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AGENDA

1. Introductions and Apologies for Absence

2. Declaration of Interest, Minutes and Action Log (Pages 1 - 5)

3. Subgroup Update Reports (Page 7)
   (i) Children and Young People Subgroup
   (ii) Managing Offenders Subgroup
   (iii) Safer Borough Board Subgroup
   (iv) Violence against Women and Girls Subgroup

4. Safer Neighbourhood Board Update (Page 17)
   (i) SNB Minutes - 31 May 2018
5. Performance Report (Page 29)
   (i) Performance Report

6. Public Spaces Protection Order (Pages 51 - 58)
   (i) PSPO Map
   (ii) PSPO Summary
   (iii) PSPO Draft Order

7. DRAFT Community Safety Plan 2018-2021 (Pages 75 - 76)

8. Update on IPOC Investigation

9. Update on Fatal Domestic Violence Incident

10. Quality Impact Assessment - The effectiveness of Probation Work by the London CRC (Page 77)
    (i) Presentation Slides

11. Transition Workshop

12. Forward Plan (Pages 101 - 102)

13. Any Other Business
    - GDPR Report

14. Date of Next Meeting
    Community Safety Partnership Board
    Wednesday 26th September 2018, 10.00-1.00pm
    Barking Learning Centre, Conference Room
Community Safety Partnership Board Minutes
Wednesday 28 March 2017, 10.00-1.00pm
Barking Learning Centre, Conference Room

Present: Fiona Taylor (Chair), Jonathon Toy, Melody Williams, Hazel North-Stephens, Rita Chadha, Sean Wilson, Tim Barfoot, Councillor Butt, Tara Poore, Angie Fuller, Carol Douch, Suzanne Naidai, Pip Salvador-Jones and Hamera-Asfa Davey.

Apologies: Stephen Norman, Katherine Gilcreest, Matthew Cole, John Cooze, Greg Tillett, Lucy Satchell-Day, Sharon Morrow, Steve Thompson, Jane Scotchbrook

Minutes: Jade Hodgson, Partnership Boards Business Manager

Minutes

1. Introductions and Apologies for Absence
   The chair welcome everyone to the Board and introductions and apologies noted. Fiona Taylor (FT) introduced herself as the newly appointed CSP Chair.

2. Declarations of Interest
   No declarations of interest to record.

3. Minutes and Action Log
   Minutes and actions were confirmed correct. The chair asked members to update on actions before the next partnership board in June.
   Action 1: Protocol for HMO is in hand.
   Action 4: Crime and Disorder Strategic Assessment completed, action closed.

4. CSP Chairs Report
   The chair outlined the proposed changes to the CSP chairs report. It was agreed that the report will become a partnership update to give partner organisations the opportunity to highlight areas of concern and areas that require support from the board to ensure the CSP is proactive. The chair noted overlapping areas which need to be addressed to ensure all areas of the board are effective. The Chair welcome input from partners on effective changes to the board and highlighted the idea of reducing the meeting times. FT will continue to meet partners for introductory discussion. Changes will be tabled at the CSP meeting in June for approval by the board.

5. Safer Neighbourhood Board Updates
   The chair requested for comments on the Safer Neighbourhood Board updates to be sent to Jade Hodgson (JH) to feed back to Steve Thompson (ST).

6. Subgroup Updates
   Safer Borough Board
   Jonathon Toy (JT) gave update to the board on the progress of the SBB.
   - Priority 1: Safety in town centres, high volume issues within certain key locations in the borough. PSPO for Barking Town Centre in force since w/c 19th March to address issues around ASB, aggressive begging, drinking etc. Liaison with voluntary organisations has taken place and agreed more street presence like street pastors.
   - Priority 2: High volume of residential burglary and theft of motor vehicle. Evident links between the two areas.
   - Priority 3: Fire safety in residential properties, expanding personal evacuations plans.
- CSP is required to develop a strong communication strategy, addressing perceptions of crime and safety to support the subgroup.

Rita Chadha (RC) highlighted that in light of General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR) it would be helpful to review the information sharing protocol to ensure protocols remain effective.

**ACTION: Update from Dan James at Junes CSP meeting.**

**Violence against Women and Girls (VAWG)**
Melody Williams (MW) and Hazel North-Stephens (HNS) updated members of the progress in VAWG.
- The subgroup has been focusing on workshops to shape the VWAG strategy. Meetings have been well attended and positive feedback provided to shape the strategy.
- Heavy focus on domestic violence although VWAG has wider remit. VWAG need to review to see how we can work through the overlapping areas.
- Requires regular participation from key partners, contact has been made to address attendance.
- Dan James (DJ) has provided a lot of information for the VWAG dataset, need to expand data to include data from BHR and CCG.

**Children and Young People**
Angie Fuller (AF) updated members on the progress of CYP.
- Targets are underway and the meeting has good attendance.
- It was requested at the last CSP for the membership to widen to incorporate CSE and victim targets. This has now been completed with Linda Helliar (CSE Lead) and Erik Stein joining the subgroup.
- One member of staff has been trained to have access to police data.
- Ending Gangs and Serious Youth Violence meeting has been refreshed and is making progress.

There was a lengthy discussion on changing the Community Safety Partnership approach to gangs and serious youth violence. In summary the following action were agreed:

**ACTION: Sean Wilson (SW) /Neil Matthews (NM) to provide problem solving profile of key gangs and associates for the fortnightly ending gang and youth violence case management meeting (April 2018).**

**ACTION: SW/NM/Carol Douch (CD) to review current information sharing for both children and adult safeguarding cases.**

**ACTION: AF/SW to review current information sharing protocol to ensure that it is fit for purpose.**

**ACTION: SW to liaise with gang’s unit around level of information provided, feedback to members on outcomes.**

**Managing Offenders**
- Current recruitment for ESG and restructure around IOM in progress.
- Helpful for borough priorities to inform the subgroup.
- Focus on Drug Intervention Programmes for those coming out of sentencing, appropriately trained staff.
Hate, Intolerance and Extremism

- Currently in an operational phase. Two schools identified around hate incidents.
- Subgroup are currently developing a strategy going forward, linking with MOPAC.
- Home office and Charity Commissioner issuing guidance on role of Civil society organisations in cases of national and local emergency. Picked up by home office, national body part of steering group.
- Recommendations of that group will feed into role of civil society which will feed into CSP.

7. Performance Report
Dan James (DJ) presented the performance report highlighting that the data recorded is up until January 2018. Data shows that ASB and Arson are reducing. There are concerns around burglary which has increased by 26%. Despite early decrease in serious youth violence this has also seen an increase since 2015. Data also shows that knife crime is increasing although YOS has seen a slight decrease. Although not recorded in the report there has been an increase in personal robbery.

8. Crime and Disorder Strategic Assessment
The assessment is produced annually by the CSP looking at crime and disorder priorities based on data and information across partner organisations. The assessment allows us to look at data and identify priorities to ensure partnership are cited and committed to the priorities for next 12 months. The assessment is also used to identify emerging trends that will impact CSP agenda.

The workshop provided feedback on the emerging trends and priorities set out locally, regionally and wider cross cutting areas.

Feedback on assessment:
- Positive feedback on the refreshed assessment, content is well recorded, and assessment is more user friendly.
- Environmental Crime and ASB additions were welcomed.
- Worth highlighting / showing where the reduction in MARAC referrals have come from on page 7.
- Would be useful to look at risk to life crimes for future reporting.
- Public perceptions to be changed to Residents Survey.

Feedback on priorities:
- Beneficial to include perpetrators of SYV, also to include an understanding of who will be collecting data on gun discharge for Keeping Children and Young People safe.
- VAWG priorities were agreed but need to address borough manifesto to align priorities.
- Need to be mindful of young individuals being exploited by adults (including those outside the borough) who are being exploited to commit organised crime.
- Explore changing the robbery priority to focus on IOM.
- Need clarification on prevent, we need clear line of accountability for where prevent sits. Currently agreed to be included within LSCB.
- Need to clearly highlight what the borough manifesto targets are as well within the document.
- More focus on Substance Misuse as a cross cutting issue
- Emerging Trends – Include MH and wellbeing, support with transition from youth to adult by partners, shew report identifying emerging trends and work around regen, changes to drug markets and organised crime, how changes to finance impact the...
borough, legislations (devolution CJS, role of Mayor taking on greater remit of Criminal Justice, Brexit)

- Include perceptions of safety
- Brexit and its implications need to be included

**ACTION:** Jade Hodgson to add emerging trends section to the CSP Subgroup reports.
**ACTION:** AF to invite John Poynton from Red Thread to future CSP to bring some learning to members of the board.
**ACTION:** JT, FT, RC, Chris Bush (CB) and Teresa DeVito to meet to discuss prevent.
**ACTION:** FT to liaise with Pat Hayes (PH) and Jenny Coombes (JC) with regards to a Be First rep on the CSP board.

The development of a trauma informed health intervention model was discussed and requested to be presented at the next meeting.

**ACTION:** JH to add trauma informed health intervention model to agenda for June CSP.
**ACTION:** FT to liaise with chairs of SAB and LSCB so information is not missed between the boards.

RC highlighted more work is to be done on victim profile and changes to reporting to understanding why under reporting is an issue locally. Potential to explore whether the insight team can pick this up.

**ACTION:** FT to liaise with Tom Hook around potentially having the insight team to look into reasons of under reporting locally.
**ACTION:** JH, JT and DJ to make amendments to the assessment and circulate to members.

Potential to publish in May 2018. Work up action plan to come to board in June.

9. **Forward Plan**
   FT asked for members to review forward plan. The chair highlighted it would be useful to have one substantive agenda item at each partnership. If agencies feel that have something to bring forward, please forward agenda items to Jade Hodgson (JH).

10. **Any Other Business**
    No business or comments to report

11. **Details of next meeting**
    Community Safety Partnership Board
    Wednesday 27th June 2018, 10.00-13.00
    Barking Learning Centre, Conference Room
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Action required</th>
<th>Date of Meeting</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Responsible Manager(s)</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments/Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Jonathan Toy to write protocol on HMO’s and potential displacement of vulnerable people to be signed off as a partnership and brought back to December meeting for endorsement.</td>
<td>12 September 2017</td>
<td>28 February 2018</td>
<td>Jonathan Toy</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>Action in hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Gang and Knife Crime Action Plan - Agreed we need to review the term ‘young people’ and the strategy difference between age groups. Angie Fuller to agree a time-scale outside of the meeting and complete the piece of work by June.</td>
<td>13 December 2017</td>
<td>01 September 2018</td>
<td>Angie Fuller/ Jonathan Toy</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>Jonathon and Angie to agree support for the Gang and Knife Crime action plan. Meeting to be arranged. Scheduled for September Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Jonathon Toy and Tim Barfoot to compile an operation plan for the PSPO’s once met with the Intel Tasking Group.</td>
<td>13 December 2017</td>
<td>13 March 2018</td>
<td>Jonathon Toy/ Tim Barfoot</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Dan James to provide update report to review Information Sharing Protocol in light of GDPR.</td>
<td>28 March 2018</td>
<td>01 June 2018</td>
<td>Dan James</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>Item added to the forward plan for July CSP Board. Item to be circulated ahead of July's CSP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Sean Wilson and Neil Matthews to provide problem solving profile of key gangs and associates for the ending gang and youth violence case management meeting (next meeting scheduled in April 2018).</td>
<td>28 March 2018</td>
<td>01 June 2018</td>
<td>Sean Wilson/ Neil Matthew</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sean Wilson, Neil Matthews and Carol Douch to review current information sharing for both children and adult safeguarding cases. Send information sharing protocols to Jade Hodgson/ Fiona Taylor. Fiona Taylor to take ISA through legal</td>
<td>28 March 2018</td>
<td>01 May 2018</td>
<td>Sean Wilson, Neil Matthews/ Carol Douch/ Fiona Taylor</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Angie Fuller and Sean Wilson to review current information sharing protocol to ensure that it is fit for purpose. Send information sharing protocols to Jade Hodgson/ Fiona Taylor. Fiona Taylor to take ISA through legal</td>
<td>28 March 2018</td>
<td>01 May 2018</td>
<td>Angie Fuller/ Sean Wilson/ Fiona Taylor</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Sean Wilson to liaise with gang’s unit around level of information being shared with partners, feedback to members on outcome of discussion.</td>
<td>28 March 2018</td>
<td>09 April 2018</td>
<td>Sean Wilson</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Angie Fuller to invite John Poynton from Red Thread to future CSP to bring some learning to members of the board. To agree meeting date with CSP members.</td>
<td>28 March 2018</td>
<td>01 August 2018</td>
<td>Angie Fuller</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Jonathon Toy, Fiona Taylor, Rita Chadha, Chris Bush and Teresa DeVito to meet to discuss prevent.</td>
<td>28 March 2018</td>
<td>01 May 2018</td>
<td>Jonathon Toy/ Fiona Taylor</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>Meeting has been arranged and taken place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Fiona Taylor to liaise with Pat Hayes and Jenni Coombes with regards to a Be First rep on the CSP board.</td>
<td>28 March 2018</td>
<td>01 May 2018</td>
<td>Fiona Taylor</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>Jenni Coombes is now the agreed Be First representative. Invites and membership list has been amended to reflect addition of new CSP member.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Fiona Taylor to liaise with chairs of SAB and LSCB so information is not missed between the boards.</td>
<td>28 March 2018</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Fiona Taylor</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>work is being done around victim profiling and the changes to reporting for victims. Further work needs to be done to identify why under reporting is a local issue for Barking and Dagenham. Fiona Taylor to liaise with Tom Hook around potentially having the insight team to look into reasons of under reporting locally.</td>
<td>28 March 2018</td>
<td>01 May 2018</td>
<td>Fiona Taylor</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Jade Hodgson, Jonathon Toy and Dan James to make amendments to the assessment and circulate to members.</td>
<td>28 March 2018</td>
<td>01 July 2018</td>
<td>Jonathon Toy/ Dan James/ Jade Hodgson</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>Amendments completed. Final assessment will be circulated once the newly elected cabinet member has had the opportunity to review and comment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Purpose of Presenting the Report and Decisions Required

1.1 At each meeting of the Community Safety Partnership Board each sub-group, excluding the Executive Planning Group, report on their progress and performance since the last meeting of the Board.

1.2 Please note that the Hate, Intolerance and Extremism subgroup have not met since the last Community Safety Partnership Board.

2. Recommendation(s)

2.1 The Board is recommended to note and discuss the contents of the appended subgroup reports.

List of Appendices:

Appendix 1: Childrens’ and Young People
Appendix 2: Managing Offenders
Appendix 3: Safer Borough Board
Appendix 4: Violence against Women and Girls
This page is intentionally left blank
1. **Brief Update**

1.1 The sub group has had two meetings during this quarter, one of which has been an additional extraordinary meeting convened to focus on the new standards for the HMIP inspection of Youth Offending Services. This took the style of a workshop to look at the three domains that will be inspected in the new framework and to focus on the governance and leadership domain to reiterate the importance of the sub group and its responsibilities as a YOS management board as well as add partnership input into the Self Evaluation that has been created to identify where further developments are needed as areas of focus for the YOS in line with the HMIP expectations.

1.2 Overall the majority of the actions within the Children and Young People’s sub group are progressing well and on track. The one issue that the group is still struggling with is the ability to gather information when young people have been the victim of a stabbing incident. There is no process to gather this information or refer through to the youth at risk matrix.

1.3 The partnership attendance at the board has been expanded to incorporate education colleagues and youth services to ensure that the wider partnership is involved, particularly to continue to impact first time entrants into the criminal justice system.

1.4 Members of the sub group have been, and continue to be involved at looking at ways in which the borough may do things differently, particularly in the area of exploitation in its widest context and a focus on Contextual Safeguarding will compliment this work.
2. **Key Challenge(s)**

2.1 Whilst the majority of the partners attend the sub group on a regular basis there is still no consistent representative from the Community Rehabilitation company, however they have now started to engage in a virtual way.

2.2 Whilst first time entrants has decreased over the last three quarters there is still more work to do to ensure that the performance against the three youth offending indicators continues to improve against a backdrop of challenging and concerning young people that are becoming involved in quite risky behaviours and placing themselves and others in danger.

2.3 Serious youth violence and knife crime remains a priority for the sub group and the ongoing actions will be updated to reflect this over the next 12 months.

3. **Emerging Trends**

3.1 There are more young people coming to the attention of social care and YOS who have become involved in concerning behaviours and very quickly escalated to the point of serious safeguarding and welfare issues through the risks that they are placing themselves in through criminal behaviours and peer group/gang associations.

3.2 Young people involved in criminal behaviours may not necessarily have the same profile as we have seen over the last ten years. Cases coming to light show that the previous indicators such as being NEET, missing, looked after, open and known to services may not be present in more recent cases. This can make it harder to identify those young people that are potentially more likely to be at risk of becoming involved in offending or at risk of being exploited in some form.

4. **Support required from CSP Board**

4.1 Assistance from the police to develop a process where the YOS can receive regular reports to identify young people under the age of 18 who have been reported as being the victim of a stabbing whether life changing or not. This will enable them to be offered support via the youth at risk matrix which in turn could reduce the potential for them to become a perpetrator themselves.
1. Brief Update

1.1 Delay in Sub Group meeting during Quarter 4 (2017/18). Membership of the group has been reviewed and new meeting date circulated (18/06/2018). Focus will be upon refreshing the forward plan and ensuring aligned priorities.

1.2 Ongoing review of IOM structure.

1.3 Recommendation to CSP Board to approve proposal to merge B&D and Havering Reoffending boards. Hoped that this will encourage active partnership engagement, at an appropriately senior level and ensure we maximise use of available resources.

1.4 Performance review demonstrating low levels of drug/alcohol service referrals (especially prior to release from custody). Will be discussed as substantive agenda item on 18/06/2018 to consider multi-agency response to improve referrals to and engagement with DIP services.

2. Key Challenge(s)

2.1 Subgroup membership still under review to ensure appropriate agency representation and appropriate level of seniority to ensure effectiveness of the Subgroup.

2.2 Improving referral rates to DIP services. Identifying obstacles and generating an action plan to ensure a multi agency response.

3. Support required from CSP Board

3.1 Approval of proposal to form a joint BDH Reoffending Board.
3.2 Clarification of funding/commissioning opportunities and these will be accessed to promote interventions in relation to SGV / supporting Youth to Adult transitions.

4. **List of Appendices:** None
1. Update/ what is working well

1.1 A new Police Superintendent is now in place for partnerships, Superintendent Shabnam Chaudri will be invited onto the Safe Borough Board subgroup as a member.

1.2 Burglary statistics are down 22% although the rolling trend is slightly up by 27 offences for 2017. Records peaked in January 2018, however since then there has been a steady decrease.

1.3 Theft of motor-vehicle is seeing a small group causing a large amount of these crimes, crimes rates are seeing a reduction in theft of a motor vehicle when those individuals are in prison. Challenges within the BCU has caused work to be overlooked and more work can be done around prevention. Subgroup is struggling with what they can do locally around decision making, currently an operation process rather than targeting offenders. Statistics are also showing a reduction in personal robbery however compared to 2017 robbery is on the up.

1.4 A great deal of work is being done around violence with injury, Arc Theatre will be running a knife crime programme to increase awareness of the risks of carrying knives and the impact it has on the community. Work is also being done to develop a long-term Trauma Informed Health Intervention Model that will support children and young people at an earlier age who are at risk of becoming involved in violence and crime. The model will put provisions in place to address trauma and deliver services in a trauma informed approach. Test spot purchasing is also being carried out across the borough to ensure companies are following the correct provisions and methods when selling knives and corrosive substances.

1.5 We are seeing a reduction in ASB, fixed penalty notices (FPN’s) have been issued for littering and fly tipping this has resulted in the value of the fines issued being doubled. The council, through the Safer Borough Board subgroup have dealt with 2500 eye sore gardens. There will be cost implications for fly tipping due to the need for increased staff and cameras to pick up the crimes.
2. **Key Challenge(s)**

2.1 Sustainability of Operation Mexico.

2.2 Sustainability of work completed around ASB and how to address fly tipping that is a big issue in the borough and a concern of residents.

2.3 The lack of intel sharing products for tasking.

2.4 Residents are showing concerns around perceptions of safety, this is higher than neighbouring boroughs.

3. **Support/challenges - CSP Board**

3.1 Robust communication strategy around residential burglary, currently not joined up in getting positive comms messages around safety and keeping you and your property safe.

3.2 Robust communications plan to support the perception of safety.

3.3 Support with building up neighbourhood watch, how that operates and help with expansion of the scheme.

3.4 Dan James to look at what other areas are doing well and what are they delivering to support reduction of theft of motor vehicle.

3.5 Support with effectively joining up physical presence in Barking Town Centre and Dagenham Heathway. Partnership to be an enabler to bring the control into one co-ordinated team.
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1. Brief Update

1.1 The Violence Against Women and Girls (VAWG) Sub Group has met once since the last CSP Board

1.2 The group have been focused on the development of the VAWG strategy and several priorities have been affirmed:
   i) Support Survivors
   ii) Educate and Communicate
   iii) Challenge Abusive Behaviours
   iv) Include Lived Experience

1.3 The shape of the strategy has changed from the original draft as a result of a new process through the LBBD Corporate Strategy Group, and to take on board feedback and group discussion around missing factors. However, the original principles have remained the same.

1.4 The VAWG group have supported the Safeguarding Adults Board through a learning event on Modern Slavery.

2. Key Challenge(s)

2.1 The development of a VAWG dataset has been valuable and the work is attributed to the performance and intelligence team. However, this needs further development to ensure it is representative of all members.

2.2 Currently we collate police data (and have been given authority from police colleagues to use the Safeguarding dashboard), children’s care and support data, court data, MARAC data and commissioned service data.
2.3 It would be useful to include data from BHRUT in relation to domestic abuse, female genital mutilation. They also collate data around child sexual exploitation which would be useful to the children and young people’s sub group.

2.4 There is a heightened appetite for improved understanding of modern slavery locally, and there is opportunity to work closely with the safeguarding adults board to work from a joined up approach to modern slavery and human trafficking.

3. Emerging Trends

3.1 There is a move to more recognition of trauma-informed approaches being more effective when working with survivors, and the need for community interventions to tackle people using abusive behaviour.

3.2 We are seeing slight increases in adolescent to parent violence.

3.3 We are seeing sporadic rates of repeat referrals through the MARAC provision, and an increased rate of escalation cases as a result of police commitment to refer all cases where a victim is known for three or more non-crime book domestics in 12 months.

3.4 Domestic violence with injury cases has decreased from a prevalence perspective, as have the volume of all domestic abuse incidents. However, domestic abuse offences have increased slightly. The types of cases seen at MARAC are changing regarding their levels and dynamics of risk. Taken together, this suggests we are starting to see small decreases in physical violence and more coercive and controlling behaviour – which is no less risky than physical violence and often has wider ranging and severe impacts on individuals.

4. Support required from CSP Board

4.1 All partners to prioritise the development of intelligence products that will inform strategic decision-making across the sub structure.

4.2 Support to move towards a better understanding of how to evidence coercive and control cases across the partnership. This could potentially be managed by the MARAC process but would require robust support from all members to be effective. Conversations are being had with MARAC representatives to explore this, but a strategic perspective would be helpful to inform decision making.

4.3 Commitment to develop a CSP communications strategy, working alongside other communications strategies such as the Healthy Lifestyles promotion plans which will support the Health and Wellbeing Board.

5. List of Appendices:

5.1 None
1. Purpose of Presenting the Report and Decisions Required

1.1 At each meeting of the Community Safety Partnership (CSP) Board the Safer Neighbourhood Board (SNB) provides the minutes of the last meeting to update the board on their progress and performance since the last Community Safety Partnership Board.

1.2 This is to update the CSP on any issues arising from SNB meetings since the last CSP. Since the last CSP the SNB have held an closed meeting on Thursday 31 May 2018.

2. Recommendation(s)

2.1 The Community Safety Partnership Board is recommended to note the content of the SNB update.

2.2 Consider if there are recommendations for further work which arise from this.

List of Appendices:

Appendix A: SNB Closed Meeting (31 May 2018)
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# Safer Neighbourhoods Board (Closed SNB)

## AGENDA

**Date:** Thursday 31st May 2018  
**Time:** 5.00pm-7.30pm  
**Venue:** Dagenham and Redbridge Football Club  
**Chair:** Steve Thompson, Chair of SNB  
**Contact officer:** Abdul Chowdhury, PA to Director of Enforcement

### AGENDA ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Introductions and apologies</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>5 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Minutes from last meeting and matters arising</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>5 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Safer Neighbourhood Board Chair’s report</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>5 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Performance Summary</td>
<td>Shabnam Chaudhri /John Cooze</td>
<td>15 mins</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5 | Update reports from  
- Community Payback  
- Independent Advisory Group  
- Stop and Search  
- Victim Support  
- Neighbourhood watch  
- Ward Panels | Cheryl Deane  
Keith Hutton  
Steve Thompson  
Tara Poore  
John Cooze  
John Cooze | 20 mins | |
| 7 | Perception of Crime & Safety | Jonathon Toy | 15 mins | Verbal |
| 6 | Application for funding MOPAC  
Safer Neighbourhood Board | Steve Thompson | 20 mins | Verbal |
| 7 | Any other business | All Attendees | 10 mins | Verbal |

**Details of next meeting**  
Safer Neighbourhood Board (Closed Meeting)  
Thursday 6th September 2018, 5.00-7.30pm  
Dagenham and Redbridge Football Club
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Safer Neighbourhood Board – Closed Meeting - Minutes

Date: Thursday 31st May 2018  Time: 5.00-7.30pm
Location: Dagenham and Redbridge FC
Chair: Steve Thompson, MBE
Contact Officer: Abdul Chowdhury, PA to Director Jonathan Toy
Tel: 0208 227 5153 Email: Abdul.Chowdhury@lbld.gov.uk

Present: Steve Thompson (Chair), Rita Giles MBE, Cllr. Margaret Mullane, Dan Neville, Diane Worbey, Jonathan Toy, Cheryl Deane, Spt.Int. Shabnam Chaudhri, John Cooze,

Apologies: Katherine Gilcrest, Tara Poore, Rita Chadha, Keith Hutton, Jane Scotchbrook (Retired) replaced by Shabnam Chaudhri, Inspector John Goodwin

Minutes

1 Introductions and apologies - Chair

Steve Thompson (ST) welcomed everyone to the meeting and introductions and apologies were noted.

A special welcome to Shabnam Chaudhri Incoming Supt. who has taken over from Jane Scotchbrook. SC took the opportunity to thank JS for her hard work for the last 15-20 months.

Background:

SC has over 29 years of Policing experience and a career detective by trade. Was involved in the Olympics back in 2012 and its security upkeeping. Also, has been involved in business change and has had a direct and responsible implemented changes to central and north BCU area in general with spending a short amount of time in the borough last year. In addition, SC was a DCI in Hackney and lead on gangs both in a proactive and a reactive position with also covered domestic violence and hate crime. Finally spend 18 months in the borough of Newham.

2 Minutes from last meeting and matters arising

Minutes have been agreed as a true account with last minute changes requested by Supt. Jane Scotchbrook. The amendments are as follows:

Page 2, final two paragraphs - Jane Scotchbrook explained that when a situation occurs in a neighbouring ward, officers would sometimes be required to be moved for operational reasons as an impact on one ward often has an impact on another.

If DWOs needed to be relocated on a rare occasion for a short-term operation, consultation takes place in the first instance with the leaders of the local authorities, together with the chairs of the SNB and IAG. Jane Scotchbrook stated that
communication had greatly improved but acknowledged that ward chairs should also be informed if DWOs were to be moved.

Page 3, paragraph 2 - Jane Scotchbrook informed the meeting that as announced in the SNB public meeting, cycles had been provided to ward officers. Hubs are currently being identified to ensure DWOs can reach their wards with a maximum 20-minute walk in the future.

Page 3, final paragraph - Street Watch – Jane Scotchbrook informed that Havering have had success and shared some data and timeline – In the 12000 minutes clocked (200hrs), only one crime has taken place.

Actions:

- There hasn’t been an occasion where neighbourhood officers had been moved, and ST was informed. Dan Neville raised this for discussion because of the recent and tragic death of young man up on Marks Gate. Dan confirmed that whilst been up there and supporting the officers that in fact they had been drafted from neighbouring wards. It could not be confirmed if necessarily if all was on overtime but having spoken to DWO’s from other wards at the crime scene. ST raised this when informed by Dan and was told that any dedicated officers that have been moved were on overtime.
- ST also raised concern when extra work was being undertaken in the town centres with extra Police following political uproar few weeks ago. It was confirmed that officers were on overtime and if they were doing a shift in the ward and then doing overtime in the evening there must be provisions for down time especially if they are being moved to different parts of the borough. Assurances were given that work DWO’s do would not impact on the wards.
- SC clarified that officers doing overtime was after their duties/shifts in the wards were completed. On a more positive note x2 DWO’s have been appointed. One them in Thames Ward (Katie Ward) the other is Village Ward (Jordan Paul). The officers will be in place once they hand in their 28 days’ notice period which they can waiver and start earlier if they wish to do so. ST pointed out that is would be good to say in future updates that approval has been made and a definite start date in place of recruited staffs. This would provide a more accurate information and with confidence from public with a realistic expectation.
- Overall feedback is that currently no chairs from other wards have informed of the DWO’s being extracted to fill void etc for incidents or the like.
- Performance Summary is an agenda item, so this would be looked at in more details.
- Jane Scotchbrook to circulate report related to Domestic Violence. SC informed that there were some domestic abuse initiatives, but JS was not aware of a report yet. ST said this would remain as an outstanding item. At the time media reported that appeared to be flagging a new initiative to be introduced. It now appears this may not be happening. JT provided current work done in the borough from Council perspective these include: Violence against Women and Girls sub-group Partnership Board. This is chaired by Melody Williams from ELFT who may know really good progress. On a more wider issue there is a real press for the Police investigating coercive and controlling behaviour. The government position of this type of behaviour is now considered as domestic violence. The home office is pushing for this line quite hard in
terms of proven action of domestic abuse. Invitation will need to extend to Hazel North Stevens, Commissioning Manager to come along and brief on what has been going on. There is also a multi-agency referral committee which look at high risk cases where the most vulnerable. Currently in the borough the domestic violence recorded is very high recorded as 2,600 incidents a year. Trying to get more referrals through the MARRAC. There is also a rise intergenerational domestic violence and the concerns on trends. So, a real focus remains in this area and feed back in the next meeting from Hazel North Stevens.

- ST was not able to attend the CSP following the last SNB meeting so unsure if Cllr. Butt raised the issues around community payback. JT cannot also recall this coming up. There is an Executive meeting in the next 10 days and can be raised there. **ACTION: JT to raise in the Executive Meeting.**
- St informed that in the last meeting that Cheryl Deane did not feel the council was at all supportive in Community Payback as well as it could do. Given there has been an election in between things have changed. This will remain on the agenda until further notice. JT reiterated the that the council is very supportive of Community Payback which is incredibly useful. Happy to work closer and create a better relationship to deliver on projects. Cheryl has had a different experience to the one described by JT considering all things go through her. She also pointed out that the work she undertakes is not just in LBBD but other boroughs too. Cllr. Mullane mentioned past relationships and current restructure may not have been quite on par but moving forward there is room for new improvements. Cllr. Mullane also mentioned the locality is keen to commission a lot of work and would be very happy to meet Cheryl. **ACTION: JT and Cllr. Mullane and CD to meet to discuss and work together.**
- Stop and Search minutes ST to give update.

### 3 Safer Neighbourhood Board Chair’s report

A brief update given recent tragic events in the borough over the last few months and very worrying. By supporting the police with actions through issuing section 60’s which have been issued a lot in the borough since last meeting. Looking at ways to engage predominantly young people and ways in dealing with the various problems arising from it.

One of the major parts of this meeting is the performance summary which plays an important role in understanding trends.

**STEVE IF I HAVE MISSED ANYTHING IN RESPECT OF YOUR BRIEF PLEASE FEEL FREE TO ADD.**

- Page 3 – Burglary in a Dwelling; SC provide a little information on this before looking at the data. SC reminded everyone about operation MEXICO across the BCU which has had a big impact on the borough with significant reductions. Current trend is there appearing to be an increase that believe that is due to theft of high value motor vehicle from homes. ST asked if this gets included in the figures on page 3, MOPAC report when vehicle theft is categorised separately. JC confirmed that they are two different categories even the motor vehicle involved in the crime. St pointed out that there was a 30% increase in a rolling year.

One of the highlights of the last open meeting in February was a presentation by Inspector Neil Mathews on operation Mexico with positive information. If anything, it would appear there has been an increase in crime.

There was some disagreement on the actual figures that showed an increase with SC highlighting there had been instances where the figures had gone down before increasing again. Dan Neville pointed out that the figures and the informed rolling 12-month numbers did not add up and would be significantly higher. Also, the period would lead up to believe that figures were shown longer than 12months.

ST informed that on an annual figure showed that in May 2017 was 1,019 and in January 2018 which around the time operation Mexico would have started increase to 1,254, with the last figures in April 2018 is 1,267. Given the numbers operation MEXICO does not appear to have had the desired effect. JT clarified that the MOPAC report shows a 3-5-year trend of each of the crime types.

John Cooze presented the figures on the screen and directed all to the figures from the MET website which were better organised to a monthly basis. DN confirmed that he uses this in his chairs meeting and appears to more useful as it would be broken down to each ward etc. ST proposed that looking ahead a better way than presenting would be by forwarding a link to the relevant information to save time and be more accurate Print for whoever requires print versions).

Abdul provided clarity that the MOPAC report he was able to disseminate after a bit of trouble was readily accessible as a London wide data. This can be accessed without signing up or account set up.

ST asked for an update on how operation Mexico was going given the figures now and the impact indicated. SC informed an update on operation Mexico was not available but would need to be fed back in the next meeting. ST agrees the figures could be also as a result of a short period of monitoring, but the idea is that updates would be provided in this type of meeting given the time since last open meeting where operation Mexico was launched. DN mentioned that categorising of
burglaries would somehow have contributed to the figures being higher than would have previously anticipated. An example of this would be a burglary of a shed would be same as dwelling/residential property.

SC agrees this may be the case over the last 5 years but certainly not over the last 6 months.

ST suggested that a presentation in the next open meeting an update can be provided on operation Mexico. From a public perception this would be a good update. **ACTION: Abdul to ensure Inspector Neil Mathews is invited to the next open meeting to provide update on operation MEXICO.**

- There has been very good work on ASB in the borough. ST welcomed JT to provide update: Last financial year LBBD issued 2,133 fly tips, issues record number of FPN’s, several enforcement cameras to capture culprits with one of the images there was 39K hits on social media. In summary it is working better than it was but not as well as it should be. Working closely with cabinet lead Cllr Mullane on new technology to tackle ongoing problem.
- A lot work to be done on private rental property with very big turnover and in some wards 30-40% of housing stock is privately rented.
- Successful issue on illegal camps in the borough. In 2015/16 there were 53 illegals in camps. This year in single figures and swift action has paid dividends as immediate removal injunction order with officers on site with 2 hours site is cleared before building up of rubbish as has been the case.
- DN asked about public place orders: JT: PPPO has been issued in Broad street which was mainly to do with street drinking and problematic family. A bit slow on enforcement. Barking Town Centre come into effect in the last month or so serving around 50 PFN. This included fly tipping, urinating and aggressive begging. Working closely with PC James Kent local to Barking.

JT/JC – work in progress aspiration of a Town Centre Team to jointly create a much more presence. Cllr. Mullane informed the various patrols that have been taking place which have had a positive impact. DN clarified that this was the B&D estate teams paid for by the tenants. Cllr. Mullane has checked their returns and if the returns are not good she is happy to send it back. SAT/SUN good returns and emailed JC to say well done keep up the good work. DN – Abbey Ruins is not an estate but still paid for by the tenants. JC explained the benefits of patrolling there has been priceless given the knifes and other dangerous weapons found there. JT explained that DN had a point, but the points mentioned by JC and recent event of knife possession demonstrated the need to be able to monitor and stop a sinister crime taking place via CCTV. DN pointed out that there appears to be less work in the estate and more on public roads this has been the feedback via tweeter feeds. JC mentioned that the name may not be appropriate but actually this is more like a council
founded tasking team if anything. There is a tasking process where on Mondays meeting takes place and concentrate of local priorities. Not all issues are on the estate.

Cllr. Mullane:

1. Meeting on the Heathway with residents on 4th June 2018. This included all the councillors. Getting ready for feedback and historically a lot of problems have emanated from the Heathway area. Enforcement to win the hearts and minds of residents by the way of action.

2. Cllr Mullane would like to visit the Estate Police Teams/Tasking Team. There is a real concern that the officers do not identify themselves clearly and communications and a piece of work to be undertaken with JT. **ACTION: Cllr Mullane & JT to pay visit to patrol team.**

3. SC informed that a revisit to role and responsibilities could be down to a misdirection of roles. There is agreement that if on route an emergency takes place that this would be given priority. Cllr Mullane has had complaints going back a while now so important to address. SC informed that it is her expectation that officers should engage directly with residents and be on foot. **ACTION: SC is happy to have conversation with the team. There should be no reason for stop & Search, engagement and foot patrol.**

ST mentioned that there was extra x12 promised with the new BCU structure of which there is only x4 so far. Could that be a reason for the deployment to other non-estate duties. SC clarified that she has had the same conversation with neighbouring borough who also have been promised x12 officers. SC clarified that that was not the reason why current officers were patrolling outside of the estate. SC will have a conversation with her managers to get clarity. ST explained that because of the extraction of DWO’s at times has created an underline tone but needs to be addressed.

JT confirmed that he was able to go directly into MOPAC report and it was showing figures on a 3-year trend.

ST asked if SC could provide a report of current knife crime and the plans to tackle it. SC was happy to explain that currently PAN London knife crime has been at an increase. The BCU have been given a priority borough with provisions of 3 carriers who will be first to respond to major incidents. There is a newly formed crime task force by the commissioner that will work in the borough as it is seen as a priority. In recent days there has been acid attack and knife crime in valentine’s park.

ST highlights of reports outlined stop and search and the lack of it and the reintroduction. Considering the priority on knife crime we don’t seem to be seeing stop and search. There has been more section 60’s in Christmas gone that we have had in 6 years.
SC shared her concern of the lack of stop and search and would like to see this be introduced. Meeting on Monday with chief inspectors to find out issues around why stop, and search is low. Will be looked at holistically from training etc.

5 Update reports

- **Community Payback - Cheryl Deane**
  Better platforms are needed to create greater awareness and understanding of Community Payback.

- **Independent Advisory Group – Keith Hutton**
  The IAG appears to be no longer part of communication stream and often left out of key decision-making processes. JC and SC to look into this and feedback to chair (A).

- **Stop and Search (Body Cam Review) – Steve Thompson**
  The review done in B&D on body cam searches in total three times now has been positive and very impressed with the professionalism of the officers. There has been no one occasion where there was a problem. Only critic is around uploading of the video on to the system.

- **Victim Support – Tara Poore**
  Victim Support are still installing home security items to all residents in the borough free of charge. There will also be a weekly drop in at Barking Police station starting next week.

  **ACTION: Abdul to inform Cllr. Mullane on what exactly is meant by all residents to get clarity.**

- **Neighbourhood Watch – Diane Worbey**
  Neighbourhood Watch has been successful in 3.5k bid for signage with the council happy to meet the costs and provide installation for free. ST asked about Street Watch which is currently being looked at with health & Safety in mind. JT added that Street Audits jointly with community, police, enforcement can be done monthly. Better perception. Owl System ongoing research needed.

- **Ward Panels – John Cooze**
  Abdul has booked all the Chair Ward Panel Meetings but the lack of DWO’s is of concern given there are policing updates required.

  **ACTION: SC will instruct that all DWO’s to attend Ward Panel Meetings.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Perception of Crime &amp; Safety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ACTION:</strong> Abdul to move this agenda item to the next meeting due to lack of time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Application for Funding – MOPAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ACTION:</strong> Abdul to speak to Jade Hodgson and Daniel James and look at the previous application made. It is essential this given priority with submission as soon as possible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Any other business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>All Attendees</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **Introduction**

1.1 This performance report provides the Community Safety Partnership members with an overview of performance across the key performance indicators for Crime and Disorder, at April 2018. The performance report is made up of one page performance summaries for each indicator.

2. Please note: A number of key performance indicators are being developed by MOPAC and the local authority for 2018/19 and beyond. At the time of writing this report they were still in development but will be included in future reports.

2.1 Members of the Community Safety Partnership are invited to raise any further issues or to request additional information on any of the indicators not provided in detail in this report.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barking and Dagenham Community Safety Partnership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appendix 1: One Page Performance Summaries using FYTD data to APRIL 2018</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>For Community Safety Partnership meeting on 04/07/2018</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce First Time Entrants into the Youth Justice System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce the use of custody for Children and Young People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce reoffending by children and young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce Serious Youth Violence and repeat victims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce Knife Crime Offences and Repeat Victims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce the number of Young Victims of Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce the number of gun crimes including discharges</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Violence Against Women and Girls Sub Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Performance (Financial Year to Date at April 2018 unless stated otherwise)</th>
<th>Target 2018/19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Abuse and Repeat victimisation</td>
<td>Up 2.9% (up 6 reported offences)</td>
<td>Increase the number of victims of domestic abuse to come forward and a reduction in the number of repeat victims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeat Referrals to MARAC</td>
<td>Up to 48.8% and now exceeding the 28% to 40% range recommended by Safelives</td>
<td>To achieve a repeat referral rate of 28% to 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Abuse and Repeat victimisation</td>
<td>Up 34.3% (up 11 reported offences)</td>
<td>Increase the reporting of sexual violence and reduce the number of repeat victims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAWG Harmful Practices reporting</td>
<td>In development</td>
<td>Increase reporting of harmful practices including Female Genital Mutilation (FGM), honour-based violence and forced marriage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Slavery and Human Trafficking Reporting</td>
<td>In development</td>
<td>Increase reporting of modern slavery offences including sex trafficking and exploitation, domestic servitude and labour exploitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAWG Cases and the CJS</td>
<td>In development</td>
<td>Reduce the rates of attrition in VAWG cases as they progress through the criminal justice process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Work will take place over the next year to review and align with the above Domestic Abuse targets the Borough Manifesto targets)

**Hate Crime and Intolerance Sub Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Performance (Financial Year to Date at April 2018 unless stated otherwise)</th>
<th>Target 2018/19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encourage more victims of hate crime to come forward and report</td>
<td>See Summary Sheet for Hate Crime Trends</td>
<td>INCREASE REPORTING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce the levels of repeat victimisation for Hate Crime</td>
<td>In development</td>
<td>REDUCTION IN REPEATS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce Attrition of Hate Crime as they progress through the criminal justice process</td>
<td>In development</td>
<td>REDUCTION IN ATTRITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hate Crime Victim Satisfaction with the police and criminal justice service</td>
<td>In development</td>
<td>INCREASE IN SATISFACTION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Safer Borough Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Performance (Financial Year to Date at April 2018 unless stated otherwise)</th>
<th>Target 2018/19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduction of Burglary offences</td>
<td>Down 16.3% (Down 22 offences)</td>
<td>REDUCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in theft of motor vehicle</td>
<td>Up 18% (up 18 offences)</td>
<td>REDUCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Non Domestic Abuse Violence With Injury</td>
<td>Up 3.2% (up 3 offences)</td>
<td>REDUCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Personal Robbery offences.</td>
<td>Down 9% (down 9 offences)</td>
<td>REDUCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction of repeat victimisation in Barking and Dagenham</td>
<td>In development</td>
<td>REDUCTION IN REPEATS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tackle ASB in the borough</td>
<td>Down 16% (down 87 calls)</td>
<td>REDUCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enviro crime</td>
<td>In development</td>
<td>REDUCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Safety - Arson incidents</td>
<td>163 FYTD at March 2018 below the target of 165 for that point of the year</td>
<td>No more than 165 at year end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents perception of safety</td>
<td>In development</td>
<td>INCREASE IN FEELING OF SAFETY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reducing Reoffending Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Performance (Financial Year to Date at April 2018 unless stated otherwise)</th>
<th>Target 2018/19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support to victims and improvement of services to ensure victim satisfaction is at its highest.</td>
<td>In development</td>
<td>IMPROVEMENT IN SATISFACTION RATINGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support offenders with accommodation, education, training, employment, finance and debt and drug and alcohol services.</td>
<td>In development</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To improve statistics in the reduction of recidivism / Reoffending</td>
<td>29.3% in line with the London and England and Wales Averages</td>
<td>Reduction in offending rate and frequency rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction of reoffending, particularly within priority indicators and areas of focus (Non- Domestic Abuse Violence With Injury, Burglary, Theft of Motor Vehicle, Robbery of Personal Property),</td>
<td>In development</td>
<td>REDUCTION IN offending rate and frequency rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIP- ATR starts and successful completions</td>
<td>In development</td>
<td>ACHIEVE TARGET FOR DIP COMPLETIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIP- DRR Starts and successful completions</td>
<td>In development</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please note: A ‘reduction on previous year’ target has been set by the Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) but no specific numerical target to achieve has been set. Locally the following range has been applied to monitor performance for crime indicators: ≥5.0% (RED), ≥-4.9% and 4.9% (AMBER), ≤-5.0% (GREEN).*
**First Time Entrants into the Criminal Justice System**

**Source:** Barking and Dagenham YOS / YJMIS

| **Definition** | First Time Entrants (FTEs) to the criminal justice system are classified as offenders, (aged 10 – 17) who received their first reprimand, warning, caution or conviction, based on data recorded on the Police National Computer |
| **How this indicator works** | The measure excludes any offenders who at the time of their first conviction or caution, according to their PNC record, were resident outside of England or Wales. Penalty notices for disorder, other types of penalty notices, cannabis warnings and other sanctions given by the police are not counted. |
| **What good looks like** | Ideally we would see a reduction on the previous year |
| **Why this indicator is important** | The life chances of young people who have a criminal conviction may be adversely affected in many ways in both the short term and long term. Reducing First Time Entrants is a priority for all London boroughs to address as set by the Mayors Office for Policing and Crime. |
| **Any issues to consider** | A rising young population is expected which could lead to a natural increase in youth offenders. |
| **2018/19 Target** | Year on Year reduction from 2017/18 |

The latest data covers the period October 2016 to September 2017 and was released in March 2018. Barking and Dagenham has remained consistently much higher than both the London and National average for the Rate of FTE's per 1000 10 - 17 year olds and this is a focus for the Youth Offending Service and Partner agencies. However, both the latest quarter and rolling 12 month figures show a reduction in this figure indicating that progress is being made and the YOS expect this trend to continue.RAG rated RED as B&D rate is still above regional and national averages.

The YOS has:
- Delivered additional group work programmes and targeted interventions to young people on triage cases.
- The borough has developed a Youth "At Risk" matrix to identify young people within schools who may be displaying concerning or worrying behaviours that may lead them into criminal activity.
- Two support workers have been employed to work with these young people in an effort to reduce the possibility of them becoming an FTE.
- The support workers have liaised with schools and police and regularly attend the MASH meetings to build partner relationships and ensure that partners understand and are clear about the criteria and how to refer.

**Performance Overview**

The YOS has:
- Delivered additional group work programmes and targeted interventions to young people on triage cases.
- The borough has developed a Youth "At Risk" matrix to identify young people within schools who may be displaying concerning or worrying behaviours that may lead them into criminal activity.
- Two support workers have been employed to work with these young people in an effort to reduce the possibility of them becoming an FTE.
- The support workers have liaised with schools and police and regularly attend the MASH meetings to build partner relationships and ensure that partners understand and are clear about the criteria and how to refer.

**Actions to Sustain or improve performance**

The YOS has:
- Delivered additional group work programmes and targeted interventions to young people on triage cases.
- The borough has developed a Youth "At Risk" matrix to identify young people within schools who may be displaying concerning or worrying behaviours that may lead them into criminal activity.
- Two support workers have been employed to work with these young people in an effort to reduce the possibility of them becoming an FTE.
- The support workers have liaised with schools and police and regularly attend the MASH meetings to build partner relationships and ensure that partners understand and are clear about the criteria and how to refer.

**RAG STATUS: RED**

**LEAD OFFICER:** Angie Fuller, Youth Offending Service Manager
The number of young people who are sentenced to custody - rate per,1000 population aged 10 to 17 years

Source: Barking and Dagenham YOS / YJMIS

Definition
This indicator measures the percentage of custodial sentences issued to young people as a proportion of all young peoples convictions (given in court only and so does not include pre-court disposals).

How this indicator works
The proportionate use of custody is the percentage of young people (aged 10-17) sentenced to custody out of all those receiving a conviction in court (total of first-tier disposal, community service, and custodial sentence). Age is measured at time of arrest.

What good looks like
We are looking for fewer young people to be sentenced to custody then previous months and years.

Why this indicator is important
It is a Key Performance Indicator for the Youth Offending Service.

Any issues to consider
A rising young population is expected which could lead to a natural increase in youth offenders.

2017/18 Target
Ideally year on year reductions

The nature of the offences has increased in severity and there have been a number of serious incidents where a custodial sentence was extremely likely. However, the latest 12 month data to December 2017 shows that the number of young people receiving custodial sentences (29) has decreased when comparing it to the 12 months to December 2016 (33). Therefore the custody rate per 1,000 people aged 10 to 17 years has also reduced over the same periods from 1.50 down to 1.28. However, the borough still has a higher rate per 1,000 population for 10 to 17 years olds when compared to regional and national averages hence the amber rating instead of Green.

Performance Overview

The YOS are:
• Involved in ongoing work with the police and other partners to address the level of serious violence within the borough.
• Attending the Ending gang and serious youth violence meetings every two weeks to address the cases of most concern.
• Where appropriate offering alternative community sentences
• The YOS has commissioned ‘Spark to life’ to offer a mentor work with the cases of highest risk and those in danger of receiving a custodial sentence
• The YOS have completed full analysis of the custodial cohort and presented it to the Children and Young people’s CSP sub group in January 2018.
• Following up recommendations and actions from the above analysis work
• The custodial cohort will continue to be monitored by the board as part of its ongoing performance reporting.

LEAD OFFICER: Angie Fuller, Youth Offending Service Manager

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Barking and Dagenham</th>
<th>London</th>
<th>London PCC Area</th>
<th>England</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jul 13 - Jun 14</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 13 - Sep 14</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 14 - Dec 14</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 14 - Mar 15</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 14 - Jun 15</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 14 - Sep 15</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 15 - Dec 15</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 15 - Mar 16</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 15 - Jun 16</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 15 - Sep 16</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 16 - Dec 16</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 16 - Mar 17</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 16 - Jun 17</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 16 - Sep 17</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Custody Rate per 1,000 Young People - Jan 17 - Dec 17
## Rate of Juvenile Proven Reoffending

**Source:** Barking and Dagenham YOS / YJMIS

### Definition

Proven re-offending is defined as any offence committed in a one year follow up period where the offender has received a court conviction, caution, reprimand or warning.

### How this indicator works

The Ministry of Justice’s methodology tracks the proven re-offending rate of the identified offenders over a one year period. Offenders are defined as all offenders the specified three month period who received a caution (for adults), a final warning or reprimand (for juveniles), a non-custodial conviction, or were discharged from custody. A proven re-offence is defined as committing an offence or receiving a court conviction, caution, or reprimand in a one year follow-up period. Following this one year period, a further six months is allowed for cases to progress through the courts.

### What good looks like

We are looking for consistent decreases in this figure over time

### Why this indicator is important

Reducing re-offending is a CSP and MOPAC priority and juvenile reoffending is a Key Performance Indicator for the Youth Offending Service

### Any issues to consider

The methodology for this indicator has changed for all reports produced from October 2017 onwards. The main changes are moving to a three month cohort instead of a 12 month cohort and a change in the data source (nDellus). The new approach creates one consistent measure of proven reoffending and allows users to relate the performance of the CRCs in reducing reoffending with the overall figure for England and Wales. However, users should be cautious when making any comparison with the October to December 2015 cohort and earlier cohorts. It is estimated the impact of changing data source was an increase in the reoffending rate of around 0.5 percentage points. The impact of changing data source for juveniles discharged from Youth Offenders Institutions is marginal.

### 2017/18 Target

[Graph showing year over year reduction]

**Performance Overview**

The latest results of the 2015/16 cohort show an increase in the number of young people being arrested in 2015/16 (269 young offenders) with a higher proportion reoffending compared to the previous 12-month cohort (51.7% vs 45.1% respectively). Barking and Dagenham has a higher proportion of juvenile offenders reoffending when compared to the regional and national averages (51.7% BD, 47.9% London, 41.9% England and Wales). However, the average number of reoffences per reoffender was lower than the previous year which is good (3.28 offences) this is in contrast to the London and National averages which continue to show an increase. Amber rating rather than green to reflect the increase in reoffending (time lag needs to be considered) but overall decrease in average number of reoffences per offender.

**RAG RATING:** Amber

### Actions to Sustain or improve performance

The YOS expect reoffending rates to continue to rise as there have been some groups within the borough that have committed large numbers of offences, particularly vehicle crime.

The YOS are:

- Working with the police to understand this cohort better and jointly work on ways to impact on these groups.
- Undertaking further analysis to ascertain the reasons for the increase reoffending for this cohort.
- Will present a detailed report to the CSP Children and Young People’s sub group in April 2018 for further discussion to address any issues identified.
- Has received support from the Youth Justice Board to utilise the re-offending tracker tool to better the YOS’ understanding of the re-offending cohort.

**LEAD Officer** Angie Fuller, YOS Service Manager
Serious Youth Violence

Source: MetStats2 (From Police systems)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Serious Youth Violence is defined by the MPS as ‘Any offence of most serious violence or weapon enabled crime, where the victim is aged 1-19.’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How this indicator works</td>
<td>Serious Youth Violence is a count of victims of Most Serious Violence aged 1-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What good looks like</td>
<td>We are looking for a decrease in this figure, and would normally compare with the same period in the previous year, as crime is (broadly) seasonal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why this indicator is important</td>
<td>This indicator has been agreed as one of the high volume crime priorities for Barking and Dagenham. This was agreed between the Leader, the Crime and Enforcement Portfolio holder, the Chief Executive of the council, CSP Chair, Borough Commander and the Mayors Office of Policing And Crime (MOPAC) for the 2017/18 period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any issues to consider</td>
<td>Year on Year reduction from 2017/18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2017/18 Target

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current performance: Month totals</th>
<th>Current performance: Qtr totals (FYTD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Serious Youth Violence</strong></td>
<td><strong>Serious Youth Violence</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Performance Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions to Sustain or improve performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Although this measure focuses on those young people who are victims of serious youth violence, the perpetrators of these behaviours are often at greatest risk of becoming a victim of serious youth violence so the actions to address this area focus on both the victim and the perpetrator. £268,000 of the London Crime Prevention Fund has been allocated to the area of keeping children and young people safe (42% of the total funding). Work streams include: 1) High level mentoring support for those identified as high risk of involvement in violence, gang involvement or resettling back into the community after a custodial sentence. 2) Supporting the delivery of Out of Court Disposals work in a bid to work with young people at an earlier stage to avoid entry into the criminal justice system. 3) Counselling and mentoring workshops and performances with targeted groups of young people in schools and other settings on offences with weapons such as knives, noxious substances and CSE. 4) Development of a Youth Matrix to identify the most at risk young people through schools, police, youth service and Youth Offending Service. 5) Full Time Support workers to provide one to one mentoring as part of early intervention identified by the matrix. We are working with schools and voluntary organisations to develop a trauma informed approach which will have a long term impact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RAG STATUS: Green

LEAD DIRECTOR: Jonathan Toy, Operational Director Enforcement Services

Using 2018/19 Financial Year To Date figures at April 2018 (18 victims) Serious Youth Violence is down by 28% (-7 victims) compared to April 2017 (25 victims). In comparison the number of SYV victims across London is down by 14.7%.
### Knife Crime

**Source:** MetStats2 (From Police systems)

| Definition | The number of knife crime offences reported to the police. Knife crime includes threats and attempts, in addition to actual stabbings. When the victim is convinced of the presence of a knife, even if it is concealed, and there is evidence of the suspect's intention to create this impression then incident counts. |
| How this indicator works | As described. A count of knife crime offences. We compare Financial Year to Date Figures up to the latest month reported compared to the same point in the previous year. |
| What good looks like | We are looking for a decrease in this figure, and would normally compare with the same period in the previous year, as crime is (broadly) seasonal |
| Why this indicator is important | Due to the impact of the offence on the victim their family and local community. Both Knife Crime and Gun Crime figures are mandatory high harm crimes for all London boroughs to address as set by the Mayors Office for Policing and Crime. |
| Any issues to consider | Year on Year reduction from 2017/18 |

#### Performance Overview

Using Financial Year To Date figures at April 2018 (24 offences) Barking and Dagenham shows a 33.3% decrease down 12 offences when compared to April 2017 (36). In comparison Knife Crime across London is down 6.4%.

| RAG STATUS: Green | LEAD OFFICER: Jonathan Toy, Operational Director Enforcement Services |

#### Actions to Sustain or improve performance

- **Month totals**
  - April: 24
  - May: 37
  - June: 38
  - July: 58
  - August: 48
  - September: 42
  - October: 29
  - November: 45
  - December: 28
  - January: 24
  - February: 28
  - March: 31

- **Qtr totals (YTD)**
  - Q1: 36
  - Q2: 37
  - Q3: 38
  - Q4: 48

![Knife Crime Graph](chart_url)
**Gun Crime**

Source: MetStats2 (From Police systems)

**Definition**

Gun Crime offences are categorised as such if they satisfy the following criteria:
1) The offence classification is any notifiable offence AND
2) a. A firearm is seen during the offence, or
b. Physical evidence such as bullet, injury or damage is found at the scene that a victim, witness or police officer believes was caused by a firearm or
c. An object is presented as a firearm but obscured e.g. in a bag or pocket, or
d. A firearm is intimated and the victim is convinced of the presence, AND
3) The crime report includes one of the 23 ‘R’ feature codes for barrelled firearms (which includes Lethal hand gun, shot gun, etc to non lethal Air weapon, stun gun, ball bearing gun etc). OR
1) The offence classification is one of ‘Possession of a Firearm with Intent’ AND
2) The crime report includes one of the 23 ‘R’ feature codes for barrelled firearms (which includes Lethal hand gun, shot gun, etc to non lethal Air weapon, stun gun, ball bearing gun etc)

**How this indicator works**

As described. A count of Gun crime offences. We compare Financial Year to Date Figures up to the latest month reported compared to the same point in the previous year.

**What good looks like**

We are looking for a decrease in this figure, and would normally compare with the same period in the previous year, as crime is (broadly) seasonal.

**Why this indicator is important**

Due to the impact of the offence on the victim their family and local community. Both Knife Crime and Gun Crime figures are mandatory high harm crimes for all London boroughs to address as set by the Mayors Office for Policing and Crime.

**Any issues to consider**

The numbers are generally small and will therefore impact on high % changes

**2017/18 Target**

Year on Year reduction from 2017/18

**Performance Overview**

Using 2018/19 Financial Year To Date figures at April 2018 (7 offences) Barking and Dagenham shows a 22.2% decrease (down 2 offences) in the number of gun crime offences reported when compared to April 2017 (9 offences). In comparison the number of gun crime offences across London is down by 10.0%

**Actions to Sustain or improve performance**

The Police are taking the following steps to reduce gun crime:
- Regular weapons sweep at well-known hot spots,
- Engagement from gangs and multi-agency approach to deter youths and habitual knife carriers away from a life of crime by doing home visits and using the gang exit programme and box up crime.
- Targeted warrants (where firearms are seized)
- Priority firearms offenders are circulated on local briefings so all officers are aware of who they are.

**RAG RATING:** Green

**LEAD DIRECTOR:** Jonathan Toy, Operational Director Enforcement Services
Domestic Abuse

Source: MetStats2 (From Police systems)

| Definition | Any incident of threatening behaviour, violence, or abuse (psychological, physical, sexual, financial or emotional) between adults who are or have been intimate partners or family, regardless of gender. |
| How this indicator works | Simple monthly and Year To Date (YTD) count of offences reported. Rate per 1,000 residents is used to compare against other areas. For the rate per 1,000 population we use rolling 12 month figures against the 2011 Census figure for all individuals residing in the borough (187,029). This is consistent with Iquanta. |
| What good looks like | For monitoring. DV is likely to be an under reported crime. An increase in offences could show that more people recognise domestic abuse as a crime and report it rather than the situation getting worse. |
| Why this indicator is important | Due to the impact of the offence on the local community. Domestic Abuse is a mandatory high harm crime for all London boroughs to address as set by the Mayors Office for Policing and Crime. |
| Any issues to consider | Potential under reporting of crimes to the Police. |

2017/18 Target

For monitoring

| Current performance: Month totals | Current performance: Qtr totals (YTD) |
| Barking and Dagenham Domestic Abuse Offences reported to Police |

| Performance Overview | Actions to Sustain or improve performance |
| Using 2018/19 Financial Year To Date figures at April 2018 (209 offences) Barking and Dagenham shows a 2.9% increase up 6 offences reported when compared to April 2017 (203) Barking and Dagenham has the highest rate of Domestic Abuse Offences per 1,000 population in London. In comparison the number of Domestic Abuse Offences reported to police across London is up 3.5%. |
| Barking & Dagenham is the first in London to use the DV Protection notice. When police attend DV call out they can issue the notice to the alleged perpetrator which bans them from attending the premises for 28 days. If breached the individual is arrested and taken to court and there is the possibility of a prison sentence. |

RAG RATING: GREY (MONITORING)

LEAD DIRECTOR: Jonathan Toy, Operational Director Enforcement Services
### Number of repeat referrals to MARAC

**Definition**
- **Numerator**: Number of repeat cases of domestic abuse within the last 12 months referred to the MARAC
- **Denominator**: Number of cases discussed at the MARAC

**Source**
- Safelives data form held by local MARAC Coordinator

**What does good performance look like?**
The target recommended by Safelives is to achieve a repeat referral rate of between 28% to 40%. A lower than expected rate usually indicates that not all repeat victims are being identified and referred to MARAC.

**Why is this indicator important?**
This indicator helps to monitor partner agencies ability to flag repeat high risk cases of domestic abuse and refer them to the MARAC for support.

**How this indicator works**
This indicator looks at the number of repeat cases of domestic abuse that are being referred to the MARAC from partners.

### Monthly data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018/19 (FYTD figure)</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year-to-date target (Lower range)</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year-to-date target (Upper range)</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/18 Accumulative</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17 Accumulative</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Performance overview**
At April 2018 the rate of repeat referrals to MARAC has increased to 43.8% and is now exceeding the recommended levels expected by Safelives (28 to 40%). However, this is only based on one months data. Repeat referral rate is a single indicator and is not fully representative of MARAC performance. MARAC processes vary across areas and therefore benchmarking should be considered with caution for this indicator.

MARAC Chair has raised this internally within Police, and this has been discussed at the VAWG sub group to CSP. A commitment was made in December 2017 that police would refer all cases where there had been 3 non-crime book domestics in 12 months. This has seen an increase in total cases, and we are seeing higher numbers of repeat victims known to police, but this has not led to an increase in repeat cases known to MARAC and therefore has not impacted this indicator. These cases are referred to as escalation cases rather than repeats. There is some concern that although the number of cases has increased, they are not all presenting as high risk. This is being monitored and will be on the agenda at the next VAWG sub group meeting (19th April 2018).

**Actions to sustain or improve performance**

**Benchmarking**
Benchmarking data is currently available for Jan 2017 to December 2017:
- Metropolitan Police Force average: 21%
- National: 28%
- Most Similar Force: 29%

**Responsible Director**
Mark Fowler

---

**Page 40**
**Definition**
All offences of rape, sexual activity involving a child under 13, sexual assault, causing sexual activity without consent, sexual activity with a person with a mental disorder, abuse of children through prostitution, pornography or trafficking.

**How this indicator works**
Only offences reported to the police within the period are counted.

**What good looks like**
For monitoring – an increase in reporting is encouraged.

**Why this indicator is important**
Due to the impact of the offence on the local community. Hate Crime is a mandatory high harm crime for all London boroughs to address as set by the Mayors Office for Policing and Crime.

**Any issues to consider**
Offences could have taken place some weeks, months or even years before being reported to the Police.

### 2017/18 Target

**Performance Overview**

Using Financial Year To Date Figures at April 2018 (43 offences) Barking and Dagenham shows a 34.3% increase up 11 offences when compared to April 2017 (32). In comparison the number of Sexual Abuse offences reported to police across London is up 5.3%.

**RAG RATING:** GREY (MONITORING)

**Actions to Sustain or improve performance**
Increases in sexual offences reported are being attributed to national media coverage of sexual abuse and more victims coming forward to report crimes.

**LEAD DIRECTOR:**
Jonathan Toy, Operational Director Enforcement Services
### Hate Crime

**Definition**
Hate crime covers any notifiable offence that is perceived, by the victim or any other person, as having been motivated (entirely or partially) by a hostility or prejudice to a personal characteristic or perceived personal characteristic, such as ethnicity or religion.

**How this indicator works**
The figures presented here are for hate crimes reported to the police. Hate crimes are any offences which are flagged as having a hate element when recorded by police. Hate Crimes are calculated to have very specific meanings therefore none of the Hate Crime categories should be summed together. Not all definitions are included here but, as an example, Islamophobic Hate Crime is a subset of Racist and Religious Hate Crime, and so the two figures should not be summed. *Racist and Religious Hate Crime includes Race Hate Crime, Anti-semitic Hate Crime, Islamophobic Hate Crime and Faith Hate Crime.*

**What good looks like**
For monitoring – an increase in reporting is encouraged.

**Why this indicator is important**
Due to the impact of the offence on the local community. Hate Crime is a mandatory high harm crime for all London boroughs to address as set by the Mayors Office for Policing and Crime.

**Any issues to consider**
The numbers are generally small and will therefore impact on high % changes

**2017/18 Target**
For monitoring

---

### Hate Crime Figures for Barking and Dagenham

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Recorded Crime Count</th>
<th>Barking and Dagenham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anti Semitic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Hate Crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith Hate Crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islamophobic Hate Crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racist and Religious Hate Crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender Hate Crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Hate Crime Figures for Barking and Dagenham Cont.

---

### Performance Overview

The latest data publicly available is up to March 2018. In Barking and Dagenham when comparing 2017/18 full year figures to 2016/17: Anti Semitic Hate Crime shows no change (1 crime in total), Disability Hate Crime is down 3 reports (-33.3%, 6 crimes in total), Faith Hate Crime is up 106.7% (up 16 for a total of 31 crimes), Islamophobic Hate Crimes are up 115.4% (up 15 crimes to 28 crimes in total), Racist and Religious Hate Crimes are up by 9.4% (up 31 to a total of 360 crimes), Transgender Hate Crimes show no change at 1 offence reported. In comparison to total across London is: Antisemitic -5.0%, Disability -33.3%, Faith up 18.2%, Islamophobic up 31.2%, Racist and Religious down 1.5% and Transgender down 13.0%

**RAG RATING:** GREY (MONITORING)

---

### Actions to Sustain or improve performance

**LEAD DIRECTOR:** Jonathan Toy, Operational Director Enforcement Services
**Burglary**

**Source:** MetStats2 (From Police systems)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>This indicator includes residential burglary and burglary of a business property</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How this indicator works</th>
<th>A count of total burglary offences reported to police (Residential and Business and Community)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What good looks like</th>
<th>We are looking for a decrease in this figure, and would normally compare with the same period in the previous year, as crime is (broadly) seasonal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why this indicator is important</th>
<th>This indicator has been agreed as one of the high volume crime priorities for Barking and Dagenham. This was agreed between the Leader, the Crime and Enforcement Portfolio holder, the Chief Executive of the council, CSP Chair, Borough Commander and the Mayors Office of Policing And Crime (MOPAC) for the 2017/18 period.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Any issues to consider</th>
<th>On 1st April 2017 the Home Office recording rules for burglary change, instead of 'Burglary Dwelling' and 'Burglary in a Building Other Than a Dwelling', the categories will be 'Residential Burglary' and 'Burglary – Business and Community'. The main change relates to sheds and garages: an item stolen from a shed or garage, regardless of whether the shed/garage is attached to the dwelling, should be recorded as 'Residential Burglary'. So, for example, until 31 March 2017, a burglary from a shed which does not adjoin a dwelling will be counted as 'Burglary in a Building Other Than a Dwelling', so not residential. From 1 April 2017, if the burglary happens within the curtilage of the property it will count as 'Residential Burglary', regardless of whether the shed/garage is attached to the dwelling. This means that comparisons of Residential or Business &amp; Community burglary volumes after 1 April 2017 to volumes prior to that date are misleading and should not be reported. Comparisons should only be made for Total Burglary as they are on this one page performance summary.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018/19 Target</th>
<th>Year on Year reduction from 2017/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Performance Overview</strong></th>
<th><strong>Actions to Sustain or improve performance</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**2018/19 FYTD** Figures at April 2018 (111 offences) shows a 16.5% decrease (-22 offences) when compared to April 2017 (133 offences). In comparison total burglary across London is up 5.9%.

As part of Operation Mexico a dedicated police unit was set up on 8th January 2018 made up of 2 Sergeants and 16 Constables, who operate out of Fresh Wharf police station. The unit investigates all crimes of Robbery and Residential Burglary where there has been a forensic identification. In terms of Residential Burglary the unit will investigate: 1. Any linked series, 2. Any artefact offence, 3. Any offence with a named suspect, 4. Any offence with a realistic line of enquiry which could lead to the identification of suspects, 5. Any other offences which the CID DI believes should be investigated by the unit. Proactive work will be undertaken especially on linked series offences to locate and arrest suspects who are currently wanted. This initiative will help reduce the current increase trend and will also improve victim care and positive outcomes. Since inception the Operation Mexico team have made 120 arrests and 180 charges, 67 of which are for residential burglary. Input from community safety partners to develop a robust communication strategy around Residential Burglary from the is being developed.

**RAG STATUS:** Green

**LEAD DIRECTOR:** Jonathan Toy, Operational Director Enforcement Services
### Theft of Motor Vehicle

**Source:** MetStats2 (From Police systems)

| Definition | The number of thefts from a motor vehicle. This includes thefts of removable items both inside and on the outside of the vehicle. Examples include but are not limited to, theft of radios, sat nav’s, handbags / bags, petro / diesel siphoning, exhausts, alloy wheels, theft of number plates and badges from vehicles. |
| How this indicator works | Overall count of Crimes listed in the definition compared to the same point in the previous year. |
| What good looks like | We are looking for a decrease in this figure, and would normally compare with the same period in the previous year, as crime is (broadly) seasonal. In 2018/19 we need to achieve fewer Theft Of Motor Vehicle Offences compared to 2017/18 (1279) |
| Why this indicator is important | Reducing Personal Robbery was an indicator chosen as a priority for 2018/19 by the Community Safety Partnership |
| Any issues to consider | To achieve a reduction on the number of theft of motor vehicle offences in 2018/19 (1279 offences) |

#### 2018/19 Target

To achieve a reduction on the number of theft of motor vehicle offences in 2018/19 (1279 offences)

#### Current performance: Month totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
<th>2018/19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Current performance: Qtr totals (FYTD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
<th>2018/19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Performance Overview

Using Financial Year to Date Figures at April 2018 there has been 103 Theft Of Motor Vehicle Offences up 18% (up 16 offences) on the 87 offences reported in April 2017. Barking and Dagenham has the highest rate of Theft Of Motor Vehicle Offences per 1,000 residents in London.

#### Actions to Sustain or improve performance

The Metropolitan police are working with the industry regarding vehicle design. Intelligence and Analytics officer reviewing evidence base and what is working well in other areas.

#### RAG Status: RED

**LEAD DIRECTOR:** Jonathan Toy, Operational Director Enforcement Services
**Non Domestic Abuse Violence With Injury**

*Source: MetStats2 (From Police systems)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Violence with Injury includes the following offences: Attempted murder, intentional destruction of a viable unborn child, causing death or serious injury by dangerous driving, causing death by careless driving under the influence of drink or drugs, cause or allow death or serious physical harm to child or vulnerable person, causing death by careless or inconsiderate driving, causing death by driving; unlicensed, disqualified or uninsured drivers, assault with intent to cause serious harm, endangering life, assault with Injury, Racially or religiously aggravated assault with injury, causing death by aggravated vehicle taking. Non Domestic Violence Within Injury is all of the above which have not been flagged as a Domestic Incident.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How this indicator works</td>
<td>Overall count of Crimes listed in the definition compared to the same point in the previous year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What good looks like</td>
<td>We are looking for a decrease in this figure, and would normally compare with the same period in the previous year, as crime is (broadly) seasonal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why this indicator is important</td>
<td>This indicator has been agreed as one of the high volume crime priorities for Barking and Dagenham. This was agreed between the Leader, the Crime and Enforcement Portfolio holder, the Chief Executive of the council, CSP Chair, Borough Commander and the Mayors Office of Policing And Crime (MOPAC) for the 2017/18 period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any issues to consider</td>
<td>In April 2014 changes were made to the way in which violence was recorded and classified (see new Home Office Counting Rules Guidance). HMIC inspections of police data in 2013-14 also raised concerns about a notable proportion of crime reports not being recorded, particularly during domestic abuse inspections. Implementation of the new recording and classification guidance and training to improve crime recording mechanisms around violence and domestic abuse have led to a rapid upward trajectory in Violence with Injury.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2018/19 Target**

| Year on Year reduction from 2017/18 |
|---|---|
| Current performance: Month totals | Current performance: Qtr totals (FYTD) |
| ![Graph](image) Non Domestic Abuse Violence With Injury | ![Graph](image) Non Domestic Abuse Violence With Injury |
| April | May | June | July | August | September | October | November | December | January | February | March |
| 98 | 122 | 117 | 106 | 113 | 130 | 117 | 101 | 142 | 96 | 94 | 130 |

**Performance Overview**

Using 2018/19 Financial Year To Date figures at April 2018 (98 offences) shows that Non Domestic Abuse Violence With Injury is up by 3.2% (+3 offences) compared to April 2017 (95 offences). Therefore AMBER RATING. In comparison Non DA VWI across London is down 10.5%. As this is the first month in a new Financial Year being reported on % changes will be influenced by small numbers. It is worth noting that we had 1333 offences at the end of 2017/18 and therefore achieved the MOPAC target to reduce offences to levels below the 2016/17 baseline (1366 offences). Using Rolling 12 month figures to April 2018 (1336) shows that we are still under the 2016/17 baseline figure by -2.1%

**Actions to Sustain or improve performance**

Actions in this area include: Test Purchasing, Commissioning ARC Theatre, Knife Crime Programme in 2018/19, developing a long term trauma informed model. Focus on reduction Non DA VWI is concentrated on the two Town centres in the borough. The partnership needs to provide a visible presence in these areas.

**RAG STATUS: AMBER**

**LEAD Director:** Jonathan Toy, Operational Director Enforcement Services
Personal Robbery
Source: MetStats2 (From Police systems)

Definition
Personal Robbery is the use of threat or force in a theft from a person.

How this indicator works
Overall count of Crimes listed in the definition compared to the same point in the previous year.

What good looks like
We are looking for a decrease in this figure, and would normally compare with the same period in the previous year, as crime is (broadly) seasonal. In 2018/19 we need to achieve fewer Personal Robbery Offences compared to 2017/18 (907)

Why this indicator is important
Reducing Personal Robbery was an indicator chosen as a priority for 2018/19 by the Community Safety Partnership

Any issues to consider
Personal Robbery will not include crimes such as theft from a person e.g. bag dipping. There has to be that threat of violence present.

2018/19 Target
Reduction on 2017/18 baseline

Performance Overview

Financial Year To Date at April 2018 there were 39 Personal Robbery Offences reported. This is down 38% (-28 offences) on the 63 reported in April 2017. This is a good start to achieve the reduction target set. The target for 2018/19 is to have fewer personal robbery offences compared to 2017/18 (907)

RAG Status: Green

Actions to Sustain or improve performance
As part of Operation Mexico a dedicated police unit was set up on 8th January 2018 made up of 2 Sergeants and 16 Constables, who operate out of Fresh Wharf police station. The unit investigates all crimes of Robbery and Residential Burglary where there has been a forensic identification. In terms of Residential Burglary the unit will investigate: 1. Any linked series, 2. Any artifice offence, 3. Any offence with a named suspect, 4. Any offence with a realistic line of enquiry which could lead to the identification of suspects, 5. Any other offences which the CID DI believes should be investigated by the unit. Proactive work will be undertaken especially on linked series offences to locate and arrest suspects who are currently wanted. This initiative will help reduce the current increase trend and will also improve victim care and positive outcomes.

LEAD DIRECTOR: Jonathan Toy, Operational Director Enforcement Services
Anti Social Behaviour Reported to the Police

Source: MetStats2 (From Police systems)

| Definition | Anti-social behaviour includes Abandoned Vehicles, Vehicle Nuisance, Rowdy/Inconsiderate Behaviour, Rowdy/Nuisance Neighbours, Malicious/Nuisance Communications, Street Drinking, Prostitution Related Behaviour, Noise, Begging. |
| How this indicator works | As defined, it is a count of all calls reported to the police. |
| What good looks like | Ideally we would see a year on year reduction in ASB calls reported to the Police. |
| Why this indicator is important | This indicator has been agreed as one of the high volume crime priorities for Barking and Dagenham. This was agreed between the Leader, the Crime and Enforcement Portfolio holder, the Chief Executive of the council, CSP Chair, Borough Commander and the Mayors Office of Policing And Crime (MOPAC) for the 2017/18 period. |
| Any issues to consider | Year on Year reduction from 2017/18 |
| 2018/19 Target | Performance Overview | Actions to Sustain or improve performance |
| Current performance: Month totals | | Using YTD Figures at April 2018 (454 calls) ASB calls to the police are down 16.0% (down 87 calls) on the 541 calls reported in April 2017. In comparison ASB Calls to the Police across London are down 9.2%. |
| Current performance: Qtr totals (FYTD) | | Actions within this area include:• Issued over 1,320 fines for enviro-crime including more than 335 fines for littering, • Wall of shame officially launched, • Dealt with 1,600 reports of eyesore gardens,• 28 prosecutions of rogue landlords. The Community Safety Partnership will need to review how we sustain this level of work. |

RAG STATUS: Green

LEAD DIRECTOR: Jonathan Toy, Operational Director Enforcement Services
**Arson Incidents**  
**Source: Local Fire Service**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>The malicious burning of a dwelling or other.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>How this indicator works</strong></td>
<td>To achieve fewer Arson incidents that the monthly target specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What good looks like</strong></td>
<td>Simple monthly and year to date count of incidents reported to the London Fire service for Barking and Dagenham.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Why this indicator is important</strong></td>
<td>All Community Safety partners can have an influence on reducing the number of Arson incidents in Barking and Dagenham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any issues to consider</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2017/18 Target</strong></td>
<td>No more than 169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2017/18 were 163 arson incidents reported to the fire service down from 199 at the same point in the previous year. We were below the target set for the number of arson incidents reported to the Fire Service. This has continued into 2017/18 with 8 arson incidents reported to the fire service and below the level expected and therefore the indicator has been marked as GREEN (Good Performance). A full breakdown of indicators for the fire service is attached in Appendix 1.

LFB have been working with blue light and local authority partners through the Community Safety Partnership to reduce arson within the Borough and we have seen a significant reduction in rubbish fires and arson as a result. This clearly shows the value of effective joint working.

**RAG Status:** GREEN

**LEAD Director:** Jonathan Toy, Operational Director Enforcement Services
Proven re-offending is defined as any offence committed in a one year follow up period where the offender has received a court conviction, caution, reprimand or warning.

The Ministry of Justice’s methodology tracks the proven re-offending rate of the identified offenders over a one year period. Offenders are defined as all offenders the specified three month period who received a caution (for adults), a final warning or reprimand (for juveniles), a non-custodial conviction, or were discharged from custody. A proven re-offense is defined as committing an offence or receiving a court conviction, caution, or reprimand in a one year follow-up period. Following this one year period, a further six months is allowed for cases to progress through the courts.

We are looking for consistent decreases in this figure over time. Reducing re-offending is a CSP and MOPAC priority.

The methodology for this indicator has changed for all reports produced from October 2017 onwards. The main changes are moving to a three month cohort instead of a 12 month cohort and a change in the data source (nDelius). The new approach creates one consistent measure of proven reoffending and allows users to relate the performance of the CRCs in reducing reoffending with the overall figure for England and Wales. However, users should be cautious when making any comparison with the October to December 2015 cohort and earlier cohorts. It is estimated the impact of changing data source is an increase in the reoffending rate of around 0.5 percentage points. The impact of changing data source for juveniles discharged from Youth Offenders Institutions is marginal.

The 18-25 year old cohort is an area of focus for reoffending. Discussions are therefore not comparable to previous years - see "Any issues to consider" above.

The latest full year that can be reported is the cohort of offenders indentified between Jul 2015 to Jun 2016 (released 26 Apr 2018): 2923 adult and juvenile offenders from Barking and Dagenham were cautioned, received a non-custodial conviction at court or released from custody. 855 of these offenders committed a proven re-offence within a year. This gives an overall proven reoffending rate of 29.3%, in line with both the London and England and Wales averages of 29.1% and 29.5% respectively. 2,694 proven reoffences were committed over the one year follow-up period by the Barking and Dagenham cohort, with those that reoffended committing, on average, 3.15 reoffences each. This is slightly below the E&W average of 3.46 and London average of 3.84 which is good.

The 18-25 year old cohort is an area of focus for reoffending. Discussions are therefore not comparable to previous years - see "Any issues to consider" above.

The 18-25 year old cohort is an area of focus for reoffending. Discussions are therefore not comparable to previous years - see "Any issues to consider" above.

The 18-25 year old cohort is an area of focus for reoffending. Discussions are therefore not comparable to previous years - see "Any issues to consider" above.

The 18-25 year old cohort is an area of focus for reoffending. Discussions are therefore not comparable to previous years - see "Any issues to consider" above.

The 18-25 year old cohort is an area of focus for reoffending. Discussions are therefore not comparable to previous years - see "Any issues to consider" above.

The 18-25 year old cohort is an area of focus for reoffending. Discussions are therefore not comparable to previous years - see "Any issues to consider" above.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOROUGH TARGETS: BARKING &amp; DAGENHAM</th>
<th>Total / Target</th>
<th>2017/18 Total</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling fires 6</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary fires - (all motives)</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling fires with accidental motive</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling fires with unknown motive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling fires with deliberate motive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-domestic building primary fires</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(RRO Yes)(all motives).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care Home fires</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shut in lift relases</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFA in non-domestic buildings</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Rubbish fires (all motives)</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson incidents (all deliberate fires)</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson in rubbish - deliberate and unknown</td>
<td>2,367</td>
<td>2,409</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFSV by LFB staff - volume</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>193</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1 HFSVs - high risk people/places (%)</td>
<td>2,383</td>
<td>2,389</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson in open land/ outdoor secondary fires (excl rubbish) with deliberate or unknown motive</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All fires</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary fires</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary fires</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fires in care homes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fires in sheltered housing</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP

REPORT

Subject: Public Spaces Protection Order- Heathway

Date: Wednesday 04 July 2018

Author: Penny Pyke, ASB Manager

Contact: 02082275292, penny.pyke@lbld.gov.uk

1. Purpose of Presenting the Report and Decisions Required

1.1 The Heathway is the second largest shopping area in the Borough and this area is the subject of complaints relating to ‘antisocial behaviour’. The behaviour complained about includes street drinking, begging, spitting and urination and intimidating behaviour.

1.2 Public Spaces Protection Orders are made under the Antisocial Behaviour Crime and Policing Act 2014 and can prohibit a wide range of behaviours.

1.3 It is proposed that the Council implements a Public Spaces Protection Order. This would provide the police and Council Civil Enforcement Officers with a wider range of powers to deal with the issues reported more robustly and is part of a wider plan to make the Heathway a more welcoming place to live and visit.

2. Recommendation(s)

2.1 It is recommended that the Community Safety Partnership Board:

- Consider the proposal regarding the implementation of a Public Spaces Protection Order to tackle specific types of antisocial behaviour in Heathway.

- Consider the geographical area of the proposed order, considering the consultation responses and the views of Members.

- Make comments to the relevant Director to assist them in deciding whether to grant this Order.
3. **Public Spaces Protection Orders- The Legislation**

3.1 The Antisocial Behaviour Crime and Policing Act 2014 set out several fundamental changes to the legislation related to antisocial behaviour.

3.2 In summary, the act aimed to simplify the legislation related to addressing antisocial behaviour, since the introduction of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, by reducing the numbers of powers to just six:

- Civil Injunctions
- Criminal Behaviour Orders
- Community Protection Notices
- Closure Orders
- Public Space Protection Orders
- Dispersal Powers

3.3 A local authority can make a Public Spaces Protection Order if it is satisfied that two conditions are met:

- First condition – Activities carried out on a public place within the local authority’s area have had a detrimental effect on the quality of life of those in the locality, or it is likely that activities will be carried on in a public place within that area and they will have such an effect.

- Second condition – That the effect of the specified activities is or is likely to be of a persistent or continuing nature, is or is likely to be unreasonable and justifies the restrictions imposed by the notice.

3.4 The order identifies the area that the restriction applies and prohibits specific things from being done, and/or requires specific things to be done by persons carrying out specified acts in that area. For example, a Public Space Protection order can include such activities as:

- Drinking alcohol in a specified public place
- Control of dogs in a specified public place
- Playing loud music in a specified public place
- Parking inconsiderately near a school
- Persistent disturbance from motor vehicles driving inconsiderately to the detriment of local people

3.5 The breach of the order is an offence, discharged by the local authority through a fine. These will be issued through the Council’s Enforcement Service and can also be issued by Police and Police Community Support Officers.

3.6 The order is for a period of no more than 3 years. However, there is provision to extend the order, both in terms of the time and the area that it covers.

3.7 Local Authorities across England and Wales have been introducing Public Spaces Protection Orders. One of the key challenges has come from human rights campaigners who argue that these types of controls impacts disproportionately on protected rights. These include Article 8, the right to a private and family life, Article 10 the right to freedom of expression and Article 11 the Freedom of assembly and association.
4. **A Council Wide Framework**

4.1 Barking and Dagenham is seeing significant changes socially, economically, and demographically. These changes both increase opportunity for our current and future residents and business, but also increase behaviour that can have a detrimental effect on the quality of live in our town centres and residential areas.

4.2 Public Space Protection Orders provide a valuable tool by placing a framework in an area which controls behaviour which has been evidenced as a significant nuisance to local people. As such, Public Space Protection Orders are a key part of our enforcement activity, as set out in our Enforcement Policy. They support our aim to change behaviour, increase civic pride, alongside an ability to deal with matters quickly.

4.3 Public Spaces Protection Orders are a useful tool that provide the Council with the ability to control activities that cause persistent antisocial behaviour to local communities.

4.4 Several council departments have been looking at the possibility of introducing these orders for a range of different issues, across different areas of the borough.

4.5 A formalised council approach for the introduction of Public Spaces Protection Orders was agreed by Cabinet on the 15 November 2016.

4.6 To ensure that Barking and Dagenham has a robust and responsive process that minimises delay, the following principles in relation to the Introduction of a Public Spaces Protection Order were agreed:

- **Principle 1** – for an application for a Public Spaces Protection Order, there needs to be a clear evidence base that the nuisance is a persistent nuisance in the defined area. Evidence will need to be gathered through statistical data and/or resident’s survey feedback to demonstrate this.

- **Principle 2** – There needs to be a period of consultation of no less than one month prior to the creation of an Order. Consultation must include council and partnership services as well as specific interested bodies and ward councillors. This will take place through a range of communication sources, including the council’s Community and Voluntary Sector portal, Safer Neighbourhood Ward Panels and Public Notices.

- **Principle 3** – The Public Spaces Protection Order must be supported by the Police. In addition, the Public Spaces Protection Order must be endorsed by the LBBD Community Safety Partnership (CSP) Board. The membership includes the relevant Cabinet Member and senior representatives from the 6 co-operating authorities: The Local Authority, Police Service, NHS, National Probation Service, Fire Authority and Transport for London. The CSP Board meetings are open to the public,
enabling public participation. The CSP Board would also be responsible for review applications.

- Principle 4 – The final report seeking formal adoption of a Public Spaces Protection Order must be signed off by the relevant Strategic Director and the Director of Law and Governance, or their authorised nominees. That final report must include consideration of the Human Rights convention in adoption and be accompanied by an Equality Impact Assessment.

- Principle 5 – Once adopted there must be signage around the area defined by the Public Spaces Protection Order, clearly identifying the order and the relevant restrictions.

5. The Evidence for a Public Spaces Protection Order in the Heathway

5.1 The area effected by antisocial behaviour is shown on the map marked as appendix 1. This area is a ‘public place’ as defined by the Act. It is an area to which the public have access, although the area includes shop forecourts which are owned by individuals as well as alleyways and other private land.

5.2 Analysis of ‘antisocial behaviour’ complaints in this area shows complaints are about street drinking, begging, spitting and urination and noise by groups. There are also complaints about drug use and supply, littering and criminal acts (like robbery). Criminal matters like drug use and supply are not appropriate to deal with by way of a PSPO as they are criminal offences and should be dealt with as such. Civil enforcement officers have substantial powers to deal with issues of littering and fly-tipping and therefore it is not suggested that these issues are included in the proposed PSPO.

5.3 Consultation with residents who live in the area and the public more widely was undertaken between 26 February 2018 and 8 April 2018. 3007 homes and businesses were written to directing them to the consultation as well as promotion of the consultation through social media. 338 people responded to the consultation which is 11% of the homes and businesses written to.

5.4 In summary there were 338 responses to the consultation with 317 respondents (93.79%) agreeing with the proposal to put in place a Public Spaces Protection Order. In terms of the issues which the public felt should be covered by the PSPO:

- 88.31% (559 people) felt drinking alcohol in public places should be prohibited
- 49.61% (314 people) felt urination in the street should be prohibited
- 86.10% (549 people) felt spitting in the street should be prohibited
- 87.20% (552 people) felt that begging should be prohibited
- 86.73% (549 people) felt littering should be prohibited
- 61.14% (387 people) felt intimidation from groups and individuals was an issue in the area.

5.5 94 people also reported other issues, not covered by the above. These issues were:
• Violence
• Drugs
• Issues connected to mopeds and other vehicles
• Theft
• Misogyny/sexual harassment
• Cycling on footpath
• Massage stickers and cards on street furniture

It is not appropriate to include criminal matters or those covered by existing civil enforcement powers in a PSPO. The only issues which are not covered by existing legislation are misogyny/sexual harassment and cycling on a footpath.

5.6 Misogyny/sexual harassment was an issue raised by 2 respondents. This behaviour would be covered by a prohibition around behaviour which causes or is likely to cause harassment, alarm or distress which is already proposed.

5.7 Cycling on a footpath was raised by 1 respondent. There are proposals for a cycle lane in this area and it is accepted that some people are cycling on the footpath in some parts of the Heathway currently due to safety. It is therefore not proposed that this issue is included as there are changes to the environment which may reduce this issue.

6. Proposal and Issues

6.1 The issues being proposed as being covered by the proposed Public Spaces Protection Order are:
   • Consuming alcohol in the street
   • Spitting
   • Begging
   • Intimidating and threatening behaviour

6.2 It is not proposed that littering should be included as there are substantial civil enforcement powers already in place to address this issue.

6.3 It is not proposed that urination is included in the order as less than half of respondents felt this was an issue in the area.

6.4 The Community Safety Partnership are asked to consider the geographical area of the proposed area. The Police asked for Chequers Parade to be included in this order as there were some complaints about people drinking alcohol in the street in this area. The CSP are asked to consider:
   • There have not been consistent complaints in this area to the Council and those to the Police are historic
   • Inclusion of this area makes the total area of the proposed order very large and necessitates the inclusion of several roads where there are no complaints of antisocial behaviour
   • The inclusion of these areas may dilute the enforcement of the order and detract from the key area were complaints are being made which is the shopping area of the Heathway
Ward Members considered these issues and were in agreement that they wanted the area of the proposed PSPO to remain as the full area as shown in the map at appendix 1.

7. **Options Appraisal**

7.1 Other work to tackle the issues of antisocial behaviour have been taken. This work includes:

- Identification of those causing issues and these individuals the subject of specific action involving both support and enforcement
- Environmental measures including making changes to improve the general appearance of the area, cleaning and removing the evidence of antisocial behaviour
- Work with retailers
- Licensing visits and action against licensed premises

7.2 While the police and the Council can continue to use existing powers to deal with the issues being reported, the implementation of a Public Spaces Protection Order would allow the setting of a standard of behaviours for everyone in the area. It would also provide more robust powers for dealing with the consumption of alcohol (a fine rather than just seizure) as well as providing a mechanism for dealing with spitting and begging.

7.3 The public have an expectation that the Council and the police will use all the powers available to them to respond to concerns.

8. **Consultation**

8.1 Public consultation was undertaken via the Council's consultation portal. As explained in 3.3-3.5 this consultation shows public support for a PSPO. A full breakdown of the consultation responses can be found at appendix 1.

8.2 Meetings with Ward Members for all the impacted wards have been held prior to the public consultation and following this to review the results of the consultation.

8.3 Ward Members felt very strongly that a Public Spaces Protection Order was necessary to tackle the issues of antisocial behaviour on the Heathway. Members were concerned that visible enforcement was necessary for any order to be effective.

8.4 Discussion took place with Members regarding the geographical area of the proposed order, as discussed in 4.3. Members expressed a wish to include the whole area as shown in the map in appendix 1.

9. **Financial Issues**

9.1 The making of a Public Spaces Protection Order in this area would require the Council to erect signage to publicise the order. This work would have a cost less than £4,000.
10. Legal Issues

10.1 Details of the legislation under which Public Spaces Protection Orders are made are found in Section 1 of this report and the governance framework that the Council has adopted is found in Section 2.

11. Other Issues

Risk Management

11.1 The proposed Public Spaces Protection Order is to provide greater powers to deal with antisocial vehicle use and therefore limit this activity and the associated risks. The making of the order carries the risk of an individual or group taking the Council to judicial review, however this risk has been mitigated by the consultation on this proposal.

11.2 The risk of not putting in place a Public Spaces Protection Order to deal with this issue is that the activity continues, with the associated risks to public safety, of public nuisance and a loss of confidence from the community that we effectively deal with antisocial behaviour.

Contractual Issues

11.3 No contractual issues.

Staffing Issues

11.4 No staffing issues.

Corporate Policy and Customer Impact

11.5 The Council has a clear vision of ‘One borough; one community; London’s growth opportunity’. Dealing effectively with antisocial behaviour is important part of creating a cohesive community. Therefore, the proposal of providing greater powers to deal with antisocial fits with the Council’s vision and expectations of our communities.

Safeguarding Children

11.6 Safeguarding children is a priority throughout work to tackle crime and antisocial behaviour and has been considered throughout these proposals. Antisocial vehicle use is predominately an activity which is engaged in by adults although children and young people are attracted to this which carries significant risks. Therefore, the proposals to provide additional powers to deal with this behaviour and keep roads safe is one which would positively impact on our safeguarding duties in respect of children.

Health Issues

11.7 The antisocial behaviour is reported by complainants to have a negative impact on them in terms of their health and wellbeing. This would be positively impacted on by the proposals.

Crime and Disorder Issues

11.8 The Community Safety Partnership (CSP) is the local partnership Board with responsibility for addressing crime and disorder issues in the borough and its
comments are considered by the officer/s with delegated authority to make Public Spaces Protection Orders.

11.9 The wider crime and disorder issues in relation to this issue are contained in the body of this report.

**Property / Asset Issues**

11.10 No property/asset issues

12. **List of appendices:**

- Appendix 1- Map of area
- Appendix 2- Consultation report
- Appendix 3- Draft PSPO
This page is intentionally left blank
## Report Settings Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Heathway PSPO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Respondents</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Custom selection (see Table Of Contents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filter</td>
<td>(none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pivot</td>
<td>(none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Created on</td>
<td>2018-04-12 08:09:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Created by</td>
<td>Nick Saunders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contents</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent Info</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you other</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience of Heathway</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues in Heathway area</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Behaviours</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Scale</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support PSPO</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibited</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other suggested PSPO behaviours</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Comments</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Respondent Info

**Are you:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% Total</th>
<th>% Answer</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A resident of the area (see map)?</td>
<td>51.89%</td>
<td>52.31%</td>
<td>60.82%</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A resident of the borough?</td>
<td>33.02%</td>
<td>33.29%</td>
<td>38.70%</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner or works for a business in the area?</td>
<td>1.35%</td>
<td>1.36%</td>
<td>1.58%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A member of the public who uses businesses / visits this area?</td>
<td>11.46%</td>
<td>11.55%</td>
<td>13.43%</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.48%</td>
<td>1.49%</td>
<td>1.74%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[No Response]</td>
<td>0.81%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.95%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>742</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question responses: **627 (99.05%)**
Are you other

Please state

Question responses: 10 (1.58%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% Total</th>
<th>% Answer</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Responses]</td>
<td>1.58%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[No Response]</td>
<td>98.42%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>633</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Experience of Heathway

What is your experience of the Heathway shops and surrounding area as a place to live, visit or work in?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience Level</th>
<th>% Total</th>
<th>% Answer</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very positive</td>
<td>1.42%</td>
<td>1.43%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>5.21%</td>
<td>5.25%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral / neither positive or negative</td>
<td>18.17%</td>
<td>18.28%</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>38.55%</td>
<td>38.79%</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very negative</td>
<td>36.02%</td>
<td>36.25%</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[No Response]</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>633</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question responses: **629 (99.37%)**
Issues in Heathway area

Have you witnessed any of the following behaviour in the area? (Please select all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviour</th>
<th>% Total</th>
<th>% Answer</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drinking alcohol in the street</td>
<td>18.59%</td>
<td>18.63%</td>
<td>88.31%</td>
<td>559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urinating in public</td>
<td>10.44%</td>
<td>10.46%</td>
<td>49.61%</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spitting</td>
<td>18.12%</td>
<td>18.16%</td>
<td>86.10%</td>
<td>545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littering</td>
<td>18.26%</td>
<td>18.29%</td>
<td>86.73%</td>
<td>549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimidation from groups</td>
<td>12.87%</td>
<td>12.90%</td>
<td>61.14%</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begging</td>
<td>18.36%</td>
<td>18.39%</td>
<td>87.20%</td>
<td>552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.16%</td>
<td>3.17%</td>
<td>15.01%</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[No Response]</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.95%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3,007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other Behaviours

Please give details of behaviour not listed above

Question responses: 94 (14.85%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% Total</th>
<th>% Answer</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Responses]</td>
<td>14.85%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[No Response]</td>
<td>85.15%</td>
<td></td>
<td>539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>633</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If you have witnessed any of this behaviour, what impact has it had on your enjoyment of the area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>% Total</th>
<th>% Answer</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - no impact</td>
<td>1.42%</td>
<td>1.44%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - very little impact</td>
<td>2.21%</td>
<td>2.24%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - some impact</td>
<td>15.80%</td>
<td>15.97%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - significant impact</td>
<td>41.39%</td>
<td>41.85%</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - extreme impact</td>
<td>38.07%</td>
<td>38.50%</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[No Response]</td>
<td>1.11%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>633</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Support PSPO

Would you support a Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO) in the Heathway area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% Total</th>
<th>% Answer</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>96.21%</td>
<td>97.13%</td>
<td>609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.84%</td>
<td>2.87%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[No Response]</td>
<td>0.95%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 100.00% 100.00% 633
What specific behaviours do you think that this order should prohibit (Please tick all that apply)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviour</th>
<th>% Total</th>
<th>% Answer</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drinking alcohol in street</td>
<td>23.96%</td>
<td>24.32%</td>
<td>88.94%</td>
<td>563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urinating</td>
<td>22.21%</td>
<td>22.55%</td>
<td>82.46%</td>
<td>522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spitting</td>
<td>23.15%</td>
<td>23.50%</td>
<td>85.94%</td>
<td>544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begging</td>
<td>22.51%</td>
<td>22.85%</td>
<td>83.57%</td>
<td>529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6.68%</td>
<td>6.78%</td>
<td>24.80%</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[No Response]</td>
<td>1.49%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5.53%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 100.00%  100.00%  0%  2,350
Other suggested PSPO behaviours

Please give details of specific behaviours not listed that you think this order should prohibit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% Total</th>
<th>% Answer</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Responses]</td>
<td>23.06%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[No Response]</td>
<td>76.94%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>633</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question responses: **146 (23.06%)**
### Other Comments

**Any other comments?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% Total</th>
<th>% Answer</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Responses]</td>
<td>36.81%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[No Response]</td>
<td>63.19%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>633</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question responses: **233 (36.81%)**
Barking and Dagenham Council (herein “the Council”) makes this Order under section 59 of the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 (“the 2014 Act”), having consulted as required by section 72.

The order takes effect on **xx 2018** and has a duration of 36 months.

It applies to the public place: As marked in red on the attached map. This will be known as “The Restricted Area”.

The Council is satisfied that activities have been carried out in this Restricted Area which have had a detrimental effect on the quality of life of those in the locality. Further, it is satisfied that the effect of these activities is or is likely to be of a persistent or continuing nature and is or is likely to be such as to make the activities unreasonable and the effect justifies the restrictions imposed.

The activities carried out are as follows:

1. Consumption of alcohol in a public place
2. Spitting
3. Begging
4. Groups engaging in behaviour which causes residents and other users of the area nuisance, annoyance, harassment, alarm or distress.

The Council therefore under section 59 (4) prohibits:

1. The consumption of alcohol or being in possession of an open container of alcohol in any public place other than a place licensed for the sale and consumption of alcohol.
2. Spitting saliva or any other product from the mouth onto the ground without making any attempt to collect the saliva or product.
3. No person shall beg or seek money or alms within the restricted area
4. Acting in a manner which causes or is likely to cause harassment, alarm or distress to any other person.

Failure without reasonable excuse, to comply with the prohibitions or requirements imposed by this Order is a summary offence under section 67 of the 2014 Act. A person guilty of an offence under section 67 is liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding level 3 on the standard scale.

A constable or an authorised person may under section 68 of the 2014 Act issue a fixed penalty notice to anyone he or she has reason to believe has committed an offence under section 67 in relation to this Order.
Signed

Dated

By authority of Barking and Dagenham Council under section 101 of the Local Government Act 1972

Town Hall, 1 Town Square, IG11 7LU
1. Purpose of Presenting the Report and Decisions Required

1.1 Every three years the Community Safety Partnership (CSP) Board are required to refresh the Community Safety Plan in line with the Crime and Disorder Strategic Assessment. The annual Crime and Disorder Strategic Assessment should inform the plan and set out the activities to address the strategic priorities and improving community safety.

1.2 The purpose of the plan is to outline the aims of the Community Safety Partnership at a strategic level. In addition, the plan outlines the current shape of the borough, what the strategic assessment tells us, what our communities tell us and the priorities groups to help deliver the aims.

1.3 The DRAFT plan will be circulated to members prior to the meeting and tabled for comment with the view to come back in September to finalise.

1.4 The plan once signed off by the Partnership will be published into the public domain. The plan will keep the residents informed on the progress of the Community Safety Partnership, the aims and priorities which will be a focus point for addressing the Crime and Disorder agenda.

2. Recommendation(s)

2.1 Members are recommended to discuss the plan and agree it’s principles and consider work which could be done to meet the priorities.

2.2 The Community Safety Partnership Board is recommended to approve the content of the DRAFT Community Safety Plan.

2.3 Consider if there are recommendations for further work which arise from this.
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COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP

REPORT

Subject: Quality and Impact inspection: The effectiveness of probation work by the London Community Rehabilitation Company

Date: Wednesday 04 July 2018

Author: Steve Calder, London CRC, Contracts and Partnership Manager

Contact: Steven.calder@londoncrc.org.uk, 07464648130

Security: [RESTRICTED]

1. Purpose of Presenting the Report and Decisions Required

1.1 A PowerPoint presentation will be presented at the board by Steven Calder, Contractions and Partnerships Manager for London CRC. The presentation will give an overview to the partnership of the current CRC structure and scope of control. To provide the partnership with an update following the recent HMIP Inspection of London CRC and the progress against the recommended actions.

2. Recommendation(s)

2.1 It is recommended that the Community Safety Partnership Board:

- Note the content of the report and disseminate any relevant information to appropriate staff members in their organisations.

3. List of Appendices:

Appendix 1: Power Point Presentation
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Barking and Dagenham CSP – May 2018

Steve Calder
Contracts and Partnership Manager - North East
Who are we?

- **London CRC at a glance**

  We are part of the British Criminal Justice Service, working with:

  - London Metropolitan Police
  - Courts
  - 32 London Local Authorities
  - Prisons across England, Scotland and Wales
  - National Probation Service.

  - We supervise low to medium risk offenders serving Community Orders, Suspended Sentence Orders, and also those in prison, or released on licence to serve the remainder of their sentence in the community.

  - High risk offenders are managed by the National Probation Service. When cases are deemed to be increasing to high risk, London CRC will risk escalate these cases to the NPS.
We work with

30,000 Cases

20,000 In the community

5,000 In custody

4,000 Women (12% of caseload)

8,000 Stand Alone CP

2,400 Accredited Programmes delivered
Our Operational Model

The core principle of the operational structure is to ensure we are getting the basics right.

- Area Managers supported by key roles
- Strengthened local links
- Borough-based offender managers
- Designed to ensure clear lines of accountability and improved service delivery.
Area Structure

Area Managers oversee five to eight boroughs, supported by:

- Interventions Manager
- Quality and Performance Manager
- Contract and Partnerships Manager
- Community Team Senior Probation Officers

Area Manager

Supported by 4 key roles

- Interventions Manager
  - Manage, maintain and build relationships and services e.g. Substance misuse, Housing, ETE, Mental Health

- Quality and Performance Manager
  - Assist Area Manager and SPOs to manage Quality and Performance

- Contract and Partnerships Manager
  - Manage and maintain relationships with key partners and stakeholders: MARAC, Prevent, Safeguarding, IOM, GTO

- Community Team SPOs
  - Span of control 8-12 OMs
  - Caseload average 55
  - 1 line of accountability

Reducing reoffending and improving lives
Our Focus

For London CRC, last year was about identifying the legacy issues hindering progress, and developing a radical shift in business, cultural and professional practice.

It has taken some time, but 2017 has been a year in which we focus successfully embedding probation practices that have been designed to improve outcomes.

Now, as we begin to embed quality, we are moving towards our reducing reoffending agenda.

- New senior management team
- Accountability structure
- Enforcement briefings
- Performance Training
- Unmanaged cases auditing
- OM Recruitment

- Training for new PSOs
- Custody Team implementation
- Strengthened relationships with key partners

- Interventions strategy
- Estates strategy
- New MI system
- Omnia – new app for managing cases and interventions
HMIP 2017 Quality and Impact Inspection

Recommendations and London CRC’s Action Plan
Recommendation one

Ensure, in all cases, that responsible officers identify the risk of harm posed by individuals and deliver plans of work that protect the public sufficiently.

Action plan:

• Sentence Plan quality audits
  – SPOs responsible for monitoring their OMs and implementing improvement plans where necessary; process monitored by Area Managers
  – Monthly case delivery audits carried out by Quality and Performance Team
  – Quarterly case management audits focus on assessment, enforcement and safeguarding.

• Omnia
  – Improved risk and needs functionality will drive improvements in risk assessment
  – Modular, service user centric action planning will drive improvements in risk management.

• REACTA
  – New safeguarding training and process for all OMs, underpinned by quality assurance and performance management frameworks.

• PSO training
  – Comprehensive two week training programme
  – Culminating in job-ready Action Plan, six months of evidenced practice, and follow-up days.
Recommendation two

Improve the range, volume, quality and take-up of interventions to better address individual rehabilitation needs.

Action plan:

- **Interventions strategy**
  - Interventions Managers conducting gap analysis
  - Results will be used to shape a portfolio of interventions that are fit for purpose, evidence-based and drive service users towards adopting a pro-social identity.

- **Evidence based practice**
  - Will apply the latest thinking on desistance to develop a range of evidence-based interventions
  - Interventions, that are evidenced to be effective for individual service user profiles, will be available through the Choose and Book functionality within Omnia.

- **Rehabilitation Activity Requirements (RARs)**
  - Will use learnings to develop a comprehensive suite of RARs to address service user needs.
**Recommendation two – continued**

Improve the range, volume, quality and take-up of interventions to better address individual rehabilitation needs.

**Action plan:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domestic abuse (DA)</th>
<th>Extremism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Developing training materials to support service user pro-social identity shift</td>
<td>• Training a number of OMs to deliver ‘Delivering Dialogues’ intervention for service users at risk of radicalisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reviewing potential new DA interventions, including Positive Relationships group work programme.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gangs</th>
<th>Integrated Offender Management (IOM)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Reviewing SGO policy and procedures</td>
<td>• Involved in MOPAC IOM working group to help shape thinking on future approach to IOM across London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• London-wide SGO lead working with Trident to review and ensure effective information sharing</td>
<td>• Continue to attend, and subject to local agreement, co-chair borough IOM panels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Working with MOPAC to develop a knife crime RAR.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women’s strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Developing tailored interventions for women service users.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation three

Deliver Unpaid Work (Community Payback) effectively.

Action plan

• Improvement plan focused on
  – Quality and performance: ensuring appropriate enforcement and MI for managing cases to the appropriate standard within 12 months
  – Projects: ensuring correct type and number of projects in the right locations, to ensure all service users are able to complete their Unpaid Work hours
  – Structure and people: ensuring appropriate structure, roles and skills to deliver Unpaid Work effectively
  – Stakeholders: developing internal and external stakeholder strategy
  – IT: ensuring Unpaid Work employees (field supervisors in particular) have access to appropriate systems
Recommendation four

Improve local strategic relationships with partners to support delivery of services and the safeguarding of children.

Action plan

- **REACTA training**
  - New recording convention ensures effective use of safeguarding checks, underpinned by performance management and quality assurance framework
  - Focuses on relevant initial checks, effective management oversight, home visits, referrals and joint working
  - Improved data quality and more meaningful performance reporting.

- **Position statement**
  - Issued to all safeguarding partners at local borough and regional level
  - Confirms level of engagement the CRC will provide at different levels and what MI will be provided.

- **Contracts and Partnerships (C&P) Managers**
  - Five C&P Managers support Area Managers to build relationships at local borough level and attend some Safeguarding Children Board meetings
  - Responsible for relationships with Social Services around the safeguarding agenda.
Recommendation five

Ensure all practitioners have the training, skills and knowledge needed to carry out their duties.

Action plan

• Practice standards
  – Established and updated regularly for the CRC’s Communities Directorate
  – Developing specific standards for Community Payback and Programmes teams.

• Training
  – Rolling out REACTA training, compliance, and enforcement engagement events
  – Q&P Managers identifying and delivering local training needs
  – Developing comprehensive operational case management training programme
  – Quality assured by Q&P Team and monitored by quarterly Training Governance Group.

• Support
  – Area Managers and SPOs hold monthly 1-2-1s and team meetings to review practice, reinforce consistent good standards, enable professional development, and identify training needs.

• Q&P Managers
  – Local function to support delivery of practice standards, assure practice activities, deliver training and ensure professional development.
Recommendation six

Use Management Information (MI) to better understand and manage staff workloads, engagement and tensions inherent in delivering a large-scale performance improvement project.

Action plan

- **MI and workloads**
  - SPO and OM dashboards provide overview of workloads, tasks and caseloads, allowing regular review and effective allocation of cases
  - Piloting new triage tool – a framework to better manage and engage with service users according to risk and needs.

- **Inclusion strategy**
  - Feedback from local engagement events used to help shape inclusion event co-created by Director of Probation and cross-grade working group
  - Output will help Equality and Diversity Board shape strategy which will include focus on professional development, practice development and support, and service user needs.
## BDH Service Users

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caseloads</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Custody</th>
<th>Licence</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Service Users</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>1037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Service Users</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 – 25</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 – 50</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 and above</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# BDH Service Users

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BDH Offences - Male

- Burglary: 11%
- Criminal Damage: 2%
- Drink Driving: 5%
- Drug possession/supply/import/export/production: 21%
- Fraud/Forgery: 3%
- Handling Stolen Goods: 2%
- Theft (from vehicles and non motor): 8%
- Violence: 34%
- Motor Theft: 2%
- Other: 5%
- Public Order: 7%
- Other: 5%
BDH Offences - Female

- Burglary: 2%
- Criminal Damage: 2%
- Drink Driving: 5%
- Drug Possession/supply/import/export/production: 6%
- Fraud/Forgery: 10%
- Handling Stolen Goods: 3%
- Sexual: 0%
- Theft: 16%
- Violence: 32%
- Public Order: 0%
- Other: 24%
Community Payback

CP West
Jergen Goud, Operations Manager

CP North East
Claire Farquhar, Operations Manager

CP South
Annette Gordon, Operations Manager

Community Payback
Regional Organisation Guide

Reducing reoffending and improving lives
Community Payback in Barking and Dagenham

832 Active CP requirement

* includes duplicate orders where a service user has more than one UPW requirement

547 service users instructed to attend CP project in Barking and Dagenham throughout March 2018

1,775 hours of service completed in Barking and Dagenham throughout April 2018
Contact Us

Steve Calder
Contracts and Partnership Manager, North West London
Steven.calder@londoncrc.org.uk
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Meeting</th>
<th>Publication Date</th>
<th>Report Title</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Item Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 04 July 2018</td>
<td>Tuesday 26 June 2018</td>
<td>Sub-Group Updates</td>
<td>Chairs of sub-groups</td>
<td>For Information</td>
<td>20 mins</td>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td>Item Received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Safer Neighbourhood Board Update</td>
<td>Steve Thompson</td>
<td>For Information</td>
<td>5 mins</td>
<td>Item 4</td>
<td>Item Received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Performance Report</td>
<td>Dan James</td>
<td>For Information</td>
<td>5 mins</td>
<td>Item 5</td>
<td>Item Received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P SPD - Heathway</td>
<td>Katherine Gilcrest</td>
<td>For Discussion</td>
<td>10 mins</td>
<td>Item 6</td>
<td>Item Received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen Port</td>
<td>Hazel North-Stephens</td>
<td>For Information</td>
<td>10 mins</td>
<td>Item 7</td>
<td>Verbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DVHR Learning</td>
<td>Hazel North-Stephens</td>
<td>For Information</td>
<td>10 mins</td>
<td>Item 8</td>
<td>Verbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community Safety Plan refresh</td>
<td>Jade Hodgson</td>
<td>For Discussion</td>
<td>15 mins</td>
<td>Item 9</td>
<td>Item Received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quality and Impact inspection: The effectiveness of probation work by the London Community Rehabilitation Company</td>
<td>Steven Calder</td>
<td>For Discussion</td>
<td>20 mins</td>
<td>Item 10</td>
<td>Item Received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transition Workshop</td>
<td>Steve Calder/ Angie Fuller</td>
<td>For Discussion</td>
<td>45 mins</td>
<td>Item 11</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AOB - Information Sharing Update in light of GDPR</td>
<td>Steven Calder</td>
<td>For Discussion</td>
<td>5 mins</td>
<td>Item 12</td>
<td>Item Received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chair’s Report</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>For Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Item to be circulated after the board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 26 September 2018</td>
<td>Tuesday 18 September 2018</td>
<td>Sub-Group Updates</td>
<td>Chairs of sub-groups</td>
<td>For Information</td>
<td>25 mins</td>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Safer Neighbourhood Board Update</td>
<td>Steve Thompson</td>
<td>For Information</td>
<td>5 mins</td>
<td>Item 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Performance Report</td>
<td>Dan James</td>
<td>For Information</td>
<td>10 mins</td>
<td>Item 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy</td>
<td>Matthew Cole</td>
<td>For Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Requested on 13 June 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VAWG Strategy</td>
<td>Hazel North-Stephens</td>
<td>For Discussion</td>
<td>15 mins</td>
<td>Item 7</td>
<td>Item TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trauma Informed Health Intervention Model</td>
<td>Jonathon Toy/ Hazel North-Stephens</td>
<td>For Discussion</td>
<td>20 mins</td>
<td>Item 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gang and Knife Crime Action Plan (TBC)</td>
<td>Angie Fuller/ Jonathon Toy</td>
<td>For Decision</td>
<td>30 mins</td>
<td>Item 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community Safety Plan refresh</td>
<td>Jade Hodgson</td>
<td>For Decision</td>
<td>15 mins</td>
<td>Item 10</td>
<td>Statutory Matter for sign off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AOB</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>For Discussion</td>
<td>5 mins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 19 December 2018</td>
<td>Tuesday 11 December 2018</td>
<td>Sub-Group Updates</td>
<td>Chairs of sub-groups</td>
<td>For Information</td>
<td>25 mins</td>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CSP Training Plan</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>For Discussion</td>
<td>15 mins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Safer Neighbourhood Board Update</td>
<td>Steve Thompson</td>
<td>For Information</td>
<td>5 mins</td>
<td>Item 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Performance Report</td>
<td>Dan James</td>
<td>For Information</td>
<td>10 mins</td>
<td>Item 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AOB</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>For Discussion</td>
<td>5 mins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 27 March 2019</td>
<td>Tuesday 19 March 2019</td>
<td>Sub-Group Updates</td>
<td>Chairs of sub-groups</td>
<td>For Information</td>
<td>25 mins</td>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Safer Neighbourhood Board Update</td>
<td>Steve Thompson</td>
<td>For Information</td>
<td>5 mins</td>
<td>Item 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Performance Report</td>
<td>Dan James</td>
<td>For Information</td>
<td>10 mins</td>
<td>Item 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AOB</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>For Discussion</td>
<td>5 mins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 26 June 2019</td>
<td>Tuesday 18 June 2019</td>
<td>Sub-Group Updates</td>
<td>Chairs of sub-groups</td>
<td>For Information</td>
<td>25 mins</td>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Safer Neighbourhood Board Update</td>
<td>Steve Thompson</td>
<td>For Information</td>
<td>5 mins</td>
<td>Item 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Performance Report</td>
<td>Dan James</td>
<td>For Information</td>
<td>10 mins</td>
<td>Item 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Crime and Disorder Strategic Assessment</td>
<td>Dan James</td>
<td>For Decision</td>
<td>45 mins</td>
<td></td>
<td>Statutory Matter for sign off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AOB</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>For Discussion</td>
<td>5 mins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/09/2019</td>
<td>MEETING TO BE BOOKED</td>
<td>Sub-Group Updates</td>
<td>Chairs of sub-groups</td>
<td>For Information</td>
<td>25 mins</td>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Safer Neighbourhood Board Update</td>
<td>Steve Thompson</td>
<td>For Information</td>
<td>5 mins</td>
<td>Item 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Performance Report</td>
<td>Dan James</td>
<td>For Information</td>
<td>10 mins</td>
<td>Item 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AOB</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>For Discussion</td>
<td>5 mins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Meeting Date</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Item No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/12/2019</td>
<td>01 December</td>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td>Safer Neighbourhood Board Update</td>
<td>Steve Thompson</td>
<td>For Information</td>
<td>25 mins</td>
<td>Item 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Item 4</td>
<td>Performance Report</td>
<td>Dan James</td>
<td>For Information</td>
<td>5 mins</td>
<td>Item 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AOB</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>For Discussion</td>
<td>5 mins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/03/2020</td>
<td>01 March 2020</td>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td>Safer Neighbourhood Board Update</td>
<td>Steve Thompson</td>
<td>For Information</td>
<td>25 mins</td>
<td>Item 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Item 4</td>
<td>Performance Report</td>
<td>Dan James</td>
<td>For Information</td>
<td>5 mins</td>
<td>Item 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AOB</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>For Discussion</td>
<td>5 mins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/06/2020</td>
<td>01 June 2020</td>
<td>Item 4</td>
<td>Performance Report</td>
<td>Dan James</td>
<td>For Information</td>
<td>10 mins</td>
<td>Item 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AOB</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>For Decision</td>
<td>45 mins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/09/2020</td>
<td>01 September</td>
<td>Item 5</td>
<td>AOB</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>For Discussion</td>
<td>5 mins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>