

# Chichester District Council

## OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

12 March 2018

### Community Safety Review Final report from the Task & Finish Group (TFG)

#### 1. Contacts

**Author:** Pam Dignum, Chairman of the Community Safety Task and Finish Group  
Phone: 01243 538585 Email: pdignum@chichester.gov.uk

#### 2. Recommendations

The committee is requested to consider the final report from the Community Safety Partnership (CSP) and to note the following:

- 1) That the required level of scrutiny of the Community Safety Partnership (CSP) had been achieved.
- 2) That the performance of the CSP is good and that evidence of effective partnership working in the district had been demonstrated.
- 3) That next year's review should focus on cybercrime, drugs and the impacts of any West Sussex County Council (WSCC) budget cuts on areas the Council may be responsible for (as outlined in para 5.1(e) of the report).

#### 3. Background

- 3.1 Chichester District Council (CDC) has a statutory responsibility to participate in the CSP in accordance with sections 19 and 20 of the Police and Justice Act 2006. Overview and Scrutiny committees of local authorities have a responsibility to scrutinise the activity of CSPs on an annual basis.
- 3.2 The TFG comprised of Ms Pam Dignum (Chair), Caroline Neville and Mr H Potter and met twice in February 2019.
- 3.3 At the first meeting Ms P Bushby from the Council's Communities Team, outlined the CSP annual report 2018/19, CSP performance plan 2018/21 and CSP spending plan 2018/19.
- 3.4 At the second meeting the following witnesses gave evidence:
  - Mrs Eileen Lintill, Cabinet Member for Community Services and the Council's representative on the Police and Crime Panel (PCP), emphasised the main purpose of that panel in holding the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) to account.
  - Emily King, Principal Manager Community Safety and Wellbeing, provided an overview and a general progress update on the SWSP Community Safety Plan and Chichester District Council links in.

- Chief Inspector Kris Ottery of Sussex Police outlined some priority partnership work around serious organised crime.

#### 4. Outcomes to be achieved

- 4.1. The terms of reference set the outcomes as reviewing the CSP's performance over the last year, identifying areas of concern and giving any necessary input into the strategic direction of the CSP for the following year.

#### 5. Evidence

- 5.1. Ms Bushby praised joint working with the Police and with the Arun and Chichester Prevention team. Prevention and detection were emphasized along with help for victims. The joint 4 key priorities were child sexual exploitation (CSE), street community, mental health (not discussed) and serious organised crime.
  - a) Crime levels were relatively low with a small decrease on last year except theft from vehicles, largely by a Hants organised crime group (one caught and in prison). Partnership with police especially good with vehicle crime and bike thefts (marking them helps); also with rough sleeping and tackling exploitation. Police have targeted criminals via other means like benefit fraud and non-payment of council tax. Cross-border partnership was important.
  - b) Hate crime was 9/10 verbal but numbers remained low at around 8 per month. The Wrenford Centre in Chichester is helping its attendees with stickers on shops where they can find help via the "Our City" project.
  - c) Cybercrime is growing but CDC with WSCC are promoting awareness online, backed by schools, where this is covered along with domestic abuse training and 5 ways to Wellbeing. Ms Bushby also gives a range of training in a variety of settings around these issues.
  - d) Drugs: County Lines emanate from London; and whilst there is little evidence of a problem in the north of the district there is evidence of this activity in the City. Multi-agency response pays off : children in Ave de Chartres car park led to arrest of drug dealers.
  - e) Neighbourhoods are helped by action such as the creation of a community hub in Chi East, cleaning up Midhurst Holmbush area, and actions to help rough sleepers. Roads are made safer by courses for older drivers and attention to speeds. The gypsy & traveller transit site is working well with small problems quickly resolved. WSCC spending cuts will impact on CDC, with less early intervention so more ASB could be expected, and maybe an increase in crime. The value of having an ASB case worker is clear.
- 5.2. So the public is protected to a good degree, but some problems are outside the CSP's control, such as thefts from cars, airbnbs used for drug dealing, or hidden exploitation.
- 5.3. The Performance Plan 18-21 showed continued work on all priorities, reducing impact of crimes such as domestic abuse, ASB, hate and cyber, including

training at university level and use of wardens; surveillance of those in danger of exploitation, information for immigrants or those radically-inclined, cyclist safety and public presence.

- 5.4. CSP spending plans 18/19 showed more targeted initiatives and projects being delivered despite less funding, most of which had to be spent in the year.
- 5.5. At the 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting Mrs Lintill had very constrained time so emphasized that the main purpose of the Police and Crime panel was to hold the Commissioner Katy Bourne to account, ensuring she confers with the Chief Constable about issues. Her panel also looked at precept proposals for budget and how this money was used. The powers of the Police and Crime Panel had not changed; members should view her 17/18 report and view the website plus Minutes.
- 5.6. Emily King of WSCC spoke of its working priorities for community safety, closely connecting to CDC's aims. She praised:
  - a) the "Prevent" strategy, progressing strongly, working against hate crime, giving victim support.
  - b) work against organised crime, with 3 local groups, county wide work using social media effectively
  - c) work against drug and alcohol misuse. Depot staff report finds, pinpointing areas sometimes unexpected. Drugs have become stronger; there is an alert system and large hauls have been found. Treatment providers and First Aiders are important; analysis of drug-related deaths can help alongside providing overdose training for staff. Social media is monitored.
  - d) Child exploitation: investment led to progress with support for carers, with school surveys. Schools responded by "safe digital life" workstreams, breaking down "crime type" silos, to show the whole context via lessons in geography, IT, emphasizing that people when in groups behave differently.
  - e) Domestic abuse can be worse after separation. Only 50% of reported cases involve children. Schools have a role in awareness, prevention in future. This needs collaboration with police triage system.
- 5.7. WSCC are developing an exploitation strategy statement, focusing on safeguarding adults and children, looking at a wider definition including loan sharks, poor accommodation, cuckooing and other aspects of life which leave some people vulnerable.
- 5.8. Members realised that as well as an ageing population locally, the community is changing with needs outside traditional areas, with wider pockets of vulnerability. So the work of CDC with WSCC and other partners is vital.
- 5.9. Kris Ottery outlined some priority partnership work on tackling
  - a) radicalisation especially when digitally based
  - b) modern slavery (eg car wash, agriculture, cleaning, cannabis farm)
  - c) County lines into Bognor and drug sales (leading to addiction, debts, violence)

d) local crime (fake goods in Selsey), and serious organised crime

- 5.10. The TFG had read police material emphasising that there was more demand yet fewer officers, so prioritisation using technology was vital; crime was changing with CSE, drugs, knives, hate crime; much work was intelligence-led; the aim was still to keep people free from harm and to respond to real concerns; there were on average 19k emergency calls to Sussex Police monthly graded 1-5 by a triage team. Their visible presence was stronger in areas of greater risk
- 5.11. He answered questions on anti-slavery actions by saying they used native speakers of Polish, Romanian etc on Facebook to give facts on workers' rights, and give a different image of police from their own countries. Some workers were unwilling to admit slavery because they didn't want to be sent back to their own country.
- 5.12. How was new money to be spent? It would provide 100 more PCSOs across Sussex where needed most; car break-ins at beauty spots didn't need full police officers so a good example of where PCSO's could be deployed. The 6 West Sussex districts would allocate staff to prevention, missing persons, CSE, community investigations, burglaries across borders, county lines. Public perception of police must change by publicising actions and successes; the public could go out with police patrols.
- 5.13. Why no local 101 centre? Surges in usage would make this impractical. A 45 minute wait to be answered was not the norm; it was usually much shorter. The public could visit a 101 centre to see.
- 5.14. Speeding enforcement could be good but what about speeding in villages? They could ask for "community speed watch" monitoring. No rural issue of guns was experienced.
- 5.15. Short-term prison sentences to be abolished? GPS would help keep watch on short-term offenders.
- 5.16. Public role? The public must report suspicious behaviour, anonymously if necessary via Crimestoppers. The public must be vigilant because the police can't be around 24/7. Police had to prioritise, and the public could help by not using 101 for minor problems or matters unrelated to crime.
- 5.17. The complex nature of crime was clear, constantly changing, with abuse of airbnbs was a developing one. Police services were under financial and personnel constraints, and existing partnerships were vital to success, including training in schools to increase awareness and use of media, plus public co-operation.
- 5.18. The group felt police had answered their questions and had given a good account of their ability to respond to a changing crime scene despite reduced manpower and funding.

## **6. Conclusion**

- 6.1. The required level of scrutiny had been achieved, the performance of CSP and police very good, showing effective partnership working, in a changing scene.

## 7. Alternatives that have been considered

7.1. The nature of the statutory duty to review performance does constrain the topic. The speakers invited were to evidence those specific elements, however in future opportunity could be taken to explore other areas of work in more detail and introduce other partners and witnesses to the committee.

## 8. Other Implications

	Yes	No
<b>Crime and Disorder</b>	X	
<b>Climate Change and Biodiversity</b>		X
<b>Human Rights and Equality Impact</b>	X	
<b>Safeguarding and Early Help</b>	X	
<b>General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR)</b>		X
<b>Health and Wellbeing</b>	X	

## 9. Appendices

Appendix 1 – Community Safety Partnership Annual Report 2018/19

## 10. Background Papers

Community Safety Review 2019 Task and Finish Group terms of reference are available online (Overview and Scrutiny Committee agenda of 15 January 2019)