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<td>The Scrutiny Panel to receive details of the anti-graffiti and graffiti removal policy of London Midland.</td>
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<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
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NORTHAMPTON BOROUGH COUNCIL

MINUTES OF SCRUTINY PANEL 2 - THE IMPACT OF ANTI SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR ON THE TOWN

Thursday, 8 October 2015

COUNCILLORS PRESENT: Councillor Dennis Meredith (Chair); Councillors Tony Ansell, Rufia Ashraf, Anamul Haque (Enam), Jamie Lane, Zoe Smith and Graham Walker

WITNESSES Councillor Anna King, Cabinet Member for Community Safety Ruth Austen, Environmental Health and Licensing Manager Jason Toyne, Park Ranger Andrew Langton, Neighbourhood Warden

OFFICER Tracy Tiff, Scrutiny Officer

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Brian Oldham and Phil Larratt.

2. DEPUTATIONS/PUBLIC ADDRESSES

There were none.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (INCLUDING WHIPPING)

There were none.

4. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 17 September 2015 were signed by the Chair as a true and accurate record.

5. WITNESS EVIDENCE

(A) CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY SAFETY, NORTHAMPTON BOROUGH COUNCIL, (NBC)

The Scrutiny Panel noted a written response to the core questions from the Cabinet Member for Community Safety. The salient points contained within the written responses were noted.

The Scrutiny Panel asked questions, made comment and heard:
• In answer to a query regarding whether anti-social behaviour had been observed during a recent Guide Dog event in the town centre, Councillor King confirmed that during this event she had not observed anti-social behaviour or littering. Police presence had been observed and she had nothing to report.

• The Chair commented that during his recent walkabout of the town centre he had noted a number of street drinkers by the fountain the town centre. Councillor King confirmed that underlying work with other Agencies is underway, through the Community Safety Partnership and health providers; looking to provide help and assistance to vulnerable people.

• The work of the Neighbourhood Wardens was commended.

• The Scrutiny Panel welcomed the variety of projects that the Community Safety Partnership has put in place to address anti-social behaviour, such as street football, street and school pastors etc. In relation to how these are advertised and promoted, Councillor King confirmed that the communication team uses a variety of methods including social media to promote the activities. It was suggested that ward Councillors could promote such activities within their wards, for example using community notices boards. It was suggested that a potential recommendation of the final report could be around Councillors promoting such activities within their wards.

• The Scrutiny Panel commented that street drinkers often move from the town centre to Delapre and Briar Hill. The Chair acknowledged that from his recent site visit he had observed the good rapport that the Neighbourhood Wardens have with street drinkers.

• In answer to a query regarding new legislation, Ruth Austen confirmed that new powers are available to local authorities to make Public Spaces Protection Orders but each Council has to adopt these, they have to be appropriate and enforceable. There is a legal process that has to be followed.

• In response to a query regarding skate boarders near to St Giles church, Councillor King confirmed that she would report this issue to the Community Safety Partnership.

• In response to a question about the recruitment of Special Constables; Ruth Austen confirmed that recruitment is progressing. Lots of Special Constables have already been engaged and some more are in the final stages of training. A presentation from a Special Constable had been given to the Police and Crime Panel. It was suggested that it would be useful for this Scrutiny Panel to have sight of the presentation. It was therefore requested that a copy is forwarded to the Scrutiny Panel.

• It was suggested that if the Scrutiny Panel has any supplementary questions to put to the Police when a representative attends a future meeting; that it would be useful for Members to forward their individual queries to the Chair so that questions could be collated and forwarded to the Police in advance of the meeting.

• The Scrutiny Panel commented that there was anecdotal evidence that Market Traders were concerned about anti-social behaviour in the Market Square. It was noted that the Chair and Deputy Chair of the Markets Action Group had been invited to attend a future meeting of the Scrutiny Panel and provide a response to the core questions.

• In response to a query regarding PCSOs, Councillor King confirmed that after Northamptonshire County Council had withdrawn its funding for PCSOs, NBC had also and had then put its funding into Park Rangers.
Councillor King was thanked for her informative address.

AGREED: That the information provided informs the evidence base of this Scrutiny Review.

(B) ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION MANAGER, NEIGHBOURHOOD WARDENS, PARK RANGER, NBC

The Scrutiny Panel noted a written response to the core questions from the Environmental Services (Direct Services) Manager, Neighbourhood Wardens and Park Rangers. The salient points contained within the written responses were noted.

The job role of the Neighbourhood Wardens and Park Rangers was provided to the Scrutiny Panel.

The Scrutiny Panel asked questions, made comment and heard:

- The Scrutiny Panel heard about the Junior Warden Scheme which is run in a number of ways. It is cost effective as it comprises officer time, support from Agencies and a presentation. If trips were involved it would cost in the region of £500-£700. It would be possible to use some of the Junior Warden Schemes in schools, for example one has been run in Spring Lane School. The children are shown how CCTV works in the town centre for example. Educating children young can create effective advocates. Around 5-6 Junior Warden Schemes are run a year, up to a maximum of ten schemes.
- The Scrutiny Panel referred to “Hazard Alley” in Milton Keynes and commended its effectiveness. It is a unit that has a mock set up of various scenes such as fire safety, home safety etc. It was felt that such a facility in Northampton would be useful. Hazard Alley is run by a Charity. A potential recommendation of the final report was suggested around further educating children on issues around anti-social behaviour.
- It was felt that it would be useful if members of the Panel could visit “Hazard Alley”.
- In answer to a comment that the previous shelter that had been available for street drinkers had been useful, Ruth Austen commented that such a shelter had existed but there had also been negative feedback. The re-installation of such a shelter could be investigated. The Scrutiny Panel acknowledged that there is also a need to provide assistance and support to such vulnerable people.
- The work of the Street Pastors was commended. It was acknowledged that Street Pastors are mainly volunteers. It was felt that evidence from religious groups would be useful to the evidence base of this Scrutiny Review. Street Pastors would be contacted, along with other Agencies and Religious Groups and a briefing note presented to a future meeting of the Scrutiny Panel detailing the support that they provide to street drinkers.
- The work of the Salvation Army was noted.
- The Scrutiny Panel highlighted the need for a paper document that details where street drinkers, rough sleepers and beggars can go for assistance. Councillors could then distribute such documents. This was felt to be an important potential recommendation of the final report.
In answer to a query regarding the issuing of Fixed Penalty Notices, the Park Ranger confirmed that 7-8 are issues per period.

The Chair commented that from his walkabout of the town centre he felt there was the need for further training for Neighbourhood Wardens, particularly in relation to Street Drinkers. It was highlighted that all newly recruited Neighbourhood Wardens had received training delivered by the University and all Neighbourhood Wardens had received training on handling confrontation situations.

The Park Ranger confirmed that he works closely with PCSOs.

Park Rangers cover similar issues to that of Neighbourhood Wardens but in parks and open spaces. Weekend work is undertaken. Mainly, Park Rangers are lone workers. 1:1s take place and objectives set. There are five Park Rangers, two of which are full time of 40 hours a week, one works 37.5 hours and two 20 hours a week.

The Chair suggested that it would be useful for Neighbourhood Wardens to be issued with a body camera and felt this would be a useful potential recommendation of the final report.

Ruth Austen, Jason Toyne and Andrew Langton were thanked for their informative address.

AGREED: That the information provided informs the evidence base of this Scrutiny Review.

(C) ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH AND LICENSING MANAGER, NBC

The Scrutiny Panel noted a written response to the core questions from the Environmental Health and Licensing Manager. The salient points contained within the written responses were noted.

The Scrutiny Panel asked questions, made comment and heard:

- In response to a concern regarding the selling of one can of alcohol to individuals, particularly early in the morning; Ruth Austen confirmed that she would report this issue to the Licensing Team.
- Environmental Health and Licensing has excellent joint working with the Police, with excellent exchange of information.
- In response to a query regarding a licensed premise opening near to a car park and the potential for anti-social behaviour, Ruth Austen confirmed that the Statement of Licensing Principles is currently out for consultation. There is a need for evidence to back up any actions taken. It is not normally possible to provide evidence of problems before a premises opens and so it is difficult to limit times on new licences. All licences are monitored.
- The Scrutiny Panel felt that alcohol and drugs were a key factor to anti-social behaviour and there was the need to look at opening hours; this could be a potential recommendation of the final report to the Licensing Committee.
• The Chair suggested that it would be useful for the Scrutiny Panel to report any acts of anti-social behaviour that it observes.

AGREED: That the information provided informs the evidence base of this Scrutiny Review.

(D) TOWN CENTRE MANAGER
The Scrutiny Panel noted a written response to the core questions from the Town Centre Manager. The salient points contained within the written responses were noted.

The Scrutiny Panel asked questions, made comment and heard:

• The Scrutiny Panel reported that they had observed “pink balls” for people to dispose of chewing gum in and commended this idea. The Town Centre Manager advised that he had not had sight of these but would investigate; he highlighted that the pavements do receive a deep steam clean to remove chewing gum.
• The Scrutiny Panel discussed Talking CCTV cameras.
• Concern was raised regarding the number of street drinkers present by All Saints church. The Town Centre Manager advised that he regularly carries out walkabouts of the town centre and reports back his findings to Enterprise. If he notes incidents photographs are taken. The Town Centre Manager liaises with all Agencies. He added that he is aware of street drinking, begging and anti-social behaviour. The Town Centre Manager’s team is responsible for cleaning up and any incidents are reported to the relevant department or Agency. A number of street drinkers, for example, have underlying issues and there is a need to refer them to the correct Agency for the foundations for support.
• The night time economy was referred to. The Town Centre Manager advised that the cleaning regime had changed to address this, as some night clubs are open till 6am. Cleaning takes place first thing in the morning.
• In response to a query about psychoactive substances and shops selling these in the town, the Town Centre Manager advised that it is not illegal to sell these substances to people aged 18 and above. The substances state that they must not be drunk, inhaled, smoked etc. It is illegal to sell them to minors. There was a shop in the town centre that did sell psychoactive substances to a minor, they were prosecuted and the shop has since closed down. Shops that sell psychoactive substances in the town are monitored.
• The Scrutiny Panel referred to acts of anti-social behaviour outside a pub in the town centre and the Town Centre Manager confirmed that action is being taken to rectify this.
• The Scrutiny Panel felt that issues such as times that shops can sell alcohol, such as early in the morning, causes such problems. A potential recommendation of the final could be around recommending to the Licensing Committee that such conditions on certain licences are reviewed. It was felt that this would take away the problems of street drinkers that are present early in the morning in the town centre.

Derrick Simpson was thanked for his informative address.
AGREED: That the information provided informs the evidence base of this Scrutiny Review.

6. BACKGROUND DATA
The Scrutiny Panel received a briefing note that detailed various pieces of legislation.

AGREED: That the information provided informs the evidence base of this Scrutiny Review.

The meeting concluded at 7:46pm
The Scrutiny Panel is currently undertaking a review investigating the impact of anti-social behaviour on the town.

Key lines of Inquiry:

- To investigate the levels of anti-social behaviour in the town, such as tackling psychoactive substances, alcohol, littering (including chewing gum), graffiti, fly-tipping, street urination and dog fouling
- To consider the nature of the psychoactive substances market and any health consequences
- To review the policies and strategies for dealing with the impact of anti-social behaviour in the town
- To consider the paper/Bill that is currently being drafted by the Home Office to address the issue of psychoactive substances
- To identify the prevention strategies that can help to address anti-social behaviour on the town
- To identify ‘hotspots’ of the impact of anti-social behaviour on the town
- To consider the enforcement powers that the Council and other Agencies has in respect of anti-social behaviour
- To consider how Northampton Borough Council can work in partnership with local groups, Agencies, organisations and residents to reduce and prevent the impact anti-social behaviour has on the town

The expected outcomes of this Scrutiny Review are:

- To make informed recommendations to all relevant parties on methods to deal with anti-social behaviour on the town
CORE QUESTIONS:

A series of key questions have been put together to inform the evidence base of the Scrutiny Panel:

1. Please provide details of your organisation and its role in addressing anti-social behaviour

2. What Strategies and Policies do you have in place for addressing anti-social behaviour?

3. What specific practices and measures do you currently undertake to address/tackle anti-social behaviour?

4. Do you have specific budget/resources/funding in relation to addressing anti-social behaviour, if so please provide further details.

5. Are the current partnership arrangements for tackling anti-social behaviour sufficient, and if not where are the gaps?

6. Do you feel there is adequate co-ordination between Agencies regarding dealing with anti-social behaviour? If not how could it be improved?

7. How does anti-social behaviour impact upon you/organisation?

8. What do you think could be done to ensure effective strategic and operational links are made to tackle anti-social behaviour, or improve, on a town scale?

9 Please provide details of the enforcement powers that you have in respect of anti-social behaviour

10 Do you have the resources to enforce the powers that you have? Please explain.

11 Do you have information regarding the nature of the psychoactive substances market that you are able to inform the Scrutiny Panel of?

12 Please can you provide details of any health consequences of using psychoactive substances

13 Do you have any suggestions on how, as partners, we can improve our approach in addressing anti-social behaviour?
14 What do you think is the key contributing factor to anti-social behaviour across Northampton?

15 Do you have further information regarding the impact of anti-social behaviour on the town of which you would like to inform the Scrutiny Panel?
NORTHAMPTON BOROUGH COUNCIL
OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY

SCRUTINY PANEL 2 – THE IMPACT OF ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR ON THE TOWN

CORE QUESTIONS – EXPERT ADVISORS

1. Please provide details of your organisation and its role in addressing anti-social behaviour

Northampton Partnership Homes (NPH) is an Arm’s Length Management Organisation which commenced trading on 5 January 2015. NPH manages the housing stock owned by Northampton Borough Council (NBC) via 15-year Management Agreement. NPH is a key strategic partner in preventing and tackling anti-social behaviour within the Borough of Northampton.

2. What Strategies and Policies do you have in place for addressing anti-social behaviour?

NPH has adopted a number of Strategies and Policies of NBC including those relating to anti-social behaviour. NPH is in the process of developing its own strategies and procedures relating to this specific area of work.

3. What specific practices and measures do you currently undertake to address/tackle anti-social behaviour?

NPH operates Introductory Tenancies for all new tenants. This means their tenancy runs for an initial 12 month probationary period. Within the 12 months it is reviewed and a decision taken whether the tenancy should be extended for a further probationary period or possession sought or a secure tenancy granted.

NPH also uses a wide range of both intervention and enforcement measures to deal with anti-social behaviour which include but is not limited to the following:-

- Mediation
- Restorative Justice approaches
- Good Neighbour Agreements
- Acceptable Behaviour Contracts
- Tenancy Sustainment Contracts
- Injunctions
- Demotion of tenancy
- Notices of Seeking Possession
- Possession Orders
- Eviction

NPH is a member of Restorative Northamptonshire and has 2 trained coordinators.

NPH monitors satisfaction with how it deals with ASB on a regular basis using questionnaires which are benchmarked.

4. Do you have specific budget/resources/funding in relation to addressing anti-social behaviour, if so please provide further details?

NPH currently has a small team of two specialist Tenancy Compliance Officer (TCO) posts. We are in the process of recruiting two further TCO posts. This will double the size of the team and enable more complex cases to be dealt with in a timely manner as well as deliver a more proactive service in relation to ASB.

In addition, there are 16 area based Housing Officers that deal with the first point of contact for most reports of anti-social behaviour and deal with low level anti-social behaviour such as a neighbour making too much noise on occasion.

NPH has a small budget specifically for dealing with victims and witnesses of anti-social behaviour. The sorts of costs covered within this are mediation services, obtaining statements using professional services and expert witness statements.

There is also a limited budget available for environmental enhancement works which can be used to reduce the likelihood of crime and disorder on estates managed by NPH. These sorts of work may include fencing and other security measures.

5. Are the current partnership arrangements for tackling anti-social behaviour sufficient, and if not where are the gaps?

NPH is a strategic partner of the Northampton Community Safety Partnership.

NPH staff attend the LISP meetings, Weeks of Action and NASBAG meetings.

NPH staff also attend informal regular meetings with SCT officers to discuss common issues on their geographical areas.

We do not access youth services and intervention directly. This is currently achieved via the NBC Anti-Social Behaviour Unit.
6. Do you feel there is adequate co-ordination between Agencies regarding dealing with anti-social behaviour? If not how could it be improved?

At a strategic level the coordination is very good through both the Community Safety Partnership Meetings and NASBAG meetings.

At a local and operational level there are some instances and examples of highly developed working relationships. This is not replicated across Northampton for a wide variety of reasons.

7. How does anti-social behaviour impact upon you/organisation?

Anti-social behaviour accounts for a fairly significant amount of staff time and is an area of high priority for customers. There is also an amount of time spent liaising with other statutory and non-statutory agencies. As well as receiving “straightforward” reports of ASB, a proportion of people making reports are vulnerable and need support when making contact or explaining the issues they are experiencing. This creates additional pressures on resources. There are also a range of impacts depending on the appropriate course of action from writing an advisory letter, home visiting to obtaining possession and/or rehousing a victim in alternative accommodation on a temporary or permanent basis.

8. What do you think could be done to ensure effective strategic and operational links are made to tackle anti-social behaviour, or improve, on a town scale?

The ongoing development and dealing with locally agreed problems, priorities and solutions through strategic and operational forums is essential. This needs to involve partners on an ongoing regular basis and not rely on ad hoc informal, irregular communication.

9. Please provide details of the enforcement powers that you have in respect of anti-social behaviour

NPH has a wide range of powers it can use directly by way of enforcing a tenancy agreement. There are also a range of other powers NPH can contribute towards which are contained within the ASB Crime and Policing Act. NPH is unable to directly use those powers.

The enforcement powers that NPH can use are as follows:

- Issuing of Notice of Seeking Possession
- Issuing of Notice of Possession Proceedings
- Demotion Orders
- Injunctions
- Possession Orders
- Eviction

10. Do you have the resources to enforce the powers that you have? Please explain.
NPH is in the process of starting to explore the provision of services to deal with ASB via a strategic review. The additional staffing resources will help to develop how we are going to address perceived issues relating to the under-reporting of ASB, engagement with NPH by community groups to address wider social issues, proactive ASB services such as engaging with young people, victim of harassment and hate crime as well as raising awareness and training (eg with the police and other statutory organisations).

11 Do you have information regarding the nature of the psychoactive substances market that you are able to inform the Scrutiny Panel of?

No we do not have any specific information about the nature of the psychoactive substances market. NPH, in the main, deals with issues relating to anti-social behaviour committed by NBC tenants and this is usually within their homes or neighbourhoods and not within the generic town centre.

12 Please can you provide details of any health consequences of using psychoactive substances

We are unable to provide any details.

13 Do you have any suggestions on how, as partners, we can improve our approach in addressing anti-social behaviour?

NPH has a number of suggestions where the approach to ASB may be improved further:

- Work shadowing between staff from partner organisations – with the aim of better understanding what partner agencies powers involve and how they can be effectively used in tackling anti-social behaviour. An example of this is where trainee police officers come and work shadow NPH. It would be useful if this was reciprocated and we could send new Housing Officers to work shadow SCT Police Officers.

- Area based meetings at an operational level would allow the sharing of information and intelligence and development of action plans at a local level to address issues of concern. This could lead to a number of quick wins.

14 What do you think is the key contributing factor to anti-social behaviour across Northampton?

When the perpetrators of ASB are youths or juveniles a contributory factor is the lack of local facilities. It is often cited from those engaged in anti-social behaviour that they were bored and had nothing better to do. This may also be linked to a lack of training and employment opportunities.
NPH's largest category of reports of ASB is noise nuisance. The reports come from tenants of a variety of ages against tenants and residents of a variety of ages. In terms of key contributing factor, mental health as well as drug and alcohol issues tend to be involved with many of the perpetrators we come across.

15 Do you have further information regarding the impact of anti-social behaviour on the town of which you would like to inform the Scrutiny Panel?

NPH is able to look at Local Lettings Plans in line with NBC’s Allocations Policy. These can contribute towards the reduction in crime and disorder and anti-social behaviour.
Response to the Core Questions  PubWatch

Pubwatch is a private association of Northampton’s licensees who work together to share best practice, information on changes to licensing, engage positively with the local authority and police, and to promote the 4 licensing objectives (public nuisance, crime and disorder, public safety, protection of children) in any way that we can.

We work in a variety of ways, the most visible of which is the “Pubwatch ban”, whereby a person who has committed an assault or offence in one member’s venue can be banned from all members’ venues. We have also worked with Northampton police on various initiatives, such as public campaigns around ASB (e.g. “We serve drinks not drunks”), use of breathalysers by doormen as a tool to assist in refusing a drunk person entry, challenge 21 and many more. We have also set up a system by which banned persons can be referred onto an Alcohol Awareness Course (provided by S2S) in exchange for a reduced length of ban.

Pubwatch members are all committed to responsible retailing, and to taking a proactive approach to prevention of ASB within their venues.

2. Already mentioned the Pubwatch ban, a very powerful tool. Public campaigns such as “We serve drinks not drunks” and “Zero tolerance to violence”. Driving best practice within the trade on responsible retailing, such as challenge 21. The “Best Bar None” accreditation/award scheme. We work closely with the police, and have tried many initiatives that they have brought to us, that have worked in other towns/counties; this drives continual development within the trade.

3. As per 2. Additionally, many town centre venues use the Pubwatch radio system, linked to the town CCTV control room. This enables us to warn each other of problematic persons, get CCTV cover when issues arise, and often a quicker route to getting Police attendance.

4. Pubwatch is self-funding through members subscription fees. There is no budget or funding beyond that.
5. We work closely with the Licensing Dept. at Northampton Police. They attend every Pubwatch meeting and the Police Update is a permanent agenda item. The Licensing Dept. at the Borough Council sometimes attend PW meetings, and are always available should there be a need. PW is also invited to attend multi-agency meetings such as the Alcohol Harm Reduction Committee. I believe that these arrangements work well towards the shared objectives of tackling ASB.

6. No comment.

7. Anti-social behaviour impacts PW members directly from assaults on licensees or their staff, through to affecting the public perception of their venue. PW exists almost entirely to tackle ASB within and around members’ premises.

8. Again, no comment, other than the limiting factor usually appears to be what powers are available to the police or council.

9. As a private association PW has no statutory powers beyond those of any private individual. We are able to enforce a ban on a person from all members’ venues. We do also use Acceptable Behaviour Agreements – a contract signed by a person promising good behaviour in future.

10. We are dependent on members being able to identify banned persons and refusing to serve them. To a certain extent the Data Protection Act impedes this, as the Police are not always able to provide photographs of people involved in violent incidents. Without a photograph to distribute to our members they cannot identify a banned person.

11. N/A

12. N/A

13. Statutory powers often seem to be the limiting factor. PW members sometimes report that they have reported ASB to the police, but either i) no Police attended or ii) the Police were unable to act as no crime was being committed when they attended. The (Section 27??) notices that the Police could issue to force a person to leave the town centre were very helpful, but these no longer exist. We are waiting to see what will replace them. We tend to have problems caused by just a few people, and the powers just don’t seem to exist to deal with them.

14. Cycle of poor education and poor parenting skills, which passes from generation to generation. Historically, I could add inadequate policing; the reinvigorated Operation Night Safe from July 2013 onwards has showed just what a powerful impact good policing can have. Inadequate punishments handed out to offenders by courts, however, often not sufficient deterrent.

15. The relationship between the Police and licencees is a positive one. PW members work very hard to ensure that inside, our venues are as safe as
possible. We look to the Police to provide the same kind of service outside our venues, in the streets. Since the relaunch of Operation Night Safe this has been significantly improved. PW is pleased that the Police continue to try new initiatives to improve their policing of the Night Time Economy, and that they continue to be willing to listen to our feedback. This partnership is undoubtedly helping to reduce ASB within the NTE.

We believe strongly in promoting proactive action – dealing with a problem as soon as it appears, rather than after it has already escalated. We hope that the (Section 27??) notices, or something similar, will return. Getting an agitated person out of the town centre before they start trouble is much better than having to arrest them afterwards.
NORTHAMPTON BOROUGH COUNCIL

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY

SCRUTINY PANEL 2 – THE IMPACT OF ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR ON THE TOWN

CORE QUESTIONS – EXPERT ADVISORS

RESPONSE TO THE CORE QUESTIONS FROM S LANG, (NRCI)

AGENDA ITEM 5(D)

The Scrutiny Panel is currently undertaking a review investigating the impact of anti-social behaviour on the town.

Key lines of Inquiry:

- To investigate the levels of anti-social behaviour in the town, such as tackling psychoactive substances, alcohol, littering (including chewing gum), graffiti, fly-tipping, street urination and dog fouling
- To consider the nature of the psychoactive substances market and any health consequences
- To review the policies and strategies for dealing with the impact of anti-social behaviour in the town
- To consider the paper/Bill that is currently being drafted by the Home Office to address the issue of psychoactive substances
- To identify the prevention strategies that can help to address anti-social behaviour on the town
- To identify ‘hotspots’ of the impact of anti-social behaviour on the town
- To consider the enforcement powers that the Council and other Agencies has in respect of anti-social behaviour
- To consider how Northampton Borough Council can work in partnership with local groups, Agencies, organisations and residents to reduce and prevent the impact anti-social behaviour has on the town

The expected outcomes of this Scrutiny Review are:

- To make informed recommendations to all relevant parties on methods to deal with anti-social behaviour on the town
CORE QUESTIONS:

A series of key questions have been put together to inform the evidence base of the Scrutiny Panel:

1. Please provide details of your organisation and its role in addressing anti-social behaviour

The Northampton Retail Crime Initiative (NRCI) is a non-profit making Limited by guarantee Registered Company. It has been in existence since 2001 and works in partnership with Northants Police, Northampton Borough Council, Northampton CSP, Northampton Town Centre BID and member Retail Stores throughout Northampton. We offer an information and intelligence sharing service to member Retail stores around Retail Offenders. We also administrate a civil Exclusion Order system that excludes retail Offenders from member stores for a period of 12 months, if their offending falls into the simple following criteria:-

a) **Violent or abusive** to store staff or Officers on arrest or detention.
b) **Going Equipped to Steal** – foil lined bags or detaggers etc.
c) **A Prolific Offender**.
d) **Already Excluded**.

If an Offender is Excluded from one member store, they are Excluded from all.

The orders are mostly served by Police, in custody on the Offender being Charged or disposed of for a retail Offence.

So far this year 159 Exclusion Orders have been served to 128 different Offenders. 25 have 2 Current Exclusions and 3 have 3 current Exclusion Orders.

Not a single Exclusion Order has been challenged by an Offender or their legal representative.

The NRCI currently has over 160 retail members throughout Northampton.

The information and intelligence is shared by the way of a secure database called DISC, provided by Littoraris Ltd.
The NRCI is also a member of the Northamptonshire Business Crime Partnership (NBCP), which is currently in the process of dropping the NRCI model into several Northants Towns/Areas to form a coherent robust partnership between Police, Councils and member Retailers. Wellingborough RCI was launched last month, Kettering RCI is imminent and the rest will be launched next year.

The NRCI is a member of the National Association of Business Crime Partnerships. The NRCI was audited by them earlier this year, looking at all our Policies, Procedures and our Administration of the scheme. We were awarded their ‘Safer Business Award’ with distinction.

2. What Strategies and Policies do you have in place for addressing anti-social behaviour?

   a) As above – the use of our Exclusion Order Scheme, especially the element around Violent or Abusive to store Staff. Do it only once during the commission of a Retail Offence and the Offender is excluded from all member stores.

   b) Retailers can use our system to collate incidents of ASB in and around their businesses. The exclusive Information Sharing Partnership approach then allows us to share details of ASB Offenders.

3. What specific practices and measures do you currently undertake to address/tackle anti-social behaviour?

   As Question 2 above.

4. Do you have specific budget/resources/funding in relation to addressing anti-social behaviour, if so please provide further details.

   No the NRCI is merely a partnership service. We are there to highlight and assist raising issues around retail ASB.

5. Are the current partnership arrangements for tackling anti-social behaviour sufficient, and if not where are the gaps?

   Though you should not really ‘pigeon hole’ issues, causes of ASB can be categorised in to Drink/drug addiction, Mental health wellbeing, education and poverty; or a combination of these issues.

   There is an overriding need to deal with issues holistically and not in isolation by Partner Agencies.

   See Question 6 below.
6. Do you feel there is adequate co-ordination between Agencies regarding dealing with anti-social behaviour? If not how could it be improved?

Simply, it’s about ownership, everyone needs to ensure that their part of the Partnership is cohesive, effective and inclusive. In these days of Austerity, lack of funding takes its toll. If one part is not totally delivering, all parts will eventually fail.

We have to organise our resources across all agencies differently to achieve this to ensure we have a consistent ‘problem solving’ approach.

As a suggestion, would it be plausible to set up a task force consisting of Local Police, ASBU, Council Wardens, Housing, Health, Licensing and partners etc under one streamlined management structure?

This could deliver an agile, more dynamic organisation to tackle the symptoms and causes of ASB.

The Town Centre Tasking Group address part of this but it could be simplified to increase efficiency and provide just one ‘Agency’ not a collective of all.

7. How does anti-social behaviour impact upon you/organisation?

Dealing with Retail Store Staff who have had the most horrendous abusive or violence thrown at them when they are only doing their job. Constantly seeing the same Offenders doing the same things with the same behavioural patterns going in and out of prison for very short periods (if at all!) to continue to reoffend. It is incredible cyclic!

8. What do you think could be done to ensure effective strategic and operational links are made to tackle anti-social behaviour, or improve, on a town scale?

See question 6 above.

9. Please provide details of the enforcement powers that you have in respect of anti-social behaviour

None

10. Do you have the resources to enforce the powers that you have? Please explain.

None

11. Do you have information regarding the nature of the psychoactive substances market that you are able to inform the Scrutiny Panel of?
12 Please can you provide details of any health consequences of using psychoactive substances?

Not qualified to do so.

13 Do you have any suggestions on how, as partners, we can improve our approach in addressing anti-social behaviour?

See question 6 above.

14 What do you think is the key contributing factor to anti-social behaviour across Northampton?

Alcohol / Drugs.

15 Do you have further information regarding the impact of anti-social behaviour on the town of which you would like to inform the Scrutiny Panel?

No
The Scrutiny Panel is currently undertaking a review investigating the impact of anti-social behaviour on the town.

**Key lines of Inquiry:**

- To investigate the levels of anti-social behaviour in the town, such as tackling psychoactive substances, alcohol, littering (including chewing gum), graffiti, fly-tipping, street urination and dog fouling.
- To consider the nature of the psychoactive substances market and any health consequences.
- To review the policies and strategies for dealing with the impact of anti-social behaviour in the town.
- To consider the paper/Bill that is currently being drafted by the Home Office to address the issue of psychoactive substances.
- To identify the prevention strategies that can help to address anti-social behaviour on the town.
- To identify `hotspots' of the impact of anti-social behaviour on the town.
- To consider the enforcement powers that the Council and other Agencies has in respect of anti-social behaviour.
- To consider how Northampton Borough Council can work in partnership with local groups, Agencies, organisations and residents to reduce and prevent the impact anti-social behaviour has on the town.

The expected outcomes of this Scrutiny Review are:

- To make informed recommendations to all relevant parties on methods to deal with anti-social behaviour on the town.
CORE QUESTIONS: Answers in Blue

A series of key questions have been put together to inform the evidence base of the Scrutiny Panel:

1. Please provide details of your organisation and its role in addressing anti-social behaviour West Hunsbury parish Council. No direct role but will take up issues with the relevant Authorities should issues arise or potential concerns be raised

2. What Strategies and Policies do you have in place for addressing anti-social behaviour? Non specific policy apart from acting as a facilitator and contact point. The parish plan identifies ASB as an area to monitor with police and something that developing a community spirit as part of a wider strategy for the Parish will also influence positively as a secondary benefit.

3. What specific practices and measures do you currently undertake to address/tackle anti-social behaviour? None directly

4. Do you have specific budget/resources/funding in relation to addressing anti-social behaviour, if so please provide further details. No

5. Are the current partnership arrangements for tackling anti-social behaviour sufficient, and if not where are the gaps? WHPC will liaise with the police where appropriate – the only real example to date has been around parking issues and speeding

6. Do you feel there is adequate co-ordination between Agencies regarding dealing with anti-social behaviour? If not how could it be improved?

7. How does anti-social behaviour impact upon you/organisation? Very minor issues largely dealt with by the Police and other agencies

8. What do you think could be done to ensure effective strategic and operational links are made to tackle anti-social behaviour, or improve, on a town scale?

9. Please provide details of the enforcement powers that you have in respect of anti-social behaviour Not known

10. Do you have the resources to enforce the powers that you have? Please explain. Not aware of any powers – so no

11. Do you have information regarding the nature of the psychoactive substances market that you are able to inform the Scrutiny Panel of? No
12 Please can you provide details of any health consequences of using psychoactive substances N/A

13 Do you have any suggestions on how, as partners, we can improve our approach in addressing anti-social behaviour? See 14 below – each level needs dealing with differently. 1 is criminal activity and a Police Matter, 2 is about influencing individuals and is something that can be addressed town wide through media articles and campaigns. 3 is probably something for Social Services to manage and help with. Are all the partners sufficiently joined up to facilitate this?

14 What do you think is the key contributing factor to anti-social behaviour across Northampton? On three levels – 1. those who deliberately set out to cause problems and issues for presumably fun: 2. Those who are thoughtless and commit minor nuisance such as littering and dog fouling, poor parking and speeding and 3. Those who have personal issues / attitudes who kick off and become anti-social

15 Do you have further information regarding the impact of anti-social behaviour on the town of which you would like to inform the Scrutiny Panel? No – apart from litter and dog fouling have demanded additional spending by WHPC on bins
INTRODUCTION

At an early evidence gathering meeting, Scrutiny Panel 2 (The Impact of Anti-Social Behaviour on the Town) agreed that the Chair and Deputy Chair would undertake various site visits and report back their findings to the Panel.

TOWN CENTRE WALKABOUT

On 30 September 2015, between the hours of 2pm and 3:30pm, Councillor Dennis Meredith, Chair, attended a walkabout of the Town Centre with the Neighbourhood Wardens. The walkabout provided the Chair with an insight into some of the issues that the Neighbourhood Wardens deal with.

The Chair observed a number of issues that the Neighbourhood Wardens deal with such as:

- A couple of shops in the town that sell psychoactive substances. The Police are aware of the substances sold by these shops.
- Neighbourhood Wardens have a good rapport with regular Street Drinkers in the town. The Chair witnessed the Neighbourhood Wardens removing a can of alcohol from a Street Drinker and pouring it away.
- The Chair saw 20 Street Drinkers during his site visit
- Some shops will open at 6am and sell just one can of alcohol at a time, often to Street Drinkers
- The Chair had dialogue with a number of Market Traders and their anecdotal evidence was that Street Drinkers had increased and tend to congregate near to the bus station area
- Street Drinkers were observed in Emporium Way. Evidence of street urination was present. Problems with pigeons was noted too but the Chair highlights that a previous Overview and Scrutiny report “Keep Northampton Tidy” had looked at this issue and proposed recommendations for improvement. The Chair also walked along Sheep Street and along the alley way, noting littering and evidence of urination.
• The Chair witnessed three individuals dropping cigarette butts on the floor, the Neighbourhood Wardens told them to pick them up.
• During the walkabout, the Chair noted a homeless woman that is often seen sitting near to the fountain in the market square. The woman appeared to have been inebriated. The Chair spoke to a number of shoppers who commented that they no longer sat near to the fountain as Street Drinkers and homeless people often gather here.
• During the site visit, the Chair witnessed a couple arguing; this had been picked up on CCTV and the Neighbourhood Wardens notified. The Neighbourhood Wardens acted very quickly.

3 MEETING OF NORTHAMPTON ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR ACTION GROUP (NASBAG)

3.1 On 5 November 2015 the Chair of the Scrutiny Panel attended and observed a meeting of the Northampton Anti-Social Behaviour Action Group (NASBAG). NASBAG is chaired by the Northampton Anti-Social Behaviour Unit and is made up of wide range of Agency representatives that deal with anti-social behaviour (ASB):

Northants Police
Northants Youth Offending Service
Northampton Borough Council
Northampton Partnership Homes
Service Six (Youth Support Agency)
Northants Probation
Registered Social Landlords (RSL’s)

3.2 Key points:

• The meeting was split into three sections – Central, North East & South West (co-terminus with the policing sectors), with focus on two key categories:
  ➢ Youths
  ➢ Adults (including Street Drinkers and Beggars)

• The Chair was surprised at the number and the ages of youth offenders, some being aged 12-14.
• In some cases, there was the lack of parental responsibility, and appropriate interventions are sought by agencies to address this.
• Many of the adults that commit ASB have alcohol, drug and mental health related problems. Some are violent.
• Partner agencies from the NASBAG have been successful in engaging with a number of referrals and these have now been removed from the referral list due to improved behaviour; some ASB cases are going to court.
• There is a separate Youth Court where criminal and ASB cases are heard for under 18’s.
• The Chair noted that some ASB takes place in blocks of flats within the town.
• The number of Sex Workers in the town has reduced significantly to that of ten years ago. The remaining Sex Workers have drug and/or alcohol problems.
The majority of Beggars and Street Drinkers are known to the Anti-Social Behaviour Unit, and those individuals are being engaged with or enforcement action is being progressed.

Street Drinkers range from 18 years upwards.

Street Drinkers and Beggars often move from town to town. They become known to the Agencies and then move on; again, it is typical for Street Drinkers to have drug, alcohol or mental health issues.

A Case Manager from the ASBU who co-ordinates the multi-agency work with street drinkers and beggars has been invited to attend the January meeting of this Scrutiny Panel.

The Chair highlights that the ASBU Officers know Street Drinkers by name and are aware of their situations.

The Chair welcomes the work of NASBAG emphasising there is a lot of work is being carried out to address ASB.

The Chair highlights that NASBAG is a caring Action Group that has the aim of helping young people, aiming to stop them re-offending and prevent them from progressing through the Criminal Justice system. The Youth Offending Service is very active in such instances.

The Chair is pleased to note how the work of NASBAG directs people, helping to prevent them from re-offending, and takes enforcement action when required.

3.3 The Chair and another member of the Scrutiny Panel also observed a meeting of NASBAG on 3 December 2015.

3.4 The Chair of the Scrutiny Panel also observed a meeting of the Street Drinkers, Beggars and Rough Sleepers Group that undertakes actions from the parent Group – NASBAG. The purpose of attending this meeting was for the Chair to note how the actions set at NASBAG are followed through in partnership with other support Agencies.

4 ESTATE WALKABOUT, BLACKTHORN

4.1 On 14 October 2015, between the hours of 2pm and 3pm, the Chair went on a walkabout of Blackthorn with a Neighbourhood Warden.

4.2 Key points:

- During the walkabout with the Neighbourhood Warden, fly-tipping was observed. This was immediately reported by the Neighbourhood Warden. The Neighbourhood Warden investigates what has been fly-tipped for personal evidence, such as a name and address. It would be useful if the fly-tipping could be collected quickly after being reported.
- On occasions residents have left rubbish outside their properties and a Section 46 Notice is issued. The Neighbourhood Warden confirmed this is a useful exercise.
- Further training for Neighbourhood Wardens was supported.
- The Neighbourhood Warden has built up a strong relationship with the residents in the ward and felt that body cameras would not be useful for her to use in this location. The Neighbourhood Warden confirmed she felt very safe working as a lone worker.
- The Neighbourhood Warden attends a variety of residents’ meetings in the area and gave her support to a newly formed Residents Association.
The Neighbourhood Warden has regular contact with local schools and Children’s Centres in the ward.

During the estate walkabout, the Chair visited a Children’s Centre. A room in Children’s Centres and other community buildings could be used for Neighbourhood Wardens to hot-desk, with a telephone, on various set days for residents to meet with the Neighbourhood Warden and share any issues they may have. The Chair felt it would be useful for the Neighbourhood Wardens to also be permitted to use the toilet facilities of such venues also.

The Neighbourhood Warden reporting fly-tipping

5  NIGHTSAFE STAKEHOLDER EVENT

5.1 On 17 October 2015, between the hours of 11pm and 3:30am, the Chair and Deputy Chair, representing the Scrutiny Panel, attended the Nightsafe Stakeholders’ event. The event was led by the Police Licensing Sargeant. An initial brief took place at 10:30pm. The Night Safe event visited the Criminal Justice Centre which is a ‘holding’ centre for people who have committed offences. It comprises 40 en-suite cells with provision for an additional 40 if needed. All cells have camera links. The Night Safe event left the Criminal Justice Centre for the town centre just before midnight and walked around Bridge Street and other areas with pubs and clubs.

5.2 Key points:

- There is evidence that “pre-loading” takes place regularly
- There are approximately 769 licensed premises in the town, which includes shops, supermarkets and takeaways as well as pubs and clubs.
- Any problematic premises are monitored
- By 2am a number of inebriated individuals were observed
- The Night Safe event visited a night club
- One night club had a member of staff encouraging individuals to visit with the offer of a ticket for two free shots
- A pub was also visited which was noted as well managed. An entrance fee of £5 is charged
There are two premises that remain open until 6am on a regular basis at weekends, but both stop serving alcohol before that time.

A number of street drinkers, beggars and rough sleepers were seen.

A lot of littering, such as bottles and fast food cartons was observed.

There is a stark difference between the town centre during the day time hours and the night time economy.

The work of the Street Pastors was commended. The Chair spoke with a Street Pastor who explained the purpose of their voluntary role—providing support to people on a night out who are in need of assistance. The Chair felt it would be useful to invite the Street Pastors to a future meeting of the Panel to explain their role.

During the event a discussion was held regarding the using of psychoactive substances and illegal drugs.

The event saw the Police Officers in action and how they calmly and professionally handled various situations during the site visit.

A theft offence was observed which ended in an arrest.

6  RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 That the information provided in this briefing note informs the evidence base of this Scrutiny Review.

6.2 That potential recommendations of the final report include:

A letter is sent to the MPs highlighting the problems of anti-social behaviour that the selling of, and users of psychoactive substances create.

Consideration is given to providing Neighbourhood Wardens with body-worn CCTV cameras, similar to those used by Police Officers. This would assist them in dealing with incidents of anti-social behaviour.

The training programme for Neighbourhood Wardens includes dealing with Street Drinkers.

The option of providing a shelter, or similar area, where Street Drinkers can congregate is explored.

That when reports of fly-tipping are made by Neighbourhood Wardens the rubbish is collected as a matter of urgency.
A room in Children’s’ Centres, and other appropriate community buildings, is used for Neighbourhood Wardens to hot-desk, with a telephone, on various set days. The purpose being for residents to meet with the Neighbourhood Warden and share any issues they may have. The days and times that the Neighbourhood Warden is based at one of the community buildings should be widely promoted within the ward.

In acknowledging that the need to ascertain why individuals rough sleep and street drink; Religious organisations are contacted to establish how they do and could provide assistance.

6.3 That details of the cleaning schedule of the town centre, including Emporium Way is provided to the Scrutiny Panel.

6.4 In recognising that there are already a number of flats that have cameras in their communal areas; it is recommended that the Scrutiny Panel requests information on their effectiveness in respect of reducing ASB from Northampton Partnership Homes (NPH).

6.5 All agencies dealing with anti-social behaviour are recommended to link in with, and make referrals to the Northampton Anti-Social Behaviour Unit (ASBU) to ensure effective management of anti-social behaviour issues/cases.

6.6 In ensuring an effective response is provided in supporting victims/witnesses and addressing perpetrators behaviour, it is recognised that the ECIN’s case management system is the central location for detailing and logging all anti-social behaviour cases for Northampton Borough Council.

Author: Tracy Tiff, Scrutiny Officer, on behalf of Councillor Dennis Meredith, Chair, Scrutiny Panel
2 – The Impact of Anti-Social Behaviour on the Town Centre
9 November 2015
INTRODUCTION

At its meeting held on 8 October 2015, Scrutiny Panel 2 (The Impact of Anti-Social Behaviour on the Town) heard about the Safety Centre “Hazard Alley” that is located in Milton Keynes.

The Chair felt that it would be useful for this Scrutiny Panel to receive a briefing note on Hazard Alley which would inform the evidence base of the Scrutiny review.

HAZARD ALLEY

It is reported that Hazard Alley, located at the Safety Centre Milton Keynes, is the first purpose-built interactive centre where children, aged 6-12, can experience 12 hazardous scenarios in perfect safety.

The Centre reports that Hazard Alley is the result of collaboration between Buckinghamshire Fire & Rescue Service and Thames Valley Police. It creates a partnership between statutory organisations, local government, health authorities, and the private sector. The Centre adds that in this respect it meets the requirements of both the ‘Health of the Nation’ document and the Crime and Disorder Act.

The Centre is supported by a Board of Trustees who are drawn from both the public and private sector.

Hazard Alley was opened in 1994 by the Duchess of Gloucester. The Centre reports that it quickly established itself as a 'must do' for schools seeking innovative new ways to introduce children to elements of the National Curriculum such as peer pressure and bullying, vandalism and personal safety.

The Centre has approximately 20,000 children, including special needs groups, visiting per year. Since its inception, over 320,000 school children have received its interactive safety education.
2.6 It is noted that the Safety Centre has also encouraged and helped other areas to create their own centres.

HAZARDOUS SCENARIOS

2.7 The 12 hazardous scenarios that children can experience at Hazard Alley are:

- Fire Safety
- Home Safety
- Building Site
- Road Safety
- Railway Safety
- Car Safety
- Personal Safety
- Water Safety
- First Aid & the Recovery Position
- Farm Safety
- Crime & Consequences
- Vandalism & Consequences
- Drug Awareness
- Internet Safety

FIRE SAFETY

2.8 It is reported that this area is used to raise awareness of domestic fire safety precautions (smoke alarms, escape routes etc.) and teaches children what to do in the event of a fire in the home.

HOME SAFETY

2.9 This area raises children's awareness of the potential dangers in the home and the causes of everyday domestic accidents.

BUILDING SITE

2.10 This area is used to show that a building site is not a place to play and not a place that children should be without permission. It also raises awareness of the dangers of abandoned or burnt out vehicles.

ROAD SAFETY

2.11 This area of Hazard Alley raises the children's awareness of the need to find a safe place to cross a road, and the distances vehicles take to stop. The subject of safer cycling is also discussed.
RAILWAY SAFETY

2.12 This area of Hazard Alley emphasises the dangers of playing on or near the railway and high voltage lines and overhead cables. We also discuss the serious implications of vandalism on the railway.

CAR SAFETY

2.13 This area makes children and adults aware of the dangers and hazards of a garage forecourt, and the importance of wearing seatbelts etc.

PERSONAL SAFETY

2.14 This area raises children’s awareness of the ‘Early Warning Signs’ given by our bodies when we are not feeling safe and to avoid danger by acting on these signs. Peer pressure is also discussed and who they can talk to about it.

WATER SAFETY

2.15 Awareness is raised of hazards associated with swimming anywhere other than a swimming pool. Also what to do, and not to do, if someone is in trouble in the water.

FIRST AID AND THE RECOVERY POSITION

2.16 This area is for teaching children how to respond to an emergency and put someone into the recovery position.

FARM SAFETY

2.17 This area raises awareness of the many dangers of farm machinery and farmyard animals.

CRIME AND CONSEQUENCES

2.18 This area aims to make children understand the feelings associated with crime from the perspective of the victim, the offender and the community as a whole.

VANDALISM AND CONSEQUENCES

2.19 This area raises the children's awareness of the consequences of vandalism, for them and for others. It is reported that awareness of vandalism is a constant theme throughout the Safety Centre. A specific scenario depicts an anti-vandalism message. This is shown as a video, which is filmed against a Milton Keynes background, using local school aged pupils to deliver far-reaching messages. The substation scenario
reminds children of the dangers of electricity and how to report any incidents of vandalism.

**DRUG AWARENESS**

2.20 The Centre reports that its Schools Liaison Officers are trained to present drug education messages. Classroom work involves the presentation of an interactive CD ROM (funded by Milton Keynes Drug Action Team - MKDAT), followed by role-play and discussion work. The Centre goes on to state that the session highlights the distinction between: socially accepted drugs, over the counter medicines, prescription medicines and illegal drugs. Protective Behaviours strategies are used throughout to emphasise the fact that behaviour is a choice with an effect.

2.21 The Safety Centre offers follow-up lessons to every group that visits the Centre. It is reported that these sessions directly reinforce the messages given at the Centre whilst encouraging community safety and citizenship. They are specifically designed to encourage children to change their behaviour towards taking responsibility.

**INTERNET SAFETY**

**INTERNET SAFETY FOR PARENTS**

2.21 The Centre reports that it offers parents sessions which cover risks associated with social networking, gaming, cyberbullying, sexting and what people can do as a parent to manage these risks.

2.22 It is highlighted that these sessions are not suitable for children and are delivered on school premises at parents’ convenience (twilight sessions / evenings / inset days).

**INTERNET SAFETY FOR CHILDREN**

2.23 The Centre reports it is important that we make children aware of the benefits of using these sites, but also of possible dangers. With this in mind, The Safety Centre offers Year 5 & 6 children the opportunity to watch an Internet Safety Chatroom DVD.

2.24 The children are presented with a series of questions and their answers are recorded by the guide. Schools then receive the recorded answers.

**CHILDREN’S FOLLOW UP SESSIONS**

2.25 The Safety Centre offers follow-up lessons to every group that visits the Centre. These sessions directly reinforce the messages given at the Centre whilst encouraging community safety and citizenship. It is reported
they are specifically designed to encourage children to change their behaviour towards taking responsibility.

2.26.1 It is reported that all of the scenarios link to various elements of the curriculum.

2.27 The Centre can accommodate up to 72 children per tour.

2.28 Sessions start from 9.30am, 12.30pm and 6.30 pm (these times are flexible) and the tour lasts for two hours (1 and a half in the evening). There is a 15 minutes introduction before each tour starts to and a 10-15 minutes debrief at the end of the tour. The overall time of the visit to the Centre is estimated at a minimum of 2 and 1/2 hours.

2.29 The Centre is open from 9 - 5, Monday to Friday, and there be a 24-hour answer phone facility.

2.30 The cost is £7.25 plus vat (£8.70) per child with a minimum group size of 6 children, no charge is made for accompanying adults. Evening visitors are asked to pay for a minimum of 15 children. There is a bursary available to give help with the cost. The aim of the bursary is to provide grants for children that are 'disadvantaged' in order that they might benefit from the Safety Centre facility.

3 OPEN DAY

3.1 Every year the Centre holds an open day for all to come and have a look at the facilities on offer and experience some of the interactive displays. It is a free event.

3.2 The next open day is scheduled for 24 July 2016.

4 RECOMMENDATION

4.1 That the information provided in this briefing note informs the evidence base of this Scrutiny Review.

Author: Tracy Tiff, Scrutiny Officer, on behalf of Councillor Dennis Meredith, Chair, Scrutiny Panel
2 – The Impact of Anti-Social Behaviour on the Town Centre
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1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 At its meeting held on 8 October 2015, Scrutiny Panel 2 (The Impact of Anti-Social Behaviour on the Town) heard about the work undertaken by Street Pastors.

1.2 The Chair felt that it would be useful for this Scrutiny Panel to receive a briefing note on Street Pastors, which would inform the evidence base of this Scrutiny review.

2 STREET PASTORS

2.1 Street Pastors were founded in Brixton, south London, in 2003 by Reverend Les Isaac. It was based on a model from Jamaica. Street Pastors is an initiative of the Ascension Trust, a registered charity established in 1993.

2.2 Street Pastors are trained volunteers from local churches who care about their community.

2.3 The reported role of a Street Pastor is someone who is:

- a Christian and is part of a local church;
- concerned for society and their local community;
- willing to engage with people, whatever their perspective on life and wherever they hang out;
- happy to work in a team and in collaboration with other agencies and projects, both statutory and voluntary.
2.4 Equipment carried by Street Pastors:

- Shoulder bag
- Torch
- Gardening gloves
- Rubber Gloves
- Flip flops
- Small bottles of water
- Small dustpan & brush for broken glass
- First Aid equipment
- Note Pad & Pen
- Wireless handset - Team Leader to operate
- Mobile Phone - to be carried by one of the team
- Spikeys - a plastic "use once only" stopper that helps prevent drinks from being spiked
- Community Safety Packs/Handouts
- Evidence Bags/Drugs Bags/Knife Tube
- Leaflets

CASE STUDIES

2.5 The following case studies are published on the National Street Pastors Website:

**Case Study 1**

I would like to say a huge thanks to the street pastors. I think they do a really good job. Especially offering flip flops to my friend. It's such a good idea and cause. Thank you."

"I was down town on Saturday night, I had no shoes on and a street pastor came and gave me a pair of flip flops to wear. I went to offer him money which he refused. He was really caring and polite. I think they're a great set of people and what they're doing just proves how caring they are … I can't say a bad word about them." 

"Thank you so much for your kindness. My friend and her feet were so grateful! We genuinely couldn't believe it. It's such a great thing you are doing and you made our night!"

**Case Study 2**

My story begins at a nightclub I was at a few weeks ago. I was out with a few friends getting absolutely hammered, carelessly knocking back shots and drinking copious amounts of beer. The nightclub closes and I stumble outside and my girlfriend points out that there is a group of street pastors, just like the ones I saw on TV (they were involved in a documentary recently). I decided to drunkenly approach them and gregariously tell them that I saw them on TV and that I thought it was nice that they helped people who have had a bit too much to drink.

"I don't remember the entire conversion but basically I asked them if they were religious and one of them explained that they were Christian. I explained to them that I was not religious but I appreciated the work that they are doing.
“To be honest, I thought that was their motivation for doing this kind of work was to try to preach to people about religion but I soon found out that wasn’t their motivation and they explained to me their motivation was Jesus Christ and the kindness that he showed the world.”

I actually have tears in my eyes writing this. Honestly, I’m not really an emotional person and I’m very rarely touched by words like this so I don’t know why this gets to me so much.

“I said to the street pastors that they are really nice people for doing what they do and one of them replied to me and said ‘You’re a really nice person too.’ That’s it. A few simple words seemed to have a profound effect on me and I don’t know why.

I don’t feel as if I’ve really done anything that is that bad in my life and I don’t go about thinking that I’m a bad person. I don’t think I’m unpleasant in any way but I feel that in this day and age it is very rare for people to say such nice things to random strangers, especially outside of nightclubs, so maybe that is why it touched me in the way that it did.

NORTHAMPTON STREET PASTORS

2.6 Northampton Street Pastors were formed in October 2008 and come under the umbrella of The Ascension Trust which has over 11,500 Street and Prayer Pastors impacting over 250 local town and cities nationally. It consists of volunteers who are drawn from 18 Christian churches of different denominations in Northampton.

2.7 It is reported that there are often between 12,000-30,000 people out partying in the “night-time economy” in Northampton on a Friday or Saturday night. The aim of the Street Pastors is to provide a listening ear and practical help to the socially marginalised, the needy and often those who have drunk too much. Street Pastors are non-judgemental and will give time and help to anyone in need.

2.8 Street Pastors patrol the streets of Northampton on some Fridays and every Saturday night from 22.30 to 04.00 and form what is known as “The Urban Trinity” working in partnership with the police and local council. In addition the Street Pastors work with a range of voluntary and statutory organisations in order to reach and help all those in need.

2.9 The Street Pastors comment that many people ask them if it is “dangerous” at that time of night but most evenings there is a really positive atmosphere, opportunity for the Street Pastors to help, and genuine appreciation by revellers of what Street Pastors are doing to help whether it is providing practical help like flip-flops, water or just listening.

2.10 As of July 2015, there are over 40 Street Pastors in Northampton who have all been on the training course to develop specific skills and knowledge to deal with a variety of potential situations. Most Street Pastors will go out with a Team Leader to form a patrol on one Friday or Saturday a month. .
2.11 The Street Pastors advise that one of the additional benefits of the work is that the Police and Crime Commissioner for Northamptonshire has acknowledged that Northampton Street Pastors has contributed to the reduction of violent crime, reducing acquisitive crime and making Northamptonshire a secure place.

3 RECOMMENDATION

3.1 That the information provided in this briefing note informs the evidence base of this Scrutiny Review.