



SAFER HARTLEPOOL PARTNERSHIP AGENDA



Monday 6 March 2023

at 10.00 am

**in the Council Chamber,
Civic Centre, Hartlepool.**

MEMBERS: SAFER HARTLEPOOL PARTNERSHIP

Responsible Authority Members:

Councillor Moore, Elected Member, Hartlepool Borough Council
Councillor Cassidy, Elected Member, Hartlepool Borough Council
Denise McGuckin, Managing Director, Hartlepool Borough Council
Tony Hanson, Director of Neighbourhoods and Regulatory Services, Hartlepool Borough Council
Sylvia Pinkney, Assistant Director, Regulatory Services, Hartlepool Borough Council
Superintendent Emily Harrison, Community Safety, Cleveland Police
Jo Heaney, Chair of Youth Offending Board
Karen Hawkins, Director of Place, North East and North Cumbria Integrated Care Board (NENC ICB)
Ann Powell, Head of Stockton and Hartlepool Probation Delivery Unit
Michael Ireland, Cleveland Fire Authority

Other Members:

Craig Blundred, Director of Public Health, Hartlepool Borough Council
Steve Turner, Office of Police and Crime Commissioner for Cleveland
Michelle Hill, Hartlepool Voluntary and Community Sector Representative, Safer Communities
Angela Corner, Head of Community Resilience, Thirteen 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

Non-Voting Observer, Representative of Audit and Governance Committee, 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 17 October 2022.

4. PRESENTATIONS

- 4.1 Cleveland Online Policing App (COPA) - *Project Manager, Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Cleveland*

5. ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

- 5.1 Martyn's Law and Publicly Accessible Locations Update – *Director of Neighbourhoods and Regulatory Services*
- 5.2 Serious Violence – *Director of Neighbourhoods and Regulatory Services*
- 5.3 Independent Review Of Prevent – *Director of Neighbourhoods and Regulatory Services*

6. ANY OTHER BUSINESS WHICH THE CHAIR CONSIDERS URGENT



SAFER HARTLEPOOL PARTNERSHIP

MINUTES AND DECISION RECORD

17 OCTOBER 2022

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

Present:

Responsible Authority Members:

Councillor Moore, Elected Member, Hartlepool Borough Council (Chair)
Tony Hanson, Director of Neighbourhoods and Regulatory Services
Hartlepool Borough Council
Karen Hawkins, Director of Commissioning, Strategy and Delivery, NHS Tees
Valley Clinical Commissioning Group
Mick Ireland, Cleveland Fire Authority

Other Members:

Lynsey Blas, Office of Police and Crime Commissioner for Cleveland
Sally Robinson, Director of Children's and Joint Commissioning Services,
Hartlepool Borough Council

Also Present:

Inspector Zoe Kelsey, Cleveland Police
John Lovatt, Assistant Director, Adult Social Care, Hartlepool Borough
Council, as substitute for Jill Harrison.

Officers:

Phil Hepburn, Community Safety Operations Manager
David Cosgrove, Democratic Services Team

11. Apologies for Absence

Denise McGuckin, Managing Director, Hartlepool Borough Council
Councillor Cassidy, Elected Member, Hartlepool Borough Council
Superintendent Emily Harrison, Community Safety, Cleveland Police
Steve Turner, Office of Police and Crime Commissioner for Cleveland
Sarah Wilson, Officer for Consultation and Engagement, Office of Police
and Crime Commissioner for Cleveland
Councillor Rob Cook, Non-Voting Observer, Representative of Audit and
Governance Committee, Hartlepool Borough Council

Jill Harrison, Director of Adult and Community Based Services, Hartlepool Borough Council
Councillor Rob Cook, Non-Voting Observer, Representative of Audit and Governance Committee, Hartlepool Borough Council
Sue Lax, Designated Nurse for safeguarding Adults, North East and North Cumbria Integrated Care Board.

12. Declarations of Interest

None.

13. Minutes of the meeting held on 18 July 2022

Confirmed.

14. Targeted Detached Youth Service (*Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner*)

The Officer for Consultation and Engagement, Office of Police and Crime Commissioner for Cleveland, was unfortunately not present due to ill health and the Cleveland Police Inspector outlined the working of the Targeted Detached Youth Service in Hartlepool. The Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC) had previously provided funding to the four Community Safety Partnerships across Cleveland to commission a Targeted Youth Outreach Service, which had then been directed by the Local Authority Community Safety leads.

The Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC) had awarded a three year contract from 1st April 2022 for the provision of this new Targeted Detached Youth Service to the Belle Vue Sports, Community and Youth Centre – the provider of the previous Targeted Youth Outreach Service. The Inspector outlined the management process of the programme which included quarterly meetings to monitor targets and the management of the scheme. On a weekly basis, the officers and those involved in delivering the service met to identify the individuals and the areas to be targeted. Work with youths was undertaken out in the community and also in the Belle Vue Centre.

The Chair welcomed the scheme and the positive outcomes that were starting to come forward from it. The Chair asked if there were any details of the work undertaken that could be shared with the Partnership and an indication of the impact the work was having. The Inspector stated that a report was to be prepared and this could be submitted to a future meeting.

The Director of Children's and Joint Commissioning Services referenced the Multi Agency Child Exploitation work undertaken by the team and how the aim of the outreach service was to divert young people away from potential exploitation and crime. The Director questioned how the team

was working with the Children's Hub to safeguard children at risk of criminal exploitation and if this could be included in the future report.

Decision

That the report be noted.

15. Prevent Update (*Director of Neighbourhoods and Regulatory Services*)

The Director of Neighbourhoods and Regulatory Services reported that as reported in January 2019, a Prevent Duty Toolkit for Local Authorities and Partner Agencies had been published by the Home Office in August 2018 to supplement the Prevent Duty Guidance for England and Wales (March 2015). The Toolkit included a self-assessment tool to enable local authorities and their partners to assess Prevent delivery in their local area against ten benchmarks linked to statutory responsibilities and best practice delivery.

While an Initial self-assessment in April 2019 had not been scored, the 2022 self-assessment, which was carried out with the Home Office Prevent Local Delivery and Communities Regional Advisor, was scored and the details were set out in the report. Where areas of weakness had been identified a series of recommendations were agreed and an action plan, submitted with the report, had been drawn up identifying the works required to meet statutory requirements and providing progress update. Members of the Operational Prevent Group would focus on the action plan over the coming months and would seek to incorporate good practice from other areas. The Partnership was asked to approve the action plan and the Director stated that a further update report would be provided to the Partnership in six months' time.

Decision

That the Action Plan be approved and a further update report be submitted to the Partnership in six months' time.

16. Update on Evaluation of the Integrated Community Safety Team 2021 (*Neighbourhood Safety Group*)

The Director of Neighbourhoods and Regulatory Services reported that in August 2018 following an interim review, an action plan based on the recommendations from the interim review had been developed to be overseen by the Neighbourhood Safety Group of the Safer Hartlepool Partnership. This identified that a full review of the model would be undertaken during 2019/20 and with a completion date of December 2020. Unfortunately, that review was delayed due to the Covid-19 pandemic. The

evaluation proposal was subsequently considered and agreed by the Neighbourhood Safety Group in February 2021 and the review commenced the following month.

The Evaluation Report was presented to the Neighbourhood Safety Group in October 2021. The report identified a series of findings from across the breadth of the service and set out 16 recommendations for the Neighbourhood Safety Group, Safer Hartlepool Partnership and individual partner organisations. It was agreed by the Partnership at its meeting of 6th December 2021 that the Neighbourhood Safety Group should prepare an action plan setting out how the recommendations included within the evaluation would be responded to over the next 18 months and that progress updates be brought to the Safer Hartlepool Partnership by the Neighbourhood Safety Group twice a year on the implementation of the action plan which was submitted with the report to the Partnership.

The Chair referred to recommendation 1 of the Action Plan in relation to the aim and purpose of the Team and the preparation of a long-term plan with a clear performance management framework. The Chair commented that this should not be delayed any further and requested a report to the next meeting of the Partnership. The Chair commented that at a previous meeting there had been concerns expressed around the location of the team in the Police offices and the working from home of a number of staff during the Covid-19 pandemic. Had those staff started to return to work and was the collocation of officers from various agencies working as intended.

The Community Safety Operations Manager stated that during the pandemic it was mainly admin support staff that were working at home. The new hybrid working model was working well and there were the multi-agency meetings each morning to review data and intelligence and determine the appropriate response. Inspector Kelsey confirmed that those meetings were going ahead and that they provided some excellent joint working. In response to a question from the public, the Fire Brigade representative stated that there was always a Fire Brigade Officer present at the briefing meetings. The Inspector also stated that Council officers from Children's and Adults services were also present to address any safeguarding issues.

A Member of the public complained that the discussions of those meetings were not shared with the community and that the Council had, in ending the Community Forums, stopped the public being able to discuss these issues. The Chair highlighted that the decision to end the Community Forums had been taken by full Council and the public had access to meetings such as this to raise their concerns.

A Member commented that the report stated that all officers couldn't attend the meetings due to shift patterns. The Community Safety Operations Manager stated that this referred to the Community Enforcement Team Officers who operated on split shift patterns, so bringing the whole team

together was a little more difficult. Enforcement staff did come together for regular meetings but this had been difficult during the Covid-19 pandemic.

Decision

That the progress on the Action Plan, as reported be noted and that a further report on the preparation of a long-term plan with a clear performance management framework for the Integrated Community Safety Team be submitted to a future meeting.

17. Any Other Items which the Chairman Considers are Urgent

The Chairman ruled that the following item of business should be considered by the Committee as a matter of urgency in accordance with the provisions of Section 100(B) (4) (b) of the Local Government Act 1972.

18. Neighbourhood Policing Update

Inspector Kelsey updated the meeting on the work of the Neighbourhood Policing Team. The Inspector highlighted that Operation Endurance, which had been reported to the previous meeting, was now a Cleveland-wide operation tackling the problems caused by the illegal use of motorbikes and quadbikes. Many riders of these vehicles were resorting to wearing balaclavas to hide their identity but CCTV was being used to pick up any occasions when they gave away their identity. The force was also widening its targeting of these youths and the problems they were causing by working with housing providers to look at impacts on tenancies from the use of and storage of illegal bikes.

There had been a joint operation with Durham Police targeting rural crime where burglary was a particular issue. Police had also disrupted twelve large cannabis farms in recent weeks and Operation New York, a joint operation with the National Crime Agency, had targeted cannabis farm equipment and had also lead to the seizure of illegal cigarettes. This operation had also lead to the rescue of a young male that had been illegally trafficked into the country.

In the discussions the Inspector requested that should people have any dash-cam or mobile phone pictures or footage of the illegal use of motorbikes and quadbikes, then they should share these with the Police, particularly if they had date and time stamps, as this could add to the intelligence being gathered. This could also be shared with the Police quickly and easily via the new COPA app which was now available. Members requested that information on the new COPA app be shared with all Members and as widely as possible.

The Inspector reported that locally, seven people had been arrested for burglary. Many of these crimes were opportunist with criminals checking car doors and house front doors randomly to see if they could gain access. The Inspector urged the public to lock up properly to prevent this kind of opportunistic crime.

A Member of the public commended the police on the work they had done around the Rossmere area which was improving the situation for local residents. There was some concern expressed by a Member of the Public at the apparent lack of use of court injunctions to control the behaviour of certain individuals. The Inspector and the Community Safety Operations Manager assured the meeting that, where necessary, such court orders were regularly used. A further issue relating to Rossmere Way was also raised, though the Chair stated that the issue had been resolved and resident concerned was satisfied with the result.

A Member of the public referred to the press reports of the force being allocated 190 new constables and where these officers were as there appeared to be little Police presence in the community. The inspector stated that new officers were coming through from training on a regular basis in smaller groups between 10 and 20. It had to be acknowledged that over the past decade the numbers of Police in Cleveland had been reduced substantially due to funding cuts.

Issues around illegal parking in bus laybys in the King Oswy area were raised and the Community Safety Operations Manager indicated that enforcement officers would be asked to patrol the area. Public concerns around the use of electric scooters on the pavement were also discussed. The Chair commented that if they were the rented scooters provided by Ginger, if the public could provide date, time and location details it would be possible to have those users stopped from using them again. It was, however, a Tees Valley Combined Authority trial scheme and Hartlepool BC had no involvement in the management of the scheme.

19. Date and Time of Next Meeting

The Chair reported that the next meeting would be held on Monday 5 December, 2022 at 10.00 am

The meeting concluded at 11.00 am.

CHAIR



SAFER HARTLEPOOL PARTNERSHIP

6th March 2023



Report of: Director of Neighbourhoods and Regulatory Services

Subject: MARTYN'S LAW AND PUBLICLY ACCESSIBLE LOCATIONS UPDATE

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To provide the Partnership with an update of Martyn's Law previously referred to as the Protect Duty. An initial report was presented to the Partnership in March 2022 detailing the Governments plans, and this report will highlight the duty in more significant detail.
- 1.2 To update the Partnership on the Publicly Accessible Locations (PAL) pilot.

2 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 On Monday 19th December 2022, the Government announced proposals for new measures to be taken to protect public venues. This was previously referred to as the Protect Duty, however it will now be known as 'Martyn's Law' in tribute to Martyn Hett, who was killed alongside 21 others in the Manchester Arena terrorist attack in 2017.
- 2.2 The terrorist threat we currently face is multifaceted, diverse, and continually evolving. As such, it remains difficult to predict which locations could be targeted by terrorists with attempts being harder to spot and harder to stop.
- 2.3 We need to improve security and ensure robust, proportionate, and consistent measures at public places to make sure we can better prepare and improve public security, in light of possible future attacks.
- 2.4 Without legal compulsion, counter terrorism security efforts often fall behind legally required activities. The prioritisation, consideration and application of security processes and measures is currently inconsistent.
- 2.5 Martyn's Law will improve public safety, enhancing national security and reducing the risk to the public from terrorism by the protection of public venues. It will place a requirement on those responsible for certain locations to consider the threat from terrorism and implement appropriate and proportionate mitigation measures.

- 2.6 The legislation will ensure relevant parties are prepared, ready to respond and know what to do in the event of an attack. Better protection will be delivered through enhanced security systems, staff training, and clearer processes.

3 MARTYN'S LAW PROPOSAL

- 3.1 The proposal is that the Duty would apply to any place to which the public or any section of the public has access, on payment or otherwise, as of right or by virtue of express or implied permission. Publicly Accessible Locations include a wide variety of everyday locations that may be publicly or privately owned and can also include temporary events.

4 SCOPE OF MARTYN'S LAW

- 4.1 Premises will fall within the scope of the Duty where “qualifying activities” take place. This will include locations for purposes such as entertainment and leisure, retail, food and drink, museums and galleries, sports grounds, public areas of local and central Government buildings (e.g., town halls), visitor attractions, temporary events, Places of Worship, health, and education.
- 4.2 It is proposed that the Duty will apply to eligible locations which are either: a building; or location/event (including a temporary event) that has a defined boundary, allowing capacity to be known. Eligible locations whose maximum occupancy meets the above specified thresholds will be then drawn into the relevant tier.
- 4.3 Therefore, premises will be drawn into the scope of the Duty if they meet the following three tests:
- That the premises is an eligible one – i.e. building or event with a defined boundary;
 - That a qualifying activity takes place at the location; and
 - That the maximum occupancy of the premises meets a specified threshold of either 100+ or 800+.

5 WHO WILL THE LAW APPLY TO

- 5.1 Martyn's Law will impose a duty on the owners and operators of certain locations to increase their preparedness for and protection from a terrorist attack by requiring them to take proportionate steps, depending on the size and nature of the activities that take place there. Proportionality is a fundamental consideration for this proposed new duty. It will therefore establish a tiered model, linked to the activity that takes place at a location and its capacity:
- **A standard tier** will drive good preparedness outcomes. Duty holders will be required to undertake simple yet effective activities to improve protective security and preparedness. This will apply to qualifying locations with a

maximum capacity of over 100. This could include larger retail stores, bars, or restaurants.

- **An enhanced tier** will see additional requirements placed on high-capacity locations in recognition of the potential catastrophic consequences of a successful attack. This will apply to locations with a capacity of over 800 people at any time. This could include live music venues, theatres, and department stores.

- 5.2 Eligible locations whose maximum occupancy meets the above specified thresholds will be then drawn into the relevant tier.
- 5.3 Standard tier duty holders will need to undertake modest activities to meet their obligations. This will include an obligation for staff to complete free training, awareness raising and cascading of information to staff and completion of a preparedness plan. The aim is to ensure staff are better prepared to respond quickly to evolving situations, aware of what processes they should follow, able to make rapid decisions and carry out actions that will save lives. This could be as simple as locking doors to delay attacker's progress and access while guiding staff and customers to alternative exits. It could also enable lifesaving treatment to be administered by staff while awaiting the arrival of emergency services.
- 5.4 Enhanced tier duty holders will need to undertake a risk assessments and security plans, considered to a 'reasonably practicable' standard. This will allow Duty holders to assess the balance of risk reduction against the time, money and effort required to achieve a successful level of security preparedness – a recognised standard in other regulatory regimes (including Fire and Health and Safety).
- 5.5 The Government will introduce the Protect Duty as soon as Parliamentary time allows. There will be a lead in time allowing for those captured by the Duty to prepare for commencement. While there is no current indication of when Martyn's Law will progress through Parliament, Hartlepool Borough Council would encourage partners to consider how the Duty will affect their stakeholders. Further updates will be provided to the Partnership when the Parliamentary timetable is published.

6 PUBLICLY ACCESSIBLE LOCATIONS (PAL) PROJECT

- 6.1 As previously reported to the Safer Hartlepool Partnership in March 2022, in preparation for the introduction of Martyn's Law Hartlepool Borough Council have been taking part in the Publicly Accessible Locations Pilot and have been working closely with the Counter Terrorism North East Policing team since 1st April 2022.
- 6.2 By participating in the Pilot Hartlepool Borough Council have established a dedicated overarching Publicly Accessible Locations Group and a number of working subgroups. This preparatory work has given the council a head start on the Martyn's Law requirements. The Council has been risk assessing its

premises which may hold “qualifying activities” through a joined-up approach of Council employees and a dedicated Counter Terrorism Security Advisor who is employed by Counter Terrorism Policing North East. The Pilot has placed the Council in a good position for the impending legislative requirements as it has provided a good baseline for greater coordination of security planning, greater awareness and training in counter terrorism.

- 6.3 At the start of the Pilot a Protect Duty baseline assessment was completed in the form of a Maturity Matrix. The Matrix allows for an assessment of the organisations preparedness to be made on specified areas. The Matrix covers Governance and Leadership, Partnership and Engagement, Information Management, Risk and Incident Management, Culture and Awareness and Exercising and Learning. The Matrix provides four levels which are categorised as level 1 – Absent, level 1 – Aware, level 2 – Planning, level 3 – Implementing and level 4 – Evaluating. The Matrix has been reviewed during the pilot period and the average level of preparedness has increased from level 0 to level 1 and we are currently working towards level 2.
- 6.4 Training staff on counter terrorism risks is a high priority within the Pilot. All Hartlepool Borough Council employees have been requested to complete online ProtectUK training alongside the See, Check and Notify training. The training will help develop staff awareness across the organisation and increase awareness around hostile reconnaissance. All staff who have a council mobile phone have been asked to download the free ProtectUK App. In person training is being arranged for grounds maintenance staff and stakeholders such as parks volunteer groups, and it is hoped that further in person training will be rolled out across the Local Authority.

7 LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 7.1 There are no legal implications associated with this report.

8 EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY CONSIDERATIONS

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

9 OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Financial Considerations	No relevant issues
Child/Family Poverty Considerations	No relevant issues
Staff Considerations	No relevant issues
Asset Management Considerations	No relevant issues
Environment, Sustainability & Climate Change Considerations	No relevant issues

10 RECOMMENDATIONS

10.1 That Partners note the report.

10.2 That Partners start to consider the potential financial implications of meeting the legislative obligations.

11 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

11.1 The Safer Hartlepool Partnership will have a responsibility in relation to Martyn's Law when the legislation is introduced.

12 BACKGROUND PAPERS

12.1 There are no background papers to accompany this report

13 CONTACT OFFICER(S)

Tony Hanson
Director of Neighbourhoods and Regulatory Services
Hartlepool Borough Council
Civic Centre
Victoria Road
Hartlepool
TS24 8AY
tony.hanson@hartlepool.gov.uk

Sylvia Pinkney
Assistant Director (Regulatory Services)
Hartlepool Borough Council
Civic Centre
Victoria Road
Hartlepool
TS24 8AY
Sylvia.pinkney@hartlepool.gov.uk



SAFER HARTLEPOOL PARTNERSHIP

6th March 2023



Report of: Director of Neighbourhoods and Regulatory Services

Subject: SERIOUS VIOLENCE

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 This is a Non Key decision and provides a further update on the Serious Violence Duty, following a previous report which was presented to the partnership in March 2022.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The Serious Violence Duty (The Duty) created by The Police, Crime, Sentencing and Courts Act 2022 (PCSC) was introduced in October 2022. It requires local authorities, the police, fire and rescue authorities, specified criminal justice agencies and health authorities to work together to formulate an evidence based analysis of the problems associated with serious violence in a local area, and then produce and implement a strategy detailing how they will respond to those particular issues.
- 2.2 Serious violence has a devastating impact on the lives of victims and families, instils fear within communities and is extremely costly to society.

3. THE DUTY

- 3.1 The Duty is a key part of the Government's programme of work to collaborate and plan to prevent and reduce serious violence from taking a multi-agency approach, to understand the causes and consequences of serious violence, focusing on prevention and early intervention, and informed by evidence.
- 3.2 In addition to law enforcement, there is a need to understand and address the factors that cause someone to commit violent crime in the first place. This includes where coercion is a factor regarding vulnerable children and adults. The Duty aims to ensure that agencies are focused on their activities to prevent and reduce serious violence while also providing sufficient flexibility

so that the relevant organisations will engage and work together in the most effective local partnership for any given area.

- 3.3 The Duty does not require the creation of new multi-agency structures. Local senior leaders may use existing local structures where possible to comply with the requirements of the Duty to work together to prevent and reduce serious violence in their local areas and, ultimately, to improve community safety and safeguarding.

4. DEFINING SERIOUS VIOLENCE

- 4.1 Specified authorities will need to work together to identify the kinds of serious violence that occur in their area as far as possible.
- 4.2 The PCSC does not define serious violence for the purposes of the Duty. In determining what amounts to serious violence in a local area, the specified authorities must take into account the following factors listed in Section 13 (6) of the PCSC:
- a) The maximum penalty which could be imposed for any violent offence;
 - b) The impact of the violence on any victim;
 - c) The prevalence of the violence in the area, and
 - d) The impact of the violence on the community in the area.
- 4.3 Section 13 of the PCSC provides that, for the purposes of the Duty, violence includes domestic abuse, sexual offences, violence against property and threats of violence, but does not include terrorism. This does not mean that specified authorities will be compelled to take action on these crime types specifically linked to the Duty alone, but instead that they should consider whether violence of these kinds amounts to serious violence in their area, in accordance with the factors set out above.
- 4.4 This approach allows the strategy to take account of new and emerging forms of serious violence as they develop and are identified, and recognises the geographical difference in the prevalence of different types of serious violent crimes.

5. CLEVELAND UNIT FOR THE REDUCTION OF VIOLENCE (CURV)

- 5.1 The Cleveland Specified Authorities Stockton, Redcar and Cleveland, Middlesbrough and Hartlepool have agreed to work jointly through CURV to help meet the legal obligations specified by The Duty. CURV will have a coordinating role, carrying out data analysis, apply for funding streams and submit Home Office returns on behalf of the authorities. This has been supported by the CURV Governance Group.
- 5.2 The multi-agency Governance Group provides governance of all the work being carried out by CURV including the approval of funding bids we are

represented on the group by the Managing Director who also represents the other Cleveland local authorities.

- 5.3 Funding opportunities have already been identified and achieved by the CURV team. 2022/23 intervention funding has been used to purchase equipment that would support the combined priority of providing additional security around public spaces in order to reduce serious violence in the Night Time Economy.
- 5.4 The Cleveland specified local authorities and CURV have agreed in principle that they would create a Serious Violence Duty Coordinator Role. The Coordinator will support the specified authorities in delivering their statutory obligations created by The Duty.

6. CLEVELAND SERIOUS VIOLENCE STRATEGIC NEED ASSESSMENT

- 6.1 The Cleveland OPCC's Unit for Reduction of Violence (CURV) has commissioned Crest Advisory to complete a Strategic Needs Assessment of the nature, scale and drivers of Serious Violence in Cleveland.
- 6.2 The Strategic Needs Assessment provides a good baseline of knowledge and understanding on Serious Violence in Cleveland – both in terms of seeking to identify and target interventions, and also in terms of directing future research activity.

7. PREPERATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF A STRATEGY

- 7.1 In order to prepare and implement a strategy to prevent and reduce serious violence in the area, the partnership will collectively develop a strategy which will outline the multi-agency response that the partnership will take to address the drivers identified in the strategic needs assessment and work to prevent and reduce serious violence in the local area.
- 7.2 The strategy should contain bespoke solutions to prevent and reduce serious violence in the area, and will set out how the proposed actions will enhance and complement existing local arrangements responding to serious violence. This must be kept under review, which should be done on an annual basis and updated when necessary.

8. LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 8.1 The Police, Crime, Sentencing and Court Act 2022 places a duty on the Partnership to include serious violence as one of its priorities and to produce a serious violence strategy.

9. EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY CONSIDERATIONS

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

10. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Financial Considerations	No relevant issues
Child/Family Poverty Considerations	No relevant issues
Staff Considerations	No relevant issues
Asset Management Considerations	No relevant issues
Environment, Sustainability & Climate Change Considerations	No relevant issues

11. RECOMMENDATIONS

11.1 That members note the report.

12. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

12.1 The Partnership has responsibility to produce a serious violence strategy under The Police Crime Sentencing and Courts Act 2022.

13. BACKGROUND PAPERS

13.1 Cleveland Serious Violence Strategic Need Assessment

14. CONTACT OFFICER(S)

Tony Hanson
 Director of Neighbourhoods and Regulatory Services
 Hartlepool Borough Council
 Civic Centre
 Victoria Road
 Hartlepool
tony.hanson@hartlepool.gov.uk

Sylvia Pinkney
 Assistant Director (Regulatory Services)
 Hartlepool Borough Council
 Civic Centre
 Victoria Road
 Hartlepool
Sylvia.pinkney@hartlepool.gov.uk



SAFER HARTLEPOOL PARTNERSHIP

6th MARCH 2023



Report of: Director of Neighbourhoods and Regulatory Services

Subject: INDEPENDENT REVIEW OF PREVENT

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To inform the Safer Hartlepool Partnership of the findings and recommendations of the Independent Review of Prevent.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 During the passage of the Counter Terrorism and Border Security Act 2019 on 12 February 2019, the Government committed to carrying out an independent review into the Prevent strand of its counter-terrorism strategy, CONTEST. The purpose of the review was to:
- Consider if Prevent is achieving its objectives to support those vulnerable to being drawn into any form of terrorism;
 - Assess how effectively and efficiently Prevent is being delivered at both the local and national level;
 - Consider how effectively Prevent interacts with other safeguarding and vulnerability strategies; and
 - Consider how effective the Statutory Prevent Duty is, and how effectively is it being implemented.

- 2.2 After much delay, the Independent Review of Prevent, led by William Shawcross, was published on 8th February 2023.

3. INDEPENDENT REVIEW OF PREVENT

- 3.1 The Independent Review of Prevent has paved the way for a stronger, more transparent, and proportionate approach to stopping people from being radicalised into terrorism, and recognises the need for Prevent to better understand ideology and the individual agency of people who willingly support terrorism.

- 3.2 The Review has also highlighted the need for Prevent to focus its activity where it will have the most impact, while remaining flexible enough to respond to evolving threats and all radicalisation risks, and for greater emphasis to be placed on tackling Islamist ideology which underpins the primary terror threat to the UK.
- 3.3 In total, the review made 34 recommendations that have been accepted by the government including:
- A revision of the Prevent Duty;
 - New initiatives to encourage referrals from friends, family and community cohorts; and
 - Move national Prevent delivery to a regionalised model and streamline the Channel case management process.
- 3.4 A summary of the review's headline recommendations and Government's response to them is attached at **Appendix 1**. Full versions of the reports can be accessed here: [Independent Review of Prevent's report and government response - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/reports/publications/independent-review-of-prevent-report-and-government-response)

4. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Risk Implications	No relevant issues
Financial Considerations	No relevant issues
Legal Considerations	No relevant issues
Equality and Diversity Considerations	No relevant issues
Child/Family Poverty Considerations	No relevant issues
Staff Considerations	No relevant issues
Asset Management Considerations	No relevant issues

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 5.1 That the Safer Hartlepool Partnership notes the report.

6. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

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

7. BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 7.1 Independent Review of Prevent, February 2023: [Independent Review of Prevent \(publishing.service.gov.uk\)](https://publishing.service.gov.uk/government/reports/publications/independent-review-of-prevent-report-and-government-response)

Government Response to the Independent Review of Prevent, February 2023: [The response to the Independent Review of Prevent \(publishing.service.gov.uk\)](https://publishing.service.gov.uk/government/reports/publications/government-response-to-the-independent-review-of-prevent)

8. CONTACT OFFICER(S)

Tony Hanson
Director of Neighbourhoods and Regulatory Services
Hartlepool Borough Council
Civic Centre
Victoria Road
Hartlepool
tony.hanson@hartlepool.gov.uk

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

Independent Review of Prevent

Summary of headline recommendations and Government responses.

Recommendation 1: Revise Prevent objective to clarify and emphasise the importance of tackling extremist ideology as a terrorism driver.

Gov. response: We will change the first objective of Prevent to clearly specify the need to tackle the ideological causes of terrorism and ensure the revised first Prevent objective is clearly reflected in the updated Guidance and, where necessary, legislation. We will also ensure that training on ideology currently being developed by the CCE is mandatory for all Prevent staff and frontline sectors.

Recommendation 2: Move away from 'vulnerability' language towards 'susceptibility'. The Vulnerability Assessment Framework should become the Prevent Assessment Framework.

Gov. response: We recognise that Prevent should be focused on tackling radicalising influences themselves, to which some are susceptible, rather than wider issues such as mental health. Prevent work must always be aware of the risk presented by the individual or group in question and recognise the agency of individuals in aligning with extremist groups. We commit to using the term 'susceptibility to becoming terrorists or supporting terrorism' where relevant and defining this language more clearly. The VAF will be replaced by a new Prevent Assessment Framework which will align with the recommendation to narrow the use of the term 'vulnerable' to discussions relating to welfare concerns and circumstances beyond an individual's control.

Recommendation 3: Reset thresholds to ensure proportionality across Prevent work streams. Prevent must work to one bar across the ideological threats. The bar should not be set so high as to only include concerns related to the most established terrorist organisations, nor so low as to capture mainstream politicians, commentators or publications.

Gov. response: We agree it is important to have one, consistent and proportionate threshold across all extremist ideologies and work streams. We will ensure designated Prevent leads have the training and support they need to provide effective advice. The new Prevent Assessment Framework will better define the criteria used to determine whether a case should be considered for Channel. We will also set out rigorous criteria to ensure that the proportion of funding allocated to civil society organisations to tackle specific ideologies is fully reflective of the threat we face.

Recommendation 4: Improve understanding of 'blasphemy' as part of the wider Islamist threat. HSG should conduct research into understanding and countering Islamist violence, incitement and intimidation linked to 'blasphemy'.

Gov. response: DLUHC will lead on tackling blasphemy-related incidents and Prevent will focus on where this contributes to radicalisation or terrorism. The CCE will conduct research on violence associated with blasphemy and will then consider with partners how Prevent should adapt to address this.

Recommendation 5: Explore the prevalence of antisemitism in Channel cases and whether this is reflected in a breakdown of Channel referrals more widely. Feed these findings into work to disrupt radicalisers and counter extremist narratives.

Gov. response: We will improve our understanding of ideologies that spread anti-Semitic narratives and take direct action to address this including taking steps to disrupt radicalisers

that spread harmful views which explicitly target the Jewish community. We will also continue to support DLUHC's work to counter other forms of racial and religious hatred and increase our pool of intervention providers that specialise in tackling antisemitism.

Recommendation 6: Amend the Counter-Terrorism and Security Act 2015 to stipulate that relevant agencies must "have due regard to the need to prevent people from becoming terrorists or supporting terrorism".

Gov. response: Accepted.

Recommendation 7: Keep current terminology to describe Islamist and XRW ideology and ensure use of terminology is consistent across products, guidance, and training materials.

Gov. response: Accepted.

Recommendation 9: Restrict Prevent funding to groups and projects which challenge extremist and terrorist ideology via counter-narratives and activities and not towards general youth work or community initiatives.

Gov. response: We recognise that Prevent project funding has focused too broadly and insufficient checks have been conducted, and acknowledge the review's finding that there was limited evidence that Prevent and RICU-funded projects countered extremist ideology. We will refocus on projects that explicitly counter radicalisation and challenge extremist and terrorist ideology; strengthen our approach to moderating funding bids from local authorities for civil society projects; and provide clear communications to local authorities on the need for projects to challenge extremist and terrorist ideology and ensure appropriate oversight.

Recommendation 10: Ensure Prevent disruptions takes action to limit the influence of 'chronic' radicalisers and networks which sit below the terrorism threshold, that promote narratives legitimising terrorism and terrorists without breaking the law.

Gov. response: We will commit to accelerating and strengthening our work to disrupt chronic radicalisers who operate below legal thresholds by introducing a new partnership approach with local, regional and national partners, law enforcement agencies, other Government departments, and wider counter-extremism experts. We will provide specialist training on the activities and harmful narratives of such radicalisers and will work with DLUHC and the CCE to establish a cross-Government mechanism to co-ordinate work on tackling non-violent extremism.

Recommendation 11: Move national Prevent delivery to a regionalised model that has consistent lines with the centre of Prevent in the Home Office.

Gov. response: We will move to a regional Prevent delivery model directly overseen by the Home Office and significantly reduce the number of local authority areas of highest threat that we fund. This will increase join-up with CTP and other regional partners, ensure each local authority has access to expert Prevent support from Home Office regional Prevent advisers, and enable resource to be surged into areas to meet radicalisation risks.

Recommendation 12: Ensure high level decision-making within Prevent is informed by proper consideration of the terrorism threat picture to ensure that any action taken is proportionate.

Gov. response: We acknowledge that Islamist terrorism is currently the primary terrorist threat and that this is not currently reflected in Prevent caseloads. We will introduce a security threat check process that is informed by the latest assessments from the JTAC,

CTP, Home Office analysts, the CCE, DLUHC, and counterterrorism local profiles and ensure the process is outlined in refreshed guidance.

Recommendation 13: Lengthen the Prevent funding cycle to between two and five years in order to better sustain positive local work

Gov. response: We will explore options with HM Treasury for developing a multi-year plan for Prevent funding. This approach must be implemented in a way which provides value for money and complements our commitment to move to a regional delivery model, and be accompanied by a comprehensive and robust evaluation plan.

Recommendation 15: Develop a plan to improve the quality of referrals around revised core objectives. Referrals should have an identifiable ideological element that is consistent across ideologies.

Gov. response: We will clearly communicate that Prevent referrals should only be made where there are genuine concerns of radicalisation and that ideology is a critical consideration. We are also working to strengthen referral pathways and improve information sharing, through the rollout of a national Prevent referral form. We are improving the Prevent case management system to better record ideology.

Recommendation 16: Improve Prevent datasets by revising how referrals are categorised. HSG should consider all options, including delineating and/or removing the 'Mixed, Unstable or Unclear' and 'Other' strands, against Prevent objectives.

Gov. response: We agree that we need to improve our understanding of the categorisation of referrals and have commissioned independent research to understand the types of MUU referrals and cases and use the findings to improve the categorisation of cases. We will also delineate MUU categories in annual published statistics.

Recommendation 17: The Government should launch new initiatives to encourage referrals from friends, family and community cohorts.

Gov. response: We will continue to test and develop current resources and will increase work with non-statutory partners, the third sector, and with communities to build awareness of the signs of radicalisation and how to get support.

Recommendation 19: Streamline Channel case management process by testing a hybrid model for referrals, risk assessment and information gathering. The Police and local authorities would handle referrals simultaneously. Initial discussions with the referee would be carried out by either of these authorities, while the Police would complete risk assessments and information gathering.

Gov. response: We will move to the national model of Channel delivery recommended over the next 18 months.

Recommendation 20: The Home Office should investigate whether there is an imbalance, or disparity, in thresholds applied to Islamist and XRW Channel cases, and if so why. Examine whether Islamist referrals tend to be individuals much further along the trajectory towards violence compared to referrals where individuals present a susceptibility to radicalising influences or extremist exploitation.

Gov. response: We recognise the need to ensure there is no disparity in thresholds and have commissioned an independent evaluation to increase understanding of the nature of the cohort, including across ideologies, how they progress through the Channel process, of

the impact that Channel has on counter-terrorism risk, and review the process by which cases are adopted.

Recommendation 21: CCE to review all Prevent advisory boards and panels to ensure membership includes necessary, credible and impartial expertise on extremist ideology. The relevant Government minister should sign off all membership and terms of reference.

Gov. response: We will seek the expertise of the CCE, DLUHC and wider Government partners to ensure the membership and terms of reference of current and future Prevent advisory groups are robust and ensure products developed by advisory boards are rigorous. We will continue to ensure the membership and terms of reference of all Prevent advisory boards is agreed by ministers.

Recommendation 22: Develop a new training and induction package for all Government and public sector staff working in counter-extremism and counter-terrorism, focussing on improving understanding of the ideological nature of terrorism, including: worldviews, objectives and methodologies of violent and non-violent extremist groups, grievance narratives and issues exploited by terrorist recruiters and extremists.

Gov. response: We have recently launched updated training packages on Prevent awareness, referrals, Channel, and a Prevent refresher course and are developing new courses that will allow users to improve their understanding of Prevent, terrorism, and extremism; a new Prevent face-to-face training course for public sector workers will be rolled out nationwide in 2023. DLUHC are also developing and delivering wider counter-extremism training for Government and stakeholders on the ideologies and harms which affect communities.

Recommendation 23: Ensure Prevent training upholds a consistent and proportionate threshold across ideological threats.

Gov. response: Accepted. Prevent training materials will clearly reflect the threat from both violent extremism and non-violent extremism

Recommendation 24: Training for Prevent, Channel, and public sector staff subject to the Prevent Duty should include clear guidance on how and when to make appropriate referral decisions and clearly specify the requirement to ensure referrals have an identifiable ideological element and terrorism risk.

Gov. response: We recognise that a more informed and muscular approach is needed to tackle the hesitancy and cultural timidity among some when considering referrals into Prevent. Significant work is underway to overhaul and improve the training offer and we will also roll out new face-to-face training to frontline public sector workers.

Recommendation 25: Ensure Prevent does not fund, work with, or consult with extremism-linked groups or individuals, and applies the same thresholds for non-engagement across ideologies. Training should include engagement process and principles, and a due diligence function to assess risk attached to engagement decisions.

Gov. response: Since April 2022, due diligence has been conducted through internal expert extremism analysts and we will work with partners to further strengthen this. As part of updating training for all Prevent staff we will clearly set out the requirement to not fund or work with extremist linked groups or individuals and will take further steps to ensure that all organisations with whom we partner are fully aware of the behaviours and conduct we expect.

Recommendation 29: The Home Office should implement a further due diligence procedure around the recruitment of intervention providers.

Gov. response: We commit to further strengthening due diligence processes and to bolstering annual checks conducted on each intervention provider. This will include a more robust and extensive assessment of social media accounts and other public platforms. We will also issue new guidance for intervention providers to ensure there are clear expectations of the behaviours and conduct we expect.

Recommendation 30: Establish a dedicated unit within HSG to rapidly rebut misinformation about Prevent and challenge inaccuracies.

Gov. response: We will tackle inaccurate claims through a dedicated Prevent communications team and equip our partners and stakeholders, including civil society organisations, to challenge Prevent myths and related extremist narratives. We will create a standards and compliance unit which will fully consider accusations around the mishandling of Prevent referrals or cases, and failures to adhere to the Prevent Duty.

Recommendation 31: RICU should equip Prevent practitioners with better information about extremism-linked campaigns to undermine their work.

Gov. response: We agree we must provide Prevent practitioners with the information they need to effectively challenge misinformation about Prevent. We will strengthen current work by providing additional analysis that outlines the activities of non-violent extremism-linked individuals, groups or organisations seeking to undermine the work of Prevent.

Recommendation 32: Prevent-funded civil society organisations and counter-narrative projects should take on extremism-linked activists who seek to demonise the scheme. Civil society organisations should be ready and able to challenge and expose groups which promote disinformation about Prevent.

Gov. response: We agree we must support civil society organisations to better tackle misinformation and disinformation about Prevent, through additional support, resources and training.