



BEDFORDSHIRE POLICE

Chief Constable : Michael O'Byrne QPM LLB

Police Headquarters,
Woburn Road,
Kempston,
Bedford MK43 9AX.

Telephone: (01234) 841212
Fax: (01234) 842014

MOB/ajt
12 July 1999

Ms Louise Hobbs
Home Office
Room 421
Clive House
Petty France
LONDON SW 1H 9HD

Dear Ms Hobbs

THE TILLEY AWARD

Please find enclosed an application for this year's Tilley Award for problem oriented policing initiatives.

The project submitted centres around Jansel House in Stopsley, Luton. Over a period of time this particular locality has been the subject of numerous complaints from members of the public. Under the auspices of Operation Tattoo, the Community Beat Manager and Community Policing Team at Luton have tackled the issue in an innovative and dynamic way.

The Crime and Disorder Act clearly specified the need for a partnership response. As can be seen from the project documentation, a multi-agency approach has been put in place and this has incorporated the support of the Safer Luton Partnership, the local MPs Margaret Moran and Kelvin Hopkins, and also Local Authority Councillors. The success of the Jansel House project and the approach which has been taken of a long term evaluation of the problem is already having positive results with a reduction in the level of calls for assistance from the local community.

I commend this project to you as worthy of receiving the Tilley Award. I look forward to hearing from you on the outcome of this year's Awards.

Yours sincerely

M O'BYRNE
Chief Constable

JANSEL HOUSE, LUTON, BEDFORDSHIRE

A CASE FOR OPERATION TATTOO

In October 1998 Luton Police instigated a new style of Community Policing, whose objective was to adopt a problem solving approach.

A team was formed and after receiving a specialist training package including Problem Solving and Partnership Working, Officers were tasked with identifying the main crime and community issues on each beat.

Information was analysed by each Beat Manager from both internal and external sources. It quickly became apparent that residents/businesses were not informing the Police about the true extent of local problems/issues. In order to rectify this situation a comprehensive on-going public consultation programme was developed and instigated.

The Beat Manager covering the Jansel House area identified a problem involving nuisance youths. Police computer data bases were interrogated and residents/businesses consulted. An Action Planning Group was formed involving a variety of agencies and residents. A "goal" was agreed and action plans developed to support the objective. All Forum members are accountable for all actions they own. The Action Planning Team meet once a month in order to discuss progress made. All action owners are expected to present an update. When all actions have been reviewed, agreement is sought to take forward the next phase and a new action plan is agreed and implemented.

The Action plans incorporated, an education programme including peer led discussions, publicity, letters to parents, environmental design survey of Jansel house (shops and residential), survey of youth opinion, extension of youth provision and Police enforcement patrols.

Between October 1998 and February 1999 the Police received 39 telephone calls from the Jansel house and Hitchin Road area regarding nuisance youths.

Between March - June 1999 there were seven calls received by the Police regarding the same issues. This shows a reduction of 75% in the incidents dealt with by the Police.

This has enabled the response side of the policing team to concentrate on other matters. It has also led to an increase in the quality of life of the people who suffered at the hands of the nuisance youths. The Action Planning Team are still in being and continue to work towards eradicating the problems of their area.

THE TILLEY AWARD

PROBLEM ORIENTED POLICING

**JANSEL HOUSE
LUTON
BEDFORDSHIRE**

**A CASE FOR OPERATION
TATTOO**

THE TILLEY AWARD

PROBLEM ORIENTED POLICING **JANSEL HOUSE, LUTON BEDFORDSHIRE**

Jansel House is a high rise block which offers housing and retail outlets in Stopsley, a suburb of Luton, which is a large urban town with a population of 175,000.

Luton is just 30 miles from London and is home to London Luton Airport, the M1, main line railway, Luton Town Football Club, Luton University, the Arndale Shopping Centre and a varied and vibrant social scene; all of which is governed by a unitary authority, Luton Borough Council.

LUTON COMMUNITY POLICING TEAM

In August 1998, Inspector Nigel STONE was appointed head of the existing Community Policing Team for Luton, which comprised of Local Beat Officers (LBO's), the Amdale (Town Centre) Policing Unit, Schools Liaison and Crime Prevention. In order to reflect the Chief Constable's decision to change to the more innovative 'community style' policing it was necessary to make major changes.

THE FUTURE: NEW LOOK 'BEAT MANAGERS'

A structure was designed that would support a Problem Orientated Policing Task Group while the LBO's were renamed Beat Managers. It was recognised that the Officers could not carry out the function of a Beat Manager and solve problems without clear direction, focus and the appropriate training. A two day course (See Appendix 1) was devised along with continued coaching in how to solve problems combined with a comprehensive, user-friendly booklet which is now used by all Beat Managers when tackling a new community problem. (See unused material). Later in the year all staff attended a days training session covering "Problem Solving".

The booklet now forms a standard operating procedure, setting out a minimum level of service which a Beat Manager must provide. It is designed to act as a quality control mechanism so that each of the 16 Wards in Luton receive the same quality of service.

The aim of the Beat Manager is to:

- Improve local consultation/communication links
- Identify the main crimes and quality of life issues
- Establish a multi-agency/partnership approach to problem solving

1. Improve local consultation/communication links

For several years it had been felt the Police and community had lost the ability to speak to one another - particularly in less serious matters. To address this problem, Police Surgeries and Ward Focus Groups were set up. Meanwhile the rest of the Division were trained in order that they too were aware of their responsibilities for community and quality of life issues.

2. **Identify the main crimes and quality of life issues**

Problem orientated policing' soon became part of the mainstream policing style and it was also agreed by the Divisional Leadership Team that 'quality of life' issues would form part of the Divisional Policing Objectives for 1999 - 2000. As a result of this the Beat Managers now target local problems with the help of local residents/business/employees and other interested individuals and groups.

3. **Establish a Multi-agency, partnership approach to problem solving**

This is at the heart of the Beat Manager's strategy. Solutions are sought from wherever they can be found. There are no boundaries, real or imaginary. See the Action Plan for Jansel House (See Appendix 2).

STRUCTURE OF THE COMMUNITY POLICING UNIT: POST APRIL 1999

- 1 x Inspector (Department Head)
- 1 x Sergeant (Responsible for the 16+ Beat Managers)
- 1 x Community Researcher
- 1 x Neighbourhood Watch Co-ordinator
- 2 x Crime Prevention Officers

Once the Inspector and Sergeant had been appointed to the Community Policing Unit and the LBO's had become Beat Managers, a post for a Community Related Intelligence Researcher was created.

While the Division was well catered for in terms of researchers of crime matters, community related issues were not being addressed. The 'Community Researcher' is responsible for researching matters raised by any member of the Team. The data is then made available to the public at Action Forums held in each Ward allowing everyone the chance to make informed decisions about the best way of addressing the problem.

Through this policing style and the Divisional objectives, the main problems in each of the 16 Wards, crime or social, will be identified and tackled. For the first time in Luton this gives a specific Divisional Objective for the Community Policing Team.

Divisional administration was also changed to reflect the new policing style. By restructuring the Community Policing Team Management Meetings to link in with the Senior Management and CID Tasking Meetings, policing responses were prioritised. This is achieved through an Operational Priorities Group Meeting Chaired by a

Superintendent. Three Divisional priorities are set every week put forward by the problem orientated aspect of policing and CID/Intelligence Department. This group then dovetails into the Beat Managers' weekly Tasking Meetings where the progress of each problem solving package is discussed. Each Beat Manager is accountable for their previous week's work and show progress made against their objectives. The Officers are required to submit a work plan for the forthcoming week. A structure is then proposed for the following week allowing Line Managers to monitor performance. If necessary

Officers can move from one Ward to another in order to help a colleague whose need may be greater than their own.

Success so far...and the future:

THE JANSEL HOUSE PROJECT

In October 1998, when the final guide lines and terms of reference were proposed for the Beat Manager Scheme, each Officer was tasked with researching their area and producing an audit for crime and for quality of life issues.

In each Ward, a similar theme surfaced, that the majority of nuisance complaints and public concern centred around the activity of local youths.

During 1997/1998 some 1600 calls were received concerning problems with youths, some 25% of the total calls about community issues.

The Beat Manager for Stopsley, which incorporates Jansel House, was clearly able to highlight nuisance youths as the main quality of life issue for that Ward . (see Appendix 6). The Majority of incidents being centred around the Jansel house complex and nearby streets.

Therefore our primary objectives were to reduce calls from the public relating to nuisance youths in this area. Certain members of the community had lost confidence in the Police Service's ability to tackle and deal effectively with this issue, which did not appear to be responding to any tactics then employed.

Our second objective, therefore, was to increase public confidence in our ability to deal with local problems.

It was obvious that this issue could not be solved effectively by the Police alone, therefore it was necessary to increase the community's involvement in Policing issues by promoting multi-agency problem solving forums.

Lastly it was hoped that by highlighting the anti social activities of some of the youths and the effect on the quality of life of the victims, that parental co-operation would be encouraged.

In order to ascertain the nature and scale of the problem, Police data systems were researched, tenants and resident groups were consulted along with local businesses, schools and councillors etc.

Bedfordshire Police employ two main systems to record crime and incidents. The first is the Operational Information System (OIS) on which details are logged of persons calling in to report crime, accidents and community problems, to create a case history. The second being a crime system (CIS).

These systems were researched to ascertain the type of incidents involved and the frequency of occurrence. In addition, in order to get the most accurate picture possible, views were sought from members of the community at Local Council run consultative forums, from local councillors and council officials and through calls from the public to the Beat Managers.

Feedback was also obtained through the Police Surgeries held monthly organised by each Beat Manager and through a new concept known as the Ward Focus Groups. (See Appendix 3).

These are monthly meetings held between the Beat Manager and nominated members of the community and provides an avenue for a two way exchange of accurate information and allows representatives of the community to raise concerns and be informed about current developments.

As a result of the research and public consultation, the activities of nuisance youths could clearly be broken down into several aspects of their behaviour.

The knock-on effect of these activities was a reduction in the quality of life of residents, loss of business by local traders, increased fear of crime and minor damage.

As far as the Police were concerned, the impact was increased calls about nuisance behaviour, increased Police hours to deal with the incidents and a general loss of public confidence in the Police Service.

Research revealed that a number of factors were exacerbating the problem. The lack of youth provision in the area was clearly not providing enough diversionary activities.

The presence of the shops themselves at Jansel House proved a magnet to local young people and the design of the shopping precinct itself, with a covered, well lit walkway in front of the shop units provided an ideal, sheltered meeting place.

Homerun, a combined off licence, video store and Pizza Takeaway in particular provided a popular attraction.

It was also clear that many parents were not aware of either their children's location at night or their activities.

The vast majority of complaints about nuisance youths were centred in this relatively small geographical area.

It was also apparent that while there was a low level of activity on other nights of the week, the vast majority of incidents occurred on Friday nights after 7.00 pm and not subsiding until after 11.30 pm when Homerun closed.

Collection of the information was hampered by the difficulty of obtaining meaningful analysis of activity on a street by street basis. The Operational Information System having no search facility in place to do so, research was painstakingly carried out by

researching individual incidents and using local knowledge to select the streets in the target area.

Consultation with local businesses and members of the community also proved very time consuming,

Having established an initial starting point for levels of activity ie numbers of incidents/reports etc, attention was turned to possible solutions.

A three tier approach was discussed and tendered as a possible way to address the problem in an integrated fashion. The entire initiative was designated Operation TATTOO and split into two distinct time frames.

A short term response was initiated which involved enforcement van crews, consisting of teams of Beat Managers, a Supervisor and any available Special Constables.

The intention was to provide a high profile response to complaints to restore public confidence and send a clear message to the youths themselves. Before the commencement of the van crews, a media campaign was launched to highlight the problem to the general public and as a clear warning of our future intentions.

During the patrols, gangs of youths were approached and spoken to in an effort to educate them about anti-social behaviour. If they were found to be in an area of high complaints, their details were taken and letters sent to the parents outlining the circumstances.

If their behaviour gave cause for concern, a separate letter was sent to their parents.

Any young person found drinking or drunk or otherwise acting in an unsociable manner ie fighting, were taken, if possible, directly home to their parents.

A data base containing the young people's details was constructed which allowed us to give a history of their activities or petty offending and also to identify the hard core of persistent nuisance youths. This information was always made available to parents. (See Appendix 4)

Young people who consistently ignored warnings about their behaviour or to keep away from the 'hot spot' areas were referred to the Youth Offending Team or local schools for any follow up that they felt might be necessary.

At regular intervals, media (see Appendix 5) and television coverage was actively sought in order to maintain the problem at the highest level in the public consciousness. It was felt to be extremely important that our actions were seen to be open and honest by publishing our intentions beforehand.

It was apparent, right from the outset, that the problem of nuisance youths could not be solved by the Police alone, therefore, long term solutions would need to involve a multi-agency problem solving approach.

With this in mind, on 20 August 1998, the first meeting of the Quality of Life Forum was called by the Community Policing Team at Luton Police Station. Representatives from a multitude of agencies were invited and views sought on the town wide problem of nuisance youths.

It was decided by the members that this Forum would meet on a regular basis to discuss the various issues involved Town Wide. There would be a system of referrals whereby areas identified as 'hotspots' could be referred to a sub-group whose task it would be to target these areas and develop a multi-agency action plan to deal with it.

One of the first referrals was that of Jansel House and on the 9 November 1998 the first meeting of the Jansel House Action Forum was held at Ashcroft High School. Representatives from 25 agencies, businesses and residents were all invited to attend.

Initially, the history and extent of the problem was outlined by the Beat Manager and the Supervisor and the result of the research carried out was presented to the meeting.

A 'First thoughts' session was utilised to identify the key issues and a commitment obtained from all parties that they were willing to work together on a common solution. Networking during the meeting increased contacts and allowed for person to person interaction between agencies etc.

Having established a commitment for a multi-agency working forum, a second meeting was arranged.

The next meeting was a good deal more constructive with a great deal of ideas and suggestions being proposed which allowed us to produce our action plan an example of which is attached as Appendix 2.

The agreement of action plans and the ownership of their completion placed pressure on everyone to deliver their commitments.

At the second meeting, an agreed target was set to reduce incidents of nuisance youths and calls about such incidents by 20% by 31st July 1999.

At subsequent meetings, each individual having an action was required to report back on their progress and a note made of the results. The action plan was then altered or carried on according to the wishes of the Forum.

The formation of these multi agency groups encourages everyone to have ownership of the problem and not rely entirely on the Police to deal with the local issues.

A third strand to the strategy was the use of the Beat Manager, Supervisor and Crime Prevention staff to pilot the use of video recorded environmental surveys on behalf of the Action Forum.

A video film, with accompanying dialogue was made of the Jansel House area where it was felt environmental factors may be aggravating the problem. Recommendations to rectify the situation were made in the dialogue and copies of the survey tape sent to the MP for the area, local residents, businesses and the local authority.

The video film prompted the owners of Jansel House, Chamberlain Holdings to make a number of improvements to the area.

The Beat Manager took responsibility to lead the Group. The action plans produced by the Forum were incorporated into the Beat Manager Problem Solving Package to avoid duplication.

The specialist experience of the supervisor in multi agency working was also usefully employed to guide the system.

Specialist trained Crime Prevention. Officers and Beat Managers were employed carrying out the environmental surveys at the request of the Action Planning Forum.

When this strategy was first devised there was no funding from either within or outside the Police Service. However, all the agencies, businesses and the Police gave considerable resources to it by way of individual's time.

Sponsorship and funding has been considered and we have obtained a video camera from a local retailer to assist production of the environmental survey films. The local Council are also considering allocation of monies for some improvement of youth facilities. Opportunities for additional funding will always be considered when the need arises. All the Beat Managers for various Wards of Luton were fully briefed in the detail of the strategy and 'hands on' training given in the production of action plans.

With reference to the enforcement van crews, all the Beat Managers were briefed on the proposed actions and targets and given an Operational Order with set guidelines. The Supervisor in charge of each van was required to brief their Officers and then ensure that a consistent approach was adopted and that all performance requirements were logged.

Other support members of the Community policing Team were expected to contribute and if necessary make up the numbers on the van crews should there be insufficient Beat Managers available.

Some difficulties were experienced with certain aspects of the strategy. For instance, it was extremely difficult on some occasions to get sufficient Beat Managers for the enforcement van crew due to annual leave, Court and other commitments, hence the need for Support Officers to fill the gap.

With so many people working on the Action Planning Forums, there were occasions when meetings had to be arranged for the benefit of others. Sometimes, this entailed the Beat Manager moving a rest day to accommodate these meetings. It is a credit to them and their commitment that this was achieved with no complaint whatsoever.

A lack of administrative support for the Quality of Life and Action Forums proved a heavy burden for both the Beat, Managers and the Supervisor, who had to fulfil this role.

There were occasions when local representatives failed to attend meetings and this was highlighted by placing a comment to that effect on the action plans and sending them to the Head of the Agency involved.

It was disappointing that certain parents, in spite of being contacted several times, showed little concern about their children's behaviour. This was highlighted to the Youth Offending Team or to the Local Authority if they were Council tenants.

The slow reaction of Council departments also proved problematic and this was highlighted through local Councillors and the Chief Executive of the Council.

The performance of each enforcement van crew is reviewed and submitted to the Community Researcher who logs the results, Details of youths checked, offences detected, alcohol and drug seizures etc are all recorded.

Tactics are continually reviewed and refined, for instance the use of plain clothes patrols or observation points in order to pinpoint offenders and guide the enforcement crews to the right individual.

Any information regarding incidents or calls from the public concerning Jansel House and the neighbouring street are recorded and made available to the Forum monthly meetings.

At the end of each Jansel House Forum, a review is carried out of the actions and what has been achieved. New or existing actions are recorded based on the achievements thus far.

When the initial target date, the 31 July is reached, the original target reduction will be reviewed and adjusted according to the strategy's success or failure. At this time a public satisfaction survey will be carried out.

Success of a strategy can sometimes be hard to assess, therefore we have attempted to use criteria which give an overall view of the situation. For example we monitor and report back on the reduction of incidents etc shown by Police Data Systems (OIS/CIS). (Appendix 6) and whether there has been a reduction in overall complaints to the Beat Manager and whether targets are being achieved by the action Forum.

Also of interest is whether youth facilities have been improved and whether they are being used by local children.

All indications tend to suggest that the strategy for Jansel House has been highly successful significantly exceeding the target set by the Forum. This is based on figures obtained for the year 1998 and year to date 1999. (See Appendix 6).

This is echoed by feedback from local traders, however, there are indications that there has been some displacement to other areas.

Whilst work was being carried out trying to establish a Business Watch for the area, most local traders reported a significant improvement.

The overall Operation TATTOO strategy is currently being piloted at Luton but is reviewed by both the Divisional Commander and the Chief Constable.

It has been adopted at all levels by Officers at Luton but the Beat Managers in particular are at the forefront or driving it forward.

There is little doubt that their previous experience as Local Beat Officers and their problem solving and other specialist training has best equipped them for this role.

Additional support and training is given by their Supervisor as the initiative progresses who in turn has benefited from the Luton Leadership programme training. Between January - June 1998 Luton Division ran a Leadership Training Programme aimed at Sergeants and Inspectors. The two week Management Training Course mirrored the Force Certificate in Management Studies Course. This Course gave every supervisory (Police and Civilian Staff) a basic grounding in management techniques.

CONCLUSION

A new style of Policing was introduced (Problem Orientated Policing) within Luton in October 1998. As a result of audits carried out by the Beat Manager responsible for Jansel house a nuisance youth problem was identified in and around Jansel House and Hitchin Road.

From October 1998 to February 1999, 39 calls were received by Luton Police requesting assistance regarding nuisance youth problems, this represents an average of almost eight calls a month.

From March 1999 to June 1999 there were seven similar requests for assistance, which equates to an average of just under two per month. This represents a reduction of 75% in nuisance youth calls.

It can also be seen that from February 1999 there has only been one call for Police assistance at Jansel House itself.

The work that has been done has tangible benefits, these can be measured in financial terms (six less calls per month, 72 less calls per year, estimating £50 per Officer visit equates to a total saving of £3,600).

Results can also be measured in the reduction of victims and a significant improvement of the quality of life of both residents and business people.

This has enabled Operational Patrol Officers to concentrate on other priorities eg Divisional objective crime.

The Jansel action Forum members have set long term goals to tackle neighbourhood issues including the lack of youth provision in the area.

The Beat Manager, together with the members of the Forum are determined to build upon their success and to continue to establish a permanent improvement in the quality of life of people living and working in this area.

Only time will tell if the solutions proposed by the Jansel House Action Forum and the strategy overall will have a lasting effect. But such is the mood of optimism and flexibility amongst the members that there is little doubt that a will has been created for a lasting multi agency approach which will be equal to any challenge that presents itself.

Nuisance Youths Incidents for 1998 - 1999

1998

	<u>ELDERBERRY</u> <u>CLOSE</u>	<u>PUTTERIDGE</u> <u>ROAD</u>	<u>HITCHIN</u> <u>ROAD</u>	<u>JANSEL</u> <u>HOUSE</u>	<u>Grand</u> <u>Total</u>
<u>JANUARY</u>	0	0	2	1	3
<u>FEBRUARY</u>	0	0	3	3	6
<u>MARCH</u>	0	1	5	4	10
<u>APRIL</u>	0	0	1	0	1
<u>MAY</u>	0	0	0	0	0
<u>JUNE</u>	0	1	1	1	3
<u>JULY</u>	0	0	1	1	2
<u>AUGUST</u>	0	0	0	0	0
<u>SEPTEMBER</u>	6	0	1	0	7
<u>OCTOBER</u>	3	0	7	5	15
<u>NOVEMBER</u>	2	0	3	2	7
<u>DECEMBER</u>	0	0	2	2	4
<u>TOTAL</u>	11	2	2fi	19	58

1999

	<u>ELDERBERRY</u> <u>CLOSE</u>	<u>PUTTERIDGE</u> <u>ROAD</u>	<u>HITCHIN</u> <u>ROAD</u>	<u>JANSEL</u> <u>HOUSE</u>	<u>Grand</u> <u>Total</u>
<u>JANUARY</u>	1	1	7	5	14
<u>FEBRUARY</u>	0	1	6	0	7
<u>MARCH</u>	0	1	2	0	3
<u>APRIL</u>	1	0	2	0	3
<u>MAY</u>	0	0	1	0	1
<u>JUNE</u>	1	0	1	1	3
<u>JULY</u>					
<u>AUGUST</u>					
<u>SEPTEMBER</u>					
<u>OCTOBER</u>					
<u>NOVEMBER</u>					
<u>DECEMBER</u>					
<u>TOTAL</u>	3	3	19	fi	31