

Tilley Award 2006

Application form

Please ensure that you have read the guidance before completing this form. By making an application to the awards, entrants are agreeing to abide by the conditions laid out in the Guidance. Please complete the following form in full and within the word limit. Failure to do so could result in disqualification from the competition.

Completed application forms should be e-mailed to Tricia Perkins; patricia.perkins@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk

All entries must be received by noon on Friday 28th April 2006. No entries will be accepted after this time/date. Any queries on the application process should be directed to Tricia Perkins on 0207 035 0262. Any queries regarding other aspects of the awards should be directed to Michael Wilkinson on 0207 035 0247 or Lindsey Poole on 0207 035 0234.

Please tick box to indicate whether the entry should be considered for the main award, the criminal damage award or both;

Main award

Criminal Damage Award

Both Awards

1. Details of application

Title of the project:

Patmore & Carey Garden Estates: ASB and Crime Aggravated by Dogs.

Name of force/agency/CDRP:

Metropolitan Police Service London.

Wandsworth Borough Crime & Disorder Reduction Partnership.

Name of one contact person with position/rank (this should be one of the authors): PC Lesley Dunn.

Email address: Lesley.dunn@met.police.uk

Full postal address:

Problem Solving Advisor

Community & Partnership Focus Desk

Borough Intelligence Unit

C/o Battersea Police Station

112-118 Battersea Bridge Road

SW11 3AF

Telephone number: 0208 247 8207

Fax number: 0208 247 8918

Name of endorsing senior representatives(s): Chief Superintendent Joe Royle

Position and rank of endorsing senior representatives(s): Borough Commander

Full address of endorsing senior representatives(s)

C/o Battersea Police Station

112-118 Battersea Bridge Road

SW11 3AF

2. Summary of application

Executive Summary

This project deals with anti social behaviour and crime by youth, enabled by dangerous dogs. Data from all the stakeholders and other agencies concerned with youth and animals was used to analyse the problem and design responses.

Research & Analysis

- There was no evidence that acquisitory crime was enabled by the possession of dangerous dogs.
- There was evidence that dogs in the control of young males had attacked police & community support officers, housing staff, residents, children and pets and that serious personal injury and the death of pets had been caused.
- There was and remains only anecdotal evidence of organised dogfights.
- There was evidence that the victims knew the offenders and were too scared of retribution to support prosecutions.
- Many dog-owning residents were inconsiderate of their neighbours and disregarded byelaws and tenancy agreements pertaining to the owning and exercising of dogs on the estates.
- Anti social behaviour on the estates was caused by a core group of individuals whether or not they had dogs with them.

Response

- Resident's newsletters. 'Good news' press releases. Public, estate & ward meetings.
- Post-incident visit to victims by the partnership offering support and encouraging engagement.
- Identify target individuals, gather intelligence on and monitor their activities.
- RSPCA educational visits to identified individuals.
- Youth engagement by youth workers.
- Acceptable Behaviour Agreements, Anti Social Behaviour Orders, injunctions, seizures and banning orders. Crime investigation, arrest & process.
- Promoting two of the identified subjects to the Prolific & Priority Offenders Scheme.
- Council Dog Warden & Parks Police Patrols & joint operations with police.
- CCTV monitoring of hot spots.
- Securing of problematical communal areas.
- RSPCA training for Safer Neighbourhood Team personnel and patrol officers.
- Regular 4/6 weekly partnership meetings.

Assessment

APRIL 2004-SEPT2004 v APRIL2005-SEPT2005

- Police calls for service. Call type 48 Animals. **Reduced from 19 to 14.**
- Criminal intelligence reports relating to dogs. **Reduced from 22 to 19.**
- Criminal intelligence reports relating to target offenders & dogs. **Reduced from 18 to 9.**
- Crime reports relating to target offenders. **Reduced from 17 to 13.**
- Crime reports where dangerous dogs are involved. **Reduced from 9 to 2.**
- Stop & Account specific to dangerous dogs. Target to increase. **Increased from 0 to 8**

- Housing authority indicates a reduction in complaints from residents about dog issues.
- Housing authority indicates a reduction in damage to estate furniture caused by dogs.
- Perceived reduction of fear amongst housing staff.
- Dangerous dogs are no longer on the agenda of the ward meeting.
- Dangerous Dogs were not identified as an issue by the 2005 public attitude survey.

3. Description of project

Introduction

This project commenced in September 2004 and is led by Wandsworth Borough Council. Other agencies and special interest groups have contributed and supported the project. It addresses the fear of crime and disorder suffered by residents and workers on the Patmore & Carey Garden Estates. This fear was fuelled by the large amount of youths on these estates accompanied by dangerous dogs.

The problem

Anti social behaviour and criminal activity enabled by the possession of dangerous dogs on the Patmore & Carey Garden Estates, SW8.

The aim

To reduce crime reports of criminal or anti social behaviour associated with the possession of dogs on these two estates by 50%. Success would be measured by comparing the number of reports between 01APRIL04 – 30SEPT04 against the same period in 2005.

We have exceeded that aim by reducing crime reports where dangerous dogs are involved from 9 to 2. We have also achieved reductions across all other report types. This report will,

- Demonstrate that agencies and special interest groups concerned with the development and care of youth and the welfare of animals have been consulted and involved in designing responses to this problem.
- Evidence how partner agencies have been empowered to investigate this problem on behalf of and with the support of the police.
- Explain how we have considered and employed the ten principles of crime prevention.
- Show that this project has not relied upon an increase of police patrols to impact on the problem and how an effective partnership has fostered and supported the problem solving approach.
- Describe how research and tactics used on this project have been refined and used within a neighbourhood elsewhere on the borough to improve that area.
- Discuss how as a result of this project a scheme similar in nature and discipline to the Home Office Prolific & Priority Offenders Scheme has been promoted for adoption on Wandsworth Borough. Targeting habitual offenders within and against their communities.

Scanning

Impact on the community

- The residents complained that communal areas were not safe for adults, children or pets due to attacks by dangerous dogs. There were also complaints of noise and smells from certain dwellings and that dog mating was being conducted on communal areas. It was intimated that victims either knew or recognised their harassers and owners of these dogs but were too frightened of reprisals to support action by the housing authority.
- Local businesses complained of harassment and crime committed by youth who they recognised from the local estate accompanied by dogs. Again these victims were too intimidated to support enforcement.

- Under reporting of incidents and non substantiated reports contributed to a lack of understanding, crimes could not be fully investigated, victims became ever more subdued and this perpetuated the cycle of crime and the fear of crime.

Impact on the partnership organisations.

- Estate staff were unable to conduct their daily duties through the fear of being harassed by youth and attacked by dangerous dogs.
- Estate staff could not be retained.
- Community equipment such as the children's swings were being damaged and grassed areas were being fouled.
- The housing authority, though receiving many complaints of harassment and requests to be re-housed, was unable to substantiate the information and could not resolve matters.
- Police Community Support Officers had also been chased or threatened with dogs. There appeared to be a reluctance to take proceedings due to a lack of confidence and a disinclination to be responsible for an animal being destroyed.
- The police were unable to progress criminal investigations due to victims & witnesses being fearful of reprisals.
- The RSPCA reported an increase in reports of Bull Terrier type dogs being stolen and of organised dog fighting. There were also increasing reports of youths disregarding the welfare of dogs.
- Battersea Dogs home reported that Bull Terrier type dogs were the most represented breed in the home. It was believed that these dogs were acquired for their believed vicious qualities and then abandoned having failed to meet expectations or become too difficult to handle in the family home.

Analysis

Prior to the first partnership meeting in September 2004 all the agencies and special interest groups listed below were asked to research this problem.

Wandsworth Borough Council, Wandsworth Police, Lambeth Police, Council Housing, Patmore & Carey Garden Housing Co-operatives, RSPCA, Battersea Dogs Home, local vets, Social Services, Metropolitan Police Dog Section, Environmental Health, Blue Cross, Youth Offending & Youth Services, Anti social behaviour unit, Parks Police, Council Solicitors, local magistrates court, registered social landlords, council dog wardens.

- Data from police and housing authority records supported the complaints that dogs accompanied by young males had harmed adults and children on occasions causing serious personal injury. Also pets had been savaged and killed.
- Police data did not support the complaint that dangerous dogs enabled acquisitory crime.
- Information from the animal welfare organisations and vets did not evidence the complaints about organised dogfights. There was anecdotal evidence to suggest that youths would pit their dogs against one another but that the dogs had not been trained for that purpose.
- Anti social behaviour on these estates was led by a core group of offenders regardless of whether or not they had their dogs with them.
- The core group of subjects had been offending on these estates for many years. Their offending had

generally begun as bullying and harassment, minor theft, minor assaults and damage. This behaviour had largely been ignored or tolerated by a community intimidated into silence by the offender's reputation or that of his family and associates. The lack of an effective parent or guardian, the meekness and availability of potential victims and the lack of co-ordinated and sustained enforcement had led to offenders believing that they were untouchable and the frequency and seriousness of their crimes increased.

- Their victims by comparison were isolated and less rooted in the community. Victims would not report crimes for fear of reprisal. The few reported crimes could not sustain a prosecution due to witnesses being too scared to give evidence. Incident reports were made by phone or at front counters to avoid the offenders, their friends or family seeing police call on the victims. Crime reports were often made just to 'let the police know' expressing from the outset that the victim was too fearful to support an investigation.
- A lack of community based policing over many years had eroded the base of local knowledge. Significantly this led to each incident by an offender being treated in isolation and not being seen as 'part of the bigger picture'. Offenders when identified would receive a warning about their behaviour, as it was not realised that an offence was not actually the first. As a result the offenders became more convinced of their impunity and their activities became more blatant and intrusive.

Response

The above partnership data was discussed and the following responses designed, and from September 2004 set in place. The partnership continued to meet monthly to review the project.

The community. Victims, informants and witnesses. Responses designed to engage, support and empower.

- All residents were sent a letter on behalf of the partnership explaining the aims of the project. Advice was taken from the council community safety division and the policy unit about what languages to use. Contact telephone numbers for all the partners and an anonymous council hot line for information were provided. Newsletters followed at regular intervals detailing progress. Project briefing notes were provided for ward meetings.
- Empowerment of a partner agency. Housing authority staff re contacted previous victims and complainants. Police were not used to avoid any intimidation, or the fear of. Support was offered, the project was explained to them and the opportunity to improve our information was taken.
- New victims and complainants were 'adopted' by the project and contacted by the partnership. This provided a consistent and knowledgeable approach.
- Surveillance. Council dog wardens patrolled the estate.
- Surveillance. Joint patrols of police and council dog wardens.
- Surveillance. Council Parks Police agreed to patrol the estates as they travelled to other areas.

The offenders. Responses designed to identify, engage & divert, disrupt and increase the chances of being caught.

- Education. Youths identified as owning problematic dogs were called upon by the RSPCA and given advice about animal welfare. Parents and carers were also advised and the condition of any pets checked.
- Education. The Youth Offending Team was requested to give animal welfare advice to young offenders identified as owning dogs, to promote change of behaviour.
- Diversion. Youth workers were engaged at the local youth club to engage local youngsters and provide diversion.

- Improving the response. The RSPCA and police dog section delivered training to the safer neighbourhood team and its neighbour on Lambeth Borough. A briefing package was developed for the training of response officers. This training focused on how to effectively use the appropriate legislation, what other agencies could do to help, health and safety concerns and evidence gathering.
- Improving the quantity and quality of intelligence. Response team officers were briefed about the dog related problems on the estate and encouraged to seek information about youths seen with dogs. Key performance indicators (KPI's) were encouraged for crime reports and intelligence reports. Gathering full and detailed descriptions of dogs and dog names.
- Surveillance. CCTV cameras were fixed on areas where dog fighting was reported to be taking place. Using stills from CCTV the housing authority staff set up a snap shot database to help identify dogs and owners.
- Surveillance. Council dog wardens increased their patrolling of the estate. Joint patrols by police and dog wardens emphasised the partnership's commitment. The Council Parks Police patrolled the estates on their way to and from other locations.
- Surveillance. Informal by engaging and empowering the community to support the project.
- Increasing the chances of being caught. Publicising measures in place and successes in detecting offenders.
- Rule setting. Council dog wardens patrolled the estate to support the byelaws about dogs being on leads and fouling of paths and greens. It became apparent that many dog-owning residents were inconsiderate of their neighbours. First time offenders were given a warning and engaged in conversation about the project and encouraged to provide information.
- Rule setting. Repeat offenders were reported by the dog wardens and received a letter from the council advising them that they had breached the terms of their tenancy and that a notice to seek re possession would follow any further breaches. This was intended to cause concern and raise the profile of the project.

Location. Responses designed to target harden and increase the chances of catching an offender.

- Surveillance. Council Dog Wardens increased their patrolling of the estate. Council Parks Police patrolled the estates on their way to and from other locations.
- Access control. Favoured areas on the estate for youth and their dogs such as the fenced children's play area were secured to prevent entry.
- Surveillance. CCTV cameras were fixed on areas where dog fighting was reported to be taking place. More CCTV cameras were budgeted for to protect problematic areas identified as not having sufficient coverage.
- Surveillance. Informal by engaging and empowering the community to support the project.

Assessment

After 6 months in April 2005 the project was reviewed.

The community. Victims, witnesses & informants.

The quality and quantity of information being received by the partnership had improved, however victims remained reluctant to support partnership action and witnesses were rarely found. The perception was that complaints about dog noise, smells and dirt had reduced. Complaints about dog mating in public had not reduced. Information about dog fighting continued at the same level but was still not supported by evidence.

The offenders

There was a reduction in the number of persons being spoken to or reported by the council dog wardens for breaches of the byelaws relating to dogs. CCTV footage indicated that offending behaviour had been disrupted as some subjects now exercised their dogs during the night or early morning so avoiding the attentions of the council dog wardens and the safer neighbourhood team. However the picture taken as whole did not appear to have changed significantly. Research showed that 3 individuals accounted for 59% of police reports about anti social behaviour on these two estates. The same 3 individuals accounted for 81% of police reports relating to anti social behaviour and dogs. It was decided in April 2005 to focus the resources of the project on these 3 individuals.

The location.

There was a perception by housing staff that there was less dog dirt on communal areas. Dogs continued to damage the children's play area if it was not kept locked.

Analysis. Target Offenders.

These three had commenced their offending behaviour on these estates as children. Almost exclusively targeting victims from within their own community. By selecting victims who knew them, recognised them or knew of them increased their ability to control a victim's response through fear of reprisal.

Their offending had become habitual for a variety of reasons. Initially they were under the age of criminal responsibility. Early offending was not considered serious. They were following in the footsteps of another family member or an associate and reaping the benefits of that reputation. They had a large number of relatives either through blood or marriage on the estate providing a support network. Their childhood was marked by violence and under achieving at school.

Though early crimes had been harassment and minor assaults, criminal damage, shoplifting and a variety of other selfish and unacceptable activities. As the years had passed theft, robbery, burglary, possession of firearms and drug taking and supply had become the preferred activities.

The dogs that these offenders owned were bolt on accessories to their bullying & criminal personas but had come to personify them in the eyes of their community.

Offender 1. White adult male with family links to organised crime and firearms. Personally linked to the supply of drugs and possession of firearms. He does have a criminal record and has been in prison. This male lives in a flat purchased from the council by an absent family member and is therefore not subject to council tenancy conditions. There were many members of his immediate and related family also housed on the estate. He owned four large dogs of Bull Terrier variety and took in guest dogs to breed from and with.

Offender 2. Mixed race male aged 17 years. Living with his mother who is a council tenant. A long time associate of subject one. Linked to reports of dog fighting. Consistently identified over many years by residents and shopkeepers on the estate as having offended against them, their children or property. Despite this, at the time that this project commenced he did not have a criminal record. He is implicated in the supply of drugs on the Patmore Estate. His mother has intimated that his father is a significant criminal.

Offender 3. White male aged 16 years. Living at home with his mother in a council flat. The tenancy has lapsed and his mother is described as a 'tolerated trespasser'. As she is a lapsed tenant she and her family can no longer breach the conditions of a tenancy. A long time associate of subjects one and two. His mother has been implicated in the supply of drugs on the Patmore Estate. Consistently identified over the years by residents and shopkeepers on the estate as having offended against them, their children or property. Convicted of possession of firearms and implicated in the supply of drugs on the Patmore Estate. This subject does have a criminal record and has been in a young offenders institution. On release he was the subject of an Intensive Supervision & Surveillance Programme (ISSP) but failed to engage with the Youth Offending Team.

Response. Target Offenders.

- Surveillance. April 05. The project team adopted these offenders and monitored their behaviour. Offending was discussed and responses designed.
- Surveillance. April 05. The safer Neighbourhood Team accepted responsibility to investigate or assist in the investigation of any crimes in which these subjects were implicated.
- Remove the means to commit the crime. April 05. The RSPCA seize 4 dogs belonging to offender 1.
- Rule setting. June 05. Target offender 1 prosecuted for possession of a dangerous dog.
- Surveillance. September 05. The Borough's Prolific & Priority Offender Scheme (PPO) accepted offenders 1 & 2. Providing a multi agency intervention & management system for their offending.
- Surveillance. Informal as public confidence increased.
- Surveillance. Improved quality & quantity of police intelligence on dangerous dogs.
- Remove the means to commit the crime. October 05. The council compel by civil injunction the re-homing of a dangerous dog owned by target offender 3.
- Rule setting. November 05. Council seek an anti social behaviour order (ASBO) against target offender 1.
- Rule setting. November 05. ASBO granted against target offender 2.
- Remove the means to commit the crime. NOV05. Dangerous dog owned by target offender 1 is destroyed by order of the court.
- Rule setting. December 05. Target offender 1 compelled by injunction to clean his privately owned premises and advised that he would be compelled by injunction to re-home his remaining dogs.
- Rule setting. December 05. Target offender 2 arrested and charged with breach of ASBO x 2.
- Rule setting. December 05. Target offenders 1 & 2 Deflection. Through the PPO scheme engaging the offenders with the probation service, drug workers and employment schemes.
- Maintenance. Ensuring that the project sustained its momentum and that measures remained in place.

Project assessment. December 2005.

The community. Victims, witnesses & informants.

Police calls for service on the Patmore & Carey Gardens Estates - CAD type code 48/Animals.

- 01APR04 – 30SEPT04 = 19 calls. Contributed 9.7% of all the borough calls relating to animals.
- 01APR05 – 30 SEPT05 = 14 calls. Contributed 6.4% of all the borough calls relating to animals.
- **A reduction of 26%** in the targeted area achieved despite a 12% increase in the total of all Borough CAD Type 48/Animal calls.
- Increased public confidence is evidenced by the initial increase of reports.
- Increased public confidence is evidenced by the increase in victims and witnesses prepared to give evidence. Increased from 0 to 4.
- Crime reports involving dangerous dogs reduced from 9 to 2.

The offenders

- Criminal intelligence reports relating to dogs reduced from 22 to 19.
- Criminal intelligence reports relating to target offenders and dogs reduced from 18 to 9.
- Crime reports relating to target offenders reduced from 17 to 13.
- Police stop & account specific to dangerous dogs increased from 0 to 8.
- There have been no reports of dogs in the possession of the target offenders biting any person or animal since April 2005.
- There have been no reports of the target offenders committing a crime whilst accompanied by dogs since April 2005.
- Prior to the project all three offenders were linked by intelligence reports. Subjects two and three were implicitly linked whilst committing crimes. Since April 2005 there have been no intelligence reports or crime reports, which link these individuals.
- Target offender 2 - number of times arrested improved from 1 in 20 opportunities to 4 out of 7 opportunities. Evidencing the effectiveness of the PPO scheme.
- Target offender 2 - the number of persons reporting that they have been assaulted or harassed by him reduced from 8 to 2. Evidencing the effectiveness of the ASBO.
- Target offender 3 - intelligence reports about his anti social behaviour reduced from 12 to 2. Evidencing a change in his offending most likely caused by the disruption to his associate's criminality.
- There is no evidence of displacement.

The location.

- Housing authority indicates a reduction in complaints about dogs.
- Housing authority indicates a reduction in damage caused to estate furniture caused by dogs.
- Housing authority indicates a perceived reduction of dog dirt on open spaces.
- Housing authority indicates a reduction in the perceived level of fear amongst their staff.
- Dangerous dogs are no longer an agenda item at the ward meeting.
- Dangerous dogs were not identified as an issue by the 2005 public attitude survey.

Forward strategy

The experience gained during this project was used to impact on anti social behaviour and violence against the person on another part of the borough in the summer of 2005. By refining these tactics, the borough swiftly impacted on the new problem and immediately put in place partnership analysis to understand the nature of the offending and facilitate long-term partnership responses and solutions to the real underlying problems.

By combining best practice from both these projects a management system similar in discipline to the Home Office Prolific & Priority Offender scheme has been promoted for adoption by the borough. Designed to tackle habitual offenders within and against their communities.

This project on the Patmore & Carey Garden Estates will be maintained by continuing the regular review process. It will certainly benefit if the 'habitual community offenders scheme' is adopted. More specifically the local education authority will be approached in an effort to get the 'welfare of and respect for animals' included in the school syllabus perhaps during the citizenship lessons. With the intention of making long-term changes in the attitudes of young persons. Through out 2006 there are resident and youth involvement schemes planned. A crime prevention survey is due in the Spring of 2006 which will examine the physical features of the estate and consider 'defensible spaces' to compliment the community involvement measures encouraging the residents to use their open spaces and estate amenities.

The regular partnership meetings continue and new offenders and interventions are discussed. Joint educational work with the RSPCA and the Youth Involvement Team is being rolled out across neighbouring estates, as are our partnership animal welfare visits with the RSPCA.

*Note. Like many local authorities, Wandsworth Borough Council removed the clause from their tenancy agreements that said 'a pet could only be kept if permission was requested from the council prior to acquisition and that it was then registered with the council' shortly after the UK Government abolished the dog licence in 1987. The Council accepted that due to the amount of resources it would take that they did not enforce the rule, and that many tenants broke it. No one could remember when a request to keep a pet had ever been refused. Wandsworth Borough Council replaced the rule with 'a pet may be kept providing it does not cause any annoyance' because it felt that the vast majority of pets did not cause offence to anyone else and that council tenants were entitled to have pets. Hence it is necessary to prove that a pet has caused a nuisance to someone in order to enforce the tenancy agreement and have the pet removed.