



Notice of a public meeting of

Housing and Community Safety Policy and Scrutiny Committee

To: Councillors Fenton (Chair), Pavlovic (Vice-Chair), Baker, Mason, Vassie, Wells and Musson

Date: Monday, 28 October 2019

Time: 5.30 pm

Venue: The Thornton Room - Ground Floor, West Offices (G039)

AGENDA

1. **Declarations of Interest**

At this point in the meeting, members are asked to declare any personal interests not included on the Register of Interests, any prejudicial interests or any disclosable pecuniary interests which they may have in respect of business on this agenda.

2. **Public Participation**

At this point in the meeting, members of the public who have registered their wish to speak regarding an item on the agenda or an issue within the Committee's remit can do so. The deadline for registering is **5:00 pm on Friday 25 October**.

Filming, Recording or Webcasting Meetings

Please note that, subject to available resources, this meeting will be filmed and webcast, or recorded, including any registered public speakers who have given their permission. This broadcast can be viewed at: <http://www.york.gov.uk/webcasts>.

Residents are welcome to photograph, film or record Councillors and Officers at all meetings open to the press and public. This

includes the use of social media reporting, i.e. tweeting. Anyone wishing to film, record or take photos at any public meeting should contact the Democracy Officer (whose contact details are at the foot of this agenda) in advance of the meeting.

The Council's protocol on Webcasting, Filming & Recording of Meetings ensures that these practices are carried out in a manner both respectful to the conduct of the meeting and all those present. It can be viewed at:
http://www.york.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/11406/protocol_for_webcasting_filming_and_recording_of_council_meetings_20160809.pdf

- 3. Safer York Partnership Bi-annual Report** (Pages 1 - 10)
Members will receive the report which outlines the work that has been delivered through Safer York Partnership against the Community Safety Strategy for 2019-20.
- 4. County Lines Update Report and Round Table Discussion** (Pages 11 - 38)
Members will receive the report outlining how the North Yorkshire Police are working in partnership through a multi-agency approach to understand the rise of drug trade and related crime in local communities and the progress that has been made to date.
- 5. Social Rented Housing on New Developments - Referral from the Area Planning Sub Committee September 2019** (Pages 39 - 54)
Members will receive a report on Social Housing on Private Developments to consider the impact of service charges on the delivery of social rented housing by housing associations through the planning gain process. This concern was referred by the Area Planning Committee at its meeting on 5 September 2019.
- 6. Work Plan** (Pages 55 - 56)
To discuss the committee's Work Plan for 2019.
- 7. Urgent Business**
Any other business which the Chair considers urgent in accordance with the Local Government Act 1972.

Democracy Officer:

Name – Michelle Bennett

Telephone – 01904 551573

E-mail – michelle.bennett@york.gov.uk

For more information about any of the following please contact the Democratic Services Officer responsible for servicing this meeting:

- Registering to speak
- Business of the meeting
- Any special arrangements
- Copies of reports and
- For receiving reports in other formats

Contact details are set out above.

This information can be provided in your own language.

我們也用您們的語言提供這個信息 (Cantonese)

এই তথ্য আপনার নিজের ভাষায় দেয়া যেতে পারে। (Bengali)

Ta informacja może być dostarczona w twoim własnym języku. (Polish)

Bu bilgiyi kendi dilinizde almanız mümkündür. (Turkish)

یہ معلومات آپ کی اپنی زبان (بولی) میں بھی مہیا کی جاسکتی ہیں۔ (Urdu)

 (01904) 551550

This page is intentionally left blank



Housing & Community Safety Policy & Scrutiny Committee

28 October 2019

Report of Director of Health, Housing & Adult Social Care

SAFER YORK PARTNERSHIP BI-ANNUAL REPORT

Summary

1. In 2017, it was agreed that a report outlining the work that has been delivered through Safer York Partnership against the Community Safety Strategy would be reported to the Health, Housing and Adult Social Care Policy and Scrutiny Committee on a bi-annual basis. This report is the first report for 2019-20 and outlines the work that has been delivered against each of the partnership's strategic priorities.
2. The Community Safety Strategy 2017-20 was refreshed and approved by Safer York Partnership in May 2019. A new strategy is due to be drafted for implementation in April 2020 and work is currently under way with partners to identify the priorities that will be included in the new strategy.
3. North Yorkshire Police no longer supply crime figures directly to the local authorities. As a result, we now rely on national sources such as iQuanta to obtain updated data sets. Data on the Council's KPI machine is due to be updated in November. As part of the Community Safety Partnership's work to develop a new Strategy, consideration will be given to how best to capture performance information in future.

Safer York Partnership Priorities

4. Safer York Partnership identified the following strategic priorities within its three year Community Safety Strategy 2017-20:

Strategic Priority	Lead Agency
Keeping the City Centre Safe	North Yorkshire Police
Counter Terrorism	CYC Community Safety
Protecting People from Harm	CYC Safeguarding Adults & Children

Improving Quality of life through a multi-agency approach	CYC/NYP Community Safety Hub
Serious Organised Crime	North Yorkshire Police
Reducing Reoffending	Probation & Youth Offending
Tackling Substance Misuse	Public Health

Keeping the City Centre Safe

5. Work has continued through the City Centre Hotspot group with Operation Erase tackling alcohol related anti-social behaviour and Operation. There have been very few complaints from residents or visitors over the summer this year in relation to alcohol related anti-social behaviour or crime. This has been captured by the Operation Erase group as a success measure for the continued close working and joint days of action between the Neighbourhood Enforcement Team, BID Rangers, Police and British Transport Police.
- 5.1 It has become apparent that there are many multi-agency forums where various aspects of the City Centre are discussed, from community safety to specific events and economic growth. With the changes to retail shopping habits focusing more on-line and less on the high street, York is likely to evolve into a very different place over the next ten years. It is therefore essential for Safer York Partnership to be part of future planning to ensure that whatever the City looks like, it remains a safe place for residents, visitors and those who work there.

Business Crime

6. York Business Against Crime has introduced a new Digital radio system. This brings in enhanced technology that enables the Co-ordinator or the Police to establish separate talk groups, manage incidents by location and identify individuals who are misusing the system. The new radios are part of a planned approach to join up communications between key sites across the city in order to support work on counter terrorism and to improve information sharing across a broader range of crime and community safety issues.

Counter Terrorism

7. The Counter Terrorism Task Group has continued to hold monthly training and awareness sessions. Dates have been booked throughout 2020 to continue this work, delivering new national packages as they

area developed and to ensure that all key stakeholders across the city have access to regular refresher training.

- 7.1 The group is also overseeing the delivery of a programme of permanent security measures in the City Centre and played a key role in advising the Safety Advisory Group in relation to CT safety for the Christmas and New Year events in the City
- 7.2 York is widely referenced by the North East Counter Terrorism Unit as an example of good practice in developing and delivering a co-ordinated multi-agency approach to Counter Terrorism.

Protecting People from Harm

8. Operational Lead Officers and the Chairs of the Community Safety Partnership and Safeguarding Boards meet regularly. Work has continued to identify shared themes and training opportunities particularly in relation to PREVENT and Modern Slavery.

Domestic Abuse

- 8.1 An Independent Review of Multi-agency Domestic Abuse Processes was commissioned by North Yorkshire Police. This review has acknowledged the success of the Pilot Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conference process in York and recommended that this model be adopted by North Yorkshire.
- 8.2 Throughout the two year pilot, York MARAC has been held by conference call twice weekly. Information is shared on the cases to be discussed by the MARAC co-ordinator prior to the meetings so that Partners can interrogate their systems and identify their actions in relation to each case. The system has resulted in streamlined meetings and better participation across all partners. The proposal will see a Single York & North Yorkshire MARAC taking place twice weekly broken down into two sections with a break between to hear York and Selby cases and then the remainder of North Yorkshire.

Prevent

- 8.3 York Channel Panel currently has three live cases where a Home Office Intervention provider is working with the individuals concerned. The Panel meets monthly and takes the format of a case by case timed agenda to ensure that all agencies working with the individual can

contribute to the discussion on their case. There are consistently around three to four cases being managed within Channel. Since April four cases have been dismissed from the process with the panel satisfied that the risk of radicalisation of those individuals has been mitigated.

- 8.4 Common factors with Channel referrals in York are that they have been exclusively males, all with mental health issues and focused on Far Right Ideology.

Improving Quality of Life Through a Multi-Agency Approach

9. Since April, the main focus of the Community Safety Hub has been in tackling problems associated with County Lines Activity in the City. This has resulted in three premises closure orders (two full closures and one partial closure in which only the tenant has been allowed to remain. The Hub has also evicted one tenant, persuaded another to terminate their tenancy and currently has two further cases where they are seeking possession. During this period the team has worked with colleagues across the local authority, voluntary sector and the police to carry out reassurance visits to the local neighbourhood. They have also improved CCTV surveillance in the area and supported increased patrols in affected streets.
- 9.1 The Neighbourhood Enforcement Team have issued 64 Community Protection Warnings, one full notice and have prosecuted for a breach of a notice resulting in a fine. They have issued two notices for inappropriately presented commercial waste and 174 notices for inappropriately presented domestic waste. In relation to animals, they have issued 4 written undertakings in relation to dangerous dogs, two fixed penalty notices for dog fouling and 10 micro chipping notices.
- 9.2 The team has continued work on tackling unlawful waste carriage, issuing 17 notices requiring production of waste information, three notices requiring production of a waste carriers licence and two fixed penalty notices for failure to comply.
- 9.3 Campaigns to tackle flyposting, fly tipping and litter have also resulted in the issuing of fixed penalty notices. The team also work closely with North Yorkshire Police to tackle street urination with the neighbourhood policing team supplying names and addresses of those who they identify as responsible and the Neighbourhood Enforcement Team prosecuting.

Serious Organised Crime

10. The police are the lead agency for Serious Organised Crime. Multi agency work is managed through a multi-agency county and citywide Serious Organised Crime Board with operational delivery through a multi-agency disruption panel. Partnership work to share information and intelligence that may assist in disrupting organised crime groups has strengthened throughout the last twelve months.

10.1 County Lines has been an emerging issue for York. Gangs are progressively found to be involved in drug lines within York which brings the associated risk of increased violence, the use of weapons, the criminal exploitation of children and the cuckooing of vulnerable people. In May, Safer York Partnership commissioned the Violence and Vulnerability Unit, a small national team of gang/county line/community safety experts to undertake a Locality Review of County Lines in the City. This involved a full day of focus groups involving a range of Council services and key partners. The Review identified some areas of good practice but also identified the need for a more co-ordinated approach.

10.2 In October Safer York Partnership approved the establishment of a multi-agency Joint Co-ordinating Group to oversee local responses to Serious organised crime including Modern Slavery, County Lines and Exploitation.

Reducing Reoffending

11. This priority captures the contribution of the Probation Service and Youth Offending Services in supporting the wider priorities of the partnership. Both agencies report their performance through separate Board Structures rather than through the Community Safety Partnership.

11.1 The Youth Offending Service and Probation are key partners in relation to all areas of the Partnership's business and are well engaged with the meetings that support delivery activity.

Tackling Substance Misuse

12. There are clear links between many aspects of the health and wellbeing agenda and community safety. Substance misuse (whether drugs or alcohol) is strongly linked to both crime and disorder. Substance misuse can also make some people more vulnerable and therefore at risk of becoming victims of crime. The Community Safety Hub works closely with

Public Health to ensure that the education, awareness and support services are incorporated in delivery of multi-agency approaches to tackling the consequences of substance misuse and excessive alcohol consumption.

12.1 Substance misuse services (including alcohol treatment) are delivered through a contract with Changing Lives in partnership with Spectrum Health. The Community Safety Hub works closely with support services to ensure that support is offered to those in need of support. This includes joint working to provide support to those who are homeless and the inclusion of requirements to engage with support services where enforcement action is required to deal with prolific offenders.

Council Plan

13. The Community Safety Strategy links to the following priorities within the Council Plan 2015-19:

- **A focus on frontline services** – to ensure all residents, particularly the least advantaged, can access reliable services and community facilities
- **A council that listens to residents** – to ensure it delivers the services they want and works in partnership with local communities

Implications

14. In producing this report the following implications have been considered:

- **Financial** – none identified
- **Human Resources (HR)** – none identified
- **Equalities** – none identified
- **Legal** Safer York Partnership is a statutory partnership identified within the Crime and Disorder Act 1998
- **Crime and Disorder** - Safer York Partnership supports the Council's discharge of its crime and disorder duties under the Crime and Disorder Act 1998
- **Information Technology (IT)** - none identified
- **Property** – none identified

- **Other**

No other implications identified

Risk Management

15. There are no identified risks relevant to this report.

Conclusions

16. The Police and Justice Act 2006 introduced a clear role for Overview and Scrutiny Committees in overseeing the work of Community Safety Partnerships and their constituent partners. Under the council's scrutiny arrangements bi-annual performance reports from Safer York Partnership are presented to the Scrutiny and Policy Committee.

Recommendation

17. Members are asked to note and comment on the contents of this report.

Reason

18. To update Members on the performance of the Safer York Partnership.

Contact Details

Author:

Jane Mowat
Head of Community Safety
Tel: 01904 555742
Jane.mowat@york.gov.uk

Chief Officer Responsible for the report:

Sharon Houldon
Corporate Director of Health, Housing & Adult
Social Care
Tel: 01904 554045

Report Approved Date

Wards Affected:

All

For further information please contact the author of the report

Annexes

Annex 1 – Safer York BI-Annual Report Statistics

Background Papers

Community Safety Strategy 2017-20

Abbreviations

CYC- City of York Council

NYP- North Yorkshire Police

BID- Business Improvement District

MIY- Make it York

ASB- Anti-Social Behaviour

MARAC- Multi Agency Risk Assessment Conference

NEO- Neighbourhood Enforcement Officer

NYCC- North Yorkshire County Council

NFU- National Farmers Union

PSPO- Public Space Protection Orders

ANNEX 1

			Previous		2019/2020								
			Collection Frequency	2018/2019	2019/2020 Prediction	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Target	Polarity
1. Crime Prevention	CSP01	All Crime	Monthly	13,579	14118	1,147	1,208	1,166	1,185	Due 16 Oct	Due Nov	-	Up is Bad
		All Crime per 1000 population	Monthly	65	67.83	5.51	5.8	5.6	5.7	Due 16 Oct	Due Nov	-	Up is Bad
		Benchmark - National Data	Monthly	88	88.11	7.04	7.4	7.03	7.9	Due 16 Oct	Due Nov	-	
	CSP10	Burglary of a Non-Dwelling	Monthly	320	348	44	29	19	24	Due 16 Oct	Due Nov	-	Up is Bad
	CSP12	Criminal damage (excl. 59)	Monthly	1,610	1521	137	126	113	131	Due 16 Oct	Due Nov	-	Up is Bad
	CSP03	Domestic burglary (incl. attempts)	Monthly	698	546	46	43	45	48	Due 16 Oct	Due Nov	-	Up is Bad
	CSP15	Overall Violence (Violence Against Person Def.)	Monthly	4,212	4413	341	371	377	382	Due 16 Oct	Due Nov	-	Up is Bad
	CSP19	Shoplifting	Monthly	1,655	1899	165	185	145	138	Due 16 Oct	Due Nov	-	Up is Bad
	CSP04	Theft from a vehicle (incl. attempts)	Monthly	319	312	15	27	33	29	Due 16 Oct	Due Nov	-	Up is Bad
	CSP40	Theft from person	Monthly	237	288	14	29	33	20	Due 16 Oct	Due Nov	-	Up is Bad
CSP11	Theft or unauthorised taking of a cycle	Monthly	762	648	48	42	48	78	Due 16 Oct	Due Nov	-	Up is Bad	
2. ASB/Communities	CSP13	NYP Recorded ASB Calls for Service	Monthly	NA	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	-	Up is Bad
	ASBH01	New Cases recorded by ASB Hub (from Feb 2015)	Monthly	236	100	17	11	10	12	11	7	-	Neutral
		Of Which Cases categorised as: Nuisance	Monthly	151	90	17	9	8	11	10	7	-	Neutral
		Of Which Cases categorised as: Personal	Monthly	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	Neutral
		Of Which Cases categorised as: Environmental	Monthly	53	8	0	2	1	1	1	0	-	Neutral
		Of Which Cases categorised as: Other	Monthly	24	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	-	Neutral
	ASBH04	Cases Closed by ASB Hub within Period - Resolved	Monthly	385	32	2	4	9	1	4	6	-	Neutral
	ASBH05	Cases Closed by ASB Hub within Period - Unresolved	Monthly	4	6	1	0	2	0	0	0	-	Up is Bad
	CSP24	Number of Alcohol related ASB incidents	Monthly	NA	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	-	Up is Bad
	CSP28	Number of Incidents of ASB within the city centre ARZ	Monthly	2,059	1449.6	150	169	143	142	186	Due Nov	-	Up is Bad
CSP28b	Number of Incidents of Alcohol Related ASB within the city centre ARZ	Monthly	NA	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	-	Up is Bad	

ANNEX 1

CSP29a	Number of Incidents of ASB within the CIZ	Monthly	999	734.4	78	89	71	68	93	Due Nov	-	Up is Bad
CSP29b	Number of Incidents of Alcohol Related ASB within the CIZ	Monthly	NA	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	-	Up is Bad
CSP27	Number of Incidents of Violent Crime Within the ARZ	Monthly	1,010	832.8	94	83	89	81	86	Due Nov	-	Up is Bad
CSP29	Number of Incidents of Violent crime within the CIZ	Monthly	609	468	48	52	44	51	48	Due Nov	-	Up is Bad
FLT01	FLY-TIPPING - Number of issues reported	Monthly	1,642	1579.2	150	138	151	219	178	-	-	Neutral
FLT02	Number of warning letters issued (Duty of Care over Waste)	Monthly	111	40.8	10	2	2	3	4	-	-	Neutral
FLT03	Number of statutory notices issued (Unlawful Waste Carriers)	Monthly	91	26.4	2	7	2	0	4	-	-	Neutral
FLT05	Number of duty of care inspections carried out (Business visits)	Monthly	91	26.4	2	7	2	0	4	-	-	Neutral
CSP23	Hate Crimes or Incidents as Recorded by NYP	Monthly	111	111	11	10	11	5	Due 16 Oct	Due Nov	-	Up is Bad



Housing & Community Safety Policy & Scrutiny Committee**28 October 2019**

Report of Director of Health, Housing & Adult Social Care

COUNTY LINES DISCUSSION REPORT**Summary**

1. The rise of the County Lines drug trade and related crime is being felt across the County and City of York. Although thought of in a regional, national or international context, its impact is felt most by local communities. The public are aware and reporting increased visibility of drug use and concerns about young people being drawn into more serious crime and about the violence linked to dealing drugs.
2. Organised Crime Groups use intimidation tactics, exploitation and corruption for unlawful gain. They are deceitful, unscrupulous and regularly prey on the vulnerable in their pursuit of money, power or personal gratification through the harm of others.
3. This report will show that North Yorkshire Police are already working in partnership to understand the challenge and proactively respond by disrupting trafficking routes and protecting vulnerable people.
4. Serious Organised Crime is a strategic priority in the Safer York Partnership Community Safety Strategy 2017-20 and will also be carried forward into the next draft Strategy. In May 2019, the partnership commissioned the Violence and Vulnerability Unit from the Home Office & Associate of Town Centre Management to carry out a Locality Review on County Lines. The findings of this review were considered by the Partnership on the 2nd October and from that, a plan was developed to implement a joined up multi-agency response to capture the tactical work that is already taking place to address County Lines.

Drug Crime

5. Drug offences have risen steadily over the last three years across North Yorkshire. Nationally there was an 11% increase in 2018-19 and North Yorkshire mirrored this increase. While recorded drug offences equate to 3.6% of total crime in North Yorkshire, the impact on vulnerable people and communities is considerable. Much of the crime still remains hidden.
6. York is one of the hardest hit areas across North Yorkshire Force. Drug offences are also linked to wider organised crime such as modern slavery, human trafficking, fraud, violence, kidnap and serious and violent assault. Over the last year, County Lines has become the predominant form of drug dealing in the city.
7. Whilst the police have a good understanding of the supply and demand through those they interact with, the true picture is still unknown. This unknown demand largely relates to the affluent middle class use of cocaine, which whilst it may be small, will contribute to the demand on County Lines drug dealing within the city and county.

County Lines

8. County Lines is the trafficking and dealing of drugs by organised crime groups across the country and refers to the telephone 'lines' used to facilitate this.
9. York & North Yorkshire are the biggest importer of County Lines in the Yorkshire and Humber region with 20 unique deal line telephone numbers linked to 14 different County Lines. These target places which are well connected by rail and road. York is currently impacted by four of these lines.
10. The main drugs supplied are heroin and crack cocaine. These lines have been linked to child sexual exploitation, firearms, the trafficking of young people both local and from out of area, exploitation of vulnerable adults and to serious violence.
11. Violence tends to appear where rival gangs vie for control of an area or where local dealers try to profit from rival gangs. Repercussions range from violent threat to kidnap and serious assault, often involving knives.

Exploitation and Cuckooing

12. A common feature of County Lines presence is 'cuckooing'. This is when dealers take over the home of a vulnerable person and operate their drug dealing from that address. This has been prevalent in York, particularly within Council owned properties and has impacted on locations and addresses which previously had not been known to the Community Safety team.
13. County Lines relies heavily on the exploitation of young people and vulnerable adults to traffic and supply drugs between areas. This results in complex safeguarding issues. The police need to arrest to preserve evidence but 'catching' the individual makes them vulnerable to reprisals. The individual is then returned to their home location, identified to social services and their local police. Considerable work is then required to ascertain whether they are suspect or a victim.

A Multi-agency response to County Lines

14. North Yorkshire Police's response to County Lines is led strategically by a Serious Organised Crime Board, chaired by the Deputy PCC, with a prevention sub-board chaired by North Yorkshire County Council's Community Safety Lead. Operationally, Silver Command group oversees the co-ordination of intelligence and tactical operations. The Partnership's Disruption panel and Organised Crime Mapping meeting co-ordinate tactical work across partners for the combined city and county.
15. At a local (York) level. Serious Organised Crime is a priority for the Community Safety Partnership, Safer York Partnership. In May 2019, the partnership commissioned the Home Office Violence and Vulnerability Unit to carry out a Locality Review to determine how well partners are working to tackle the issue, identify any gaps and share good practice. (Annex 1) The recommendations from that review are as follows:
 - a. Consider production of an informed needs assessment
 - b. Produce local criminal exploitation delivery plan
 - c. Clear local and county governance group
 - d. If there is evidence of young people locally being recruited/groomed by gangs, consider introducing contextual safeguarding as a shared approach

- e. Consider the importance of shared language and learning
- f. A programme of multi-agency training in the area of County Lines and the associated vulnerability subjects would be useful and desirable.

Response to the recommendations to date

- 16. Since the publication of that review much has been done to address those recommendations. Safer York Partnership have approved the establishment of a York Joint Co-ordinating Group to pull together the local multi-agency tactical delivery, produce a clear action plan and drive the implementation of that plan to improve the local response to county lines.
- 17. A draft action plan was also considered by Safer York Partnership a starting point for that group. This has been based on the problem profiles, problem solving plans and national framework. These documents are not attached due to the operational sensitivity of the content.
- 18. Training and awareness events have taken place with key services within City of York Council and with the Safeguarding Boards and Community Safety Partnership. County Lines is one of the topics to be covered at a Voluntary Sector Assembly Day on 31st October.
- 19. Governance structures are already established with links to the North York & York Board and sub groups.
- 20. A Multi Agency Child Exploitation Meeting (MACEM) has been established by Childrens Social Care, City of York Council jointly with North Yorkshire Police.
- 21. Weekly intelligence sharing meetings take place between the Community Safety team and North Yorkshire Police involving only those staff who are police vetted. Membership has recently been extended to include representation from Children's social care and it is planned to extend further to include adult social care. This meeting has been pivotal to the increase in speed at which the community safety team are able to take enforcement action in order to disrupt local county lines activity.

Council Plan

- 22. The Community Safety Strategy links to the following priorities within the Council Plan 2015-19:

- **A focus on frontline services** – to ensure all residents, particularly the least advantaged, can access reliable services and community facilities
- **A council that listens to residents** – to ensure it delivers the services they want and works in partnership with local communities

Implications

23. In producing this report the following implications have been considered:

- **Financial** – none identified
- **Human Resources (HR)** – none identified
- **Equalities** – none identified
- **Legal** Safer York Partnership is a statutory partnership identified within the Crime and Disorder Act 1998
- **Crime and Disorder** - Safer York Partnership supports the Council's discharge of its crime and disorder duties under the Crime and Disorder Act 1998
- **Information Technology (IT)** - none identified
- **Property** – none identified
- **Other**

No other implications identified

Risk Management

24. There are no identified risks relevant to this report.

Conclusions

25. The report provides an overview of County Lines and how it impacts within the City of York. It also outlines how the problem has been identified and is being addressed through a multi-agency approach and demonstrates the progress that has been made to date in developing a local partnership response.

Recommendation

- 26. Members are asked to note and comment on the contents of this report in order to determine further work that can enhance the contribution of cross Board activity at a local level to support a multi-agency approach to tackling County Lines in the city.

Reason

- 27. To ensure that all opportunities for multi-agency engagement on County Lines are being fully exploited.

Contact Details

Author:

Jane Mowat
Head of Community Safety
Tel: 01904 555742
Jane.mowat@york.gov.uk

Chief Officer Responsible for the report:

Sharon Houldon
Corporate Director of Health, Housing & Adult
Social Care
Tel: 01904 554045

Report Approved Date

Wards Affected:

All

For further information please contact the author of the report

Annexes

Annex 1: Locality Review Report

Background Papers

Community Safety Strategy 2017-20

Abbreviations

MACEM- Multi Agency Child Exploitation Meeting
PCC – Police and Crime Commissioner

This page is intentionally left blank

Locality Review

York

May 2019

Paul Cullen
Mick McNally
Trish Leivesley

VVU consultant
VVU consultant
VVU associate

1 Introduction

Since the Gang and Youth Violence programme started in 2011, several challenges have emerged from the peer/locality reviews, and our understanding of the way in which gangs or groups use violence and exploit vulnerable individuals to commit crime has evolved significantly.

Increasingly, crime is being committed in private spaces as well as the public sphere, this type of crime often involves the criminal exploitation of children and adults on a physical, sexual and/or financial basis. Groups of offenders variously labelled as street gangs, organised crime groups, dangerous drug networks and disengaged young people carry out this abuse, often via illegal drug markets and for the lucrative profits that can be made from them. Most of this violence and exploitation is not reported and won't always show up in recorded crime statistics.

Increasingly it also appears that vulnerable people, especially children, are subject and exposed to a range of risk factors, making them vulnerable to a range of perpetrators. How they are then subsequently exploited often appears to depend on who gets to them first. It seems to be the case that current partnership structures across the country aren't able to respond to this new threat, often working in silos or duplicating work and resources. There is evidence nationally to show local partnerships and various agencies are trying to support the same people or families or missing vulnerable cohorts altogether.

The UK Government definition of county lines is set out below together with a definition of child criminal exploitation, which is increasingly used to describe this type of exploitation where children are involved:

County lines is a term used to describe gangs and organised criminal networks involved in exporting illegal drugs into one or more importing areas [within the UK], using dedicated mobile phone lines or other form of "deal line". They are likely to exploit children and vulnerable adults to move [and store] the drugs and money and they will often use coercion, intimidation, violence (including sexual violence) and weapons.

Child Criminal Exploitation occurs where an individual or group takes advantage of an imbalance of power to coerce, control, manipulate or deceive a child or young person under the age of 18 into any criminal activity (a) in exchange for something the victim needs or wants, and/or (b) for the financial or other advantage of the perpetrator or facilitator and/or (c) through violence or the threat of violence. The victim may have been criminally exploited even if the activity appears consensual. Child Criminal Exploitation does not always involve physical contact; it can also occur through the use of technology.

Communities, who can hold the key to understanding the issues and tracking perpetrators, are not always properly engaged. Partnerships will want to engage with them to help effect cultural change and communicate myth busting messages regarding the glamour of gang life. We have found some of the key challenges for partnerships are:

- The need to understand the relationship between serious group offending and local drug markets (including illegal, prescription drugs and new psychoactive substances)
- The links between vulnerable cohorts, locations and gangs e.g. care homes, missing young people, school absence and exclusions
- Making links between violence and vulnerability, the Prevent Programme and local secure estate.
- Vulnerabilities and exploitation experienced by gang-associated women and girls
- The exploitation of children by gangs and organised crime groups (sexual / physical exploitation or exploitation in order to commit crimes such as drug dealing)
- Gang members and associates moving into other areas, such as shire counties or seaside towns, to commit crime
- Links between street gangs and organised crime groups
- The use of social media to facilitate violence and intimidation
- The links between health, particularly mental health, and gang violence
- Youth offending services managing a more violent cohort than previously
- The ability to identify both dangerous gang nominals and young people at risk of involvement in gang crime when there is a lack of police intelligence
- Making sure that resources are effectively targeted, informed and that partnership structures are set up to respond quickly to the new threat without duplication

Often practitioners have many insights into how gangs and groups are operating and exploiting young people and vulnerable adults. This qualitative information, when triangulated across a number of interviews and linked with relevant quantitative data sets can show a richer picture of how gangs and groups work and help us to tackle them

more effectively. It can also help us to identify and protect vulnerable people. This is the locality review (LR).

2 Purpose of the Locality Review

The LR is a one-day process for local areas as part of the national serious violence strategy. It works as a broad-brush set of interviews and focus groups with front-line practitioners to gather information, knowledge and perception whilst building a qualitative picture of the key issues and drivers around county lines, gangs, youth violence and vulnerability. It is a rapid evidential assessment process that focuses on violence and vulnerability. It should –

- Enable rapid assessment of issues around gang activity, serious youth violence and victimisation through drawing upon the experiences of practitioners, communities, victims and offenders
- Test the prevalence of issues identified through cross-referencing opinions/perception from interviewees/groups and relevant quantitative data
- Identify barriers to effectively understanding and tackling local priorities (in relation to threat, risk and harm)

It is crucial to understand that this is not a review of any single organisation's role, but a process that seeks to identify what local practitioners know or believe about vulnerability at an operational level, understand how the partner agencies are working together operationally to deliver the area's gang/group and youth violence priorities and examine what blockages are perceived to effect delivery at a frontline level. The review reflects the information gathered from the practitioner interview time table and may highlight communication issues where process exist as well as potential gaps and barriers to identification and effective intervention.

It does not test any local or countywide strategic frameworks or review local strategies - these can be reviewed via other separate products -

- Local/county strategic framework review
- Training programmes covering, county lines, modern slavery, gangs
- Town centre management plans and case studies
- 5-day local strategy peer review

Find out more at <http://vvu-online.com>

You may wish to consider the implications of the Freedom of Information Act. Comments made in this report reflect the views and perceptions of interviewees, and the commissioning body may consider that it is not appropriate for public dissemination.



3 The interviews

Focus groups

Focus group 1 – Adult and Children's Safeguarding

This group was made up of a mixture of Adult and Children safeguarding managers. Within the group were three front line social workers from both areas. The group started by detailing the governance arrangements for adults and children. There were clear lines of governance within the structure that was outlined and there did appear to be cross-pollination of information between the various boards and functions in relation to wider safeguarding but not necessarily in relation to serious organised crime (SOC) work.

The safeguarding children's partnership had taken significant steps to ensure that workforce development had been addressed in relation to county lines exploitation both in a singular targeted capacity but also embedded into other training events. The group advised that this had been delivered to a range of partners.

The group were less able to articulate the nature of presenting SOC issues for themselves in terms of a profile. They did say that they were an import area, in terms of children being trafficked in but stated that there was NOT current evidence that children were being exploited locally. They did say that they had received information regarding a cohort of ten local children from the newly appointed analyst that is funded via Trusted Relationships.

They were not aware of the number of mapped organised crime groups (OCGs) operating within their local area or what these OCG's were concerned with. They said they knew that there were nominals from Liverpool, Manchester and Sheffield operating locally and that children are trafficked into their area from these urban centres. They considered their response to these children upon detection was good but were concerned that the response from home authorities was, on occasion, less comprehensive.

None of the group were aware of any serious organised crime meeting or organised crime group meetings and none attended any of these. The group advised that the police had not shared a profile of serious organised crime for their area with them. Their working relationships with neighbouring authorities were considered to be an area of strength by the group and they articulated a number of cross border activities in relation to exploited children.

The group were well versed in the national picture in relation to county lines activity and the children's social care managers were able to identify best practice examples in relation to safeguarding of vulnerable children in relation to CSE. Children safeguarding reported positive working relationships at a case level in relation to children with the police, housing and education. They reported regular multi agency exploitation case discussions in relation to children that occur weekly and felt that these added strength to safeguarding arrangements.

In relation to adult safeguarding the members demonstrated an awareness of the complex issues surrounding transition of child to adult services and also the complexities in terms of those adults where safeguarding is identified during adulthood. They advised that a review of transitional arrangements is due to take place to address some of the barriers in relation to this.

Those working with adults articulated that there had been a rise in serious violence perpetrated against adults and spoke of a number of cases where cuckooing had been a

concern. In relation to this they spoke positively in terms of links to police in these instances.

However, one member of the group considered that in relation to housing there was progress to be made in order to support residents in areas where they do not feel able to report concerns for fear of reprisals. One member of the group advised that having a high proportion of Air BNB properties could potentially present a risk for them in terms of not knowing who is in the properties.

Childrens social care reported that it does not have a MASH but does operate a co-located arrangement which aids information sharing and decision making. This will be subject to review and potential change in the coming months. The Trusted Relationships project sits within prevention and early help but offers support to children across the full threshold of need. The project seeks to provide mentoring to children at risk of or experiencing exploitation.

All parties were aware of the Multi Agency Child Exploitation Missing Meeting - MACEMM arrangements and considered that this meeting would offer good multi agency solutions and management to children. Missing had been absorbed into MACEMM as well due to recognising the intrinsic links between missing and exploitation.

The group spoke positively about close working relationships with a range of agencies and attributed this to knowing each other due to York being a small authority. They did acknowledge however that relying on individual working relationships as opposed to strong protocols and procedures can lead to a loss of direction should individuals leave. The focus for identification of children at risk of exploitation lay with the local area teams which sit with localities. This did not appear to be co-ordinated or organised in terms of SOC strategy however.

One member of the group clearly identified that the governance and mantra of the partnership was to view individuals as victims and offer support by any means. This view she said had been further cemented by a letter from the chair of the children's safeguarding partnership to the chair of Safer York partnership articulating this point. Screening tools for CSE were well embedded within the partnership and the group spoke of extending this to CCE as well. Advice was given about the possibility of using the county lines victim tracker for this purpose. The group had been unaware of this tool but felt it could be of use.

The group were keen to say that whilst they know that they do not have the difficulties that are present in other areas of the country they are not complacent to the risk that could be present in relation to county lines activity.

Focus group 2 - Police, Community safety, safeguarding, YOS.

This was a managerial group who were aware of the developing and evolving issue of gangs, county lines and the impact it is starting to have in York. The area is clearly seen by some criminal groups from Manchester, Merseyside, Huddersfield and Sheffield as an area with enough demand to make it worth developing county line networks. This is an evolving criminal enterprise with a new type of criminal exploitation emerging. York is by no means unique in this development with many areas around the county starting to see the same thing.

The police reactive response to county lines seems well informed with a regional agreement with some police force areas impacting York to target organised crime individuals from the other force areas. This is good practice and not yet a national response.

There is a force level serious organised crime county lines plan although this does not appear to have been effectively communicated, understood and delivered at a local partnership operational level. This may simply be a communication issue however, it is essential that all police and wider partners are clear on who owns this issue, what their respective roles are and where governance sits.

This group appear well sighted on the issues York needs to address and are starting to put structures and process in place to help address this growing agenda. A good example of this new work included the formation of a new meeting MACEMM to help understand and identify vulnerability linked to county lines.

The group agreed the need for a multi-agency plan to address the issue and that a clearer partnership informed needs assessment was required. The group also recognised that the current front door for referrals needs to be adapted to address the exploitation linked to this agenda. The threshold for vulnerability and need is currently being reviewed.

Project Shield is seen as an effective response and brand to tackling county lines in York, although it is currently very police focused. Broadening Shield to incorporate all partnership activity will help improve communication between York partners and showcase good news to the community. In many other areas around the UK, this tactic has also helped improve and increase the community intelligence reported on the issue. Some training has been delivered on this agenda, but more consistent and regular training is required for all partners who impact the county lines agenda.

Focus group 3 – Community Safety, Police, Fire Service, ASB

This was a practitioner group that was aware of county lines, stating that there seemed to be a couple of lines into the city which the police were “*on top of*”. The group told us that a number of closure orders had been used over the course of the year, including the use of partial closure orders. It was noted that although the use of closure orders

appeared to deal with cuckooing issues in the short term, over time there was an issue around displacement, with vulnerable adults moving from property to property.

The group noted that although initial drug lines seemed to originate from Manchester, there were now lines from Manchester, Liverpool and South Yorkshire coming into the city, along with an increase in incidents of violence, stabbings and perceptions of knife carrying amongst young people. It was also thought that some local young people / adults were connected to this issue, although the group wasn't aware of any profile / assessment setting out the extent or dynamics of this activity.

The three representatives from the Fire Service covered a range of areas across the county, and stated that the service (from their perspective) had no input / information around gangs and cuckooing, and if they did, wouldn't know who to report this to. This perception however was from a county perspective, and did not necessarily reflect the position in York itself.

It wasn't clear from the group how practitioners make referrals to support agencies around criminal exploitation (cuckooing for example), and a number of examples of how training around this issue could be useful were discussed (Fire Service, Housing joiners etc).

The Disruption Panel was raised as a police run panel to tackle organised crime groups, although it was thought to be mainly reactive in nature. The issue of reactive partnerships was something explored further by the focus group, which although enthusiastic and willing to be part of work to tackle criminal exploitation, appeared to operate without the benefit of a clear understanding of the scale of the problem.

Focus group 4 – Education and Schools

The group was made up of two local authority education representatives and the head of the pupil referral unit. The group began by identifying the various elements of workforce development that had gone into educational establishments. This had been heavily supported by a member of the group whose role it was to develop awareness and deliver training to school staff.

Educational establishments have been trained in local and national guidance. She stated there had been a particular focus on CSE and CCE within the offer made to education. Pastoral leads in schools had been trained in county lines. The group also advised that the Safer York partnership fed information into schools, and that the education safeguarding partnership shared information with the police and communication was good.

One member of the group felt she had a good grasp of the local profile in terms of her knowing they were an 'import' area. The group were not able to articulate any greater level of detail than this however in relation to the SOC picture locally.

They did say that there had been spikes in violence that surrounded 'cuckooed' properties. None of the group felt there had been an increase in children carrying weapons and this had not been seen within an education context.

They were well able to identify indicators and risk factors for children at risk but said this was via training as opposed to having victims present within their schools. The head of the pupil referral unit stated that she had many children within her establishment where they had indicators present. The group stated that county lines was '*very much on our radar*' and that intelligence sharing with the police, YOT and other agencies was an area of strength. The group felt they were not 'complacent' to the risk of county lines.

Education were linked into the newly formed MACEMM meeting and hoped this newest variation of the exploitation panel could attract higher referrals for consideration. They articulated that low referrals and identification had previously been a concern. They spoke of an intelligence sharing form that was used for intelligence sharing purposes and of regular use of this document. The group was able to identify the importance of sharing intelligence in order to gain a richer picture of activity in their area. The group felt that those at risk would potentially come from specific areas of the city and that '*children don't move out their area*' and so a child from one area being found in another would immediately flag concerns with professionals.

The group advised that whilst widely academised at both primary and secondary level this did not impact on relationships or an appetite to work together to reduce exclusions. This was potentially attributable to the academies being 'home grown' as opposed to be of the larger national franchises. The group spoke positively about the three independent schools in their area and how they are keen to be aware of potential concerns and risks for their pupils.

The group advised that they have a schools police officer who is actively engaged in a range of areas including the behaviour and attendance partnership. The group also consider that the local areas teams were well placed to support children who may be at risk.

Overall the group considered that there was strong operational practice and appetite to address exploitation of children. However, all the group considered that this was a '*very good bottom up approach*' and that this was not supported via a strategic framework. They said '*it's not strategic its operational*'.

The group were not clear in terms of the layers of policing that supported SOC and said that in their organisation there did not appear to be a clear infrastructure like there is for PREVENT etc. In addition to this they were concerned that the messages were not getting through to parents and that more activity in this area was necessary.

Focus group 5 - Criminal justice

This group was again mainly senior managers within the National Probation Service, Community Rehabilitation Company and YOT, with some front-line practitioners from ASB and YOS.

The group were aware of the growing issue of county lines and the links to violence, vulnerability and exploitation in York and also covered other areas in the region where the same issue was being seen. They have seen a growth in the well-known tactic of cuckooing vulnerable adults.

The early help structure has three local area hubs in vulnerable locations in York and supports families and vulnerable people linked to this agenda. It appears well respected and effective in identifying threat, risk and harm linked to this area, it will take referrals from social care, police and the front door. It has recognised that the current front door, social care and early help risk assessment requires a refocus to incorporate criminal exploitation and this work is ongoing. This group currently appears not to have a tasking or coordinating process for any actions agreed during the hub meetings.

Additional training on the agenda of gangs, county lines and modern slavery is required by front line practitioners who recognised the churn of staff was a barrier to maintaining knowledge and skills in this area.

Some of this group are linked to a strategic response, but recognised that a number of strategic groups are also looking at elements of the agenda in silos, creating the potential for gaps and duplication. There is an ongoing review within Probation/CRC looking at crossovers between various boards on county lines and exploitation and this should be encouraged and supported by an agreed owner within an agreed overall governance board.

Developing closer working relationships with secure estate and establishments like Barton Moss secure children's home and Wetherby young offenders institute would be useful and could help understand this agenda better.

The IOM board has adopted violent offenders as well as acquisitive crime nominals and this should be aligned to the new MACEMM to prevent duplication of partnership effort. It was agreed reviewing meeting structures and terms of references /membership for each meeting may help reduce staff demand and improve

understanding of the interconnectivity of this agenda on the following partnership groups –

- ASB meeting
- Complex case meeting
- MACEMM
- IOM

Focus group 6 – Housing, Public Protection and Licensing

The group were all aware of county lines and criminal exploitation, and could give examples of where housing staff and external workers such as taxi drivers had received training. Regarding cuckooing, it was said that a major issue is around displacement of the problem and proving that someone had been cuckooed. It was also noted that more connectivity between agencies would be helpful around cuckooing and work to tackle the problem – for example police teams were putting in doors of York properties without contacting the housing staff prior to the operation, causing a number of issues with neighbourhoods and costs (it was also noted that in some cases joiners could provide access without the need to break the door down).

Cuckooing was known to be a problem within properties managed by York, but the problem was not known about in private sector housing provision.

The group told us that police via the Disruption Panel were *“quite clear about the need to disrupt cuckooed properties in order to disrupt drug dealing”*. This has to be managed carefully as elsewhere in the country similar disruption activity has simply moved the problem into open street markets, away from cuckooed properties.

It was thought that there could be better join up between agencies (and also between police teams), and Trading Standards staff outlined how although they are often asked to participate in operations to tackle gangs and county lines (amongst other things), national priorities set by the HSE focus on health and hygiene. This makes it difficult for TS to take part in enforcement / joint operations, although they will still consider requests.

Another example of a perceived lack of join up between the police was given involving operations led by the ROCU who didn't always talk to the local neighbourhood police teams. This caused concern as housing and other staff might have cause to visit certain properties and tenancies without knowing the *“risk behind the door”*.

Director, Children, Education and Communities

This was a single interview.

There is a clear commitment and motivation in York to work collaboratively to help understand and tackle this emerging and evolving issue. There is a lot of work currently ongoing to review practice and involve the full range of partners. The police SMT are leading this step change and council SMT appear fully committed.

It is recognised that York's response is a work in progress but there seems a clear direction of travel and a willingness to learn and adapt to this changing model of crime and exploitation. It is recognised that a wider response is needed from all stakeholders including transport police, travel services and night-time economy staff to fully understand and tackle this ever-changing dynamic. Other parts of the county have seen a rise in local universities being targeted by gangs and an increase in health, drug use, violence, damage and debt issues linked to this agenda. This should be considered from a York perspective.

A step change was discussed as a potential process required to help York and its partners understand and tackle this issue in order to maintain York's reputation as a safe city. The step change should begin with the findings of the ongoing reviews being addressed by a local task and finish group supported by all relevant partners. This group could also help introduce and imbed the finding of this locality review, prioritising –

- A consistent and clear awareness and training package.
- A multi-agency needs assessment, to help address information sharing.
- A strategy agreed by all partners.
- A multi-agency operational plan.
- Clear local and county governance group.

Focus group 7 – Health and Substance misuse

This group were very much aware to the problem, although noted that they didn't know the true scale and extent of the problem. It was felt that there had been significant awareness raising of criminal exploitation at a senior level, but perhaps not so much for practitioners. It was also said that although previously there may have been denial that a city such as York would have a problem with criminal exploitation, this was not the case now.

There was strong agreement with the need for a needs assessment in order to properly scope out the nature of the risk, threat and harm inherent within gangs and criminal exploitation. It was accepted that drug markets were responsible for significant rises in violence, and that there was a need locally to better understand drug markets and what this meant for criminal exploitation.

There was discussion about how gangs nationally attempted to distort and alter local drug markets and drug usage, and it was noted that in some parts of the city

substance misuse workers were aware of gangs only selling heroin if the buyer also bought crack cocaine too - "*can't buy brown without buying white*".

It was felt by the group that senior managers from across a range of agencies needed to drive this agenda by making a series of decisions around the need for a better understanding of the issue and governance arrangements. It was also stated that tackling this problem would require very good links between children and adult safeguarding boards.

Focus group 8 – Voluntary and Community

The group was made up of members of a team that adopts a person centred and placed based approach to building resilience in communities and making places safer. The team is made up of 8 local area co-ordinators. They are a distinct unit of which there are 11 sites nationally. Whilst they work alongside the local area teams they are not part of them. They stated that people often confuse the two different functions.

The group advised that the purpose of their role is to be very neutral, they need to have trust in the communities in which they work and they need to be able to 'walk alongside' those that they support.

They considered that they were integral to increasing the sense of social inclusion in the city and that this was driven by the council's priority for reducing loneliness and social isolation. This has been a priority for a number of years and there has been significant investment in addressing these key concerns. This investment means that whilst historically there was not movement out of these communities then this was no longer the case. One member of the group stated that this was clear in relation to children and that social media and other developments meant that children were now transient across the city regardless of where they lived.

The group spoke of significant investment in empowering the homeless and addiction communities and gave an example of 'postcards from the edge, invisible York and minimum control' which gave opportunities to these communities locally. None of the group were aware of what the SOC profile for the area was and some of the group felt that it would have no bearing on them in any event.

Regular ward meetings are held but SOC was never discussed by the police at these meetings in terms of profile of ward concerns. One member of the group considered that York was not affected by SOC. Several group members recognised 'cuckooing' as a presenting issue in their communities. They stated that housing responses to those individuals was strong. Group members said that they knew where to go for help and support if needed in these circumstances.

Further discussion revealed that they were concerned that having the information regarding SOC activity within their dedicated communities may alter the manner in which they support the community. One example given was that if a community felt unable to use a green space due to antisocial or criminal behaviour taking place there then routinely the action would be to attempt to positively take back that space. If the LAC was aware of OCG activity linked to that it may interfere with that process. Due to needing to have trust in the communities in which they work they considered that sharing intelligence with the police could provide a conflict of interest. One member of the group was aware of the intelligence sharing document created by the police but said that this was due to her previous role and that she had not used it in her current role.

Two members of the group had attended training delivered by the police around SOC activity in their areas. Addresses of concern had been shared as well as nominal details. They considered that whilst interesting they left the meeting not knowing what to do with the information. The group were open minded in terms of their manager having this detail and then providing them with high level detail of activity in their areas. The manager could see the potential benefits of this also.

Another concern was the low level of 'introductions' made by the police to them. All parties felt that an increase in this type of activity by the police could positively impact the communities in which they work. They considered that this could be particularly useful in terms of low level or early concerns.

4 Summary

A desire for change was evident amongst most of those we talked to. A need to better understand the problem was also evident. These are the foundations that we feel any approach needs to initially have in place. We have also particularly emphasised details from focus groups 1 & 4, as although these groups appeared to understand some of the issue and were carrying out work, neither appeared to be well linked into the SOC partnership. This should be a focus and stated desire of more collaborative work.

From those we talked to, there was a sense that various police units are driving this work but the SOC partnership is not succeeding at the moment in getting all partners on board, especially those connected to safeguarding and communities. However, we also were told that there wasn't complacency across York and its partnerships with regards to how this issue is tackled and recognised, so there is a need perhaps for clarity around how criminal exploitation is understood, managed both strategically and operationally.

At the moment no clear multi agency strategy and/or operational delivery plan is in place. If agreed, this could be aligned to the SOC strategy and provide some clarity around the partnership ask of how they support the 4P response, perhaps locally managed by the new MACEMM.

For example, a number of other things were raised consistently by the groups during the day –

- The drug market locally is not really understood and how it is a significant driver of violence.
- The need for a common language around serious youth violence. For example, safeguarding as a term means different things to different staff, dependent on their work and the approach of their particular agency.
- There appears to be (at least from those we talked to) a lack of understanding of the make-up and numbers of the cohort of young people at risk of perpetrating violence or becoming a victim (or both). *This in itself is a key piece of work.*

National practice tells us that these issues should not be led by police, but by health and social care agencies. Senior managers talked about the need for a step change in how this issue is understood and tackled across the city. We believe this is the right thing to do, and there is a need to put a name to and jointly understand what most of the focus groups described to us during the day, especially those with practitioners. The Violence and Vulnerability Unit (VUU) are calling this community harm and exploitation, and it requires new ways of working, thinking and engagement, both with partner agencies and the community.

County lines and gang violence should be understood and placed into a group of exploitative crime types like child sexual abuse and modern slavery. This is a relatively new paradigm of serious crime, whereby groups of offenders (usually men), exploit vulnerable children and adults physically, sexually and financially. Sometimes it looks like CSE, sometimes like modern slavery, knife crime and sometimes like county lines. There is almost always a link and cross over between these crime types and it makes no sense to look at them and attempt to tackle them in silos.

There is no short-term fix to this, and this needs long term commitment above all else, planning and some resources. This long-term approach applies to partnership working just as much as work with vulnerable young people and adults.

Involving communities and young people is part of the answer – although this is the exception in the UK at the moment, and not the norm. At the moment the practitioners and co-ordinators we talked to in group 8 clearly do not see that they have a big role to play here, perhaps for cultural reasons around relationships with communities and enforcement agencies such as police. However, it's everybody's business to tackle criminal exploitation and so perhaps the need for a common language around how York plans to approach and tackle the problem is required, a common language and understanding that all groups and agencies can sign up for.

There is perhaps also a need within the city for the Adult Safeguarding Board to consider its role around vulnerable adults currently exploited by gangs via cuckooing. There is work to tackle the issue ongoing, but a couple of groups we talked to felt that at the moment the problem around cuckooing is being displaced around the city. This may be behind the perception from focus group 2 that street based drug dealing was increasing – this is exactly what you would expect to see as a result of enforcement work to tackle cuckooing, as the shopfront (which is all a cuckooed property is in effect) moves from the private to the public realm (street dealing). We have seen this occur before in other areas of the UK, and any potential cause and effect of actions to tackle county lines and exploitation needs to be carefully considered as a result.

The city clearly has strong and determined leadership, evidenced via our interviews during the day with senior officers, and this was reinforced by the other groups. The need for a step change approach as to how York understands the issue and then collectively tackles the problem is the correct course – together, via the community, health agencies, voluntary sector, police and judicial agencies and of course local authority.

5 Recommendations

The VVU has a range of expertise across the spectrum to support you to implement these recommendations, along with possible match funding from the Home Office.

- **Consider the production of an informed needs assessment** that enables, amongst other things, an understanding of violence and abuse contextualised within the context of drug trade associated violence, gang-based violence, an understanding of county line / drug markets, links to serious youth violence and violence for those aged >25. It should also look at estimating the numbers of young people involved in and around criminal exploitation who are not currently known to services or safeguarding agencies. Public Health have a major role here in terms of understanding the nature of the drug demand locally (and the implications on resources going forward), as do housing agencies, secure estate and local schools etc. We can provide a term of reference for an analysts group and suggested data collection set if required.

This will help address information sharing. A clear information collection plan with all key partners will help identify gaps and barriers to efficient information exchange.

- **Produce a local criminal exploitation delivery plan, along with a strategy** agreed by all partners. One of the main purposes of this should be to ensure that local processes and joint working is as effective as it can be. Make sure that this delivery plan is linked to the SOC plan and any regional strategy. Also develop and expand the brand "Shield" to the wider partnership group. Consider working closely with the CCG in delivering this aim as the vulnerability linked to this type of crime is exploitative and linked to the health of York residents.
- **Clear local and county governance group.** Review the meeting structure and terms of references to support the ambition to de-clutter the number of meetings that look at vulnerability and exploitation. Agree a clear governance structure that informs the other strategic boards. Consider a partnership briefing and case study day to improve local knowledge, communication and clearly define partners ask. This can lead to a day/week of partnership action - supported by the VVU team.
- **If there is evidence of young people locally being recruited / groomed by gangs, consider introducing contextual safeguarding as a shared approach** amongst all partners to protect young people subject or vulnerable to exploitation and abuse in public spaces. Contextual safeguarding is about making people safe in communities, outside of the domestic setting by finding and dealing with abuse in a social or group setting. Consider embedding criminal exploitation within safeguarding at a local level on equivalent status to CSE/familial abuse. This should include the need for clear referral routes enabling frontline staff to respond to young people and adults acting out or who are vulnerable to criminal exploitation. This should lead to a better assessment of vulnerability.
- **Consider the importance of shared language, and shared learning.** Different words around the agenda of criminal exploitation have different meanings for each agency. This will require a common lexicon around what is collectively meant by safeguarding, prevention, enforcement, criminal exploitation, joint working, governance and the involvement of community and VCS groups.
- **A programme of multi-agency training in the area of county lines and the associated vulnerability subjects would be useful and desirable,** in order to ensure that most practitioners across a range of agencies are aware of the problem and how to report it. The Violence and Vulnerability Unit currently offer online training around this matter to build knowledge , identify risk and help address staff churn for a range of practitioners. <http://vvu-online.com/#training>

6 Visits, links and cross over

- Join the Basecamp group and Home Office monthly teleconference to share practice and innovation
- Consider a community asset register -Telford have a good example to learn from
- Review findings from the serious case review in Newcastle (exploitation of adults)
- Consider a visit to the Telford Harm Hub
- Review community engagement via the SOC community coordinators practice - Brighton
- Consider the Northampton area who have rolled out trauma informed training to all police and practitioners - Ealing are also rolling out best practice for a trauma informed model.
- Look at the Telford/Grimsby CE response.
- Croydon have a data analyst who provides a gold standard product on this agenda and is given access to social media and other key data systems. Wandsworth do have a data sharing agreement with police in place so there appears no reason why information sharing can't be extended to analyst role.

7 Ongoing support

Learning from the gang and youth violence programme is shared via the Gang and Youth Violence Special Interest Group and can be access by the Home Office tackling crime unit and Basecamp online site. **The VVU can also provide additional support to assist with the introduction and implementation of our recommendations, funded via the Home office.**

<https://basecamp.com/2308334/projects/12421689>

<https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/county-lines-criminal-exploitation-of-children-and-vulnerable-adults>

Contacts to discuss the recommendations and support any future work are -

Mick McNally
michaelcmcnally1@gmail.com

Paul Cullen
sgoservices@outlook.com

or visit <http://vvu-online.com>

In their Pocket

"Once you have started you are in their pocket and lose control over your own life. You become a slave."





**Health, & Adult Social Care Policy & Scrutiny
Committee****28 October 2019**

Report of the Assistant Director – Legal & Governance

**Social Rented housing on new developments – Referral from the Area
Planning Sub Committee****Summary**

1. This report informs Members about a referral from the 5 September 2019 Area Planning Committee meeting to this Committee to consider the impact of service charges on the delivery of social rented housing by housing associations through the planning gain process.
2. To further inform members about this topic the Chair of this Committee has also submitted a topic request form at Annex 1 suggesting the committee to consider the effectiveness of the Council's current planning policies for the delivery of affordable housing on private housing developments.

Background

3. On the recently approved development on the Terry's site, it was noted at the Area Planning Committee on the 5th September that no Housing Association or Registered Provider had taken up the affordable housing allocation. It was suggested by some Members that service charges and management costs contributed to this situation which undermines intended mixed tenure provisions and social housing delivery in council planning policy documents on affordable housing.
4. The York Central development is estimated to generate 2,500 new homes with 500 of these to be provided through planning obligations around affordable housing. As it is expected that most of these will be apartments the issues raised here are especially pertinent to that application.
5. CYC has committed to developing 600 new homes across York in 8 council owned locations:
 - Lowfield Green

- Duncombe Barracks
 - Askham Bar
 - Former Manor School
 - Hospital Fields Road and Ordnance Road Lane
 - Clifton Without Primary School
 - Woolnough House
6. The housing delivery programme has as a key aim of “building accommodation suitable for a wide range of households, meeting a full range of affordable housing. Affordable housing commuted sums paid in lieu of onsite homes constitute an important part of the funding for this programme.

Planning Policy regarding Affordable Housing

7. As the local planning authority, CYC under the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the policies of its submitted Local Plan ensure that new developments given planning permission with 15 or more units deliver on site affordable housing under planning obligations. Brownfield sites must provide 20% affordable housing and Greenfield sites 30%.
8. Smaller sites may have an obligation to provide an offsite commuted sum in respect of affordable housing, in accordance with the NPPF and Local Plan policies
9. Housing Associations and Registered Providers are identified in the Local Plan as key delivery partners of affordable housing.
10. The Local Plan sets out the types, tenure mix and provision mix of affordable housing. Affordable housing includes social rented and intermediate housing with a ratio informed by the Strategic Housing Market Assessment of 80% Social and affordable rented and 20% intermediate split. Intermediate housing comprises low cost home ownership tenures including the council’s preferred Discount Sale, shared ownership and Rent to Buy.
11. The Local Plan states that affordable homes are pro rata of the market homes based on local need, integrated with “tenure build” layouts contribute to a sustainable community, making homes on sites indistinguishable from one another on market grounds. Pepper potting of

affordable homes in a development is encouraged on the grounds of integration.

12. There are examples of housing developments in other parts of the country that physically segregate less well-off tenants from wealthy homebuyers by forcing them to use separate entrances, or “poor doors”, in blocks of apartments. This is not considered acceptable under the CYC Local Plan and would undermine efforts to create and encourage an inclusive and mixed community of residents in new housing developments.
13. The exception to pepper potting is apartment blocks if they are to be transferred freehold to registered providers, for reasons discussed below.
14. Although affordable housing on developments above the 15 homes threshold are expected to be on site, however if it is robustly justified a commuted sum may be paid in lieu to the council. The commuted sums are calculated as the difference between the transfer price and the market value of the specific home (s) on that site using the following formula, as the estimated cost of providing the homes elsewhere:
15. Affordable housing commuted sum = market value of affordable homes - affordable transfer value of homes
16. For example, if 10x affordable apartments cannot be provided on site and have a market value of £200,000 each, and an affordable transfer value of £75,000 each:
17. Affordable housing commuted sum = (10 x £200,000) – (10 x £75,000) = £1.25m.

Use of Commuted sums

18. Section 106 agreements are negotiated between a developer and council to help make new home schemes more attractive to communities. It can be used to help provide affordable housing as well as roads, parks and youth services
19. CYC is currently using section 106 receipts to develop and build affordable housing itself, with 58 homes for council rent and 9 for shared ownership completed over the past 5 years. Affordable housing expenditure as a result of commuted sums is as follows:

Affordable housing commuted sums 2014/15 – 2018-19	
S106 funding received	£3,765,622.34

Received funds spent on affordable housing programme	£1,826,478.30
Approved capital programme via commuted sums	£2,418,522

Management Service charges

20. Currently service charges on new developments are dependent on a number of factors including maintenance and service expectations by new purchasers in the private sector as well as the council's own expectations around high quality homes. Whilst some of these can be covered by Housing Benefit / Universal Credit, this is not always the case, especially for more expensive charges.
21. For apartments aimed at the high value end of the market expensive service charges can cover maintenance of large entrance and indoor communal areas, costly management of external gardens, and other facilities. If the Housing Association does not own the freehold of the whole block, these will be arranged by a management company and the Housing Association has little control over the charges. In addition to the cost of rent or a mortgage on a Discount Sale property it is not uncommon for residents to pay substantial service charges, which can be unaffordable for residents on low income. For the Hungate scheme where recent phases have provided an offsite commuted sum contribution, typical service charges are in the region of £1,500-2,000/year.
22. Housing Associations have made clear that they are unable to take on apartments with significant service charges without owning the freehold and having control of the service charges. An effective design approach can also minimise charges by avoiding unnecessarily costly maintenance features. This is an approach taken in many developments across the UK, including apartment schemes considered to represent national best practice.

Key delivery partners

23. As per the Local Plan, key CYC partners in the delivery of affordable housing are Housing Associations who are usually non-profit making organisations providing a range of accommodation for rent (and in some cases purchase, including Discount Sale and shared ownership).

24. CYC 'nominate' (put forward) tenants to these homes in accordance with the section 106 agreement; terms, conditions, size, type and location of homes vary from one scheme to another. A full list of CYC Housing Association partners can be found at Annex 2.

Completion of council housing

Development	Homes delivered
Fenwick Street	8 apartments
Pottery Lane	6 houses
Lindsay House	14 apartments
Beckfield Lane	9 houses 9 flats
Hewley Avenue	8 flats
Ex right to buy repurchase scheme	4 houses
CYC 2 nd hand and off the shelf purchases for shared ownership	4 houses 5 flats

Consultation

25. This report has been produced after meetings held with officers from the Housing and Development Services team.

Relevance and Feasibility

26. In 2015 the NHBC Foundation and Homes and Communities Agency published 'Tenure integration in housing developments', which considered the success of different approaches to mixed-tenure developments. It found that:
- Financing is the main barrier to mixed tenure development.
 - If the design and quality of the overall development is to a high standard, property prices are not necessarily affected.

- A wider range of typologies and unit sizes enables people to move from one type to another and so stabilises neighbourhoods.
- Management structures and costs should be agreed before building commences.
- The boom of the private rented sector and buy to let has changed the anticipated tenure mix.

- Of the back of the 2015 report, CYC has carried out its own research in order to further understand the challenges of creating mixed tenure and reducing service charges to ensure affordability on new developments for those on low income. The result of the research found the following:
 - Whilst some tensions are inevitable, mixed tenure development carries with it less stigma and is normally a far better solution than exclusive living in marketing terms.
 - It requires well considered design and layout solutions from the outset, backed up with thorough management and maintenance plans.
 - Inclusivity doesn't have to mean literal pepper potting throughout apartment blocks. Shared entrances, public spaces, play areas and access to community facilities can help to encourage healthy interaction and ease tensions.
 - Service charges can be lowered through considered design and by having a menu of services which residents can opt in or out of.

Options

The Committee can

- i. Consider whether it wishes to look in more detail at the issues raised in this report in light of the referral from Area Planning Sub-Committee and of Cllr Fenton's specific topic request; or;
- ii. Decide that no further work is required on the issues raised either in this report or Cllr Fenton's topic request.

Analysis

27. From 2013-14 to the present, there have been 44 flats and 102 houses completed as affordable housing through the section 106 planning provisions. Of these flats, 42 were located in 3 blocks:
 - Former York College site – 16
 - Shipton Street former school – 6
 - Terrys / The Chocolate Works – 20
28. By comparison, affordable housing commuted sums were provided in respect of a total of 93 apartments that would have been required as affordable housing through the planning process. 81 of those were apartment blocks at the Hungate site.
29. There have not been any houses 'lost' from onsite provision in this way.
30. Most of the Hungate development has comprised large 5-8 storey blocks where multiple conversations with Registered Providers made clear that the affordable housing could not be provided on site. Due to the size and layout of the block it was impossible to achieve a suitable freehold transfer for affordable housing, so commuted sums of £1.5m-£3m have been agreed for each phase (dependent on the number and type of apartments).
31. Of the schemes where a commuted sum was agreed in lieu of onsite affordable housing, there were a variety of factors such as listed building status and specialist older people's provision which resulted in their unsuitability to deliver on site affordable housing.
32. Additionally there are planning law requirements which can reduce the affordable housing contribution to a low level where it is not practical to provide onsite, principally the viability review process and the Vacant Building Credit.
33. Viability reviews are a long standing process where the developer provides evidence that it is not viable to provide the policy level of affordable housing – so the development could not go ahead without a reduction.
34. The Vacant Building Credit was introduced by the government in recent years and provides a substantial reduction in affordable housing for vacant building floor space, including in cases where the affordable housing policy could have been viably delivered.

35. Developers also now have Permitted Development Rights to convert office buildings into apartments, and no affordable housing can be secured in these cases.
36. The Local Plan policies and NPPF are used to engage developers at an early stage, ideally through the pre-application process, to maximise the affordable housing contribution and to achieve a design which facilitates on site delivery wherever possible.

Council Plan

37. The Council is currently reviewing and consulting upon its new Council Plan for 2019-23. It is scheduled to be considered by the Executive at its meeting on 24 October. The Plan will, no doubt, contain suitable priorities in relation to housing matters.

Implications

38. There are no financial, human resources, equalities, Legal, crime and disorder, property of other implications arising from the recommendations in this report.

Risk Management

39. There are no risks associated with the recommendations in this report.

Conclusions

40. According to the research undertaken by CYC, experience shows that the longer a scheme takes, the likelier that the actual mix will change from initial expectations. One example is if houses built for sale fail to attract individual purchasers, then the developer may choose to sell to housing associations or other bodies which will rent out, thereby essentially altering the mix from planned allocation
41. Mixed tenure estates and properties are now the norm for many developers looking to develop on brownfield or greenfield sites with an obligation to conform to planning policy that promotes balanced and sustainable communities.
42. But competing interests – those of private owners, tenants living in affordable homes for rent, and businesses/commercial interests all on the

same development – can lead to significant policy and legal difficulties for landlords and owners.

43. The pitfalls often centre on the competing expectations of owners and tenants around service levels and related cost expectations. It is vital, therefore, for estate managers and housing officers to be able to navigate their way around leases whether shared ownership or outright, tenancy agreements and other occupancy agreements, so as to ensure a well-managed estate. This is greatly facilitated by the Housing Association taking freehold ownership of the block.

Recommendations

44. That Members to comment on the issues raised within this report and Cllr Fenton's topic request and consider whether to undertake a more detailed review is merited and if so to set an appropriate remit for consideration.

Reason: To comply with Scrutiny protocols and procedures.

Contact Details

Author:

David McLean
Scrutiny Officer
Tel: 01904 551800
david.mclean@york.gov.uk

Chief Officer Responsible for the report:

Dawn Steel
Head of Democratic Service
Tel: 01904 551004

Report Approved *tick* **Date** 26/10/2018

Wards Affected: *List wards or tick box to indicate all*

All

For further information please contact the author of the report

Further reading

Grenfell Tower: Social Housing resident reveals segregation of rich in Luxury apartments

Annexes

Annex 1 Topic Request Form by Cllr Fenton

Annex 2 List of Housing Associations working Partnership with CYC

Abbreviations

CYC- City of York Council

NFFP- National Planning Policy Framework

NHBC- National House Building Council

RP- Registered Provider

Annex 1

SCRUTINY TOPIC REGISTRATION / ASSESSMENT FORM FOR COUNCILLORS

What is the broad topic area?

The effectiveness of the current approach whereby a proportion of homes in a new development are allocated for social rent

Ambitions for the review

To better understand what the current approach is, how it is functioning and whether it is delivering the anticipated outcomes

What remit would you propose for your topic

The review should cover the council's current approach and its application in relation to:

- *The delivery of homes for social rent resulting from the granting of planning permission for a new development*
- *The delivery of homes for discounted sale resulting from the granting of planning permission for a new development*
- *The use of commuted sums resulting from the granting of planning permission for a new development*
- *The council's working relationship with housing associations in relation to the allocation of properties for social rent resulting from the granting of planning permission for a new development*
- *The scale of service charges payable by occupants of social rented properties*
- *What barriers exist that make it difficult for housing associations to take up affordable housing contributions and what policy options could help to overcome any barriers*
- *The broader issue of how Section 106 monies are used in relation to affordable homes*

Please indicate how the review would be in the public or Council's interest?

Anecdotal evidence suggests that some apartments allocated for social rent are not being let due to prohibitive service charges. It would be in the public's

and council’s interest to better understand the reasons for this and the impact. It would also be of interest to understand what steps could be taken to ensure that the numbers of properties anticipated to be made available for social rent are realised, either on the site of new developments or elsewhere via the payment of commuted sums

Supporting Information:

Referral from 5 September 2019 Area Planning Committee to the Housing and Community Safety Policy and Scrutiny Committee:

DRAFT MINUTE No 21a

Members raised concerns around the number of houses offered as rentable social housing. Mr Keogh confirmed that two of the 34 apartments had been offered to the Housing Association, however, there had not been any take up on this offer. Members considered that this was due to excessive prohibitive service charges. In response to questions regarding what would happen if there were no take up from the Housing Association, Mr Keogh explained that this would then be offered to another Housing Association.....

....In response to questions from Members regarding the social housing take up in relation to excessive prohibitive service charges and how to mitigating this problem, the Development Manager acknowledged that this was a concern and that there was uncertainty on how to mitigate this. Members suggested that this may be something that the Housing and Community Safety Policy and Scrutiny Committee could consider.

Officers Feedback on Topic Proposal

- 1. Does it have a potential impact on one or more sections of the population? **Yes** **No**
- 2. Is it a corporate priority or concern to the council’s partners? **Yes** **No**
- 3. Will the review add value and lead to effective outcomes? **Yes** **No**
- 4. Is it timely, and do we have the resources? **Yes** **No**
- 5. Will the review duplicate other work? **Yes** **No**

If the answer is ‘Yes’ to questions 1 – 4 and ‘No’ to question 5, then the Committee may decide to proceed with the review. To decide how best to carry out the review, the Committee may need advice on the following:

1) Who and how shall we consult

i.e. who do we need to consult and why? is there already any feedback from customers and/or other consultation groups that we need to take account of?

2) Do we need any experts/specialists (internal/external)

i.e. is the review dependent on specific teams, departments or external bodies? What impact will the review have on the work of any of these?

3) What other help do we need E.g. training/development/resources

i.e. what information do we need and who will provide it? what do we need to undertake this review e.g. specific resources, events, meetings etc?

4) Does this review relate to any other ongoing projects or depend on them for anything?

5) How long should it take

i.e. does the timings of completion of the review need to coincide with any other ongoing or planned work

This page is intentionally left blank

Annex 2

List of Housing Associations and Registered Providers in York

Abbeyfield

Anchor Trust

Accent Group

Riverside (York)

Habinteg Housing Association

Housing and Care21

Hanover Housing Association

Homegroup

Joseph Rowntree Housing Trust

MHA Care Group

Places for People

Railway Housing Association

Tees Valley Housing - Part of the Thirteen Group

York Housing Association

Yorkshire Housing

This page is intentionally left blank

Housing and Community Safety Policy and Scrutiny Committee

Draft Work Plan 2019-20

Monday 24 June 2019 @ 5.30pm	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Arrangements for Scrutiny in York 2. Attendance of Assistant Director for Housing and Safer Neighbourhoods – Service areas 3. Draft Work Plan
Monday 22 July 2019 @ 5.30pm	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Attendance of Executive Member for Housing and Safer Neighbourhoods 2. Year End Finance and Performance Monitoring Report 3. Housing Delivery Programme- Design Manual 4. Older Persons Accommodation Needs Update 5. Work Plan
Monday 23 September 2019 @ 5.30pm	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Housing Revenue Account Update Report 2. Decent Homes Standards 3. Work Plan
Monday 28 October 2019 @ 5.30pm	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Safer York Partnership bi annual Report 2. County Lines update report and round table discussion 3. Work Plan
Monday 25 November 2019 @ 5.30pm	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Housing Needs and Availability update 2. Housing Standards in the Private Rental Sector 3. Work Plan
Monday 23 December 2019 @ 5.30pm	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Analysis of Housing Allocation Policy 2. 6 Monthly Finance and Performance monitoring report 3. Work Plan
Monday 27 January 2020	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Work Plan 2. HMO implementation update

@ 5.30pm	
Monday 24 February 2020 @ 5.30pm	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Temporary Accommodation- Street homeless, winter provision 2. Environmental Retrofitting 3. Work Plan
Monday 23 March 2020 @ 5.30pm	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Safer York Partnership Bi-annual Report 2. Work Plan
Monday 20 April 2020 @ 5.30pm	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Work Plan
Monday 18 May 2020 @ 5.30pm	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Work Plan