and Disorder Act 1988 and comment in so far as we are able.
 - Splitting strategic/operational issues in two tier areas with strategic decisions sitting at County level.

There is already good evidence of joint working at both District and County level within Essex which provides a natural base for further development. This has already been enhanced by the requirements of the Local Area Agreement for Essex. The latest Government thinking on this issue says, "We have concluded that CDRP's strategic functions should rest at LSP (Local Strategic Partnership) level. However, in two tier areas there are both District and County level LSP's so it is not clear what this actually means. The Epping Forest CDRP is already part of the Epping Forest LSP.

- Will be developing national standards for partnership working that amongst other things will outline the role and responsibilities of each partner in helping to deliver community safety.

Awaiting the publication of the regulations and the issue of government guidance before we can comment further but the indication seems to show a major role for Local Government.

- Strategic Intelligence Assessment (based on the National Intelligence Model – NIM) to be undertaken at least on a six monthly basis and they will have to be used by all those discharging strategic and operational safety functions.

We welcome this proposal which in part happens already. It will replace the present requirement for three yearly audits which are expensive to carry out, deflect valuable resources from more important operations and which become outdated very quickly.

- Requirement to produce annual rolling three-year community safety plans.

We welcome this proposal since it will ensure the CDRP can address current issues based on intelligence gathered through the six monthly assessments.

- Partnerships to have an effective information sharing protocol in place.

An Essex protocol already exists which all partners have signed up to.

- We will ensure that CDRP's continue to engage with local people and actively encourage and empower them to be involved improving their quality of life.

The roll out of community policing teams supported by Neighbourhood Action Panels will help to address this requirement.

- There will no longer be a requirement for CDRP's to provide the Home Secretary with annual reports on the implementation of their three-year strategies but instead CDRP's will be required to produce regular reports to their communities.

In general terms we await the regulations but are inclined to welcome this development. Consideration will need to be given to "regular" and how these reports are to be delivered. The CDRP already has a regular column in the local newspapers but a report in the Council's magazine The Forester may be helpful.

- We will be extending the powers of local authority Overview and Scrutiny Committees to encompass the work of CDRP's – a form of "scrutiny plus".

We welcome this proposal which we have commented on earlier but again need to review our recommendation once the regulations are issued.

- We will be introducing a mechanism for triggering action whereby communities will be able to secure a response from partners to a particular community safety issue that has not been adequately addressed.

The development of Neighbourhood Action Panels (NAPs) and Joint Action Groups (JAGs) provide a means of addressing such concerns. Local people will be able to attend the meetings and raise issues, which will then work the way up through the CDRP process to secure an answer.

- Ward Councillors will play a key role in securing a response but the local authority scrutiny committee will be used to look at cases that cannot easily be resolved.

This puts a particular responsibility on individual Ward Councillors to deal with CDRP matters. The NAPs and JAGs should help as outlined above, but it will be necessary to consider this issue further once the regulations are issued.

- Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1988 which requires all responsible authorities to ensure that Crime and Disorder issues are mainstreamed within Service Delivery to be broadened to take account of anti-social behaviour adversely affecting the environment and substance misuse.

The Council will have no choice other than to comply with any duty placed upon it.

7. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

List of people who gave evidence to our Panel:

John Scott – Joint Chief Executive (Community)
Chris Overend – Policy Officer (Research and Democratic Services)
Caroline Wiggins – Safer Communities Co-ordinator (from December 2006)
Paul Gardener – Anti-Social Behaviour Co-ordinator
Sarah Strong – Safer Communities Assistant
Simon Ford – Safer Communities Co-ordinator (until September 2006)

Essex Police:

Chief Superintendent Andy Adams
Superintendent Graham Carey
Acting Chief Inspector Alan Ray

Essex Fire and Rescue Service:

Assistant Divisional Officer – Peter Ashby

West Essex PCT:

Alison Cowie – Director of Public Health
Mike O’Keefe – Lead Commissioner for Mental Health

North Essex Mental Health Partnership NHS Trust:

Steve Cook – Associate Director

Essex Probation Service:

Richard Meads – Unpaid Work Manager

Essex Youth Offending Team:

Paulette Burrell – West Essex Area Manage

8. GLOSSARY

ASB	Anti Social Behaviour
ASBO	Anti Social Behaviour Order
CCTV	Closed Circuit Television
CDRP	Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership
CRB	Criminal Records Bureau
CRT	Crime Reduction Team
EFDC	Epping Forest District Council
JAG	Joint Action Group
LSP	Local strategic Partnership
NAP	Neighbourhood Action Panel
NHS	National Health Service
NIM	National Intelligence Model
PCT	Primary Care Trust