



## Crime Reduction & Community Safety Group

### Tilley Awards 2007

#### 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 [tilleyawards07@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:tilleyawards07@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk)**

All entries must be received by noon on **Friday 27th April 2007**. 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. Any queries regarding publicity of the awards should be directed to Chaz Akoshile on 0207 035 1589.

#### Section 1: Details of application

Title of the project: - Trefethyn Safer Neighborhood

Name of force/agency - Torfaen CSP

Name of one contact person with position and/or rank (this should be one of the authors) -  
David Jeremiah Community Safety Manager Torfaen Community Safety Partnership

Email address:- [david.jeremiah@torfen.gov.uk](mailto:david.jeremiah@torfen.gov.uk)

Full postal address:- David Jeremiah Community Safety Manager, Torfaen County Borough Council,  
Civic Centre, Glantorfaen Road, Pontypool NP4 6YB

Telephone number: 01633 628992

Fax number:

Administrative Area and Lead Officer

National Assembly for Wales  
Catays Park  
Cardiff

Gillian Baranski – Home Office Director for Community Safety in Wales

Name of endorsing senior representatives(s): Paul Symes, Alison Ward

Name of organisation, position and/or rank of endorsing senior representatives(s):

Chef Superintendent Symes B Div. Gwent Police and Alison Ward Chief Executive Torfaen County Borough Council

Full address of endorsing senior representatives(s):

Police Station and Civic Centre Glantorfaen Road, Pontypool, NP4 6YB  
Council Offices, Torfaen County Borough Council, Glantorfaen Road Pontypool NP4 6YB

**Please tick box 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):

yes

## **Section 2: Summary of application**

Problem Orientated Crime Reduction proved its worth in a hilltop housing estate by restoring quality of life to the residents. The decision to target this area was made by the Council Chief Executive and the Divisional Commander acting in response to the high incidence of public order offences coupled with, the misbehaviour of some troubled and troublesome families and the emergence of a local gang headed by a "Fagan" character. Compounding the problem was the fact that the residents had began to see the Police and the Council as mere observers to chaos, and when the Police Station and Housing Office was rammed by a stolen Range Rover in the spring of 2005 it registered as just another event.

The Chief Officers decided to set in place a Multi-agency group to understand the problem and find a solution. Work started in the early summer of 2005. At the advent it became apparent that joint intelligence associated with the Public Order offences was discordant while the Police were trying to tackle the criminal elements within the community in isolation. Response Policing – the standard format at the time – was also not delivering what was required and was alienating the residents. On top of all this Council services were also being delivered unilaterally and discordantly. To compound the problem the local bus, essential to a poor community some 400 feet above the valley floor, was being stoned and was under threat of collapse. The Council, like the Police, responded to incident after incident whilst the community looked on in disbelief.

Once it was recognised that we had poorly delivered services the solution became obvious. In a nutshell, aspirations were agreed, information was shared, the partners negotiated who would do what, and the community was consulted and included in the planning – work began.

On the Ground Neighbourhood Policing was established, the Council's Housing Department focused their tenancy enforcement Team exclusively on the estate and youth workers and teachers were asked to fully engage with reinforcing positive action in the community. The effect of this traffic was electrifying. The "Fagan" character was charged with serious offences and received a custodial sentence, some families were evicted. Public disorder ceased. The community regained its confidence and the Elected representatives for the area spoke of an astounding turnaround. One stark indicator was the reduction in callouts to the police over the 5 November from 30 in 2005 to zero in 2006.

### **Section 3: Description of project**

#### Overview

It has long been understood that in Britain policing is by way of public consent. To gain the consent of the public the Police should engage with people to find out what they consider to be the most cause for concern and to check if what is being delivered is what the public requires. For some years this underlying principle has been negated with police officers becoming ciphers in the drive to prove statically that KPIs are being met. Also it meant that police officers were spending most of their time responding to events rather than managing them. In the words of the recent Audit Commission Report – “those police forces who apply themselves solely to meeting national targets will not serve their communities well”.

Some months ago throughout Torfaen the picture changed with the advent of the Neighbourhood Policing Teams. Police officers had to relearn the skills of communication, involvement and engagement and work more closely with others who share the responsibility to ensure safe communities. They also had to be able to defend their actions to the community and its elected representatives.

#### Objectives of the Project

In Trevethin this challenge was pre-empted by a sequence of events where a hilltop estate of Council Housing (Trevethin) was threatened with chaos from the actions of a small number of individuals who took it upon themselves to ignore normal standards of civil behaviour. This situation could not be allowed to continue and there was a clear need to restore to the community a reasonable quality of life.

To do this successfully required first an understanding of the nature and extent of the problem followed by immediate visible and effective action. As the programme developed events were closely monitored and interventions evaluated with the whole shebang being concluded with a continuing monitoring programme linked to a sustainable social inclusion strategy. It was agreed at the outset that statistical evidence of a reduction in offences is a necessary indicator of the success of the project but it would be far from sufficient. The real objective would be, and has proven to be, the feedback from the residents and the positive reports from Elected Members of the Council and other community activists.

#### Definition of the Problem

Trevethin is a Community First Area which suffered from a disproportionately high incidence of low level antisocial behaviour and criminal damage. It was recognised in the 2005 Community Safety Audit as an unpopular estate with high proportion of single parent families and poor economic and educational achievement. Only 8% of the residents have degree or higher level qualifications and almost half do not own a car. Over a third have a long term limiting illness.

Although some years earlier a community regeneration programme had improved the housing stock and corporeal environment, little or nothing had been done to tackle an underlying climate of disaffection, hopelessness and resignation. This negative outlook was predicated upon what the community saw as a small number of criminal adults supported by groups of youths who together ran the estate as a personal fiefdom. The police for some time had suspicions that one of the gangs, lead by an adult, was responsible for the drugs market in the area but they were unable to gather sufficient evidence. Similarly, although antisocial behaviour in the area was endemic the Community Safety Partnership, despite knowing the names of the individuals responsible, was unable to collect enough intelligence to seek Court injunctions. A hiatus was reached when the local police station was ram-raided, the housing office trashed and over 30 cars damaged in a night of co-ordinated vandalism.

In response, the Chief Executive of the Council met with the Police Divisional Commander to ask that the CSP prepare a plan to restore a reasonable quality of life to the residents. A Multi-agency Team, which eventually came to comprise the Partnership's Community Safety Team five police officers and a sergeant together with local youth workers, head teachers, housing officers, tenancy enforcement officers and members of the Youth Offending Team, was set in place.

## Defining the Problem

At its first meeting a fundamental impediment was identified. During the discussion on whom and what to target first it became clear that the Police had only focused on one person, the gang leader “a Fagan character” who they believed to be controlling the drugs market. Whilst doing this, perhaps for reason set out in the overview, they had sublimated the fact that he was also orchestrating the disorder. Consequently, no police officer could put a face to any of the names (connected to the public order offences) that were brought to the meeting by the Antisocial Behaviour Co-ordinator, teachers and youth workers. This was despite the fact that response police officers had been moving these very same youngsters on night after night. Bizarrely the housing officers and youth workers had more street knowledge about the criminal activities and public order incidents than the police seemed to have but had never thought to pass that information on. In addition a hastily convened public meeting degenerated into haranguing and recrimination with the Police and the Council rightfully being blamed for not recognising or even understanding the chasm that existed between them and the residents.

## Response to the Problem

Once the problems were understood and the mistakes recognised the Team started its focused work.

The model adopted was one which had been used to tackle problems on the Woodlands some months earlier. This is a street of four bedroom houses on Pen y Garn. The Woodlands had been subject to horrendous neighbour, and in many cases interfamilial, violence and disorder which had spilled out into the wider community. The associated anguish had adversely affected the local schools and a generation carryover was becoming apparent. A Problem Solving Group was set in place under Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act which included Housing Officers, the local CADRO from the divisional police, youth workers, fire officers, the Youth Offending Team, teachers and the Community Safety Team. A socio-gram of the split and extended families was drawn up and individuals profiled. Under the aegis of Section 115 of the Crime and Disorder Act information was shared which, interestingly, included some pertinent contributions from some of the primary school children’s “Daily Diary”. The outcome of that original operation was a number of acceptable behaviour contracts, two injunctions, an intervention programme for one young fire setter, a number of support interventions from the YOT and two evictions. The message went out that unacceptable behaviour would not be tolerated especially when help was available from the agencies represented on the Team, and the Woodlands returned to normality.

In essence the Multi-agency Team absorbed the Woodlands Problem Solving Group but with an extended remit, additional members and stronger backing from senior officers. At its first meeting it decided on a bifurcated approach with a Detective Sergeant leading on the criminal issues and the Community Safety Manager together with the Neighbourhood Sergeant leading on the Public Order issues. It was also agreed that it would remain one Team and that both branches should work in unison by sharing information and consulting on actions.

The Multi-agency Team quickly became a cohesive bunch of people. The Neighbourhood Team Sergeant, with the full backing of the Section Inspector, was clear as to how policing should change to respond to the new circumstances. One of his first decisions was to merge his officer’s policing skills with the softer social science skills of the Council’s officers.

For his part the Community Safety Manager set out to design a different but complementary approach to what was already being done in the area but this time with a focus on tackling community based problems through a mixture of intelligence gathering and holistic problem solving.

Personal and professional links were forged to an extent that within six months it would have been difficult for an outside observer to declare who was managing whom and who worked for which agency. The degree of confidential information exchanged between the two agencies, championed by the CADRO, reached a level which would have been unthought-of prior to the Team’s existence.

## Evaluation and Intervention

The “Fagan” character was profiled using all the newly accumulated knowledge. Despite registering for benefit he had a car which featured in a flash car magazine as having a paint job that cost thousands. The Housing officer trawled the records to show that he paid his rent and the rent for others in cash and his flat was well appointed with the latest TV etc. The youth workers collected information on his drug market activities and his acolytes were identified and profiled.

Those who were involved with the linked public order transgressions were also identified and targeted using the same methodology. Some were offered diversions from their recent involvement with the gang while others were issued with acceptable behaviour contracts. Some were investigated for criminal offences.

The community were brought on board and the first positive achievement / indicator was when residents had the confidence to provide sufficient evidence for three families to be brought before the Magistrates Court. – they were evicted from their houses - and to issue two individuals with antisocial behaviour orders. Next came the recognition (via PPO) that “Fagan” was a Prolific and Priority Offender even though he had no previous criminal record. This brought greater impetus to the investigation which concluded by him being sentenced to three years custody. He also lost his house and his car and most importantly of all his kudos.

## Evaluation of the intervention and programme

The basic premise that community policing and community management can only be undertaken with the consent of the community had been restored. The community and those who share the responsibility to make it safe and pleasant were once again communicating and sharing responsibilities. And response policing had been replaced by community policing while the Council had regained its duty of care.

Public order offences in Trevethin reduced by almost 70%. The most startling indicator of all was the reduction of callouts on Bonfire Night (on 5/11/06 the police received only two calls related to fireworks. In previous years post boxes were exploded open, cars were torched and a wooden front door was penetrated by a sky rocket being used as a RPG.

On the Quality of life indicator the elected Ward Members of the Council for the area congratulated the Team for what they call the most remarkable of turnarounds.

On the development front, Community Policing has now evolved into Neighbourhood Policing and has proved a continuing success. It is what the residents had wanted for some time as it gives them a visible police presence and a named officer with whom they can build a relationship. At the same time the initial recognition and targeting approach has evolved into a systematic monitoring, planning and prevention programme.

## Sustainability and Management

As the Team became more confident it realised that proper planning to engage the community in setting policing and other priorities would have to continue into the future. An interventionist programme is always prone to lose its way therefore a process which would be both objective and responsive and also stand up to scrutiny would need to be agreed with the community and the key players.

As had happened with the setting in place of the Multi-agency Team an existing model was adopted. A pilot Safer Neighbourhood Group had been successfully running for some months in Garndiffaith and it was thought that with adaptations for local demography and need a similar group could be set in place in Trevethin.

The Safer Neighbourhood Group was quickly established in Trevethin, St Cadocs and Penygarn with the aim of making the area a safer place by identifying individuals who are on the cusp of offending, those who are prolific or priority offenders and those who wish to be resettled and rehabilitated locally.

The primary objectives of the Group is to help achieve a 17.5 percent overall reduction in Crime and Disorder by 2008 and a reduction in the fear of Crime and Disorder (measured by the Home Office and MORI and well on target details from Gillian Baranski).

The secondary objectives of the Trevethin Safer Neighbourhood Group are:

- To identify, classify and monitor individuals who are likely to end up in the Criminal Justice System by way of database which is regularly updated.
- To assist the police in the monitoring of a small number of prolific and priority offenders in the local neighbourhood.
- Reduce the incidence of re-offending by those coming out of institutions who wish to resettle in the neighbourhood. (*Rehabilitate and Resettle*)
- Promotion of Community Safety and the Community Safety Partnership
- Better information and intelligence on individuals or families
- Enhanced community involvement (*Neighbourhood Policing*)

The Safer Neighbourhood Group now operates in the heart of the community at the youth and community centre where the members meet on a quarterly basis. The core membership of the group comprises the Community Safety Manager, the Community Safety Criminologist, Gwent Police Sectional Sergeant, Gwent Police Sectional Crime and Disorder Reduction Officer, Sectional Neighbourhood Officer, Sectional Police Community Support Officers, Tenancy Enforcement Officer, Head of local Comprehensive Schools, Head of local Primary Schools, Youth Offending Team worker, Representatives from the Community and Elected Members. Additional members are invited to join at the discretion of the established Group. officers of the Council are co-opted as appropriate at the discretion of the Chair.

The primary purpose of the Group is now to identify individuals who are causing problems in Trevethin and its environ, and agree solutions. Communication with the public, especially where confidential or sensitive information is concerned, is risky but members of the Group are encouraged to broadcast what they can once they are made clear as to what information they can return to members of the community. There is continual and additional guidance on this issue but the principle is – “tell up to the wire”.

The work of the Safer Neighbourhood Groups are in part confidential and covered by Section 115 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 - at the commencement of each meeting each member signs a caveat recognising that fact. Prior to the Safer Neighbourhood Group being established four training sessions were held with members regarding issues surrounding confidentiality, Section 115 Crime and Disorder Act 1998, consequences of breach of Section 115, and consequences of breach of trust.

The data base of individuals identified and being targeted is central to the work of the Group. It is compiled by, and the responsibility of, the Community Safety Criminologist. It is kept strictly confidential to the Group and gives due regard to Article 8 of the Human Rights Act – the right to privacy. The Safer Neighbourhood Group recognises, and is continually made aware, that lawful interference in peoples' lives can only be made for the prevention of disorder or crime and that data can only be shared when necessary and is not to be communicated wider than is required for the legitimate objectives set out in the group's terms of reference. Particular attention and guidance is given to the information that can and that that cannot be shared with members of the community.

The proceedings are formal with each meeting commencing with introductions. Each member is then asked to state their names and their organisations. In doing this the group get to know each other so that trusting relationships can be formed on a professional as well as a personal level. Trust between members of the group is central to achieving the objectives and is vital when personal information of individuals on the database is shared.

Minutes of the previous meeting are shared amongst the group and are read as a reminder of the situation at the last meeting and also to ensure that all information is correct. When the minutes are agreed as a true record the discussion of the individuals on the database begins.

The database holds information about an individual from various sources and is gathered by the Community Safety Criminologist. This includes information from the police, the Youth Offending Team, Probation, Social Services, Housing, Education, Careers, Prisons, Probation and the Community. Each individual is highlighted and issues relating to changes in their behaviour, circumstances and associates are discussed and explored. Each individual are given a rating based on these factors and based on the risk they are likely to pose to the community.

The ratings that individuals are allocated as follows:

- Rating 4 – Serious Concerns – Immediate action required
- Rating 3 – Considerable Concerns – Look at referring to appropriate service
- Rating 2 – Some Concerns – Monitor
- Rating 1 – Currently Inactive

During the review of the ratings and the database, actions are decided by the Group in terms of referrals to other agencies, interventions, support, diversion or possible prosecutions. The Community Safety Criminologist may remove a name from the register or adjust the rating given to any person on the register pending the agreement of the Group. The Group include names on the register or remove a name from the register or refer people on to one or more of the following.

- Family Support Services Education / Social Services etc
- Problem solving Groups – ASBO / ABC etc
- YOT /PIP
- PPO
- Prevent and Deter Panel
- Drug or alcohol services
- Parenting classes
- Time bank - see below

When all individuals are discussed, the chair asks the Group if there are any individuals that are not on the register that are causing concern and should be monitored. The new names are then given a rating by the group and will be included on the database ready for the next meeting. Any member of the Group can refer a person or family for inclusion on the register by contacting the Community Safety Criminologist. However, no person will be entered onto the register and so enter the purview of the Group unless it is universally and unanimously agreed that to do otherwise would be contra to the Aim of the Programme which is essentially Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998. No person or family will remain static on the register for more that three meetings.

Each meeting closes with members handing in all paper work to the Community Safety Criminologist to be shredded to ensure confidentiality is maintained.

The Group's approach is didactic and it reviews its own work. In addition the Community Safety Criminologist prepares an annual report to the Scrutiny and Overview Committee of the County Borough Council and the CSP.

Safer Neighbourhood Groups have now been extended to three other areas in Torfaen and two more are currently being developed.

#### Additional Activities – sustainable outcome

Intervention is but one part of the process. To deliver lasting change and tackle the negative culture within the estate it was decided to set in place a project through which reparation and belonging could be sponsored.

Early in 2006 the Welsh Assembly Government presented the Group with the opportunity to bid for a non

reoccurring fund aimed at tackling youth disorder.

Having in place an established team which in turn had identified a specific need to engage disaffected youngsters, a bid was prepared. The bid was accepted – one of four in Wales - and the Time Bank scheme was set-up in Trevethin, St Cadocs and Penygarn. The funding had to be spent by March 2007 and its release was contingent upon continuing funding if the pilot proved successful.

The aim of the Time Bank project was threefold. First it was to sponsor positive behaviour. Secondly it was to meet the community's needs in order to significantly reduce anti-social behaviour, and thirdly it was to reduce the community's fear of such crime and behaviour, replacing it with respect between young people and adults, particularly older people.

The basic principle of the Time Bank was that young people were to do environmental work in and around their community. For every hour that they engaged they received a Time Credit. Time Credits could then be exchange for rewards such as driving lessons, training course, and trips.

The objectives of the Time Bank were:

- To enhance community cohesion through citizen focused approach to prevent ASB and Disorder resulting in a reduction of the fear of crime
- To help young people in 5 five areas to realize their full potential by contributing as citizens within their communities.
- To bridge the intergenerational gap in Trevethin, St Cadocs and Penygarn
- To provide opportunities and support to young people to enable them to overcome existing disadvantage and wider their social participation engage.
- To engage those not in education, training or employment
- To engage those who are on the cusp of offending
- To engage those who are involved in anti social behaviour and low level criminal activity
- To address key health issues such a teenage pregnancy, drug and alcohol misuse, sexual health, smoking, diet and exercise.
- To benefit the environment of the community by addressing areas which need attention for example gardens, allotments, littered areas, vandalised areas.
- To give the young people the opportunity to be involved in the decision making and planning of their community.

The work that had gone on in the area allowed the project to focus, with confidence, on a limited amount of young people who were identified as being most at risk of offending and entering the Criminal Justice System. This was to be done in partnership with the Crime and Disorder Reduction Officer.

Some of the young people were subject to Acceptable Behaviour Contracts and Anti Social Behaviour Orders whilst other were felt to be on the cusp of offending. Since their engagement in the project those targeted young people have not committed any further offences and have not come to the attention of the police or the Community Safety Unit. One marker of success was when the ASBO co-ordinator successfully applied to the Court for the relaxation of the conditions of an ASBO on a youth who had hitherto been the bane of many lives on the estate.

Young people who had never been brought to the attention of the Community Safety Team or the police were also involved in the project; however these young people were not worked with as intensively as those young people who were at risk.

Over a period of 12 months young people volunteered over 7500 hours in community project involving gardening, cleaning the community, helping other young people, volunteering during Summer Camp, helping out at youth centres, leaflet drops, trips, mosaics, regeneration of local shops, graffiti removal, maintenance of community gardens and many more. One other success has been a dent in the intergenerational conflict and distrust that is such a large contributor to the fear of crime.

Following the great success of the Time Bank project in Trevethin continuing funding has been secured and it has been proposed that through multi-agency participation the Time Bank Scheme be rolled out in other wards in Torfaen.



Work continues in Trevethin and the community is better policed, supported and managed by a team of people who understand the problems and know how to respond.

**Section 4: Endorsement by Senior Representative**

Allison Ward Chief Executive Officer  
Torfaen County Borough Council

Chief Superintendent Paul Symes  
Chief Officer B Division Gwent Police

This application is an accurate account of recent events in an area where we as Chief Officers are jointly responsible for the quality of people's lives. We feel what occurred in Trevethin was not simply a response to a complex and pernicious problem but a holistic and carefully considered course of actions and as such it merited consideration for the Tilley Award.

The officers on the ground were given a clear remit together with our total support and the outcome stands testament to the commitment and energy of the whole team. Although our aim was to stop the disorder we were also keen to see the community better supported in the future. We both saw development of Community Policing, which was piloted in Torfaen, as central to the future wellbeing of the Estate. This, linked to a prevention and diversion program for the more troubled youngsters, has resulted in the Estate which has a number of troubled and dysfunctional families, regaining its sense of wellbeing and pride.

As Chief Responsible Officers of the Torfaen Community Safety Partnership and senior officers of Responsible Authorities we have gained much. We now more confident that we can effectively respond to similar challenges in other troubled sectors of our community and we can do so by way of a team that is better skilled and focused.

We both unconditionally support this application.

#### **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?
7. Have you saved you application form as a PDF attachment and entitled your message 'Entry for Tilley Awards 2007' before emailing it?

Once you are satisfied that you have completed your application form in full please **email it to [Tilleyawards07@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:Tilleyawards07@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk)**. Two hard copies must also be posted to Alex Blackwell at Home Office, Effective Practice, Support & Communications Team, 6th Floor, Peel Building (SE Quarter), 2 Marsham Street, London, SW1P 4DF.