



SAFER HARTLEPOOL PARTNERSHIP AGENDA



Friday 3 August 2018

at 10.00 a.m

**in Committee Room B,
Civic Centre, Hartlepool**

MEMBERS: SAFER HARTLEPOOL PARTNERSHIP

Councillor Christopher Akers-Belcher, Elected Member, Hartlepool Borough Council
Councillor Jim Lindridge, Elected Member, Hartlepool Borough Council
Gill Alexander, Chief Executive, Hartlepool Borough Council
Denise Ogden, Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods, Hartlepool Borough Council
Tony Hanson, Assistant Director, Environment and Neighbourhood Services, Hartlepool Borough Council
Peter Brambleby, Interim Director of Public Health, Hartlepool Borough Council
Chief Superintendent Alastair Simpson, Neighbourhood Partnership and Policing Command, Cleveland Police
Barry Coppinger, Office of Police and Crime Commissioner for Cleveland
Chief Inspector Nigel Burnell, Chair of Youth Offending Board
Ann Powell, Head of Area, Cleveland National Probation Service
John Graham, Director of Operations, Durham Tees Valley Community Rehabilitation Company
Simon Weastell, District Manager, Cleveland Fire Authority
John Bentley, Voluntary and Community Sector Representative, Chief Executive, Safe in Tees Valley
Chris Joynes, Director of Customer Support, Thirteen Group
Jean Golightly, Director of Nursing and Quality, Hartlepool and Stockton on Tees Clinical Commissioning Group
Sally Robinson, Director of Children's and Joint Commissioning Services, Hartlepool Borough Council
Jill Harrison, Director of Adult and Community Based Services, Hartlepool Borough Council

- 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**
- 2. TO RECEIVE ANY DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS**
- 3. MINUTES**

3.1 To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 22 June 2018



4. ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

- 4.1 Prevent Update – Contest Strategy 2018 – *Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods*
- 4.2 Safer Hartlepool Partnership Performance – *Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods*
- 4.3 Integrated Working – Neighbourhood Safety Group Update – *Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods*

5. ANY OTHER BUSINESS WHICH THE CHAIR CONSIDERS URGENT

FOR INFORMATION:

Date of next meeting – Friday 12 October 2018 at 10.00 am in the Civic Centre, Hartlepool



SAFER HARTLEPOOL PARTNERSHIP

MINUTES AND DECISION RECORD

22 JUNE 2018

The meeting commenced at 10.00 am in the Civic Centre, Hartlepool

Present:

Councillor Christopher Akers-Belcher (In the Chair)

Councillor Jim Lindridge.

Also present: Denise Ogden, Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods,
Hartlepool Borough Council
Clare Clark, Head of Community Safety and Engagement, Hartlepool
Borough Council
Chief Superintendent Alastair Simpson, Neighbourhood Partnership and
Policing Command, Cleveland Police
Chief Inspector Nigel Burnell, Chair of Youth Offending Board
Ian Armstrong, Durham Tees Valley Community Rehabilitation
Company
Ian Dixon, Cleveland Fire Authority
John Bentley, Voluntary and Community Sector Representative, Chief
Executive, Safe in Tees Valley
Libby Griffiths, Thirteen Group
A Peavor, Hartlepool and Stockton on Tees Clinical Commissioning
Group
Sally Robinson, Director of Children's and Joint Commissioning Services,
Hartlepool Borough Council

Jill Harrison, Director of Adult and Community Based Services
Martin Booth, Justice First

Officers: Rachel Parker, Community Safety Team Leader
David Cosgrove, Democratic Services Team

1. Apologies for Absence

Gill Alexander, Chief Executive, Hartlepool Borough Council
Peter Brambleby, Interim Director of Public Health, Hartlepool Borough
Council
Barry Coppinger, Office of Police and Crime Commissioner for Cleveland
John Graham, Director of Operations, Durham Tees Valley Community
Rehabilitation Company
Simon Weastell, District Manager, Cleveland Fire Authority

Chris Joynes, Director of Customer Support, Thirteen Group
 Jean Golightly, Director of Nursing and Quality, Hartlepool and Stockton on
 Tees Clinical Commissioning Group

2. **Declarations of Interest**

None.

3. **Retirement of Clare Clark**

The Chair indicated that this meeting would be the final meeting attended by Clare Clark, Head of Community Safety and Engagement within Borough Council before her retirement at the end of the month. The Chair wished to record his thanks for all the support he had received from Ms Clark during his time as Chair of the Partnership. Members echoed the Chair's sentiments.

4. **Minutes of the meeting held on 13 April, 2018**

Confirmed.

5. **Justice First – (*Justice First Manager*)**

Purpose of report

To receive a presentation from Justice First on their work with refugees and asylum seekers.

Issue(s) for consideration

Martin Booth, Fundraising Assistant with Justice First, gave a presentation to the Partnership outlining the work it undertook in Hartlepool in coordination with the Mary Thompson Fund and Tees Valley of Sanctuary. The presentation outlined the following key points: -

According to Article 1 of the 1951 United Nations Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees, a refugee is “someone who has a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, nationality, religious belief, political opinion or membership of a particular social group; is outside the country of his or her nationality and is unable, or owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country.”

An asylum seeker is someone who has applied to be recognised as a refugee and is waiting for a decision. The right to seek asylum is enshrined in international law. It is recognised that using false documents is sometimes necessary to flee a country. There is no such thing as an

“illegal” asylum seeker.

A Migrant is someone who crosses a border voluntarily for reasons like employment or education. Should a migrant elect to return home they would continue to receive the protection of their government.

An Immigrant is someone who chooses to leave voluntarily, to live elsewhere – usually permanently.

An Illegal immigrant is someone who crosses a border and intentionally avoids informing the authorities.

Asylum seekers and refugees came from all walks of life and may be fleeing their home country due to war, conflict, political, religious and sexual discrimination.

The situation of asylum seekers on the Mediterranean island of Chios was highlighted showing the different countries they were fleeing. This was an island that Mr Booth had worked as an aid worker.

Those asylum seekers that reached Britain still faced many obstacles such as language barriers. Many were educated and qualified people but those qualifications may not be recognised in the UK. Most will have been working before they left their home and didn't want to be on benefits.

World-wide 65.3 million people have been forced to flee their homes and are either refugees, asylum seekers or internally displaced persons; 5 million of those in 2016 alone. Developing countries now host over 86% of all the refugees (70% 10 years ago) and an average of 42,500 persons were forced to flee their homes every day in 2014.

There were just under 32,500 claims for asylum in the UK last year; compared to Germany (442,000), Sweden (156,000), and France (74,000). Most refugees were in countries that neighbour conflict countries: Turkey, Pakistan, Lebanon, Iran, Ethiopia, Jordan and now Bangladesh. 86% of refugees are hosted by the poorest countries, leaving just 14% across the rest of the world. Only 0.32% of UK population were refugees.

The major source countries of refugees across the world were Syria, Afghanistan, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, DRC and now Myanmar.

People Seeking Asylum in Teesside in 2017 - Stockton: 892; Redcar and Cleveland: 44; Middlesbrough: 600; and Hartlepool: 188.

Justice First staff and volunteers help asylum seekers to assess their own case and if they have reasonable prospect of mounting an appeal they are helped to collect the evidence that they need. If an appeal is accepted legal aid and state assistance is re-instated and they are supported emotionally and practically.

The Mary Thompson Fund was a hardship fund established in 2001 for asylum/sanctuary seekers and to help settle refugees. The fund provided weekly cash and food from base in Stockton with funds coming mostly from donations from local people and organisations; around £30,000 - £40,000 each year. The fund aimed to be flexible and provide a quick response. The fund applied for small grants to cover admin costs, so that every penny donated goes to people in need.

Justice First helped people refused asylum to re-engage with the legal process and also emotional and practical support. It would refer people to other agencies who can help and provided an outreach venue for the Red Cross, the Mary Thompson Fund, and local immigration solicitors. Justice First also undertook awareness raising and lobbying and worked in partnership with other organisations supporting asylum seekers.

In Hartlepool, Justice First had worked with a total number of 42 clients plus 19 dependants supported over the last three years. Currently the group was engaged with 20 clients and 19 dependants. All of these clients were supported by the Home Office. Four of these clients were successfully referred to a solicitor and were represented by them. The presentation also outlined a case study of a family in Hartlepool and the work of a volunteer with the group.

Justice First promoted the work of Tees Valley of Sanctuary in Hartlepool among twenty three other partner organisations and High Tunstall School were working to be recognised as a School of Sanctuary.

Mr Booth thanked the Council for its contribution of £5000 to support the fund over each of the next two years. This, together with support from other local authorities was valuable contribution to the organisation.

The Chair thanked Mr Booth for the presentation and stated that he and the Partnership respected the work undertaken by Justice First in supporting those asylum seekers and refugees that were now making Hartlepool their home.

Decision

That the presentation be noted.

6. Safer Hartlepool Partnership Terms of Reference – Membership Refresh *(Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods)*

Purpose of report

To consider a refresh of the Safer Hartlepool Partnership Terms of Reference to reflect changes in membership.

Issue(s) for consideration

The Head of Community Safety and Engagement reported that following discussion at the Safer Hartlepool Partnership development day held in 2017 the refreshed Terms of Reference also now includes Hartlepool Borough Councils Director of Adult and Community Based Services and the Assistant Director, Environment and Neighbourhood Services as additional members. It was proposed that reference to the Chair of the bench of Hartlepool Magistrates be removed following the closure of Hartlepool Magistrates Court.

In the Terms of Reference the Leader of the Council is the Chair of the Safer Hartlepool Partnership with the Vice Chair of the Partnership being agreed on an annual basis who must be from one of the responsible authorities other than the Council.

Decision

1. That the Partnership approves the refresh of the Terms of Reference in order to reflect changes to the Safer Hartlepool Partnership Membership as outlined in Appendix A to the report.
2. That the Partnership approves the inclusion of the Borough Council's Director of Adult and Community Based Services and the Assistant Director, Environment and Neighbourhood Services as new members to the Partnership
3. That the Partnership agrees not to invite a representative from Teesside Magistrates to become a member of the Partnership.
4. That the Partnership approves the Chief Superintendent of Neighbourhoods and Partnerships continuing in the role of Vice Chair for the new municipal year.

7. Community Safety Plan 2017-20 (Year 2) *(Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods)*

Purpose of report

To consider the annual refresh (Year 2) of the 2017-20 Safer Hartlepool Partnership Community Safety Plan.

Issue(s) for consideration

The Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods reported that following

presentation and discussion of the key findings within the annual strategic assessment to the Safer Hartlepool Partnership in April 2018 a draft version of the refreshed Community Safety Plan (Year 2) was submitted for the Partnership's consideration. Subject to approval the Community Safety Plan would be considered by the Council's Finance and Policy Committee prior to being considered for adoption by full Council.

The Chair highlighted that Substance Misuse Policy was to be considered by the Health and Wellbeing Board as a priority area this year. Further reports would, therefore, come back to the Partnership as appropriate.

The following recommendations were approved unanimously.

Decision

1. That the Partnership approves the draft Community Safety Plan 2017-20 (Year 2).
2. That the Partnership approves the Task/Sub Group reporting timetable.
3. That the Borough Council's Director of Children's and Joint Commissioning Services be appointed as Chair of the Domestic Abuse Group.

8. Acquisitive Crime Task Group Update (*Durham Tees Valley Community Rehabilitation Company*)

Purpose of report

To receive an update report on the work of the Acquisitive Crime Task Group.

Issue(s) for consideration

The Head of Community Safety and Engagement reported that following the establishment of the Task Group in March 2018 the group had investigated the potential impact of the government's welfare reforms and the implementation of Universal Credit on acquisitive crime. The detailed update report was submitted for the Partnership's consideration.

Chief Superintendent Simpson asked if the further work being undertaken by the Task Group would be reported back to the Partnership. The Chair requested that any important additional information be circulated directly to Partners when/if available.

Decision

1. That the report be noted; and
2. That any significant additional information from the Task Group be circulated to the Partnership as and when appropriate.

9. **Safer Hartlepool Partnership Performance** *(Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods)*

Purpose of report

To provide an overview of Safer Hartlepool Partnership performance for Quarter 4 – January 2018 – March 2018 (inclusive).

Issue(s) for consideration

The Community Safety Team Leader commented on the detailed statistics included with the report which showed that all recorded crime, except vehicle crime, had shown an increase over the quarter. This was, however, the lowest increase over the four Police Districts. Bicycle and vehicle crime had reduced significantly following a campaign around garden crime encouraging households to ensure sheds and gardens were locked. While no targeting bicycle crime specifically, most bicycle thefts were from homes.

There had been a reduction in recorded anti-social behaviour of around 17% with a significant reduction in nuisance anti-social behaviour. There had also been a reduction in the numbers of deliberately set fires, though this was partially attributed to the very wet weather earlier in the year.

The Community Safety Team Leader also highlighted that the number of first time entrants to the criminal justice system had also reduced significantly with only three new entrants to the system in the quarter.

The Chair commented that while there was an overall increase in recorded crime there were a number of positives that should be focussed on. It was suggested that to assist further the good work that had been done on bicycle crime, some work with schools encouraging school children to lock their bikes particularly during the school holidays. In relation to the deliberate fires it was questioned as to whether the recent high profile fires were due to accidents or arson. Chief Inspector Burnell commented that suggestion to work with schools would be taken forward. Much of the success in the bicycle crime figures had been due to reuniting stolen bikes with their owners. There was a sub group working on deliberately set fires which was also working with owners of vulnerable buildings to ensure the Police and Fire Brigade had up-to-date key holder information. The Fire Brigade representative indicated that officers were working with the Police

in investigating deliberately set fires.

The Chair considered that the new integrated community safety team was proving its worth and indicated that he would like to include some of the positive news in his next Leader's Bulletin.

It was questioned as how the work with troubled families was impacting on crime figures. The Chair suggested that a report on this important area of work would be helpful for a future meeting.

The repeat incidents of domestic violence was raised with concern expressed at the potential increase in incidents during the world cup. Chief Superintendent Simpson stated that there was additional provision and support for victims for domestic abuse, which was unfortunately a part of police officers regular business.

A member referred to the public perception around acquisitive crime where people often feel the police were not doing enough. The success around bicycle crime for example needed to be better communicated with the public, particularly through social media. The Chair agreed and suggested that some additional work through the Communications Team should be undertaken.

The issue of the nuisance caused by off-road motor cycles was raised. The Police representatives indicated that Operation Endurance was continuing to tackle this issue but there were difficulties in identifying bikes and riders. The operation was as much about education as it was seizing bikes and Hartlepool did have fewer reports of these incidents than the other districts. The Police did require as much intelligence as they could get from the public and they would take reports through social media as well. It was a misconception that officers should chase after those causing a nuisance; it was much better to focus on where the bikes were kept. The Chair commented that it would be useful to have a link from the Council's own website and social media to the Police to help in improving reporting.

The issue of Community Payback by offenders was discussed with concern being expressed at the lack of visibility of the 'pay-back'. The public needed to see that this was happening to alley the perception that it was a soft option. The Durham Tees Valley Community Rehabilitation Company representative agreed that much of their work was poorly advertised. The Chair agreed that there were similar anxieties expressed in his ward and requested that the Durham Tees Valley Community Rehabilitation Company should give a presentation to the Partnership outlining the work done and also to allow a discussion on how to better integrate some of the 'pay-back' work with Neighbourhood Services and how to improve the information sharing with the public.

The Durham Tees Valley Community Rehabilitation Company representative was asked if it was correct that Hartlepool offenders were often transferred to 'pay-back' schemes outside of Hartlepool. The

representative stated that this did happen at times to allow work to be managed appropriately but for no other reason than that. There were also a number of placements in local charity shops so offenders were paying back in Hartlepool.

Decision

1. That the report be noted.
2. That a report be submitted to a future meeting outlining the work undertaken with troubled families in Hartlepool and the consequent affect on crime.
3. That a report / presentation be received from the Durham Tees Valley Community Rehabilitation Company on the Community Payback Scheme's operation in Hartlepool.

10. Any Other Items which the Chairman Considers are Urgent

None.

The meeting noted that the next meeting would be held on Friday 3 August 2018 at 10.00 am in the Civic Centre, Hartlepool.

The meeting concluded at 11.00 am.

CHAIR



SAFER HARTLEPOOL PARTNERSHIP

3rd August 2018



Report of: Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods

Subject: PREVENT UPDATE – CONTEST STRATEGY 2018

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To update the Safer Hartlepool Partnership following the Government's review of its counter-terrorism strategy.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 Since early 2003, the United Kingdom has had a long-term strategy for countering international terrorism known as CONTEST.
- 2.2 Between March and September 2017, there were five terrorist attacks in London and Manchester in which 36 innocent people were killed and many more injured.
- 2.3 Following the London Bridge attack in June 2017, the Government reviewed its counter-terrorism strategy, and published its new CONTEST Strategy in June 2018.

3. CONTEST 2018

- 3.1 The updated CONTEST Strategy addresses all forms of terrorism and its aim is "to reduce the risk to the UK and its citizen and interests overseas from terrorism, so that people can go about their lives freely and with confidence".
- 3.2 Delivery of the strategy will continue through the existing '4 Ps' framework: Prevent and Pursue (to reduce the threats we face) and Protect and Prepare (to reduce our vulnerabilities) and focuses on six key areas:
1. Disrupting threats earlier, including through new legislation

2. Supporting counter-terrorism policing and the security and intelligence services by increasing funding and staffing levels
3. Closer working with international partners, including Five Eyes partners, the European Union, and other allies
4. Closer working with key partners outside of central government, with pilots of new multi-agency centres in London, Manchester and the West Midlands and increased co-operation with the private sector
5. Joint working with internet service providers to identify terrorist material online and remove it from internet platforms more quickly
6. Supporting and strengthening the Prevent programme

4. COUNTER-TERRORISM AND BORDER SECURITY BILL 2017-2019

- 4.1 The 2018 CONTEST Strategy will be underpinned by the introduction of new legislation that will seek to amend existing terrorism legislation to enable earlier disruption using investigations, longer prison sentences and stronger management of terrorist offenders following their release.
- 4.2 The Counter-Terrorism and Border Security Bill 2017 - 2019 is currently at the Committee Stage in the House of Commons, having already passed through the Second Reading. The provisions in this Bill will bring in legislative changes to:
 - Make it an offence to express an opinion or belief that is supportive of a proscribed organisation in certain circumstances
 - Criminalise the publication of certain images which would arouse reasonable suspicion that the offender was a member or supporter of a proscribed organisation
 - Strengthen the existing offence of downloading terrorist material and extend it to streaming such material, where this is done on three or more occasions
 - Strengthen existing offences of encouragement of terrorism and dissemination of terrorist publications
 - Increase maximum sentences for certain terrorist offences
 - Add to the list of offences for which extended sentences can be given in certain circumstances
 - Make changes to the notification requirements for registered terrorist offenders, and introduce a new police power to enter and search their homes

- Add certain terrorist offences to the list of offences for which a Serious Crime Prevention Order can be given
- Allow local authorities (as well as the police) to refer people who are considered vulnerable to being drawn into terrorism to the multi-agency panels which assess them and provide support

5. PREVENT

- 5.1 One of the four strands of the CONTEST Strategy is its Prevent programme. The Prevent Strategy aims to stop people becoming terrorists or supporting terrorism by working with a wide variety of partners in the public and private sectors and in local communities.
- 5.2 Under the Counter Terrorism and Security Act 2015, there is a legal requirement for certain specified authorities to deliver Prevent activities. These authorities include local authorities, schools, universities, health organisations, police, prisons and probation and education and health providers.
- 5.3 The updated Prevent Strategy is set out in the 2018 CONTEST document and includes the following revised objectives:
- Tackle the causes of radicalisation and respond to the ideological challenge of terrorism.
 - Safeguard and support those most at risk of radicalisation through early intervention, identifying them and offering support.
 - Enable those who have already engaged in terrorism to disengage and rehabilitate.
- 5.4 One important part of the Prevent Strategy is the “Channel” programme, a multi-agency programme coordinated by the Police to identify individuals vulnerable to radicalization and direct them towards appropriate support.
- 5.5 Local authorities are required to establish what is known as a “Channel panel” to discuss support for people identified by the police as being at risk of being drawn into terrorism, however provisions in the Counter - Terrorism and Border Security Bill will enable local authorities as well as the police to refer people to these panels.

6. CONCLUSION

- 6.1 The local Prevent Operational Group will consider the impact that any legislative changes may have on the delivery of Prevent activity in Hartlepool.

7. RISK IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 The delivery of a coordinated approach to Prevent activity in the local area is aimed at reducing the risk of violent and non-violent extremism in the local area.

8. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 8.1 There are no financial implications associated with this report.

9. LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 9.1 There are no legal implications associated with this report

10. EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY CONSIDERATIONS

- 10.1 There are no equality and diversity implications associated with this report.

11. STAFF CONSIDERATIONS

- 11.1 There are no staff implications associated with this report.

12. ASSET MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS

- 12.1 There are no asset management implications associated with this report.

13. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 13.1 That the Safer Hartlepool Partnership notes the report and comments on the 2018 CONTEST Strategy.

14. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 14.1 The Safer Hartlepool Partnership is responsible for ensuring Prevent activity is co-ordinated locally.

15. BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 15.1 The following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

CONTEST – The United Kingdom’s Strategy for Countering Terrorism 2018 - <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads>

[/attachment_data/file/716907/140618_CCS207_CCS0218929798-1_CONTEST_3.0_WEB.pdf](#)

16. CONTACT OFFICER

Denise Ogden
Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods
Level 3, Civic Centre
Victoria Road
Hartlepool
denise.ogden@hartlepool.org.uk

Rachel Parker
Community Safety Team Leader
Hartlepool Police Station
Avenue Road
Hartlepool
rachel.parker@hartlepool.gov.uk



SAFER HARTLEPOOL PARTNERSHIP

3rd August 2018



Report of: Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods

Subject: SAFER HARTLEPOOL PARTNERSHIP
PERFORMANCE

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To provide an overview of Safer Hartlepool Partnership Performance for Quarter 1 – April 2018 – June 2018 (inclusive).

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The Community Safety Plan 2017-20 outlines the Safer Hartlepool Partnership strategic objectives, annual priorities and key performance indicators 2018/19.

3. PERFORMANCE REPORT

- 3.1 The report attached (**Appendix A**) provides an overview of Safer Hartlepool Partnership performance during Quarter 1, comparing current performance to the same time period in the previous year, where appropriate.
- 3.2 In line with reporting categories defined by the Office for National Statistics (ONS), recorded crime information is presented as:

Victim-based crime – All police-recorded crimes where there is a direct victim. This victim could be an individual, an organisation or corporate body. This category includes violent crimes directed at a particular individual or individuals, sexual offences, robbery, theft offences (including burglary and vehicle offences), criminal damage and arson.

Other crimes against society - All police-recorded crimes where there are no direct individual victims. This includes public disorder, drug offences, possession of weapons and other items, handling stolen goods and other miscellaneous offences committed against the state. The rates for some crime

types within this category could be increased by proactive police activity, for example searching people and finding them in possession of drugs or weapons.

4. RISK IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 The Safer Hartlepool Partnership has a duty under Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 to consider crime and disorder implications within the exercise of its functions. This includes the duty to do all it reasonably can to reduce crime and disorder (including anti-social behaviour), the misuse of drugs, alcohol and other substances and re-offending in Hartlepool. Failure to deliver these functions could lead to an increase in crime and disorder in Hartlepool.

5. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 5.1 There are no financial considerations with this report.

6. LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 6.1 There are no legal considerations with this report.

7. EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY CONSIDERATIONS

- 7.1 There are no equality of diversity implications.

8. STAFF CONSIDERATIONS

- 8.1 There are no staff considerations with this report.

9. ASSET MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS

- 9.1 There are no asset management considerations with this report.

10. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 10.1 The Safer Hartlepool Partnership note and comment on performance in Quarter 1.

11. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 11.1 The Safer Hartlepool Partnership is responsible for overseeing the successful delivery of the Community Safety Plan 2017-20.

12. BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 12.1 The following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:-

Safer Hartlepool Partnership – Community Safety Plan 2017-20

13. CONTACT OFFICER

Denise Ogden
Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods
Hartlepool Borough Council
Regeneration and Neighbourhoods
Civic Centre
Level 3
Email: Denise.Ogden@hartlepool.gov.uk
Tel: 01429 523300

Rachel Parker
Community Safety Team Leader
Hartlepool Borough Council
Regeneration and Neighbourhoods
Hartlepool Police Station
Avenue Road
Email: Rachel.Parker@hartlepool.gov.uk
Tel: 01429 523100

Safer Hartlepool Performance Indicators Quarter 1 April-June 2018

Strategic Objective: Reduce Crime & Repeat Victimisation

Indicator Name	Baseline 2017/18	Local Directional Target 2018/19	Current Position Apr 18 - Jun 18	Actual Difference	% Difference
All Recorded Crime	10769	Reduce	2803	84	3.1%
Residential Burglary	880	Reduce	190	-6	-3.1%
Vehicle Crime	1259	Reduce	196	-75	-27.7%
Shoplifting	1534	Reduce	437	25	6.1%
Local Violence	2431	Reduce	753	148	24.5%
Repeat Cases of Domestic Violence – MARAC	33.25%	Reduce	Awaiting info		

Strategic Objective: Reduce the harm caused by Drugs and Alcohol

Indicator Name	Baseline 2017/18	Local Directional Target 2018/19	Current Position Apr 18 - Jun 18	Actual Difference	% Difference
Number of substance misusers going into effective treatment – Opiate	659	3% increase (TBC)	642	45	7.5%
Proportion of substance misusers that successfully complete treatment - Opiate	6.8%	12% (TBC)	6.1%	0.002	3.4%
Proportion of substance misusers who successfully complete treatment and represent back into treatment within 6 months of leaving treatment	26.5%	10% (TBC)	25.9%	-0.081	-23.8%
Reduction in the rate of alcohol related harm hospital admissions	Data unavailable	Data unavailable	Data unavailable		
Number of young people found in possession of alcohol	8	Reduce	0	0	0%

Strategic Objective: Create Confident, Cohesive and Safe Communities

Indicator Name	Baseline 2017/18	Local Directional Target 2018/19	Current Position Apr 18 - Jun 18	Actual Difference	% Difference
Anti-social Behaviour Incidents reported to the Police	6801	Reduce	1650	-126	-7.1%
Deliberate Fires	416	Reduce	127	-47	-27%
Criminal Damage to Dwellings	627	Reduce	138	3	2.2%
Hate Incidents	176	Increase	38	-17	-30.9%

Strategic Objective: Reduce Offending & Re-Offending

Indicator Name	Baseline 2017/18	Local Directional Target 2018/19	Current Position Apr 18 - Jun 18	Actual Difference	% Difference
Re-offending rate of young offenders*	Data not available	Reduce	Data not available		
First-Time Entrants to the Criminal Justice System	40 (TBC)	Reduce	2	-5	-71.4%
Offences committed by Prolific & Priority Offenders	Data not available	Data not available	Data not available		
Number of Troubled Families engaged with	769	1000	785	245	45.4%
Number of Troubled Families where results have been claimed	368	700	414	184	80%

* Re-offending figure is based on Cohort tracking – new cohort starts every quarter and this cohort (i.e. of Young Persons) is then tracked for a period of 12 months. Example: Jul 2015 to Jun 2016 and tracked until end of Jun2017

Recorded Crime in Hartlepool April 18 – June 18

The Office for National Statistics (ONS) has developed a new approach to presenting crime statistics to help ensure a clearer, more consistent picture on recorded crime for the public.

Previously, national organisations (i.e. ONS, HMIC, and the Home Office through the police.uk website) have taken slightly different approaches to the way that they categorise groups of crime types and to the labels they use to describe those categories.

Following a public consultation, a new crime “tree” (the crime types organised into a logic tree format, see link below) has been devised and this will now be used on the crime and policing comparator to present recorded crime and solved crime information.

Victim-based crime

All police-recorded crimes where there is a direct victim. This victim could be an individual, an organisation or corporate body. This category includes violent crimes directed at a particular individual or individuals, sexual offences, robbery, theft offences (including burglary and vehicle offences), criminal damage and arson.

Publicly Reported Crime (Victim Based Crime)				
Crime Category/Type	Apr 17 - Jun 17	Apr 18 – Jun 18	Change	% Change
Violence against the person	605	753	148	24.5%
Homicide	0	0	0	0%
Violence with injury	232	252	20	8.6%
Violence without injury	373	287	-86	-23.1%
Sexual Offences	74	52	-22	-29.7%
Rape	19	19	0	0%
Other Sexual Offences	55	33	-22	-40%
Robbery	27	21	-6	-22.2%
Business Robbery	6	2	-4	-66.7%
Personal Robbery	21	19	-2	-9.5%
Acquisitive Crime	1429	1305	-124	-8.7%
Burglary - Residential	196	190	-6	-3.1%
Burglary – Business and Community	102	92	-10	-9.8%
Bicycle Theft	56	39	-17	-30.4%
Theft from the Person	12	19	7	58.3%
Vehicle Crime (Inc Inter.)	271	196	-75	-27.7%
Shoplifting	412	437	25	6.1%
Other Theft	380	332	-48	-12.6%
Criminal Damage & Arson	388	347	-41	-10.6%
Total	2523	2478	-45	-1.8%

Other crimes against society

All police-recorded crimes where there are no direct individual victims. This includes public disorder, drug offences, possession of weapons and other items, handling stolen goods and other miscellaneous offences committed against the state.

The rates for some crime types within this category could be increased by proactive police activity, for example searching people and finding them in possession of drugs or weapons.

Police Generated Offences				
Crime Category/Type	Apr 17 - Jun 17	Apr 18 – Jun 18	Change	% Change
Public Disorder	87	185	98	112.6%
Drug Offences	61	73	12	19.7%
Trafficking of drugs	17	12	-5	-29.4%
Possession/Use of drugs	44	48	4	9.1%
Possession of Weapons	15	19	4	26.7%
Misc. Crimes Against Society	33	48	15	45.5%
Total Police Generated Crime	196	325	196	65.8%
TOTAL RECORDED CRIME IN HARTLEPOOL	2721	2803	82	3%

Recorded Crime in Cleveland April 18 – June 18

Publicly Reported Crime Apr 18 - Jun 18										
Crime Category/Type	HARTLEPOOL		REDCAR		MIDDLESBROUGH		STOCKTON		CLEVELAND	
	Crime	Per 1,000 pop	Crime	Per 1,000 pop	Crime	Per 1,000 pop	Crime	Per 1,000 pop	Crime	Per 1,000 pop
Violence against the person	753	8.3	900	6.7	1654	12.1	1497	8.0	4804	8.7
Homicide	0	0.0	1	0.0	3	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Violence with injury	252	2.8	304	2.3	516	3.8	468	2.5	1540	2.8
Violence without injury	287	3.2	316	2.4	650	4.8	560	3.0	1813	3.3
Sexual Offences	52	0.6	105	0.8	170	1.2	145	0.8	472	0.9
Rape	19	0.2	36	0.3	56	0.4	47	0.3	158	0.3
Other Sexual Offences	33	0.4	69	0.5	114	0.8	98	0.5	314	0.6
Robbery	21	0.2	10	0.1	59	0.4	31	0.2	121	0.2
Business Robbery	2	0.0	2	0.0	6	0.0	3	0.0	13	0.0
Personal Robbery	19	0.2	8	0.1	53	0.4	28	0.1	108	0.2
Acquisitive Crime	1305	14.3	1227	9.2	2258	16.6	1948	10.4	6738	12.3
Domestic Burglary	190	4.7	224	3.8	361	6.3	242	3.1	1017	4.3
Other Burglary	92	1.0	69	0.5	153	1.1	57	0.3	371	0.7
Bicycle Theft	39	0.4	28	0.2	125	0.9	83	0.4	275	0.5
Theft from the Person	19	0.2	15	0.1	71	0.5	38	0.2	143	0.3
Vehicle Crime (Inc Inter.)	196	2.2	250	1.9	304	2.2	334	1.8	1084	2.0
Shoplifting	437	4.8	314	2.3	687	5.0	754	4.0	2192	4.0
Other Theft	332	3.6	327	2.4	557	4.1	440	2.3	1656	3.0
Criminal Damage & Arson	347	3.8	533	4.0	693	5.1	636	3.4	2209	4.0
Total	2478	27.2	2775	20.7	4834	35.5	4257	22.6	14344	26.1

Police Generated Offences Apr 18 - Jun 18										
Crime Category/Type	HARTLEPOOL		REDCAR		MIDDLESBROUGH		STOCKTON		CLEVELAND	
	Crime	Per 1,000 pop	Crime	Per 1,000 pop	Crime	Per 1,000 pop	Crime	Per 1,000 pop	Crime	Per 1,000 pop
Public Disorder	185	2.0	162	1.2	396	2.9	280	1.5	1023	1.9
Drug Offences	73	0.8	40	0.3	150	1.1	81	0.4	344	0.6
Trafficking of drugs	12	0.1	9	0.1	31	0.2	16	0.1	68	0.1
Possession/Use of drugs	48	0.5	68	0.5	99	0.7	91	0.5	306	0.6
Possession of Weapons	19	0.2	14	0.1	33	0.2	29	0.2	95	0.2
Misc. Crimes Against Society	48	0.5	68	0.5	99	0.7	91	0.5	306	0.6
Total Police Generated Crime	325	3.6	284	2.1	678	5.0	481	2.6	1768	3.2
TOTAL RECORDED CRIME	2803	30.8	3059	22.8	5512	40.5	4738	25.2	16112	29.3

Anti-social Behaviour in Hartlepool April 18 – June 18

Incident Category	Apr 17 - Jun 17	Apr 18 – Jun 18	Change	% Change
AS21 - Personal	551	512	-39	-7.1%
AS22 - Nuisance	1185	1091	-94	-7.9%
AS23 - Environmental	36	47	11	30.6
Total	1772	1650	-122	-6.9%

Incident Category	HARTLEPOOL		REDCAR		MIDDLESBROUGH		STOCKTON		CLEVELAND	
	ASB	Per 1,000 pop	ASB	Per 1,000 pop	ASB	Per 1,000 pop	ASB	Per 1,000 pop	ASB	Per 1,000 pop
AS21 - Personal	512	5.6	553	4.1	738	5.4	826	4.4	2629	4.8
AS22 - Nuisance	1091	12.0	1439	10.7	2094	15.3	1896	10.1	6520	11.9
AS23 - Environmental	47	0.5	68	0.5	58	0.4	79	0.4	252	0.5
Total	1650	18.1	2060	15.4	2890	21.1	2801	14.9	9401	17.1
Quarterly Year on Year Comparison	Reduced by 7.1%		Reduced by 18.8%		Reduced by 17.8%		Reduced by 15%		Reduced by 15.5%	



SAFER HARTLEPOOL PARTNERSHIP

3rd August 2018



Report of: Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods

Subject: INTEGRATED WORKING – NEIGHBOURHOOD
SAFETY GROUP UPDATE

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To receive a progress update in relation to implementation of the integrated place based community safety model agreed by the Finance and Policy Committee in October 2017.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 In February 2018 the Safer Hartlepool Partnership received a report outlining a 'place based integrated community safety model' that would be delivered by key community safety partners in Hartlepool. The model was developed by the Safer Hartlepool Partnership Integrated Working Task and Finish Group, (now the Neighbourhood Safety Group), and was formally launched at the Safer Hartlepool Partnership Face the Public Event on 26 February 2018.

- 2.2 The report outlined that the model would in the first instance bring together Council Community Safety and Enforcement Services with the local Neighbourhood Policing Service, and would be underpinned by a community engagement approach that would contribute to delivering the following outcomes:

- Improved safety in relation to the local environment
- Improved public confidence and cohesion

- 2.3 With the overall vision of building Safer, Stronger Neighbourhoods the project scope included the following three elements:

- The development of a co-located community safety team which would be fully functional during 2018
- The development of a Team Around the Individual approach for vulnerable individuals with complex needs which would be in place by November 2017
- The development of a capacity building programme linked to community hubs.

- 2.4 An interim review of the Integrated Working Model, attached at **Appendix 2**, covers the first 3 months of operation. The review identifies that the model has largely been implemented as intended and within the anticipated timescale. It captures some early benefits whilst also identifying areas for improvement/further development which will be taken forward by the Neighbourhood Safety Group over the next year.

3. CONCLUSION

- 3.1 The review identifies that the model approved by the Finance and Policy Committee in October 2017 has largely been implemented as intended and within the anticipated timescale. It captures some early benefits whilst also identifying areas for improvement/further development.

- 3.2 The benefits identified include:

- Improved problem solving as a result of daily briefings along with the early identification of risk in relation to safeguarding concerns
- Identifiable efficiencies through an ability to better allocate resource to problems and avoid duplication
- Improved exchange of intelligence as a result of co-location leading to swifter more co-ordinated responses to problems and the ability to '*nip problems in the bud*'.
- The core team is benefiting from the broader knowledge and expertise from each of the organisations involved in the team and there is a culture of co-operation developing within the HCST as an understanding of respective roles increases.
- The Team Around the Individual (TATI) approach has also improved co-ordination on the ground in relation to managing individuals with complex needs and ensured that safeguarding risks around vulnerable adults are not left to one individual but are shared with the additional benefit of oversight of the working group.
- One of the keys to success of the TATI is the PC who is now dedicated to assist with managing the vulnerable adults identified through the group.

- 3.3 Key areas for improvement highlighted in the review include:

- Outstanding IT issues need to be resolved to enable the full benefits of co-location to be realised and consideration to be given to the Fire Service being based at Avenue Road on a full time basis.
- Corporacy in relation to the internal and external communications of the HSCT is an area that needs to be improved to generate a sense of cohesiveness within the team and increase public confidence.
- Workforce development and training is an area for further development.
- The opportunity to maximise the ability to undertake joint operations in vulnerable localities should be taken.
- Strategic partners and commissioners of health services should consider how the multi-agency neighbourhood approach could be further developed and expanded to incorporate a greater number of individuals

with complex needs given the dominance of drug and alcohol issues and links to reoffending rates.

- Increasing the presence of PCSOs based in the Early Help Locality Hubs from part time to full time to be considered and further work to improve understanding of the links and interaction between the core HCST, the Locality Hubs, and Childrens Hub.
- The need to build the capacity of the Councils Community Hubs to engage with broader community and increase footfall to ensure local communities benefit from what the Hubs have to offer.
- That consideration is given to having a mental health worker based at Avenue Road as part of the core HCST as part of the forthcoming options analysis.

- 3.4 An action plan based on the recommendations contained with the report has been developed and will be overseen by the Neighbourhood Safety Group of the Safer Hartlepool Partnership. A full review in relation to the model will also be undertaken during 2019/20 and with a completion date of December 2020.

4. RISK IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 There are no risk implications associated with this report.

5. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 5.1 There are no financial considerations associated with this report.

6. LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 6.1 There are no legal considerations associated with this report.

7. CONSULTATION AND COMMUNICATION

- 7.1 This integrated community safety model was developed following consultation with a broad range of stakeholders. Initial public consultation on the Community Safety Plan raised concerns from the local community in relation to lack of visible policing; the need for more enforcement activity, and the need to see the Police and Council working together on issues that matter to the local community. Cleveland Police Senior Management Board; the Police and Crime Commissioner; Cleveland Fire Service and the Safer Hartlepool Partnership were all consulted and are fully supportive of the model.
- 7.2 Discussions with staff representatives from across the organisations involved assisted in shaping the integrated service delivery model and have been taken into account in the interim review. Consultation with communities will continue through daily operational activity, and on a strategic level through the

Safer Hartlepool Partnership. A full review planned after 12-18 months of operation will include the views of customers.

8. CHILD AND FAMILY POVERTY

- 8.1 There are no child and family poverty considerations associated with this report.

9. EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY CONSIDERATIONS

- 9.1 The integration of Council, police, and fire services will ensure that there is a joined up approach to promoting cohesion across the neighbourhoods of Hartlepool, monitoring any community tensions and preventing hate. There will be increased resilience on the front line to tackle issues and where incidents of hate do occur responses will be timely and co-ordinated with supporting services will be maximized see **Appendix 1**.

10. SECTION 17 OF THE CRIME AND DISORDER ACT 1998 CONSIDERATIONS

- 10.1 Implementation of the integrated working model will assist the Council and partners to discharge their section 17 obligations under the Crime and Disorder Act 1998.

11. STAFF CONSIDERATIONS

- 11.1 There are no staff considerations associated with this report.

12. ASSET MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS

- 12.1 There are no asset management considerations associated with this report.

13. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 13.1 Members of the Safer Hartlepool Partnership are asked to consider the attached review, and discuss its key findings and recommendations.

14. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 14.1 The Community Safety Plan identifies the further embedding of Integrated Working as a key deliverable during 2018/19.

15. CONTACT OFFICER

Denise Ogden
Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods
Civic Centre
Victoria Road
Hartlepool
TS24 8AY
Email denise.ogden@hartlepool.gov.uk
Tel: 01429 523301

APPENDIX 1

EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Department	Division	Section	Owner/Officer
R&N	Neighbourhoods	Community Safety	Clare Clark
Service, policy, practice being reviewed/changed or planned	Community Safety		
Why are you making the change?	Bringing together partner resources to better coordinate responses to community safety issues focusing on prevention, early intervention, and vulnerable individuals and localities.		
How might this impact (positively/negatively) on people who share protected characteristics?			
		Please tick	
		POSITIVELY	NEGATIVELY
Age	Yes		
The risk based approach adopted by the new model of delivery aims to ensure that vulnerable young people and the elderly are safeguarded from harm and exploitation through improved community intelligence flow and a specialist team of officers who will provide a multi-agency case management function. This team will co-ordinate interventions to ensure need is effectively addressed.			
Disability	Yes		
The integration of council, police, and fire services will ensure that there is a joined up approach to promoting cohesion across the neighbourhoods of Hartlepool, monitoring any community tensions and preventing hate. There will be increased resilience on the front line to tackle issues and where incidents of hate do occur responses will be timely and co-ordinated with supporting services will be maximised.			
Gender Re-assignment	Yes		
The integration of council, police, and fire services will ensure that there is a joined up approach to promoting cohesion across the neighbourhoods of Hartlepool, monitoring any community tensions and preventing hate. There will be increased resilience on the front line to tackle issues and where incidents of hate do occur responses will be timely and co-ordinated with supporting services being maximised.			
Race	Yes		
The integration of council, police, and fire services will ensure that there is a joined up approach to promoting cohesion across the neighbourhoods of Hartlepool, monitoring any community tensions and preventing hate. There will be increased resilience on the front line to tackle issues and where incidents of hate do occur responses will be timely and co-ordinated with supporting services being maximised.			
Religion	Yes		
The integration of council, police, and fire services will ensure that there is a joined up approach to promoting cohesion across the neighbourhoods of Hartlepool, monitoring any community tensions and preventing hate. There will be increased resilience on the front line to tackle issues and where incidents of hate do occur responses will be timely and co-ordinated with supporting services being maximised.			
Gender	Yes		
The integration of council, police, and fire services will ensure that there is a joined up approach to promoting cohesion across the neighbourhoods of Hartlepool, monitoring any community tensions and preventing hate. There will be increased resilience on the front line to tackle issues and where incidents of hate do occur responses will be timely and co-ordinated with supporting services being maximised.			

EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Sexual Orientation	Yes	
<i>The integration of council, police, and fire services will ensure that there is a joined up approach to promoting cohesion across the neighbourhoods of Hartlepool, monitoring any community tensions and preventing hate. There will be increased resilience on the front line to tackle issues and where incidents of hate do occur responses will be timely and co-ordinated with supporting services being maximised.</i>		



Interim Review

Hartlepool Integrated Community Safety Model

1 INTRODUCTION: INTEGRATED WORKING COMMUNITY SAFETY MODEL

1.1 In May 2017 Cleveland Police and Hartlepool Borough Council formally agreed to work together to develop a 'place based integrated service delivery model' during 2017/18. The Project Initiation Document outlined that the model would in the first instance bring together Council Community Safety and Enforcement Services with the local Neighbourhood Policing Service, and would be underpinned by a community engagement approach that would contribute to delivering the following outcomes:

- Improved safety in relation to the local environment
- Improved public confidence and cohesion

1.2 With the overall vision of building Safer, Stronger Neighbourhoods the project scope included the following three elements:

- The development of a co-located community safety team which would be fully functional during 2018
- The development of a Team Around the Individual approach for vulnerable individuals with complex needs which would be in place by November 2017
- The development of a capacity building programme linked to community hubs from February 2018

1.3 Following work of over the summer months agreement was reached in relation to the operational model as outlined at **Appendix A**. Using the threat harm and risk model with a focus on vulnerable localities and individuals, the core offer of the team in addition to neighbourhood policing includes:

- Crime and anti-social behaviour prevention
- Victim Services and Crime Prevention (including personal security and targeting hardening service)
- Community Resolution and Mediation
- Car Parking Enforcement
- Environmental Crime
- Community Cohesion, Hate, and Prevent
- Community Monitoring (CCTV)
- Building Community Resilience / Volunteering Opportunities
- Fire Service Advocacy (vulnerable adults)
- Fire Service Interventions (children)
- Community Liaison (fire safety)

1.4 The Project Initiation document envisaged that the move towards a joint operational delivery model would facilitate and improve the timely exchange of information sharing and provide opportunities for joint tasking and co-ordination. It was anticipated that a joint co-located team would also create greater resilience and maximize resources enabling officers to be in the right

place at the right time, avoiding duplication of effort and building local confidence.

- 1.5 To ensure the model is being implemented as anticipated pending a comprehensive independent review of the integrated working model in 2019/20 a light touch review covering the first 3 months of operation (26 Feb – 14 May) has been undertaken. Acknowledging that 3 months is an extremely short period of time to capture any improvement in outcomes the review set out to answer the following:

- Has the service has been implemented in line with the Project Initiation Document as originally intended?
- Are there any immediate success/benefits that can be reported to the project group in relation to joint working?
- Are there any immediate areas for improvement /early learning points that need to be considered by the project group to improve daily working practices and ensure that the project delivers the outcomes as intended in the agreed model?
- Are there any further opportunities to expand or make any useful additions to the team and if so how will this be accommodated?
- How well are strategic governance arrangements working – is the Integrated Working Group fit for purpose? Does it have the right membership and what is the function of the group going forward?

- 1.7 To assist in the review process face to face discussions have taken place with managers and frontline staff involved in the new service, and members of the Integrated Working Steering Group. Observations have also taken place in relation to key meetings and available documentation (although limited due to the model still being in the embryonic stages of development) has been examined. Whilst customer perceptions are fundamental in any review of a service, due to the limited time that the service has been up and running, and the time available to undertake the review, customer perceptions have not been included in the current review, and these should form part of a full review independent review of the service in 12-18 month's time.

2. THE CO-LOCATED HARTLEPOOL COMMUNITY SAFETY TEAM

Progress/Early benefits

- 2.1 In line with the anticipated timescale the Hartlepool Community Safety Team was officially launched at the Safer Hartlepool Partnership Face the Public event on 26 February 2018. The launch followed many months of planning in relation to ensuring the physical infrastructure was in place to support a co-located team with a view to relocating staff, developing operational practices in readiness for the move, along with workforce development, training and structural changes to teams. Whilst some IT issues are not fully resolved for some staff due to the multiple networks involved the majority of the team are now fully co-located.
- 2.2 Based at Hartlepool Police Station the Team led by Hartlepool's Neighbourhood Chief Inspector meet every morning to consider the priorities for the day based on calls received from the previous 24 hours with resources being deployed in line with the Threat Risk and Harm model to ensure the appropriate allocation of resource in relation to vulnerable localities and vulnerable individuals. Attendance at these meetings includes representatives from Neighbourhood Policing staff, Volume Crime Detectives; Integrated Offender Management Staff, the Councils Community Safety staff, HBCs Children's Services and Adult Safeguarding Staff; and the Fire Service. These meetings are supplemented by a range of other meetings that take place on a monthly or bi-monthly basis that were in existence prior to the implementation of the Integrated Working Model including: Police Tasking and Co-ordination Meetings; Sector Areas of Focus Meetings (formerly referred to as JAGs); and Vulnerable Victims Meetings.
- 2.3 Observations from morning meetings suggest that whilst these meetings initially involved very little discussion with Police reading from the morning log, that as participants become more knowledgeable and confident there are some signs that these meetings are slowly evolving into meetings where there is an emerging multi-agency approach with those in attendance feeling able to feed in relevant intelligence, raise their own issues, and challenge current approaches to problems by requesting the resource of others within the team. Examples include concerns raised by the HBC Community Safety Lead in relation to a spate of arson attacks in the town, and concerns raised by HBC Children's Services representative in relation to repeat missing from home children and fear that they were involved in drugs and being exploited.
- 2.4 Morning meetings take no longer than 30 minutes (15 to read the morning log and 15 for discussion) but where further problem solving is needed this can be escalated with a lead officer identified and a case placed on ECINs to ensure multi-agency case management is maintained throughout. The range of expertise around the table means that ideas/solutions are offered and members volunteer to take ownership of cases within their own area of expertise. There are currently 17 high priority cases and 23 medium priority

cases (0 low priority) live on ECINS for the HCST with ownership of cases largely falling to Police and HBC Community Safety Staff.

- 2.5 From a safeguarding perspective daily briefings are also providing a Forum where any safeguarding risks are identified quickly enabling those risks to be managed in a more co-ordinated way with representatives from both Children's and Adult services taking a proactive role in meetings. For example where children or young people are involved in any of the cases appearing on the morning log, the Children's Services representative will go back and check systems notifying the relevant social worker or family support worker immediately, thus enabling appropriate discussions / interventions to be put in place. Where a young person is not already open to Children's Services contact will be made with the Children's Hub where feedback suggests that this is being provided more quickly than through traditional channels.
- 2.6 The Adult Services representative follows a similar process liaising with broader Adult Services teams within the Council, mental health services, and drug and alcohol services. In the majority of cases both Adults and Children's Services report that they will be already be aware of the issues raised through the morning log and reassurance is therefore provided, however where this isn't the case information is shared and interventions put in place to prevent problems from escalating.
- 2.7 For the Chief Inspector responsible for the HSCT morning meetings are already leading to identifiable efficiencies - having the right person around the table to address the problem for example means that the Police can concentrate on crime and intelligence gathering and being more proactive in obtaining warrants etc. It also means that there is more immediate feedback enabling progress on particular problems to be fed back to the Chief Inspector the same day and/or monitored through morning briefings.
- 2.8 The Chief Inspector gives an example of a call received by the Police about the potential financial exploitation of a vulnerable adult which traditionally would have been cascaded down the line from the morning meeting, from the Inspector to Sergeant and to a PC where a visit would have competed with other jobs on the queue. However in this instance because the individual was known to Adult Services the Adult Services representative was able to contact the relevant social worker who visited the vulnerable adult the same day and was able to report back that the concerns were unfounded.
- 2.8 Outside of morning meetings there is also evidence that co-location is in itself improving co-ordination and avoiding duplication leading to a more efficient and effective service. As one officer reports *'people are accessible – if someone rings with an issue it is easy to check if anyone is dealing with it'*. The fact that officers are in the same room also means that they are hearing about issues they wouldn't necessarily know about. There being clear evidence of a greater exchange of intelligence between teams, and a swifter more effective co-ordinated response to issues that come into the

team.

- 2.9 This is particularly evident in relation to the specialist team of ASB officers, Victim Services Officer, the dedicated Police Officers for Troubled Families and Adults with complex needs, and the Early Intervention Co-ordinator. One ASB officer informed during interview *'I was on the telephone taking a call from a vulnerable resident who was having problems with noise and threatening behaviour from their neighbours - at the same time the PC overheard the conversation and by the time I had come off the telephone the PC had checked systems, and identified that the Police also had issues with the individual being complained about. We went out and did a joint visit the same day and put a number of interventions in place to protect the victim and address the behaviour of the perpetrator.'*
- 2.10 During discussions with front line staff all agencies involved in the HCST were able to offer examples of real life issues that they had dealt with where co-location had made it much easier to respond. Indeed many indicated that they were able to provide a complete response within the hour which wouldn't have been possible previously due to the need to make numerous telephone calls, send emails and wait for people to respond. Not only was this saving on officer time it was also *'nipping problems in the bud preventing them from escalating.'*
- 2.11 For the team's Police Sergeants improved communication, information sharing, and the broader knowledge of local authority services now available within the HCST is leading to better quality problem solving. One Sergeant also identified efficiencies due to fewer requests for assistance being received via the Neighbourhood Police Team mailbox from the Councils Community Safety Staff which previously would have involved a request for additional Police patrols/visits in areas where residents had contacted the Councils team about crime and disorder issues. However because everybody is now in the same place the ability to have a discussion there and then is said to be resulting in a better allocation of resource. Similarly Senior Managers from HBC report the benefits of having a direct link into the team and the ability to draw on the knowledge, resources, and expertise within the broader team to get issues resolved quickly.
- 2.13 As staff begin to develop an understanding of each other's roles and what they can offer a culture of co-operation between teams is also developing. There was evidence of the Neighbourhood Safety Co-ordinator pulling together the legal documentation for a Criminal Behaviour Order at the request of the Police Inspector whilst PCs began to pull together statements that would be required to support the case. There was also evidence of Local Authority Lead Officer Chairing morning briefings where the Chief Inspector and Inspector couldn't attend.
- 2.14 This ability to draw upon the strengths of each service, and the relationships that a particular service has with the broader community is also apparent it being recognised for example that the Fire Service is a trusted service that *'can get into homes where others wouldn't'* to address concerns around

vulnerability. It is also recognised that the Councils Community Cohesion Officers have strong relationships with the local community and as a trusted service will often be the first point of contact where there are concerns for safety and a fear of going through formal Police channels. For these officers being based with the Community Safety Team and having direct access to Victim Services, Police, and ASB Officers is ensuring that issues around vulnerable victims, particularly those involving hate, are being brought to light and dealt with quickly.

- 2.13 At street level Civil Enforcement Officers are developing their role as 'the eyes and ears of the community'. There were many examples of intelligence being fed into the Police when out on patrol, and evidence of joint working in relation to disrupting the activity of organised crime groups, such as removing untaxed vehicles known to be used as pool cars for drug dealers. As anticipated the recruitment of 2 additional Civil Enforcement Officers is now complete and the implementation of a 7 day shift pattern for these officers will be in place over the next 2 months. To enhance enforcement capabilities a joint framework for the issuing of Community protection Warnings and Community Protection Notices under the Anti-Social Behaviour and Policing Act 2014 has been developed with the HCST issuing their first Community Protection Warning and Notice in May 2018. A formal request for the Councils Enforcement Staff and PCSOs to be accredited with additional powers has also been made to the Chief Constable of Cleveland Police.
- 2.14 **Attached at Appendix B (this item contains exempt information under Schedule 12A Local Government Act 1972 (as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006) namely, (paragraph 1) information relating to an individual)** are a selection of case studies that highlight some of the joint work of the HCST to date.

Early Learning/Areas for Improvement

- 2.14 Discussions held with staff during the review asked two basic questions the first being '*what difference if any has the new way of working made to you on a day to day basis*', and secondly '*are there any teething problems /areas for improvement.*' In addition to the benefits outlined above the following broad areas were identified where there was some room improvement:
- 2.15 Accommodation / IT Infrastructure

As previously indicated problems associated with IT are a current barrier to the HCST being fully co-located with issues being experienced by both Fire Service staff and the Councils Civil Enforcement Officers. The relative absence of these staff at Avenue Road was commented upon by both those that had been relocated fully to Avenue Road and those that had not it being fair to say that relationships between these teams and the rest of the HCST are not as well established as those that have developed with staff who are permanently based at Avenue Road. .

From a practical point of view for some Fire Service staff the existing arrangement of working from the Police Station part time is also problematic. This arrangement sees Fire Service staff being present most mornings at Avenue Road Police Station for a brief period before going out on morning visits, then returning to Stranton Fire Station for lunch before undertaking their remaining visits on the afternoon, and finally returning to Stranton Fire Station again at the end of the day. Staff do report benefiting from morning meetings but the lack of a fixed base and computer terminal at the Police station is perceived as problematic.

Discussions with staff also suggest that further consideration could be given to where staff are currently located within the space allocated to the HCST at Avenue Road. For practical reasons desks for Civil Enforcement Officers were originally located next to the Councils Community Safety staff to link into existing IT links to the Councils network. However due to the number of Civil Enforcement Officers and the equipment used by these officers eg radios etc it has been identified that these officers would be best located next to PCs and PCSOs. Not only would this ensure they had the space needed. It would also help to develop relationships between all patrolling officers within the HCST who have similar functions in relation to gathering community intelligence and enforcement.

This would result in Fire Service Officers relocating desks into the area occupied by the ASB and Victims Services officers, the TF and TATI PCs, and the Early Intervention Officer which would provide a better fit with their specialist functions linked to prevention, early intervention, vulnerability and risk.

One other practical issue associated with accommodation that was raised through the review is difficulties with communications between the HCST Technical Support Team and Police Staff on the front desk at Avenue Road. Two concerns were raised: the first being a failure on the part of the HCST to notify the front desk when visitors are expected in order to facilitate entry, and the second relates to complications associated with the Councils telephone system to the point that when the front desk is trying to contact the Technical Support Team upstairs they cannot get through leaving front desk staff trying to deal with a range of technical issues associated with Council Services of which they have no knowledge in situations that can often become inflamed. One suggestion to remedy this is to have a dedicated Police telephone installed on the desk space occupied by the Technical Support Team to facilitate better communication between this team and front desk staff.

2.16 Workforce culture and development

Prior to the implementation of the integrated working model, during December 2017 and January 2018, briefings were given to Police staff, and meet and greet sessions were held between Police and HBC staff to ensure there was an understanding of what strategic partners were attempting to

achieve, what they had agreed collectively in order to make this happen, along with staff governance structures. This was accompanied by joint training sessions sourced by HBC and delivered by an external provider for staff in relation to enforcement powers under the Anti- Social Behaviour and Policing Act (particularly the Community Protection Notice), and Problem Solving Training. The Police also provided training for HBC staff in relation to THRIVE to ensure consistency in responding to issues coming into the team.

Discussions with staff as part of the review however, highlighted a lack of understanding, mainly among Police staff as to what the model was about. Some staff were concerned that they didn't know what they should be doing, and that they didn't know who was who within the team. Equally for HBC staff there was confusion over structures and the importance of the visibility of the Chief Inspector as Head of the HCST going forward being noted.

For some staff who have previously been involved in Integrated Service Delivery this is to be expected with some indicating that they wouldn't expect such a model to be embedded before at least 6 months. However there is also a recognition that the implementation of the model has been complicated from an HBC point of view when compared to other agencies involved in the joint Hartlepool Community Safety Team. This involved a complete service restructure including a shift in the management of daily business from HBC to the Police under the direction of the Chief Inspector, and changes in reporting arrangements, shift patterns and relocation of workplace, requiring formal consultations to be undertaken with all HBC staff who would be involved in the team. Delays in this process which should have been concluded in December 2017 were not finalised until the middle of March. The uncertainty created during these months together with the unavoidable absence of the Chief Inspector has meant that team cohesiveness has not been as strong as it could have been.

A lack of Corporacy in relation to both internal and external communications was also evident during the review process with communications from some Police staff to the public tending to suggest business as usual. There also doesn't appear to be a process in place for the Chief Inspector to communicate with the HCST as a whole to generate a sense amongst staff that they are part of a single HCST, and there doesn't appear to be an agreed process in place for communicating with elected members as an HCST.

Developing a processes to address these issues would go some way to building a cohesive team and generate confidence amongst elected members that the team is working together as intended. This would also avoid adverse publicity such as that which followed lack of attendance at the hubs in the early days due to uncertainty and lack of clarity in relation to what had been agreed in terms of daily operational practices despite Hub rotas being agreed with managers and circulated to all staff. Whilst it is early days, and to some extent understandable issues such as this highlight how easily public confidence in the team can be undermined.

The Chief Inspector is attuned to these concerns confirming his aspirations for the HCST to be '*outstanding*' in all areas but acknowledging his unavoidable absence during the first month of operation due to the need to undertake training on behalf of the Force was unhelpful in terms of setting the tone for the team and establishing and developing working relationships. Since then changes to the morning meetings have been made to try and ensure a greater focus on multi-agency problem solving with meetings now also benefiting from the recording of actions which are fed into the following days meeting. The Chief Inspector has also introduced a weekly meeting with the Inspector and HBC Community Safety Operations Lead to review the week's actions/problem solving activity to assist in developing the work of the team. Further problem solving training and a one hour triologue looking at communication styles, how the team interacts /values people's strengths is also suggested.

The enormity of the task that the Chief Inspector has in bringing together a team comprised of 3 major statutory organisations with a remit around improving safety in neighbourhoods cannot be understated and is something that both Senior Managers within HBC and the Police raised during the review. It was acknowledged that Council services and political environment in particular can be complex and varied. The need to nurture and develop this role with the full support of HBC Senior Management is therefore seen as a key priority to ensure improved outcomes for the Hartlepool community as envisaged in the Project Initiation Document.

In this respect steps could be taken to ensure the relationship between the Chief Inspector and Director and Assistant Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods is strengthened to ensure delivery of Safer Hartlepool Partnership strategic priorities and the joining up of those priorities with safeguarding priorities. Better communication between the Directors and Chief Inspector on a day to day basis would also afford some assurance that the daily management of the team is being delivered as anticipated and to ensure joined up responses in relation to requests from elected members and dissemination of real time good news stories.

2.17 Joint Operations

The review found some very good early responses to tackling issues around vulnerable individuals and localities within the community. However save the odd example instigated by the Councils Lead Officer for Community Safety in relation to Enforcement Officers and PCSOs undertaking a joint leaflet drop together in an area where there had been a number of burglaries and car thefts, there was very little evidence available of any planned joint work or operations in relation to known or emerging vulnerable localities. There is evidence of joint priorities being identified in morning briefings in relation to hotspot areas and in the monthly area sector meetings which benefit from analytical documents produced by the HCST analyst, but links tend not to be made in relation to potential preventative work in localities with responses being fragmented.

Opportunities are also being missed in relation to maximising the impact of joint operations, a recent example being a local Police operation involving the targeting of cannabis farms. This operation involved a number of drug warrants being successfully executed at a number of addresses across Hartlepool. However with some additional planning, services in relation to the rest of the HCST could have been brought to bear following the operation to increase visibility, and reassure the local community that all agencies are working together to address neighbourhood issues. This could have included patrols from Civil Enforcement Officers; and ASB / Victim Services officers and the Fire Service Community Liaison Officer patrolling and door knocking /leaflet dropping the area to ensure the community were aware of how to contact the team with any concerns, or to identify the need for further support. Without revealing details, steps could have been taken to inform the rest of the team that an operation would be taking place, and communications made with the Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods once the operation was complete, which could have in turn resulted in a 'good news' communication to the Chair of the Safer Hartlepool Partnership.

It is understood that shift patterns may be a barrier in some instances to joint operations taking place to tackle issues in hotspot areas. Civil Enforcement Officers for example currently work 7 days a week, including bank holidays, whereas Neighbourhood Police generally don't work bank holidays. Consequently in one instance a request to the Police from the Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods for additional Police resources to tackle recurring issues on a bank holiday could not be serviced. Similar problems could be experienced due to the different hours of work on a daily basis in relation to Civil Enforcement Officers and Police. The majority of Council and Fire Service staff also work 9-5 and not on a weekend.

Nevertheless with some flexibility there is scope for joint operations to take place and consideration could be given to having a 'Day of Action' per month where intelligence suggests the benefit of proactive preventative area based operations to address key vulnerabilities and provide reassurance to communities.

3 INDIVIDUALS WITH COMPLEX NEEDS (TEAM AROUND THE INDIVIDUAL)

Progress/Early Benefits

- 3.1 The Team Around the Individual was established as anticipated by November 2017 with meetings taking place on a bi-monthly basis chaired by the Assistant Director of Adult Services. The Team Around the Individual approach is designed to improve communication and co-ordination between Partners and professionals to support identified individuals across Hartlepool living with multiple complex issues and who have needs and /or behaviours that challenge and are a risk to themselves and others.

3.2 As such partners agree to collaborate in order to maximise the use of resources, improve the persons quality of life, promote their personal safety, mitigate risks and minimise any negative impact on the Hartlepool community. The focus of the team around approach is on individuals who are:

- A Repeat victim of crime or anti-social behaviour OR
- A Repeat perpetrator of crime or anti-social behaviour OR
- Considered Vulnerable to exploitation by others

and/or experience a combination of at least three of the following issues:

- Mental ill health
- Housing issues
- Problematic substance misuse
- Frequent attendee to A&E (subject to the availability of data)

3.3 Individuals are identified via the above criteria from any agency who nominate an individual who they believe may benefit from the approach. A referral form must be completed which is considered by the working group who will determine if the criteria is met and in doing so determine if the approach is likely to be beneficial and what can be added. Following the meeting the Lead Practitioner will pull together a team around the individual meeting to ensure actions are progressed. Core members of the team include HBC Adult Services; Drug and Alcohol Services; Hartlepool Community Safety Team; HBC Housing; and NHS Safeguarding Staff. To assist in the day to management of the individuals identified via TATI Cleveland Police have also appointed a dedicated PC.

3.4 During its period of operation attendance at TATI meetings has grown with 15 organisations being in attendance at the most recent TATI meeting. Observations of meetings are that they are generally positive and benefit from a Chair who has the right knowledge and expertise to be able to mobilise resources from both within and external to their own organisation, with representation from core agencies also being at the right level operationally in order to make things happen on the ground. Where it is considered appropriate, additional members can be brought into the meeting (mainly case workers) to enable a fuller discussion to take place around potential interventions.

3.5 Since inception 18 individuals have been referred to the group, with 7 individuals receiving an intervention and interacting positively with agencies to a point where they no longer requiring support. However there is a general acceptance that for some individuals whose issues are so complex that there will continue to be a need for additional ongoing support, there being 5 such individuals who have been with TATI since inception and continue to receive support from the group. **Attached at Appendix C (this item contains exempt information under Schedule 12A Local Government Act 1972 (as amended by the Local Government (Access**

to Information) (Variation) Order 2006) namely, (paragraph 1) information relating to an individual), are examples of cases dealt with by the TATI Working Group since its inception with vulnerable individuals continuing to need support. In addition to criminal justice issues, general themes evident in relation to those that have been referred to the group include problematic substance misuse leading to exploitation/vulnerability. Of note all of those identified as requiring the support of TATI are also located within vulnerable localities.

- 3.6 Although recognised that TATI are dealing with individuals with multiple issues that are complex to move on, for front-line practitioners and others involved in the TATI process it has improved co-ordination on the ground and ensured that safeguarding risks around vulnerable adults are not left to one individual but are shared with the additional benefit of oversight from the working group. For the Chair of the Group there is also a much greater understanding now between agencies of each others roles which is leading to improved relationships and less confrontation between agencies when trying to resolve issues around risk and the impact that the individual in question is having on the broader community.
- 3.7 Worthy of note it is also recognised that one of the keys to success of the TATI is the PC who is now dedicated to assist with managing the vulnerable adults identified through the group. Outside of TATI meetings the PC has developed positive working relationships with HBC Adult Services and others working with vulnerable adults in Hartlepool and is providing a contact point within the Police for those agencies enabling early concerns to be addressed. For the Chief Inspector there is also no doubt that this role is assisting to relieve pressure on the local Neighbourhood Police and reducing demand on the Force as a whole with fewer calls going through the Police control room.

Early Learning/Areas for Improvement

- 3.8 Whilst some early benefits have been captured in relation to the TATI initiative, measuring progress to demonstrate the benefits of the approach both in terms of the impact on the individual, and the impact on services in terms of quantifiable savings is difficult. A framework agreed at the beginning of the process for example has not been utilised to date due to the level of resource required in relation to systems monitoring and ensuring that practitioners use the templates provided.
- 3.9 However as already identified the real success of the initiative is that it is acting as a focal point for managing risk in relation to our most vulnerable individuals with complex needs on a neighbourhood level, and in this respect there needs to be strategic 'buy-in' to the initiative from both the Safer Hartlepool Partnership and Tees Adult Safeguarding Board. The success of the initiative also poses further questions for strategic partners and commissioners in relation to how the multi-agency neighbourhood approach could be further developed and expanded to incorporate a greater number of individuals with complex needs.

- 3.10 A final consideration in relation to the TATI and other cases involving vulnerable adults with complex needs is the expansion of the use of ECINs to assist in managing risk associated with these individuals on a day to day basis. Whilst some staff continue to raise concerns about ‘double keying’ in relation to the use of ECINs there is also evidence that ECINs is being perceived as a positive case management tool for managing risk around vulnerable adults and that the number of staff from the Councils Adult Services Team using ECINs has grown.
- 3.11 One of the recommendations from a recent serious case review involving the murder of a vulnerable adult was the adoption of the use of ECINs to assist in information sharing and case managing risk. Both the Adult Safeguarding Board and the Safer Hartlepool Partnership have a role to play in ensuring this recommendation is implemented or alternatively provide some justification as to why they think this is no longer applicable.

4 EARLY HELP LOCALITY HUBS/COMMUNITY HUBS

Early Help Locality Hubs – early benefits

- 4.1 Whilst the Early Help Locality Teams were developed as part of an earlier review in relation to managing current demand on Children’s Services, they are perceived to be an important element of the prevention and early intervention strand of the integrated place based community safety delivery model with Children’s Early Help Teams in the Locality Hubs now benefiting from a dedicated PCSO who is based within each Locality Team 2 days a week.
- 4.2 Although the role of the PCSO in the hubs is not clearly defined and is one that continues to evolve over time, Children’s workers can approach PCSOs for information to enable a fuller discussion of options to take place in relation to young people where concerns have been raised, and joint visits are undertaken with Children’s workers where behavioural issues relating to young people have arisen to remind young people of the consequences of their actions. Schools can also contact PCSOs if they have concerns in relation to a particular child or where there are concerns around particular issues. For example PCSOs have delivered talks at school assemblies when requested by the school. This has included increasing awareness of internet safety, bullying, and explaining the role of the PCSO to try and build positive relationships.
- 4.3 As with other aspects of the model the fact that PCSOs are based in the locality teams is said to be facilitating greater information sharing between teams – in this case between the HCST and HBC Children’s workers and front line health visitors and midwives. PCSOs also report good links between Locality Teams and the Early Intervention Co-ordinator within the HSCT as a resource that can be tapped into to deliver programmes to young people where particular issues are raised such as teen to parent

abuse and bullying. The Fire Service Education Officer within the HCST also works within schools providing fire safety sessions in groups or on a one to one basis in relation to young people who have been identified as known or potential fire setters.

- 4.4 Longer term planning from an early help perspective is also evident. For example in an attempt to address concerns that the SHP are not engaging with children early enough where negative behaviours are present, the Early Intervention Co-ordinator and Community Resolution Co-ordinator are working together on a programme to take into primary schools that will involve a carousel of 4 sessions being delivered over a 2 hour period in relation to fire safety; etc. This will be piloted in 2 primary schools in the new academic year where intelligence and analysis demonstrates there are more young people at risk of engaging in anti-social behaviour.

Early Help Locality Hubs - Early Learning/Areas for Improvement

- 4.5 It is evident that relationships with the Early Help Locality Teams and schools are beginning to develop, however, the 2 days per week arrangement with the Locality Teams, alongside Police shift patterns, and holiday entitlement can result in a PCSO being off the patch for prolonged periods. As such providing a timely response to issues can be difficult with the immediacy of the impact of a police intervention – something as simple as a home visit for example being lost. Another concern from PCSOs is that it is sometimes difficult to follow up issues because Children's Services don't use ECINS and access to IT systems are not yet available to PCSOs in the Early Help Locality Hubs.
- 4.6 On occasion PCSOs also experience a disconnect between the broader support on offer from the HCST, and because of the limited time spent in localities feel that there are few opportunities to proactively engage with the broader community served by the Locality Hubs, resulting in a dilution of knowledge in relation to that community which is presenting barriers and the ability to engage positively with children and young people through for example youth activities.
- 4.7 Senior Managers within HBC acknowledge the need to address ECINS and the fact that some PCSOs cannot get access to IT systems. Further work identified to be taken forward also includes: raising awareness of the HCST with schools and how to engage with the HCST and Early Help Locality Teams; improving links between Children's Early Help Locality Hubs and the Councils Community Hubs where many parents would stand to benefit from the Community Hub offer eg benefits advice; health trainer etc; and improving understanding of the links and interaction between the core HCST, the Early Help Locality Hubs and the Children's Hub.

Community Hubs: Early Benefits

- 4.8 The HCST operational model seeks to build on local community assets by taking forward a programme of activities linked to the Councils Community

Hubs with the aim of fostering stronger relationships and partnerships with the local community, to enable those relationships to grow, support communities to take social action, and ensure links with a wider range of stakeholders working from the hubs.

- 4.9 A rota in relation to attendance of the HCST at Community Hubs was established by Community Cohesion Officers within the team week commencing the 7th March. The rota identified the presence of two members of the HSCT(a PCSO plus an HBC Officer) at each of the hubs one day a week between the hours of 11am- 2pm. The HCST are present at Community Hub North on a Monday; Central on a Tuesday, and South on a Friday. These days were agreed in conjunction with each of the Hubs with space being allocated within the foyer of each hub where members of the team could set up. In addition a separate confidential office has been allocated should any member of the community wish to make an appointment with a member of the team to discuss any community safety concerns.
- 4.10 The HSCTs attendance at the Hubs was accompanied by an initial round of publicity and over a 12 week period 124 contacts were made. Of these 45 residents benefited from crime prevention advice with the majority being related to personal safety, home crime prevention visits and cold calling zones, and 31 new residents were signed up to Cleveland Connect.
- 4.11 Although the number of neighbourhood issues raised at the Hubs during this period are low (7), intelligence fed into the Hubs from the local community has resulted in some quick wins including the discovery of a cannabis farm.

Community Hubs - Early Learning/Areas for Improvement

- 4.12 Given the number of hours that the HCST have spent in the Hubs there is some disappointment from the Team that the numbers of residents dropping in to see the team at each session are relatively low with as little as 2 residents attending some sessions and on other occasions no residents attending at all. This is particularly evident in the North and South Hubs where footfall is limited and a tendency for the same people to visit because of regular groups and activities that take place at the Hubs. An additional concern raised is that outside of the scheduled drop-in sessions there are no issues being reported by Hub staff into the HCST and no-one apparently dropping in to the Hubs to make appointments for members of the HCST to speak to the team in confidence at the Hubs.
- 4.13 To address low turn out posts have been scheduled on social media to remind residents about sessions and a feature will be included in the next round of Heartbeat. Some 10 second video clips with various officers speaking about the session that can be tweeted the night before are also being developed. It is also clear that there is scope to build the capacity of the Hubs themselves in engaging with the broader community, and for programmes and activities to be developed along with other services to increase the 'hub offer' and attract

further footfall with care being taken to attract vulnerable groups that are traditionally hard to reach.

6 ARE THERE ANY FURTHER OPPORTUNITIES TO EXPAND OR MAKE USEFUL ADDITIONS TO THE TEAM?

- 6.1 Almost without exception there was general agreement amongst those spoken to as part of this review that it was too early to consider further additions to the current core HCST. In addition as evidenced in the review one of the benefits of bringing a core Community Safety Team together from 3 major statutory services with a remit around improving Community Safety has been the ability to then tap into the resources of their parent organisations to add value to the work of the team.
- 6.2 In this respect good links were evident between the Councils Lead Operational Officer for Community Safety and other Council Services such as Housing, Trading Standards, Planning and Estates. From a Council perspective the Assistant Director has also taken an active role in encouraging Service Leads within his Division to take advantage of the integrated team and the wider expertise available. There was also evidence of the Assistant Director of Adult Services attending morning meetings to ensure that potential interventions planned for an individual were not in conflict and complemented the work of the HCST. Beyond this links to the Early Help Locality Teams and Community Hubs although requiring further development are providing further community based links with access to the HCST available to local communities in local bases.
- 6.3 It is fair to say therefore that current arrangements although in the early stages of development are encouraging. However one notable exception that has been mentioned during the review is the need for better day to day joint working arrangements with mental health and drug and alcohol services, where although said to be improving, the resistance to share information is apparent. Whilst accommodation is limited at Avenue Road as a base for the team it has been suggested that having a mental health worker based within the team would provide a useful addition to the team who would have access to systems with the ability to pull together and triage into secondary or primary care services therefore broadening out early contact and access to a greater range of services such as GPs, Access and Crisis Teams and links to the Effective Disorder Team.
- 6.4 In relation to this suggestion the Assistant Director for Adult Services has informed of a forthcoming review that will examine options in relation to the future delivery of Council commissioned mental health services. As such the potential for a mental health worker to be based within the HCST will be included along with other options in the analysis to be undertaken. Outside of

this development there is a general view that that existing arrangements should be allowed to develop and that any further potential changes should be left to a full review to consider that will take place in 2019/20.

7. GOVERNANCE/STEERING GROUP ARRANGEMENTS

- 7.1 Governance arrangements in relation to the development and implementation of the integrated community safety model were set out in the Terms of Reference of the Integrated Working Steering Group which reflected the agreement outlined in the Project Initiation Document.
- 7.2 There is general agreement that to date these arrangements have worked well in terms of developing the model, keeping track of actions, and the ability to remove barriers in relation to making progress where needed with both the Chief Superintendent and Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods providing strategic leadership and ensuring that the model is developed in line with priorities of their own organisations and the broader ambitions of the Safer Hartlepool Partnership. Given the importance of the model in bringing together a number of cross-cutting themes for community safety and safeguarding partners there is also general agreement that these arrangements need to continue under the strategic oversight of the Safer Hartlepool Partnership.
- 7.3 The Integrated Working Steering Group was set up by, and currently reports to the Safer Hartlepool Partnership. A forthcoming report to the Safer Hartlepool Partnership on the current Community Safety Plan suggests that this group will continue as the 'Neighbourhood Safety Sub Group' Chaired by the Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods. In line with the Standard Operational Protocol the Chief Inspector will be undertake the Lead Officer role with responsibility for ensuring the action plan is progressed and performance updates are provided to the group. This will relieve the Chief Inspector of his current role in Chairing a separate Neighbourhood Safety Group which will no longer continue to exist.
- 7.4 In addition to the Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods and the Chief Superintendent, current membership of the group includes the District Manager of the Fire Service; the Councils Assistant Directors of Children's, Adults, and Neighbourhood and Environmental Services; the Chief Inspector and Inspector of the HCST and the Councils Head of Community Safety and Engagement. A performance monitoring framework in relation to the HCST has largely been agreed by the group linked to Safer Hartlepool Partnership priorities around creating safer stronger neighbourhoods, and a Benefits Realisation Plan produced in conjunction with Cleveland Police Business Transformation Unit to enable efficiencies and effectiveness of the integrated working model to be captured.

- 7.5 Now that the model is up and running the Terms of Reference of the Group will invariably need to be refreshed and amended to reflect recent Council staffing changes to include the lead Operational Manager for Community Safety and the Community Safety Team Leader responsible for performance monitoring. Consideration could also be given to expanding Membership of the group to include partners from the National Probation Service, the CRC, and the CCG to reflect their role as responsible authorities for Community Safety. Given the link with the Community Hubs consideration could also be given to including the Councils Assistant Director of Preventions and Community Based Services.

8 KEY FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Key findings

- 1 Re-location of members of the integrated HCST staff has progressed in line with the Project Initiation Document, but IT issues continue to present a barrier to full relocation for the Fire Service and HBC Civil Enforcement Officers.
- 2 Joint working got off to a slow start following delays in implementing HBC structures, and the unavoidable absence of the Police Chief Inspector in the first month of operation. However there are some early benefits captured that should be acknowledged and celebrated.
- 3 Morning meetings are providing a vehicle for ensuring safeguarding risks are addressed at the earliest opportunity. Multi-agency problem solving at meetings is also slowly evolving as staff become more confident.
- 4 The core team is benefiting from the broader knowledge and expertise from each of the organisations involved in the team and there is a culture of co-operation developing within the HCST as an understanding of respective roles increases
- 5 Corporacy in relation to the internal and external communications of the HSCT is an area that needs to be improved to generate a sense of cohesiveness within the team and increase public confidence.
- 6 The importance of the Chief Inspector role as Lead Officer for the HSCT is recognised by Senior Managers within HBC and the Police. The need to nurture and develop this role is as a key priority.
- 7 The team around the individual is improving co-ordination on the ground and ensuring safeguarding risks around vulnerable adults are not left to one individual but are collectively shared.
- 8 One of the keys to success of the TATI is the PC who is now dedicated to assist with managing the vulnerable adults identified through the group.
- 9 There is a general acceptance that for some individuals referred to TATI there will continue to be a need for additional support there being 5 individuals

whose issues are so complex they will continue to receive support from the group.

- 10 The success of TATI poses further questions for strategic partners and commissioners in relation to how the multi-agency neighbourhood approach could be further developed and expanded to incorporate a greater number of individuals with complex needs, particularly those with drug alcohol issues and links to reoffending rates.
- 11 The use of ECINs is growing but there is further scope for development. Following a recent serious case review both the Adult Safeguarding Board and the Safer Hartlepool Partnership have a role to play in ensuring implementation.
- 12 PCSOs are establishing themselves as a useful addition to the Early Help Locality Teams providing additional liaison with schools, but the 2 days per week arrangement is problematic and consideration could be given to making this role full time.
- 13 Raising awareness of the HCST with schools and how to engage with the HCST and Early Help Locality Teams has been identified as an area for improvement
- 14 Links between Children's Early Help Locality Hubs and the Councils Community Hubs need to be strengthened and further work is required to build the capacity of the Community Hubs to engage with the broader community.
- 15 Further work could be undertaken to improving understanding of the links and interaction between the core HCST, the Early Help Locality Hubs and the Childrens Hub.
- 16 Links between the core HCST, the services in their own agencies, and the locality/community hubs with further development are providing an expanded community safety service adding value to the work of the core team. However the location of a mental health officer within the HCST has been identified as a useful addition to the team.
- 17 Current strategic governance arrangements are working well and there is an appetite to continue with these arrangements with the possibility of adding new members to the group to ensure Neighbourhood Safety is embedded.

Recommendations

- 1 All IT issues should be progressed with haste to enable Enforcement Staff to fully re-locate to Avenue Road and in the interim Civil Enforcement Officers to attend daily briefings with Sergeants to improve relationships and joint working

- 2 Consideration should be given to the Fire Service being based at Avenue Road on a full time basis, and the feasibility of moving HBC Civil Enforcement Officers into the space occupied by the Police, and the Fire Service into the area occupied by other case managers should be explored.
- 3 Consideration to be given to installing a dedicated police telephone at the desk space occupied by the HCST Technical Support Team.
- 4 Internal communications to be put in place from the Chief Inspector to the HCST to improve cohesiveness within the team, and regular communications to elected members from the HCST to be established.
- 5 A training programme for all HCST staff to be established to assist in workforce culture and development.
- 6 Consideration to be given to the HCST having a 'Day of Action' per month where intelligence suggests the benefit of proactive preventative area based operations to address key vulnerabilities and provide reassurance to communities.
- 7 Strategic Partners and commissioners of health services to consider how the multi-agency neighbourhood approach could be further developed and expanded to incorporate a greater number of individuals with complex needs given the dominance of drug and alcohol issues and links to reoffending rates.
- 8 All partners to ensure ECINs is progressed in their organisations, and the Safer Hartlepool Partnership and Safeguarding Boards to be proactive in holding partners to account in relation to the use of ECINs
- 9 Consideration to be given to having PCSOs based in the Early Help Locality Hubs on a full time basis.
- 10 Consideration be given to a Community Cohesion Officer from the HCST being dedicated to work with the Councils Community Hubs, to assist in developing the Hubs, links with the broader community and satellite buildings including Children's Locality Hubs.
- 11 That in light of recommendation 10 that the HCST attendance at Community Hubs is reviewed in 3 month's time and consideration given to only one rather than two members of the HCST attending the Hubs to represent the whole team.
- 12 That further work is undertaken to improve understanding of the links and interaction between the core HCST, the Locality Hubs, and Childrens Hub.

- 13 That consideration is given to having a mental health worker based at Avenue Road as part of the core HCST as part of the forthcoming options analysis.

Hartlepool Community Safety Team Operational Delivery Model

