



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.

All entries must be received by noon on **Friday 25th 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: Disorder in South Bank.
2. Key issue that the project is addressing: Anti social behavior and criminal damage

Author contact details

3. Name of application author: Sergeant Jim Brown
4. Organisation submitting the application: Cleveland Police
5. Full postal address: Cleveland Police, 2 Hampden Street, South Bank, Middlesbrough, Cleveland
6. Email address: james.brown@cleveland.pnn.police.uk
7. Telephone number: 01642 302817

Secondary project contact details

8. Name of secondary contact involved in the project: Tim Raynes
9. Secondary contact email address: tim.raynes@cleveland.pnn.police.uk
10. Secondary contact telephone number: 01642 302817

Endorsing representative contact details

11. Name of endorsing senior representative from lead organisation: Chief Inspector Peter McPhillips

12. Endorsing representative's email address: peter.mcphillips@cleveland.pnn.police.uk

Address

Cleveland Police
Troisdorf Way
Kirkleatham
REDCAR

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

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).*

Scanning:

South Bank ward had the highest levels of damage in the policing district (BCU) in the preceding 6 months accounting for 11.3% of BCU damage. A problem solving approach to reducing levels was set up with 3 aims:

1. Reduce levels of damage by 10% in the ward (organisational objective)
2. Reducing levels of damage by 10% in the POP area (organisational objective)
3. Improve the life of residents in the POP area (Neighbourhood Police Team and resident's objective).

Local community concern through established consultation confirmed this increasing trend expressing dissatisfaction at gangs of youths running amok, creating havoc in the streets damaging cars and house windows which was a particular MO identified in the police crime pattern analysis.

Analysis:

Cleveland Police data was the benchmark for measurement of progress; however, the vociferous community regularly expressed concerns and praise at consultative meetings which provided reality to statistics. South Bank is currently being regenerated by the council with demolition of elderly 'back to back' terraced housing which identified as being the most significant impact factor upon criminal damage from the community. A significant number of households were purchased by the council and simply boarded up for years creating an environment which was unsightly with obvious crime opportunities for criminals.

Response:

A multi agency problem solving group was set up producing an action plan that was reviewed fortnightly being scrutinised by local community members in the group. Initial actions were targeted at environmental impact, council and housing providers accountable. Enforcement agencies were responsible for targeting offenders; all parties tasked with victim impact. Difficulties faced were financial as partners were asked to invest funds to improve the environment, however due to the demolition this was considered a poor investment.

Assessment:

Crime statistics has shown significant reductions way beyond the 10% target achieving 43% in the POP area. A crucial benefit was improved community satisfaction. The impact of this project ensured the community were involved from day one and that Cleveland Police and its partners were committed to helping South Bank as the community felt ignored due to the environmental condition of the area which had hundreds of boarded up empty households that were increasing daily. Actions which reduced crime were targeting offenders, removal of assets from properties and joint visits to offenders enforcing tenancy.

State number of words: 382

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:

In March 2007 Cleveland Police identified South Bank ward in Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council area as having the highest level of criminal damage in the BCU. Ward officers Sgt Brown and PC Raynes were tasked with implementing sustainable solutions to reduce levels in the whole ward considering 10% reduction would be an achievable target. However to achieve greater reductions a POP area was identified comprising terraced 'back to back' street houses, typical to the area built to house steel workers and their families over a hundred years ago, about half a kilometre square in size; covering about 1100 households in its 'hey day' where the majority of offending occurred. All parking for vehicles is on street.

This area was in the heart of the community regeneration area, mirroring the council priority area. In order to assess the improved quality of life the established consultative process would be utilised which the Neighbourhood Police Team undertook 5 times per month.

South Bank ward is within the 10% most deprived areas in the country with the population reducing year on year due to its major historical source of employment, the steel industry, being drastically reduced. Areas within South Bank ward not subject of this POP have had environmental and housing investment over the last decade from the Single Regeneration Budget to the value of tens of millions of pounds. The POP area received burglary initiative funding for alley gates and CCTV in the late 1990's but significant expenditure on the environment and housing has not occurred and as a consequence the area appears neglected and unappealing. CCTV coverage is managed by the council with 10 cameras in the area monitored 24hrs a day.

Community cohesion was good with a vibrant active number of residents who were resisting the increasing crime trends and eager to assist; which was reassuring given the depth of negative feeling about public sector services abandoning the area. Vital community members were leaving the area and relocating to other wards, reflected in monthly housing figures, leading to loss of the 'community feel'. The community was disappointed with Cleveland Police who also relocated its 24hr police station to a central facility outside of the ward, some 7 miles away, replacing it with a small town office for the neighbourhood police team. Once again the feeling of isolation and abandoning the area by public sector services was perceived by the community, the previous Police Station had been a feature of the community since the 1908 and many people were sad to see it go.

Politics played a part in the process and still does. Some sections of the South Bank community are totally opposed to the regeneration plan and use any forum to promote their cause. At consultative meetings these people challenged Cleveland Police to improve performance; a call for help as they were feeling abandoned. The resisters to the regeneration plan had forums to vent their frustration and with increasing crime and anti social behaviour fuelling fear of crime, residents had ammunition to use to challenge the council on their regeneration plan. In summary sections of the community were blaming the increasing crime upon the environmental state of the area.

Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council consulted the community on a regeneration scheme some years prior to this project which involved demolition followed by redevelopment. During 2007/8 205 households were demolished and in 2008/9 157 are planned. With the ever dwindling population and increased permeability, the area has fewer eyes and ears to see and hear unlawful activity, giving increased opportunities for offenders to be undetected whilst committing crime and raising the fear of crime. The sections of the community opposed to regeneration use the consultative groups organised through neighbourhood police officers to challenge proposals both by Cleveland Police and anyone else leading to political sensitivities within the community.

Cleveland Police crime recording system was used to obtain levels of crime coupled with community consultation. Statistics clearly demonstrated that this ward with dwindling population levels and increasing crime needed a challenging sustainable solution to redress the trend. It was clear the public were equally as unhappy with crime and anti social behaviour statistics and demanded positive action to address this. Representation on the officer problem solving group from members of the community gave real evidence of the perception of crime and identified locations where trends were occurring. This evidence provided insight to life on the streets of South Bank with true perceptions on how we, the partnership could affect life. Data from Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council was used to identify properties subject of purchase and likely future purchases. There is no compulsory purchase order in place for this

area therefore the timescale for regeneration is at least 2010 for all demolition. This meant this project had to be sustainable in the long term.

Analysis:

In February 2007 an extraordinary community meeting was organised by many community champions to discuss increasing in anti social behaviour which was not attended by police. The meeting was in addition to the local beat and consultative meetings that were held by Cleveland Police and regeneration information sessions held by the council. Issues raised were:

- Perceived lack of police presence
- Lack of cohesion between police and community safety wardens shift patterns
- Perceived lack of police cover on weekends
- Anti social behaviour increases
- Querying opening times at the police station
- Because the 24hr station had moved, there was a perception that there were no police on duty and as a result crime was risk free.
- Abdication of responsibility by registered social landlords that they were placing tenants into homes without consideration for the trouble they may bring to the area.

Clearly these concerns raised were echoing the concerns of the consultative meetings that the fear of crime was increasing along with the actual trend. The characteristics of the offending were confirmed as the culture of youth gangs running amok damaging cars and house windows, and this echoed in available police data. An action plan was sent to Cleveland Police by the chair of the group with suggestions on positive measures to combat this trend, however, the tone of the action plan was equally aimed at the council in a political statement to resolve the housing regeneration problems.

In March 2007 a Cleveland Police problem profile was completed, identifying intelligence and analysing the problem from recorded police data over a 2 year period. Damage was increasing with an average of 40 offences per month. Anti social behaviour which included the community concern of gangs running amok also had an increasing trend statistically with an average of 45 incidents per month. Crime trends were mainly damaged household windows by youths throwing objects, and malicious damage to cars parked in the street. A number of key offenders were highlighted which indicated an intelligence led approach to challenging behaviour.

Peak time was identified as Wednesday and Sunday evenings. On Wednesdays 'South Bank Tomorrow' held a DJ Rapping session between 6 and 8pm. Large numbers of youths, up to 70, aged between 12 and 19 attended the event. The event was cancelled in June/July 2007 due to disruptive and unruly behaviour both within the event and outside. Organisers were undertaking this event in their own time which was not appreciated by the youths, who were abusing staff, damaging equipment, using drugs and drinking alcohol. However local youths blamed 'outsiders' attending the event causing disruption. There was some truth in this but the locals were not without a degree of blame.

Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council data highlighted increased costs for damage and boarding up at properties. A map of the POP area with owners of the properties was completed by the council in order to build up a picture of change in the community, demonstrating graphically how the community was shrinking. The map highlighted owners of properties who had speculated on purchases, some buying from the internet without seeing the property, never intending to occupy, intending to own the property until the council made a compulsory purchase and then gaining a profit. Some owners have bought the housing, which comparatively cheap to the rest of the country, intending to rent out. Warwick Street is the 3rd cheapest street in the country according to a 'Mouseprice.com' survey dated 15th March 2008. Tenants occupying households were of very poor standard causing disturbance and unrest in most streets by criminality or significant neighbour disturbance. Poorly behaved tenants created bad feeling against the regeneration plan by law abiding residents which contributed to the instability in the community. A lot of the people opposed to the regeneration plan have lived in South Bank for 20/30years, own their own home and do not want to leave it, either voluntarily or compulsorily. Poorly behaved tenants moving into the area led to long term residents selling their houses, often to the Local Authority, thus increasing the number of unoccupied boarded up houses and leading to increased criminal behaviour in the area.

Response:

Sergeant Brown and Pc Raynes set up a multi agency task group involving RSL's, Cleveland Fire Brigade, councillors, residents, youth engagement groups, council officers from housing, CCTV, community wardens, council anti social behaviour officers meeting fortnightly for the first six months and then monthly for the next 6 months. The extra ordinary community meeting set up to address anti social behaviour in February 2007 had suggested that this should occur.

A crime pattern analysis was shared with partners highlighting the core areas in the ward including the POP area and the most common modus operandi (M.O.). This recorded data mirrored the communities concerns of youths running amok in the streets in gangs causing damage. The group felt that getting control of youth gangs would reduce damage and as a result consideration was made to include management of anti social behaviour in the action plan. Partners were reminded of the aims of the group which was to reduce damage by 10% in the ward and POP area; and improve the life of residents in the POP area.

Minutes were taken and an action plan produced which was coordinated by project officers. Information sharing was encouraged, though no formal agreement was put in place, and has developed from a careful approach to proactive sharing to deter offending and bring offenders to justice if necessary.

Actions included:

1. Increase CCTV coverage with a dedicated operator for the area. Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council provided the operator, meeting the cost themselves. The operator obtained images of offending for enforcement by police. As the project developed all cameras were checked for quality as the community raised concerns. The cost implication was for one member of staff on an 8 hour shift which was a significant financial contribution during the project.
2. Information sharing allowed housing providers access to intelligence that was used to arrange meetings with parents of offenders to reinforce tenancy regulations. PCSOs working with the appropriate housing provider were responsible for this. There was no identified additional cost.
3. Directed CCTV surveillance was obtained for a 3 month period, providing police and council enforcement officers with authority to target offenders and concentrate on hotspot locations. Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council had responsibility for this.
4. Partners were asked to consider excluding persistent offenders from diversionary activities to discourage these persons from criminality. Only one person was excluded under this action, as this tactic was considered as being counter productive by diversionary service providers. However, the possibility of exclusion was promoted. No additional cost incurred.
5. Diversionary activity providers were introduced to each other at the meetings and made aware of offenders. As a result the providers were asked to introduce activities on differing days and publish these within the community. This was accomplished by a leaflet drop carried out by outreach workers. Wednesdays were identified in the crime pattern analysis as being the most prevalent day for offending. As previously mentioned, a DJ session took place on Wednesday evenings. The initial suggestion by project officers was to cancel the project which would reduce the problem, however this is short sighted and the partnership realised this type of action was draconian and we needed to embrace the activity and support it. PCSO's and community wardens were tasked with visiting the session frequently to engage with the youths. Unfortunately, crime was not reduced and the activity ceased after youths were challenged by organisers for drug/alcohol misuse and disorder within the activity.
6. Diversionary activity providers were asked to provide at least one activity per month. This has been well received and generally there was at least 1 per week including an activity bus with play stations, mixing turntables, games etc. This activity was a borough wide initiative and included activities that the youths chose when the project was devised.
7. Probation Services outreach work with youths on the streets occurred for the first time in this ward. From April 2007 for 10 weeks 2 community workers were employed for 2 hrs Monday and Wednesday 5-7pm. One of the workers was a resident of the area and was well known within the community, which enabled the introduction. The workers were asked to distribute the diary of youth activity in the ward to youths. Costs were met by probation services by using existing staff altering the location to South Bank.
8. Alcohol consumption by youths was seen as a catalyst for youth disorder and the resulting damage. Off licensees were asked to attend South Bank Police for a discussion with project officers to remind them of their responsibilities. Only one licensee attended (5 did not). Visits were made to the off licences by PCSO's and ward officers which achieved the same outcome. This was a prelude to test purchasing by trading standards officers which was to occur once per month, after 3 months this was discharged from the action plan after 2 licensees were prosecuted for under age sales. PCSO's made regular visits, minimum once per

month, during the project. There was no additional cost implication for police or council staff who simply altered their working day to an evening shift.

9. PCSO's and community wardens used mobile CCTV whilst on patrol. This police equipment did not work particularly well as it was on the lapel of the outer jacket and generally recorded the ground as the officers cycled. No alternative could be purchased due to cost implications. The community wardens did use the equipment mounted on their cycle helmet to much better effect.
10. An environmental visual audit was conducted by project officers including police crime prevention officers in order to design out crime. A comprehensive document was provided to appropriate organisations with advice on measures to reduce criminal activity. However due to cost, service providers would not commit funds to projects when the area was due for demolition. The project officers needed to ensure that the best possible solutions were implemented or discounted as the community expect public sector employees to act on the best solutions. As buildings were demolished the land left was in a poor state with stones readily available for use as ammunition by potential offenders to damage property. Cleveland Police was criticised for leaving its car park at the new police station in a state of disrepair, leaving a plentiful supply of stones for offenders to cause damage with. Cleveland Police invested £24K to resolve this.
11. Additional police patrol funds were sought from funding streams; most were rejected except for Cleveland Police who provided a limited budget in line with the tactical and co-ordination group. Budget allocation cannot be broken down into the exact amount for this project however it was thousands of pounds.
12. Cleveland Police own a sting vehicle fitted with cameras that can be deployed for crime prevention and detection purposes. This was deployed once with no hits. No additional cost implication.
13. Intelligence questioning of suspects who are arrested for damage was a district priority and all staff were encouraged to do this, no successes were achieved undertaking this activity. No additional cost implication.
14. Team targets were set for police officers for patrol time and challenging offenders. This was in line with the organisational performance improvement and neighbourhood policing priority plans set as a result of the neighbourhood policing model. Project officers had responsibility for this which had no additional cost implication. Project officers reported back to community forums on patrols and activity of the team.
15. A street clean up day was organised which the Local Authority had responsibility for which made huge improvements on the environment. Cleanups still occur regularly, but not on such a large scale, contributing significantly to the area's appearance.
16. Graffiti damage was tackled through the provision of a 'graffiti board.' This was set up at a local community centre which is well attended by youths. There are football and basketball courts open and well lit for use during the evening and these are free to use. This board was donated by the Local Authority, preventing graffiti in the community, and despite sometimes requiring a little editing by whitewashing in paint this is a valuable asset. The boards cost about £200 and no additional staff time to whitewash was incurred.
17. The alley gates were over 8 years old and were regularly broken. PCSO's were tasked with weekly checks to report unlocked gates to the council. Also street lighting was checked by the community wardens with reports of defects going to the council. The council repaired gates and lights. No additional cost implication.
18. Cleveland Police provided 2 additional PCSO's in the ward working from within the hotspot which has enhanced the visibility of the team significantly. Funding for this was provided by Cleveland Police Authority and was within the organisational rather than project budget. With the introduction of Neighbourhood Policing this additional staff provided a perfect opportunity to target the hotspot without relocating staff from other area of the ward.
19. Truancy sweeps were conducted by police in partnership with council enforcement officers; whilst not always within the core times it was felt suitable to engage with the truants reminding them of the enforcement tactic which it was hoped would cascade throughout the youth network e.g. MSN, talking, text etc. No additional cost implication. Joint patrols were undertaken in identified youth congregation areas including supermarkets. Appropriate paperwork was completed which informed schools and eventually parents.
20. The project was publicised in a local newsletter delivered to 1400 households including the POP area and a housing estate nearby. The projects aims were set out with a contact telephone number for the neighbourhood police team and 'crimestoppers'. No additional cost implication.
21. Fire statistics were highlighted as increasing in incident number. They are recorded as damage in crime statistics. The Fire Service advertised arson audits to households, and these involve Fire Officers attending households, risk assessing the property for hazards and offering smoke alarms where necessary. Fire crews were tasked with patrolling the POP area during downtime to prevent and deter offending. The brigade reported and dealt with incidents increasing the partnership presence in the POP area.
22. Cleveland Police neighbourhood officers targeted the main offenders and 6 ASBO's with banning orders from the POP area were obtained. The majority were in force from July with the exception of one obtained in August. The community requested the banning order from the POP area which police put forward and was not contested, again reflecting how vital it was to have the community on board in this project. No additional cost implication.

23. Members of the community on the group identified offenders who could be diverted away from crime and were encouraged to attempt to divert these persons. The community took this upon themselves which were in vein unfortunately as no-one took the offer up. No additional cost implication.
24. Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council agreed to strip all newly purchased properties on the day of transfer removing all metallic objects even stripping floorboards for piping underneath in order to reduce availability of property to steal. This was cascaded through the council team to other housing providers. The purpose was to remove the valuable assets before the building was sealed with metal shutters, then displaying a notice advertising all assets have been stripped. This prevented offenders damaging the metal screens. No additional cost implication.
25. Local authority staff wore high visibility jackets to enhance the presence on the streets of the partnership. No additional cost implication.

Assessment:

Recorded crime statistics have resulted in the following:

	2006/07	2007/08	% increase/decrease
Antisocial behaviour (whole ward)	1492	1044	30% reduction
Anti social behaviour (POP area)	488	257	47% reduction
Criminal damage (whole ward)	561	428	24% reduction
Criminal damage (POP area)	216	124	43% reduction

Overall the POP has met its objectives reducing criminal damage by 24% and anti social behaviour by 30% in the ward exceeding all expectations.

Even more impressive are the reductions in damage in the POP area of 43% and 47% in anti social behaviour.

In July 2007 the main ASBO targets were placed on ASBO's resulting in a dramatic drop in ASB and damage in the POP area in contrast to before this date. Information from community members of the group indicated that residents are much happier living in the POP area.

Local councillors and community groups have provided written documentation regarding appreciation of the efforts made by partners in this POP.

In February 2008 the DJ sessions have been restarted with 2 sessions arranged. PCSO's have been tasked with attending the full session as an agreement with the organisers to prevent the unruly activity that occurred previously. The events have been trouble free and are likely to continue, hopefully increasing in attendance and deepening trust between the community, organisers and the Police.

Community contact through consultation has continued monthly through the overarching 'South Bank Tomorrow' community forum set up to drive the town forward into the 21st Century. It is evident life is so much better for the community across the ward but in particular the POP area, which was the objective.

Local opinion is summarised in the following quotes which can be substantiated through contact with the individuals if required.

ES a local resident said "The area is much better now the gangs have gone. Before they terrorised the area but now they are not damaging as much and it's OK to walk the streets".

SM a resident "Thankfully the area is a lot quieter. As a pensioner I feel a lot safer in the area, getting reassuring calls from neighbourhood ward officers regularly. I feel and lots of other people do now that walking down the streets is not a problem any more".

LF a member of South Bank Tomorrow said “Being invited into the public sector problem solving meeting triggered effective partnership working in the area. I can say that it is far improved from what it used to be.”

IJ local councillor “As a local ward councillor it is my pleasure to comment on the success of the relationship between the Neighbourhood Police and the local community. This has been particularly evident since the introduction, just over a year ago, of the police led project designed to address community safety issues. As we know, the project involved a variety of partners, including residents, and took a problem-solving approach to issues around anti-social behaviour and criminal damage. Once problems were identified, partners were obliged to take appropriate action within their own area of responsibility.

From talking to local people and as a result of my own experiences I am aware that things are far calmer now than they have been for some considerable time. Whilst we still have some problems, there is a definite improvement in community confidence which is evidenced in part by the well attended police consultative meetings. Local residents also value improved feedback on issues and the regular contact police maintain with community activists, which includes residents, neighbourhood watch coordinators and councillors.

State number of words used: 4000

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

This project clearly identified at the onset significant problems that required a long term strategy to deliver improvements in the quality of life for the long suffering residents of South Bank. Cleveland Police and its partners intended to reduce criminal damage against significant barriers including; a severe decline in the environmental condition; increasing disruptive tenants moving into the area; a feeling of abandonment by statutory agencies, including Cleveland Police, who seemingly retreated from South Bank; and an increasing disaffected community who blamed the statutory agencies for allowing the town to appear in the condition it is. Not only has this project achieved its organisational targets of crime reduction it has vastly enhanced the quality of life of residents, which as neighbourhood policing champion for the BCU I am really pleased with. I have met with the community representatives identified in document and can confirm they are far happier regards life than they used to be, in contrast to the dissatisfaction from 6 months ago demonstrating sustainability.

I strongly support this project as Redcar & Cleveland District Neighbourhood Policing partnership nomination.

This is partnership working as it is supposed to be with bright ideas turned to reality through seamless information exchanging working toward a common goal.

Peter McPhillips
Chief Inspector Neighbourhood
Redcar & Cleveland District
Kirkleatham Police Office
Troisdorf Way
Kirkleatham
Redcar

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. 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 25th April 2008.