



# Home Office

## Crime Reduction & Community Safety Group

### Tilley Awards 2008 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, within the stated word limit and ensuring the file size is no more than 1MB. Failure to do so will result in your entry being rejected from the competition.

Completed application forms should be e-mailed to [tilleyawards08@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:tilleyawards08@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk).

All entries must be received by noon on **Friday 25<sup>th</sup> April 2008**. No entries will be accepted after this time/date. Any queries on the application process should be directed to Alex Blackwell on 0207 035 4811.

#### Section A: Application basics

1. Title of the project:

**The Thickley Bank Project/Partnership Intervention at Neighbourhood Level**

2. Key issue that the project is addressing e.g. Alcohol related violence:

**Alcohol related crime, anti social behaviour, general disorder, criminal damage, secondary fires and lack of community confidence.**

#### Author contact details

3. Name of application author: **Councillor Brian R. Murray-Carr**

4. Organisation submitting the application: **Bolsover Community Safety Partnership**

5. Full postal address: **Bolsover District Council, Sherwood Lodge, Bolsover, Derbyshire, S44 6NF**

6. Email address: **carolyn.bowen@bolsover.gov.uk**

7. Telephone number: **01246 242589**

#### Secondary project contact details

8. Name of secondary contact involved in the project: **Carolyn Bowen**

9. Secondary contact email address: **carolyn.bowen@bolsover.gov.uk**

10. Secondary contact telephone number: **01246 242589**

**Endorsing representative contact details**

11. Name of endorsing senior representative from lead organisation:

**M J Ritchie**

**Head of Community Services, Bolsover District Council**

12. Endorsing representative's email address: **john.ritchie@bolsover.gov.uk**

13. For all entries from England & Wales please state which Government Office or Welsh Assembly Government your organisation is covered by e.g. GO East Midlands: **GO East Midlands**

**14. Please mark this box with an X to indicate that all organisations involved in the project have been notified of this entry** (this is to prevent duplicate entries of the same project):



**Section B: Summary of application - *In no more than 400 words use this space to provide a summary of your project under the stated headings (see guidance for more information).***

This project outlines the Problem Orientated Partnership (POP) approach to crime and disorder reduction in Shirebrook part of the District of Bolsover in the North East of Derbyshire. The project identifies how problems in a specific area were resolved following a detailed analysis of the problems, those who were involved and the background in order to establish sustainable solutions associated with crime and disorder.

The submission sets out the scanning exercise which identified the multiple problems of alcohol related crime, criminal damage, anti social behaviour, assault and secondary deliberate fires which were having a significant impact on community confidence via a scanning approach. Shirebrook was identified as a problem area in every category of crime and regularly featured as number one in terms of incidents of crime by ward. Community confidence was extremely low and the Partnership and the Police were under pressure to resolve the situation.

In 2004 Shirebrook had been subject to two Section 30 Dispersal Orders which had the effect of dissipating some of the problems out into nearby areas such as the one in question. The overall problems of the area were having a significant effect on the wider community, the nearby Catholic school and church, two areas of housing and users of the Town Park and the Kissingate Leisure Centre.

The project identifies how the Problem Analysis Triangle approach was used to develop a clear understanding of who was involved, when it occurred, the background, the reasons and also establish what measures needed to be put in place to resolve the problems.

The response identifies the range of measures adopted including a major environmental clearance programme to change the whole profile of the area in question along with targeting and identifying the main perpetrators, the introduction of an alcohol control zone, CCTV system at the Kissingate Leisure Centre and extensive diversionary activities along with the details of the consultation with all groups involved.

The assessment of the impact of the actions to resolve the problems based on statistical evidence and examples of renewed community confidence suggest that this intervention had a major and sustainable benefit restoring community confidence in the ability of the agencies to turn what was becoming a no go area back into a location which can be enjoyed by all.

**State number of words: 378**

**Section C: Description of project - Describe the project in no more than 4,000 words. Please refer to the full guidance for more information on what the description should cover, in particular section 11.**

**Scanning – Why Shirebrook?**

A range of clear, specific and realistic objectives were identified in dealing with the multiple problems in this particular area namely alcohol related crime, criminal damage, anti social behaviour, assaults and secondary deliberate fires and achieve sustainable community confidence. The area in question as part of Shirebrook was identified as the number one problem in every category of crime and anti social behaviour along with deliberate fires and an area which residents in the community duly avoided. Community confidence in the ability of the Partnership to seriously address these problems was a major challenge bearing in mind the bad publicity by the local press and at public meetings.

As background Shirebrook had been the subject of two Section 30 Dispersal Orders in 2004. The Criminal Damage in Derbyshire report 2005 confirmed that Shirebrook East Ward was ranked the highest in the county of Derbyshire for criminal damage and Shirebrook was also ranked the worst place in North East Derbyshire for secondary fires in 2005. Table 1 shows the crime figures for Shirebrook East Ward for damage and arson from 2004 to 2006 which confirmed the impact of the measures set out later to deal with the problems. Table 2 shows the calls for service to the Police from 2004 to 2006 specifically for the area in question again demonstrating the impact of the measures adopted and Table 3 relates to calls to the fire service.

<b>CRIME FIGURES FOR SHIREBROOK EAST WARD</b> (All third Quarter)			
<b>Table 1:</b> <b>Damage and Arson</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>
	104	143	32
<b>Table 2:</b> <b>Calls for Service to Police</b>			
	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>
Kissinggate Leisure Centre	28	59	2
Thickley Bank	6	39	1
Catholic School	7	29	0
OAP Complex	5	14	2
Totals	46	141	5
<b>Table 3:</b> <b>Calls to Fire Service</b>			
	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>
Thickley Bank and Kissinggate	3	29	0

The problems involved the Town Park and Kissinggate Leisure Centre area and the adjoining Thickley Bank area, large expanses of land originally set out with facilities for the enjoyment of the public. This bordered onto a Catholic school which around 2005 began to experience serious anti social behaviour and criminal damage affecting everyone involved with the school and the church along with the nearby housing complex and senior citizens bungalows. The increase in anti social behaviour, alcohol related disorder and elements of violence began to affect the running and attendance of the nearby Kissinggate leisure complex due to intimidation of both users and parents. Parts of the area were covered with dense overgrown woodland and brambles such that they provided a ready hiding place for people who wanted to indulge in the activities creating problems. On occasions there were deliberate secondary fires in the areas concerned and the picnic benches and seats had been significantly damaged by deliberate fires. The area was littered with the consequences of alcohol consumption, cans, broken glass and

flytipping.

Overall the problems of the area were of significant concern to the community posing a challenge to all the agencies in trying to resolve the problems. Community confidence as judged by the responses to questions of peoples fear of crime or fear of being a victim of crime and feeling safe as judged by responses to the Citizens Panel questionnaire and discussions with local community groups and individuals was extremely low. The opportunity to restore community confidence came about via the setting up of a Local Action Group under the Partnership.

There were additional concerns emanating from this location with regards to its effects on members of the general public both those who actually use the area and within the community, from the nearby Catholic school and church, in the OAP complex and the housing estate plus overall affects on attendances at the Kissinggate Leisure Centre where the prevalence of offences began to effect attendances and the security of parents and children. This was not assisted by the number of occasions when threats were made by drunken youths, criminal damage of vehicles, examples of rowdy drunken behaviour and on one occasion a youth under the affect of alcohol tried to climb the outside wall of the Kissinggate Leisure Centre sustaining considerable injuries. The resultant publicity did little to boost confidence in the community. With regards to the criminal consequences the extent of threats, assaults, and criminal damage added to the succession of incidents whereby both the Police and Derbyshire Fire and Rescue Service were called to attend deliberate fires in this area with the Police having to face a barrage of missiles during the hours of darkness. At the Catholic school the teachers and children were regularly being intimidated by the actions of drunken and abusive youths utilising the area as hiding places to indulge in drinking and substance abuse. Further intimidation was being experienced by residents in the OAP complex and Council estate.

#### **Identification of Agency Involvement:**

All the appropriate agencies were involved to assist in not only identifying but resolving the problems at this location and initially meetings were organised with the Police, the Community Safety Partnership plus the Police Community Support Officer's who played a major part in driving forwards this initiative. At meetings the range of problems were clearly identified. Data used to identify the problem centred around calls for service to the Police, Bolsover District Council's Community Action Rangers and calls to Fire and Rescue Service plus complaints from residents to the Central Control at Bolsover and the Ward Councillors. In addition information was provided following meetings with the Board of Governors at the Catholic School which established when problems had arisen, what the nature of the problems were and numbers of youths involved and also from the Neighbourhood Watch Co-ordinators and members of the community.

The information was fed into a joint agency meeting with the Local Action Group. Bolsover District Council as owners of the Town Park and the Kissinggate Leisure Centre were involved via their leisure department staff having a direct input at a series of meetings and subsequent site meetings.

Bolsover District Council as landowners and responsible authority were a natural stakeholder having at interest along with Police who were extremely concerned about the increased number of recorded incidents as were Fire and Rescue Service.

#### **Analysis:**

The extent of the problems were assessed in terms of a combination of features for example:-

- The number of recorded incidents of calls for service to the Police and Fire Service for the area for the previous year prior to the increase in problems at this location. The number of recorded complaints at the leisure centre and to the Community Safety Partnership and District Office were also analysed. The Community Safety Partnership (through their analyst) also did hot spot plotting of the number of locations and frequency of calls for service to identify over time where the problems actually occurred. Information was gathered at meetings with the Catholic School Governors and the residents and Neighbourhood Watch Co-ordinators to provide an overall picture of the nature and frequency of problems in the area.
- The underlying conditions which precipitated this sequence of problems in part related to the general demise of this area in the District following the closure of the number one employers the local collieries and the subsequent loss of jobs and employment potentials which had a significant effect on the community and particularly young people including local schools. The area of Shirebrook had been identified around late 2004 with a very high deprivation index being ranked 16<sup>th</sup> in the country and analysis of crime rates and particularly the growth in anti

social behaviour really escalated from 2003 onwards with Shirebrook East Ward having the top 6 categories of all crime consistently month after month. The biggest single factor which allowed the problems to precipitate in this area was the element of neglect particularly to the Thickey Bank park and parts of the Kissinggate Park. There was also a notable growth in underage alcohol consumption which was established as being related to criminal damage and anti social behaviour.

- It is also suggested that earlier responses had not been based on a problem solving approach with the involvement of all the agencies and also benefited from the input of a very proactive Police Inspector and two PCSO's.
- The data used to assess the nature and frequency of the problems was based on recorded information by the Police, Bolsover District Council and Derbyshire Fire and Rescue Service and allowed provision to compare the period leading up to the subsequent analysis which when plotted over time provided a clear indication of the growth over the period in question.
- The Problem Analysis Triangle (PAT) approach was integral to the approach adopted in this initiative. In the case of the offenders direct contact was made on regular occasions with the group's involved in causing the problems for example carrying out targeted initiatives involving the Police, Community Action Network Rangers utilising their mobile CCTV vehicle, the Chairman of the Partnership and the Head of Community Services at Bolsover who went out on regular occasions to engage with those actually responsible for the problem wherever possible. The two PCSO's became extremely adept at directly talking to the parties involved particularly with regards to the offenders and the victims and played a key role in providing information relating to the background to the problems.
- Direct discussion was held with people who had been subject to problems such as anti social behaviour, criminal damage and intimidation in order to be able to establish a clear picture of the nature of the people suffering from these activities. Where people were willing they were actually visited at home with assurances of confidentiality. This allowed for individuals to be either clearly identified or described in considerable detail which aided targeted initiatives. The CAN Rangers and PCSO's provided a very valid input having gained the confidence of people in the community who provided information. It has to be stated that there were certain offenders who did not voluntarily engage some of whom could be described as the main ringleaders. Information was also gathered from discussions with the leisure centre staff, with customers and clientele able to provide a valuable insight and from the Governors at the Catholic School, and Church goes along with residents. Direct discussion took place between the Partnership Chairman, the PCSO's and all outlets selling alcohol to ascertain the extent of possible problems of where alcohol as a major contributory factor was being provided and test purchases were carried out by Trading Standards. All outlets were extremely helpful in this respect with in some cases bans on people buying in bulk. With regards the third element of the PAT approach namely the place, this had been clearly identified from the recorded information and the additional information gathered prior to the initiative. As a consequence of the information gathered a number of people were served with ABC's and ASBO's with high profile publicity via the press and local radio.

#### **Response:**

(A number of clear relationships developed from the analysis and the subsequent designed response as follows).

Clearly that the nature of the environment on the Thickey Bank and the Kissinggate Leisure Centre area contributed to an environment which allowed the problems to continue. This was addressed by the Community Safety Partnership following discussion with the Police, Fire and Rescue Service, the Catholic school and the two neighbourhood housing areas. The Partnership adopted a major environmental clearance programme to clear the area of the locations which allowed problem activities to occur. Following site discussions with a contractor and the adoption of a programme to remove all the features such as overgrown trees and neglected areas adjacent to fences along with filling in and contouring of the area plus a major tidy up and agreement by the leisure services to take on the responsibility to ensure regular area maintenance.

The area next to the Catholic school received particular attention.

The response to the problems identified during the analysis provides a clear indication of why the actions chosen were relevant and identify the methods adopted which actually worked in terms of reducing or eliminating the

problems as follows.

This was particularly noticeable around the Catholic school area resulting in an elimination of problems. The Catholic school also installed a complete security fence around the area and to date there has been no recurrence of any of the problems. One of the key aims was to improve visibility and the canopies underneath the trees were cut back to eliminate locations which contributed to anti social behaviour and crime.

To resolve the problems associated with the Kissinggate Leisure Centre the Partnership installed a CCTV system which covered the complex, car park along with the rear fishing pond area and coverage of the main entrance into the site and this had an immediate impact in terms of the notable reduction of incidents.

The Partnership also instituted the adoption of an Alcohol Control Zone incorporating the Thickley Bank and Kissinggate Leisure Park area which had a significant deterrent effect and following an initial period of regular policing resulted in a situation where the presence of youths consuming alcohol in this area literally ceased. To assist in a problem associated with the use of nuisance motorcycles a number of A frames were installed at key locations which had a major deterrent effect.

The information from both the public, stakeholders and the Police enabled the Partnership through the District Council's Anti Social Behaviour Team to target the known lead individuals with a number of high profile Acceptable Behaviour Contracts (ABC) and where appropriate Anti Social Behaviour Orders (ASBO's) sending out a clear message that anti social behaviour in these areas would not be tolerated.

The measures adopted at the Kissinggate Leisure Centre with the CCTV, increased awareness and appropriate legal action on perpetrators also had a very positive effect in terms of the visitors and users of the leisure centre whereby the problems were virtually eliminated.

One of the problems that has been recognised was the fact that the majority of youths involved in the anti social behaviour and low level crime were from the nearby comprehensive school. This had been discussed at a Local Action Group meeting where it was identified that the school was at the time accepting a daily non attendance of up to 20%. As a consequence the Partnership Chair wrote to the Board of Governors requesting an indication of what measures were to be put in place to deal with this aspect bearing in mind the number of occasions when young people had been on occasions detained or had been recognised as a major part of the problem at times when they should have been in school. A reminder was sent to the Chair of the Governors this time quoting from the official published attendance figures as produced by the school itself. Engagement at the school with members of staff and senior management along with the Governors proved to be an extremely difficult area to resolve however the 'tenacity' of the two new PCSO's found a way into resolving this problem. The initial approach from the senior staff at the school sent out a clear indication that Police were not welcome on the site however the PCSO's regularly visited the outside of the location particularly at key school times in order to develop a relationship with young people at the location and because of the extensive work that was being done to identify the perpetrators and deal with them appropriately the situation changed whereby some of the staff recognised the benefits of having a Police input and also an input from the Police Anti Social Behaviour Co-ordinator directly into the school which lead to a situation where they were able to actually talk to various classes and identify both the concerns and also the possible outcomes of people who indulged in anti social behaviour. This had a significant effect on relationships developing a much wider understanding with the young people and also had a subsequent effect on attendances which started to increase significantly from this time onwards.

This initiative placed significant demands on the lead and partnership agencies in terms of time, money and expertise and the Partnership obtained Neighbourhood Renewal Funding to carry out the remedial work along with major contributions in terms of the provision of officers from the Police, Derbyshire Fire and Rescue Service and by staff from Bolsover District Council. It is suggested this approach by all the key partners and other agencies were effectively engaged in both consultation and discussion on the measures and outcomes along with significant community engagement particularly by the Police, the CAN Rangers with Derbyshire County Council Youth Workers engaged via the Partnership to deliver a range of diversionary activities. They also provided direct engagement with the main perpetrators of the problems.

Bolsover's Leisure Services department provided an extensive range of diversionary activities aimed at all age groups male and female which included fishing, 5-a-side floodlit football, street sports, Brazilian football, extreme wheels, coaching sessions, and whole sports days. Additionally provisions were made for non sporting events such as Nail Arts and games zones. The County's climbing wall was also brought to the location along with a new

diversionary facility developed by the C Division known as Ozbox which involved enjoyable boxing circuit training for both males and females. This proved extremely effective even at times involving the staff engaging with those who had directly been responsible for the problems and encouraging them by one means or another to participate in this activity.

One difficulty facing the project in implementing the responses was the element of negative media coverage particularly not assisted by the role of the Town Council who continued to suggest at numerous meetings that nothing was being done to address the problems. Again the benefit of having a proactive Police Inspector and an active Beat Team including the PCSO's along with the Community Safety Partnership provided the measures to overcome negative approach and turned it around with the challenge in asking the question 'What have you done to help resolve the problems to date?'. The Town Council took exception to this approach. In 2006/7 the opportunity came to provide a detailed response of what had been done in not only the town centre but particularly with regards to the area in question and this allowed for a detailed press release which set out the measures adopted to resolve the problems and the subsequent outcomes which was welcomed by members of the community, the media and contained a number of challenges to the Town Council.

The effective working together of the Partnership and the agencies involved along with the community served to demonstrate the impact of the problem solving approach and the benefits of working together. This was demonstrated on a number of occasions including one by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabularies (HMIC) who felt that this example of Partnership intervention embracing all the agencies and the community was an example of excellent working practice.

The consideration of sustainability of the response was inbuilt into the measures adopted for example of the Leisure department to take over the responsibility for the maintenance of the two park areas in question, provisions of the CCTV and the continuation of the diversionary activities including a multi play area and a skateboard facility. The engagement particularly with the most difficult offenders is another example where the Partnership and Police worked together with Leisure to provide facilities in the nearby Pleasley Park adventure area with the development of periodic boot camps for the most problematic offenders and potential offenders having a significant effect on turning young people around. Similarly the provisions to utilise people on the Community Pay Back Scheme via Probation to carry out the routine maintenance and clearance of the area again addresses sustainability and was welcomed by the community.

### **Assessment:**

The project baseline involved in this example of Partnership intervention was to achieve a situation where the problems associated with crime and disorder in the areas in question has been addressed with sustainability and significant improvements in community confidence in the ability of all the agencies to permanently resolve problems. Provisions to monitor the situation including consideration of the statistics relating to any incidents in this area clearly demonstrate the success of all the ongoing initiatives. There are other examples where diversionary activities have developed for example with the Freerides which has now been taken into all the schools in the area even into the primary schools with the provision of a free facility utilising mountain bikes trailer and personnel carrier targeting young people to encourage them to take up this adoption. Similarly with the Ozbox provision this has now taken out through the whole of the division and into nearby Police divisions and has proved to be extremely successful.

The qualitative evidence of impact from the residents and the people taking part is probably best demonstrated during the occasion when the HMIC came to Shirebrook as part of their evaluation and where the Inspectors along with 1 PCSO were able to talk directly to residents, members of the public, shop keepers, Neighbourhood Watch, the District Council's leisure staff and the Police and Community Support Officers which confirmed the benefits and significant changes which had ensued following the initiatives adopted.

It is felt that the evidence of appropriate Partnership involvement has been clearly demonstrated throughout this submission.

It is also suggested that the evidence of the success of this project was attributable to the actions as outlined previously. With regards to the lessons for the future this is clearly being recognised in terms of the benefits of adopting the Partnership multi agency approach using the problem solving approach. An example of this is the Power Point presentation to the ACPO conference 2007 which has now been provided to Derbyshire County Council, to Bassetlaw Council and as presented on 28<sup>th</sup> February 2008 to 800 personnel from Derbyshire Constabulary as an example of a Partnership approach to resolve crime and disorder issues which is sustainable.

**Conclusions:**

It is suggested that the key points for this entry provide an example of a Partnership approach to problem solving involving not only the multi agencies and stakeholders but also demonstrate the way that the public were involved, consulted and informed of outcomes at every stage. One of the major features being suggested is the benefits of the Partnership approach as opposed to the expectancy at times that single agencies can best resolve problems. The other significant feature from this entry is perhaps best outlined in considering the overall effects on crime and disorder issues affecting the area perhaps best demonstrated in highlighting that the Ward area of Shirebrook East has for some 8 to 9 years exclusively demonstrated the highest levels of all major categories of crime including anti social behaviour but that when considered relative to the date of the intervention around early 2005 showed significant benefits in terms of crime reduction and calls for service to the agencies with probably the following example as one of the most conclusive. In 2003/4 Shirebrook East Ward at the time when the two Section 30's Dispersal Orders were introduced there were on occasions over 100 Police calls for service per week. In 2006 by comparison there were occasions when the level of individual crime in certain categories was recorded as nil, perhaps serving to demonstrate the extent of the culture change which has taken place in the community. It is not to say that there is still not a problem and although Shirebrook East Ward still ranks the highest in the whole of the district the rates of crime have declined significantly with the two areas in question namely the Thickley Bank and Town Park being virtually crime free. It is suggested that this is a significant and sustainable change.

**State number of words used: 3,982**

**Section D: Endorsement by Senior Representative - *Please insert letter from endorsing representative, this will not count towards your word or 1MB size limit restrictions.***



### **Checklist for Applicants:**

1. Have you read the process and application form guidance?
2. Have you completed all four sections of the application form in full including the endorsement from a senior representative?
3. Have you checked that your entry addresses all aspects of the judging criteria?
4. Have you advised all partner agencies that you are submitting an entry for your project?
5. Have you adhered to the formatting requirements within the guidance?
6. Have you checked whether there are any reasons why your project should **not** be publicised to other police forces, partner agencies and the general public e.g. civil or criminal proceedings pending in relation to your project?
7. Have you inserted your project name as a footer note on the application form? Go to View-Header and Footer to add it.
8. Have you saved you application form as a word document and entitled your message '**Tilley 08 entry (followed by project name in brackets)**' before emailing it?

Once you are satisfied that you have completed your application form in full please email it to [Tilleyawards08@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:Tilleyawards08@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk). One hard copy must also be posted to Alex Blackwell at Home Office, Effective Practice & Communication Team, 4th Floor, Fry Building (SE Quarter), 2 Marsham Street, London, SW1P 4DF and be received by 25<sup>th</sup> April 2008.