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FOREWORD FROM THE CHAIR

The introduction of Safer Neighbourhood Teams (SNTs) have transformed local policing, by the introduction (or reintroduction) of a visible policing presence on the streets. Research is still ongoing into the efficacy of SNTs in preventing and deterring crime, but in terms of tackling the public's fear of crime, there is little doubt that local teams, regularly on patrol in their community patch, are effective where they are known. A recent (London-wide) survey however showed that some people complained the SNTs were not visibly on duty enough, and there are still some people who are oblivious to the introduction of SNTs at all.

How are our SNTs in Islington performing?

This was in essence the question the Regeneration Scrutiny Committee set out to answer, and this report contains our answers to that question.

Each ward now has the minimum of one Sergeant, two PCs and three PCSOs. As we looked at this structure, and specific examples throughout 2007, coincidentally the Met launched a recruitment and advertising campaign to raise awareness of SN policing, and encourage people to become involved with their teams in order to identify local problems. This is a welcome development, and I would encourage the Met to keep up a visible information stream, so that if in a few years time the council or any organisation were to scrutinise the SNT formula, we would find that whether good or bad, everyone knows their local team, or of their local team.

One problem we identified was that where a good team was in place, after a few years officers would move on (or be moved on), and all the local knowledge and contacts accrued would be lost, with “new” officers starting afresh. We had to recognise however that for some officers, career progression or a wish for new challenges make this inevitable, but we were concerned that there seems to be a rigid policy to move on even where both the officer AND the community they serve were happy with the status quo.

It should also be borne in mind that any SNT is only as good as the officers making up the team, and although the teams we looked at were impressive and highly regarded, there surely must be in Islington and elsewhere teams that are less effective, and we would not want a Ward to be “stuck” with a poorly performing SNT where this is the case. A high profile example of this was picked up by the media in May 2007, where in Wigan two PCSOs allegedly “stood by and watched” a 10 year old boy drown. Assistant Chief Constable Dave Thompson defended the officers, saying “officers were not expected to rescue people from water”. No wonder he is only an assistant. Anyway, my point is that there will be in some wards underperforming PCSOs, and in other wards pro-active, community aware, brave and dedicated PCSOs and fellow SNT officers. Our impression was that in Islington, we are fortunate in having a clear majority of the latter, recently illustrated in my own ward of Hillrise, where in November officers bravely tackled firework-throwing thugs.

In short, Islington SNTs ARE performing well, and as a council we have to work with our local teams, panels, MAGPIs and partners, and encourage the public to participate, in supporting and scrutinising local teams. I hope this report is of help as part of that process.
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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Overview Committee approved the priority topics for scrutiny at its meeting on 15th June 2006.

1.2 The Regeneration Review Committee, as part of its work programme for the year, was asked to undertake a review into Neighbourhood Policing.

2. OBJECTIVES

2.1 The overall aim of the review was to look at the various aspects of neighbourhood policing, including the extent to which the community believe SNT’s are tackling the issues that concern them most.

2.2 The objectives of the review are as follows:

- To evaluate the progress of neighbourhood policing and identify good practice to date.
- To review the extent of community engagement and the feedback of information to shape wider policing strategies in the borough and the development and delivery of Council services.
- To review the links between the Safer Neighbourhood Police and the Council’s Multi-Agency Geographical Panels (MAGPI), reviewing the extent to which information is shared between them and the partnership working is supported.
- To identify examples of positive outcomes for the community as a result of the work of the Safer Neighbourhood Teams (SNT).
- To assess whether the role of the Safer Neighbourhood Officers is clearly understood within the community and evaluate any measures undertaken to ensure this.
- To identify the degree of integration of safer neighbourhood policing with services within the community, particularly within the voluntary and community sectors.
- To review how well the SNTs link with other relevant statutory services in delivering community based policing.
- To assess the benefits to the community as experienced and expressed by community groups and members.
- To identify any strategic differences in the delivery of safer neighbourhood policing among the 16 wards and to identify successful strategies that may be shared among them.
- To assess the relationship with the youth services and how information is shared, both to protect young people and to improve safety in the community.
- To assess the impact of Safer Neighbourhood Policing on crime and anti-social behaviour and on residents’ perception of crime in their communities.
- To consider how different tools are used (enforcement, prevention and reassurance) for delivering neighbourhood policing.
- To assess the level of control community members feel they have in directing the priorities of the SNTs.
- To consider the ethnicity of Safer Neighbourhood Panels.
3. METHODOLOGY AND TIMETABLEING

3.1 Following agreement of the Scrutiny Initiation Document (SID) officers designed a work programme for the Committee to receive presentations and witness evidence at Review Committee meetings, visits and documentary evidence.

3.2 The submissions received are detailed in the minutes of the meetings of the Regeneration Review Committee and the written evidence available on the Islington Council's website (www.islington.gov.uk/democracy) or from the scrutiny section at the Town Hall (Tel. No. 020 7527 3252)

4. BACKGROUND

4.1 London is becoming safer – crime is decreasing, more crimes are being detected and more offenders are being brought to justice. The Safer Neighbourhoods programme however was introduced to address perceived concerns of the public that whilst crime had reduced, higher rates of fear and insecurity were being reported in neighbourhoods across London and its confidence in policing was falling.

4.2 The Metropolitan Police service committed itself to a new type of policing - the concept of the Safer Neighbourhoods, which provides a team of officers dedicated to every London Borough, which is more accessible, visible and accountable to the Public.

4.3 The Metropolitan Police had tried to develop this concept of community policing before but conflicting demands meant officers were often taken away from these duties and used in other areas of London to help police specific events, such as football matches or demonstrations.

4.4 Safer Neighbourhood teams are different because the service has specific guidance, which means that officers can’t be used any longer in this way. This means that except for the most catastrophic events, Safer Neighbourhood officers will stay where the public want them to be most – in the heart of their dedicated neighbourhood.

4.5 Local communities get a real say in deciding the priorities for the area in which they live allowing the Police to provide long term, local solutions to local problems while regular policing focuses on reducing priority crime. The essence of Neighbourhood Policing is the principle of working closely with all sections of the community and with partner agencies to identify and implement lasting solutions to neighbourhood concerns. The emphasis is on accountability to communities, which is overseen through neighbourhood panels or steering groups.

4.6 In order to effectively consult their communities, SNT teams have a particular responsibility for identifying all communities within their neighbourhoods and finding ways to reach all these communities. Training from the Metropolitan Police to enable them to do this is undertaken together with ongoing assistance from Islington Council services.

4.7 Each team is made up of six Police and community support officers and their aim is to talk and listen to residents to find out what affects residents daily lives and
security. These might be issues such as anti social behaviour, graffiti, noisy neighbours or vandalism.

4.8 Safer Neighbourhood teams are dedicated to the needs of each specific neighbourhood and policing priorities for that area are decided in partnership with local stakeholders, the public and the local Crime and Disorder partnerships, local authorities and other local organisations.

4.9 The teams are permanent and not a quick fix brought in to respond to local changes in crime and disorder.

4.10 The Metropolitan Police wants to avoid target setting for SNT’s as they are designated to act on local priorities and not centrally defined goals. However key outcomes for the SNT programme are to reduce concern about anti social behaviour, increase perceptions of safety in the local area by day and night, increase satisfaction with local policing, and increase confidence that the Police are identifying and dealing with the issues that are priorities for local people. A small analytical team of council and Police staff reviews the information collected by SNT’s and uses this to inform wider policing priorities locally, as well as helping to identify local support needs. These take place through the Multi Agency Geographical Panels (MAGPI’s) and the Neighbourhood Tasking and Communication Group.
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RECOMMENDATIONS

(a) Given the concerns raised about the local knowledge that was developed by SNT officers, which is lost if they move to other wards or jobs, consideration be given to allowing officers to remain in their wards for longer periods of time.

(b) The Committee were pleased to note that the relationship between SNT’s and the Multi Agency Geographical panels in Islington (MAGPI) was working well and that this should be continued, with the sharing of best practice among teams and the panels.

(c) Whilst noting that SNT’s had shown more flexibility in shift patterns in responding to meeting local priorities, the Council should request the Police to consider the need to vary shift patterns in order to address local concerns.

(d) The Committee noted the good working relationship between SNT’s and Homes for Islington and felt that more work should be carried out to improve relationships between the SNT’s and smaller Registered Social Landlords, particularly in relation to anti social behaviour.

(e) Given the examples of joint working with some Council departments, especially on prevention and diversionary work with young people, more enforcement work be carried out in partnership with Council services.

(f) Welcome the examples of good work between the SNT’s, the Youth Service and young people, including such programmes as Trading Places, an initiative where young people swapped roles with the Police in an attempt to understand each other’s viewpoints and experiences: the Committee recommends that the Council and SNT’s do more work on communication with young people in a community context to build up self esteem among young people and to break down barriers of miscommunication.

(g) The dates of meetings of the Islington Community Safety Board be advertised in the Council diary in order that Councillors are aware of these dates and are able to attend.

(h) In view of the relative success of Safer Neighbourhood policing in reassuring the community and providing the core of a locally-based response to crime and anti-social behaviour which involves residents, the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) and Metropolitan Police Authority (MPA) should be encouraged to examine how resources could be transferred to SNTs so that the ‘default model’ of policing in London is the SNT, rather than borough-based as at present.
5. THE COMMITTEE'S FINDINGS

5.1 The Committee received a presentation from Alva Bailey, Head of Community Safety at its meeting on 16th November 2006.

5.2 The Committee were informed that the first seven Safer Neighbourhood Teams (SNTs) had been set up in late 2004/early 2005 by the Metropolitan Police Authority and the Executive had agreed in September 2005 to fund the remaining teams and an additional team for Nag's Head which went live in July 2005. This was to deal with the specific problems in relation in particular illegal cigarette selling in the Nags Head area.

5.3 Although the Metropolitan Police Authority took over some funding of these SNT's from April 2006, the Council were paying to 'top up' to the full complement for the SNT, which was one sergeant, two police constables and 3 police community support officers (PCSO's).

5.4 The SNT's are overseen by two inspectors and there is also a Boroughbeat scheme, which is a new initiative for Council staff to become a Boroughbeat special constable and carry out patrols twice a month during working hours, in areas such as high streets, housing areas and parks, alongside regular police officers.

5.5 This scheme will enable a strengthening of the existing partnerships between the Metropolitan Police and Islington Council to help make Islington's streets, communities and public spaces safer. The Boroughbeat Scheme will add up to 12 special constables.

5.6 Safer Neighbourhood Teams steering panels have been established, which allow residents to influence priorities for policing. These priorities are then fed into fortnightly tasking meetings, which could lead to decisions around the use of CCTV in the area.

5.7 Safer Neighbourhood Teams also work closely with the Youth Service, the Drug and Alcohol Action Team, the HFI Anti-Social Behaviour Response Team, public protection around under age sales of alcohol and fireworks and with Greenspace park patrols.

5.8 Alva Bailey informed the Committee that Police Community Support Officers (PCSO's) function was to reduce anti-social behaviour and be a visible presence on the streets. PCSO's were meant to be accessible and work with all sections of the community, to become familiar with all the different communities in the ward and to identify which groups resided where and to assimilate knowledge of crime trends in the area and types of crimes committed.

5.9 PCSO's are ringfenced and therefore could not be called out to other duties, however they were not a 24 hour response service and an important criteria of success was feedback from the community.

5.10 The Committee were informed that whilst the service was not a 24 hour service the Safer Neighbourhood Teams could work late shifts, if it was determined that there was a need to change shifts and work flexibly.
5.11 Whilst PCSO’s were Police staff they had no greater police powers than an ordinary person, but because of their closer links to the community and the police they were able to better generate a speedy police response.

5.12 The Committee were informed however that PCSO’s were not respected by some teenagers who knew that they did not have the power of arrest. However their role was more one of public reassurance and evidence gathering and where resources allowed there was a police officer who was readily available if needed.

5.13 The Committee were concerned at the fact that PCSO’s often progressed on to become police officers and that if this happened a lot of local knowledge would be lost as they often did not return to the particular area that they had worked in as a PCSO.

5.14 The Committee, given the concerns raised about the local knowledge that was developed by SNT officers, which is lost if they moved to other wards or jobs, consideration be given to allowing officers to remain in their posts for longer periods of time.

5.15 The Committee, at its meeting on 13th December 2006, considered evidence from the Inspectors in charge of the Islington PCSO’s and two actual PCSO’s working in the borough.

5.16 The Committee were pleased to note that all wards in the borough were now covered by Safer Neighbourhood Teams and that Finsbury Park had an extra PCSO as it was a crime hotspot. Islington had also helped the Police roll out the SNT’s faster than expected meaning that they were ahead of other boroughs in this.

5.17 The Committee were informed that SNT’s received 5 days training, which outlined the safer neighbourhoods model and that PCSO’s received an additional 8 days training to cover by-laws, fixed penalty notices and working with local authorities. Officers were also trained how to handle criminal intelligence and the SNT’s were not isolated but spoke and met with the sergeants regularly and exchanged ideas between teams.

5.18 The Committee were informed that the view of residents was that the Metropolitan Police had done an excellent job in rolling out the Safer Neighbourhood Teams, and that there were high satisfaction levels from seeing Police out patrolling and the Safer Neighbourhood Teams showed excellent leadership in the community.

5.19 The Committee were informed that the Safer Neighbourhood Teams acted as the ‘eyes and ears’ of the Police and fed intelligence back to their colleagues. Safer Neighbourhood Teams also received daily police briefings and SNT’s offered specialist knowledge of an area and were a focal point for other Police departments. In addition, because of local knowledge, they were able to identify offenders from photographs and CCTV footage.

5.20 Officers joined the Safer Neighbourhood Teams on a 2 year contract with an option for an additional year and after this period, as it was a demanding job, any staff who wanted to move on could do so. The Police had processes in place to identify
people for Safer Neighbourhood Teams and to ensure that as much local knowledge was handed over as possible.

5.21 Promotion was not usually carried out within the team and someone who was promoted to sergeant would have to go to another borough unless they could make a business case for staying.

5.22 The Committee were informed that working in SNT's offered a wide range of challenges and the Safer Neighbourhood Teams had to quantify what they did and PCSO's were highly valued and integrated into their teams.

5.23 One area of concern to the Safer Neighbourhood Teams was that not all the registered social landlords (RSL's) dealt with anti-social behaviour in the same way. Whilst the Committee noted that work was being undertaken with RSL's it tended to be with the larger RSL's and more work would need to be undertaken to get the smaller organisations involved.

5.24 The Committee also met with the then Borough Commander, Barry Norman.

5.25 Borough Commander Norman informed the Committee that one of the problems with Safer Neighbourhood Teams was that there was no career structure for PCSO's. This meant that a number of people who became PCSO's would get bored and a number of initiatives had been introduced to keep them motivated such as manning the front of police stations.

5.26 PCSO's tended to come from within Islington as opposed to police officers, who were recruited from a number of different areas.

5.27 Borough Commander Norman expressed the view that it was important to engage children at an early age, preferably at primary school level, before they became teenagers and became involved in anti-social behaviour or criminal activity and that PCSO's could assist in this.

5.28 Currently PCSO's do not enforce any of the Council’s by-laws and enforcement of these in areas, such as the environment, was something that may be able to be explored.

5.29 The Committee, at its meeting on 8th March, received evidence from Joyce Pollaya, Nags Head Town Centre Manager, about the effectiveness of the Safer Neighbourhood Team in the Nags Head area.

5.30 The creation of a Safer Neighbourhood Team had made a considerable difference to the area and had reassured residents and businesses that illegal street trading could be effectively dealt with. Since the Safer Neighbourhood Team had been introduced illegal street trading in the area had reduced by 70%.

5.31 Jan Hart, Assistant Director (Public Protection) informed us that Council officers had worked with the Police on a number of areas of enforcement and the Nags Head initiative had been an example of this. Work was also being undertaken in the licensing area and the Safer Neighbourhood Teams had meant that it had been easier to identify officers to work with and develop ideas.
5.32 Jan Hart informed the Committee that the Angel Safer Neighbourhood Team would shortly be initiating the accredited licensing scheme. This was where the Angel SNT team had been trained with Council officers to be assessors and validate the licensed premises and assist licensees to work towards accreditation.

5.33 In addition there was an ongoing programme of seminars and support for licensees and in the past an officer from Operation Trident had talked to clubs about security and a number of clubs had been audited to see if security was adequate. Test purchasing had also been undertaken with the police and work undertaken in schools.

5.34 The Committee were pleased to note that one of the main functions of Safer Neighbourhood Teams was intelligence gathering and that this would assist in ensuring that stop and search was intelligence led and not largely random. This would hopefully reduce the alienation of some young people.

5.35 At the meeting on 8th March 2007, we were informed that the Police did give out literature to people who had been stopped and searched and this included details of making complaints. The Youth Service also provided information to young people to explain the reasons for stop and search and a questionnaire had been prepared from the Youth Offending Team to obtain young peoples experiences on stop and search.

5.36 The Committee were also informed of a recent initiative, Trading Places, whereby as an attempt to increase the dialogue between the Police and young people, Police were put in the situation of young people and vice versa, which had helped understanding of each others situation and problems.

5.37 Initiatives had also been introduced whereby due to the complaints about young people drinking, a walking campaign with the Caledonian Safer Neighbourhood team was taking place to visit premises selling alcohol. In addition, in Finsbury Park SNT there had been joint patrolling between the Police and ethnic minority elders and on estates where there had been problems with dogs, there had been dog-training classes run with young people.

5.38 The Committee, at its meeting on 5th February, considered evidence from Justin Ho, Multi Agency Panels Co-ordinator, (MAGPIs) and Chez Dhaliwal, Community and Development Manager.

5.39 The Committee were informed that MAGPI's are problem solving panels that aim to deal with issues of anti social behaviour and low level crime through a multi agency response. This is achieved by exploring a range of enforcement, support and diversion tactics for victims and perpetrators.

5.40 The Panels also assess environmental factors that may make areas more vulnerable to anti social behaviour and low level crime. There are four MAGPI's that cover the North, South, East and West of the borough and match area Committee boundaries.

5.41 Membership is made up of representatives from Housing, Police, Young Peoples Services, Youth Offending team, Social Services, Connexions, Greenspace, Education, Islington Drug and Alcohol team, elected Members, Regeneration and
Waste Management and Enforcement. Meetings are held every five weeks with an opportunity to convene a meeting at short notice in response to a specific issue.

5.42 Justin Ho informed the Committee that his job was to coordinate the four multi-agency disciplinary panels, generate referrals and try to increase community involvement.

5.43 We were informed that a sergeant from each of the Safer Neighbourhood Teams was attached to each MAGPI and business from the SNT steering groups came through to each MAGPI. MAGPI's were involved in the Metropolitan Police Safer Estates Initiative and this had been set up to help estates with high levels of anti-social behaviour and to develop an action plan to assist in this. In addition MAGPIs were involved in helping making shopping areas safer.

5.44 Chez Dhaliwal informed us that Community Development workers had been employed to develop capacity in communities to respond to crime and issues with anti-social behaviour, often relating to drug and alcohol abuse. A crucial part of the work was to bridge the gap between Safer Neighbourhood Teams and the local community.

5.45 The Committee noted that there had recently been problems with Somali youths on the Finsbury Estate and a community event had been arranged with the Somali community in which the Police spoke. As a result 3 Somalis had applied to be PCSO's, establishing links between the Police and the community.

5.46 The Committee, at its meeting on 3rd May 2007 received evidence from Paul Gale who was a Police officer seconded to Fin Future and who also co-ordinated the Safer Towns Strategy and liaised with Safer Neighbourhood Teams. It also received evidence from Theresa Coyle, a local resident and manager of Andover Community Centre.

5.47 Theresa Coyle informed the Committee that she had lived on the Andover estate for 39 years and although Holloway Police station was based on the estate, Finsbury Park area had always been an area of relatively high crime and deprivation.

5.48 Whilst residents were initially sceptical about SNT’s, the large majority of residents were now in favour of them and the latest statistics showed that crime was decreasing and the effect of the local SNT was beginning to be felt. Crime on the Six Acres Estate had dropped significantly, although there had been a less significant fall on the Andover Estate.

5.49 Theresa Coyle informed us that Finsbury Park SNT, which was excellent, was building up a rapport with the community and the only crime that had not decreased was drug crime, but this she felt was due to more drug crime being reported.

5.50 The Finsbury Park SNT had benefited from continuity of staffing and this had been significant in ensuring its success. Indeed the shift hours of the SNT had been changed as it had transpired that anti-social behaviour was going on in the early hours of the morning.
5.51 The Committee were informed of an example on the Andover Estate whereby a tenant, who had mental health problems and also had a ‘crack cocaine’ habit, had had his home taken over by serious, prolific priority offenders. The community had notified the SNT and the SNT had made a decision to get key agencies involved to assist. This approach had been successful and the tenant was allowed to stay in his home, which prevented him from becoming homeless. The tenant was given extra support by the mental health team/HFI, the crack house was closed immediately and the community was re-assured that the SNT was effective and that the community could live in their homes without the fear of criminals or crime.

5.52 Paul Gale informed the Committee that he worked a lot with the Finsbury Park SNT and that he felt that they were the most successful team as they had benefited from continuity. The most successful teams were those who had continuity, as it took time to build up confidence with the community. A number of the other SNT’s had lost staff for a variety of reasons and this had affected their effectiveness, whereas the Finsbury Park SNT staff had remained constant.

5.53 The Committee also considered evidence from Abdi Dahir who worked with Somali young people in the Finsbury Park area.

5.54 Abdi Dahir expressed the view that one of the key causes of crime was that young people did not feel that sufficient support was being given to them. Somali families often came to this country not knowing English and children complained of bullying and dropped out of school and college. Unfortunately many Somali children then mixed and copied people from other areas like Camden and Tottenham, and even though they came from good families, they were often being used to sell drugs and that they were scared that if they did not do this they would be harmed.

5.55 The Somali community had elders who tried to persuade Somali youth not to commit crime, but Finsbury Park was a hard area to live in and the problems with the Finsbury Park Mosque had made things worse. Young people felt that they were Muslim and black and had no future.

5.56 Abdi Dahir intimated that the situation had improved since the SNT’s had been introduced, however there was a need for more partnership working and funding to be made available to assist in this. There was a need for a strong social club in the area, which would help to get the youth off the streets and make a difference to the community.

5.57 The Iman centre project had been set up which was a good place for young people and attracted 200-500 youths a week. Whilst the parents visited the Mosque their children did not and families were becoming separated. With necessary funding the centre could provide snooker and other sports and be a place where young people could come and speak Somali and have somewhere to go rather than be on the streets.

5.58 The Committee were of the view that there was a need to work with young people in a community context to build up their self esteem and with the Police and break down barriers of miscommunication.
5.59 Members of the Committee also visited Connexions at White Lion Street to meet young people in order to ascertain their views on Safer Neighbourhood Teams.

5.60 Young people informed us that they were aware that Police Community Support Officers had no power to arrest them, which did influence their attitude towards the teams.

5.61 In addition young people felt that the Police did not have a good relationship with them and therefore young people did not embrace the Safer Neighbourhood Teams system. The officers in the team were not taken seriously and young people felt that they could make fun of them without suffering any consequences.

5.62 The young people also expressed the view that often PCSO’s did not have an understanding of the area and whilst they knew some of their names they did not have a relationship with the community. On some estates the victims of crime had also had problems with the Police and felt therefore that the Police did not care. When the crime involved one young person on another young person the Police did not feel it was important.

5.63 Young people were of the view that SNT’s could not expect to be welcomed automatically and just because they had a uniform it did not mean that they would be accepted and young people actually had more respect for their youth workers.

5.64 Young people stated that the SNT’s should try to integrate more into the area and come into youth clubs to meet younger people and if SNT’s did visit projects they should come in on a casual basis, out of uniform, rather than coming in for a prearranged talk. In addition the Police did not attend youth led events, which could provide a good opportunity to meet members of the community.

5.65 The Committee noted the concerns of young people that they felt that the Police always thought that they were up to no good and that in order to respect the Police that they needed to be respected in return. Young people felt that if youth workers or residents of the area were to become PCSO’s, this might help as they already had a relationship with the existing local community.

5.66 The Committee at its meeting on 6th September 2007 received evidence from Jan Tucker, Chair of the Islington Community Safety Board.

5.67 Jan Tucker informed the Committee that the Islington Community Safety Board was a useful forum for providing feedback from the Safer Neighbourhood Panels and that the Borough Commander attended to address concerns and answer questions from the public.

5.68 Jan Tucker expressed the view that it was important that there was more public involvement in the work of the Islington Community Safety Board and that Councillors should if possible attend, in order to hear and be able to take up quickly the concerns of residents.

5.69 The Committee were of the view that the dates of the Islington Community Safety Board meeting should in future be included in the Council diary so that Councillors are aware of the dates and these dates should be advertised as widely as possibly to the public.
5.70 The Committee also viewed a DVD made by the Cornwallis Youth Project about their views on Safer Neighbourhood Teams and received witness evidence from Guy Lawrence of the Cornwallis Youth Project.

5.71 The DVD was particularly interesting and was made just before the tragic death of Martin Dinnegan who was in fact a member of the Cornwallis Youth Project.

5.72 The DVD highlighted two different sets of views of the young people interviewed. The young people who had chosen to be involved with the project had views similar to that of the rest of the community about the good work undertaken by SNTs, but the harder to reach young people who had been interviewed on the streets had a different perspective and were much less positive about SNT’s. However, we discovered many young people were just as scared of some of the anti social behaviour exhibited by a small number of young people as the adults in the community were.
6. CONCLUSION

6.1 The Safer Neighbourhood Teams scrutiny review has considered evidence from a number of witnesses ranging from young people, the Police, residents and agencies involved in the initiative.

6.2 The Committee were pleased to receive evidence from virtually all these sources that Safer Neighbourhood Teams had been a success and were working effectively for the benefit of the community.

6.3 However there were concerns raised with us particularly in relation to the continuity of staffing in teams and amongst young people that the SNT’s should be more engaged with young people in less formalised settings, so that more respect and mutual trust could be built up to alleviate tensions that may arise in the future. Given that Safer Neighbourhood Teams have a primary role in combating anti social behaviour and that much of this arises from young people the Committee feel that this is an important area to be addressed and this is reflected in a number of our recommendations.

6.4 The Committee were however pleased to get such positive feedback from a wide variety of sources and in view of this our recommendations seek to build on the good practice already in place and to continue with this process.
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## Neighbourhood Policing Scrutiny Initiation Document

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scrutiny Initiation Document (SID)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scrutiny Panel:</strong> Regeneration Review Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Portfolio Holders:</strong> Marisha Ray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assistant Director leading project:</strong> Alva Bailey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Objectives of the Review

- To evaluate the progress of Neighbourhood Policing and identify good practice to date.
- To review the extent of community engagement and the feedback of information to shape wider policing strategies in the borough and the development and delivery of council services.
- To review the links between the Safer Neighbourhood police and the council’s Multi-Agency Geographical Panels (MAGPI), reviewing the extent to which information is shared between them and partnership working is supported.
- To identify examples of positive outcomes for the community as a result of the work of the Safer Neighbourhood Teams (SNT).
- To assess whether the role of the Safer Neighbourhood officers is clearly understood within the community and evaluate any measures undertaken to ensure this.
- To identify the degree of integration of Safer Neighbourhood policing with services within the community, particularly within the voluntary and community sectors.
- To review how well the SNTs link with other relevant statutory services in delivering community based policing.
- To assess the benefits to the community as experienced and expressed by community groups and members.
- To identify any strategic differences in the delivery of Safer Neighbourhood policing among the 16 wards and to identify successful strategies that may be shared among them.
- To assess the relationship with the youth services and how information is shared, both to protect young people and to improve safety in the community.
- To assess the impact of Safer Neighbourhood policing on crime and anti-social behaviour and on residents’ perception of crime in their communities.
- To consider how different tools are used (enforcement, prevention & reassurance) for delivering neighbourhood policing.
- To assess the level of control community members feel they have in directing the priorities of the SNTs.
- To consider the ethnicity of safer neighbourhood panels

### Scope of the Review

The review will look at various aspects of neighbourhood policing, including the extent to which the community believe SNTs are tackling the issues that concern them most. It will explore the impact on the community, public perception and expectation, recorded statistics (where data exists), costs, impact on council and other services, effectiveness of SNTs’ interventions, processes for responding and operational and strategic co-ordination with other services and ...
community groups.

It will explore the extent and nature of neighbourhood crime and anti-social behaviour and the impact of any differences in the way SNTs operate in different wards. It will explore with young people their experience and perception of SNTs, how they impact on them, and whether they increase their actual and perceptions of safety.

The review will explore what causes greatest concern locally and whether any such concerns are being overlooked. This will also be viewed in the context of location and whether different parts of the borough suffer from different types of disorder and whether community members have shared perceptions and expectations.

It will explore the types of responses used in Islington and compare them with good practice in other boroughs. It may be useful to look at neighbouring boroughs and at how SNTs prioritise issues for targeting, including the different types of responses they use. It will seek to identify good examples of providing personal safety and crime prevention advice, tackling environmental problems and working with local authorities.

It could be useful to look at ways of incentivising PCS’s to remain in an area where they have developed specialist local knowledge.

How the review is to be carried out.

1. Who is to be involved
   • Metropolitan Police (SNT lead Inspectors)
   • SNT Sergeants
   • MET Police Borough Commander & Partnership Superintendent
   • MPS lead on SNTs, Chief Superintendent Steve Bloomfield, for a pan London perspective
   • Homes for Islington Area Housing Officers
   • Community Safety Partnerships Unit
   • Anti-social Behaviour Team, including MAGPI Co-ordinator
   • Youth Offending Team
   • Legal Department
   • Public Protection
   • Local residents
   • Local businesses
   • SNTs Community Steering Group Chairs
   • Angel and Nags Head Town Centre Managers
   • Environment Department
   • MAGPI Chairs
   • YP Parliament
   • RSL Representatives
   • Waste Management & Enforcement
   • Young People Services
   • Community Safety Board
   • Tenants and Residents Associations
   • PCSO’s
   • Young people
2. Who is to be consulted
   - All of the above

3. Who will give evidence
   - As above as required. Evidence could be gathered from:
     - Written reports
     - Presentations
     - Walkabouts with selected SNTs and community representatives.

4. How will Area Committees be engaged?
   - Options include:
     - Identifying the most important concerns
     - Consulting with relevant stakeholders
     - Monitoring achievement of actions taken by SNTs to date

Consultation and communications plan:
- MET police SNT guidance and information documents
- Ward based crime audits conducted by SNTs, where available
- ISP survey “Establishing Baseline for LAA Targets” 2006 (perception of crime)
- Council environmental service
- Homes for Islington
- Metropolitan Police Service
- Crime Reduction Strategy
- All members
- Businesses (e.g. Nags Head & Angel)
- Press office
- Other Local Authorities including Camden, Haringey and Hackney
- Tenants and residents associations

Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key output</th>
<th>To be submitted to Committee on:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Scrutiny Initiation Document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Timetable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Interim Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Final Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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