



Patrolling the Streets Commission

Commission Members:

Councillor Stephen Morgan
Councillor Darren Sanders
Councillor Clare Whelan

January 2008

Contact for enquiries:

Byron R Green
Lead Scrutiny Officer

London Borough of Lambeth
Scrutiny Team
Room 200, Town Hall
Brixton Hill
London SW2 1RW

email – bgreen@lambeth.gov.uk
telephone – 020 7926 2510
website – <http://www.lambeth.gov.uk>

Contents

Contents	3
Commission foreword	5
Executive Summary & Recommendations	6
Section 1 - Introduction.....	9
Background to this review	9
Terms of reference	10
Methodology.....	10
Timeline.....	11
Acknowledgments	13
Section 2 - Commission Findings	14
Initial research.....	14
Lambeth warden schemes as at June 2006	14
Rationale for consolidation and expansion of wardens schemes	15
What the consolidation of wardens could achieve in Lambeth.	16
Moving forward with rolling-out wardens schemes	18
Summary of funding secured for wardens schemes for 2006-07	18
Summary of funding sources for wardens proposed for 2007-08	19
An outline of Lambeth warden schemes and costs as at June 2006	19
What describes successful foot patrol initiatives?	20
Local opinion of effective street presence – what the consultation found	21
The abolition of warden schemes and redirection of funding to PCSOs	22
The initial decision	22
Streatham Rangers.....	22
The views of the commission.....	23
Other patrolling forces.....	24
Lambeth on-street presences	25
Operation Freshview	26
PRISM: Public Realm Integrated Services Model.....	27
Section 3 - Conclusion.....	28
Appendices.....	29
Appendix 1: Additional activities found in successful patrolling forces.....	30
Appendix 2: Decisions to cease wardens and divert funds to finance additional PCSOs	31
Cabinet decision, recommendations to cease wardens, January 2008	31
Officer delegated decision, closure of Streatham Community Rangers, 3 October 2007	31
The reallocation of Neighbourhood Renewal Funds	32
Appendix 3: Commission Consultation Responses.....	33

Commission foreword

Keeping people safe is among the highest priorities for any government at any level. Yet, while crime has been coming down in Lambeth under both the last administration and this one, many people do not feel safe. Crime remains the main issue for people in our borough; it is the responsibility of all their representatives to put it right.

'Visible reassurance' - people on the streets and estates – plays a large part in that. This commission was set up to explore how to achieve it. However, during its lifetime, major changes in this area were taken, with warden schemes replaced by seven police community support officers for each of Lambeth's three police subcommands: north Lambeth, Brixton/Clapham and Streatham/Norwood.

This led to significant controversy, not least from people in Streatham who were angry about their warden schemes being replaced. It is too early to assess the effectiveness of these PCSOs independently of other forms of visible reassurance. As the council seeks to take over their funding, this commission proposes such an analysis at the earliest opportunity, especially in those parts of Streatham that had long-established warden schemes.

The warden schemes got a lot of praise, even from those who proposed their abolition. We now need to see how that praise has been translated into action. The Freshview concept can be one such way, and one we welcome. However, it needs to be better targeted and based on evidence. Working with Groundwork can help; as can annual reviews. We propose both.

Another way of making people feel safe is to ensure that people feel comfortable reporting envirocrime and low-level antisocial behaviour, and then seeing that things get done as a result. That applies not to the council, but also to its partners in fighting crime. We propose that PRISM, the Public Realm improvement project, properly considers the links with all patrolling forces in Lambeth, whether employed by Lambeth or not.

This has been a long process and I am grateful to everyone who has helped during it. Particular thanks to Jim Toohill and Ben McKendrick at Lambeth CPCG for their assistance, to my fellow commission members Cllrs Stephen Morgan and Clare Whelan for playing such an active role in our deliberations and to Byron Green and Lambeth's Scrutiny team for putting our discussions all together.

Cllr Darren Sanders
Commission chair

Executive Summary & Recommendations

Members welcomed the widespread recognition that the positive impacts of wardens schemes need to be picked up by other programmes of the Council and its partners.

Members also supported a recommendation arising from the Housing Scrutiny Committee consideration of the call-in of the abolition of the Streatham Rangers Wardens scheme in October 2007: that a review of the effectiveness of PCSOs across the borough as a whole be undertaken and also with a focus on the impact on Estate in Streatham Hill and Streatham Wells wards. The Commission requested the following:

Recommendation 1: That a report to the ECS Scrutiny committee is produced reviewing how the positive impacts of warden schemes have now been taken up by new arrangements since their abolition.

Recommendation 2: That in the report, there is particular focus in the review on the impact of abolition on estates in Streatham Hill and Streatham Wells wards.

Recommendation 3: With the diversion of funds to introduce additional PCSOs across the borough, the commission recommends that a detailed analysis of their functions and effectiveness of PCSOs across the borough as a whole is undertaken and reported to back to ECS Scrutiny.

Members were very positive about the Freshview concept but felt there was a further need to look at the environmental needs of the area, such as community safety, crime and deprivation.

Recommendation 4: Members welcome the adoption of the mini-Freshview approach and recommended that there are future refinements of Freshview which are community and evidenced based.

Recommendation 5: Members recommended that officers investigate working with Groundwork when carrying out Freshview exercises.

Recommendation 6: Members welcome the December 2007 review of Freshview and the inclusion of community safety criteria into the concept and ask that regular reviews of Freshview be undertaken to see how it is working and which include more analysis of the outcomes and impact of Freshview activities.

Members are encouraged by the commencement of the PRISM project as a key priority in the borough corporate plan.

Recommendation 7: It is recommended that the PRISM project takes account of non-Public Realm members of patrolling forces in the borough, both those across

departments and those belonging to partner organisations in the community in order to encourage their engagement in and ease of communication with the reporting systems around problems with the physical environment, anti-social behaviour, crime and similar issues.

Recommendation 8: Members requested that the development and implementation of the PRISM project is monitored in the future work programme of the ECS Scrutiny Committee

Section 1 - Introduction

Background to this review

- 1.1 The National Street Warden Programme (NSWP) was first highlighted in The National Strategy Action Plan for Neighbourhood Renewal, published by the Government's Social Exclusion Unit in January 2001 with the aim to tackle all the complex causes of social exclusion and improve the quality of life in England's most deprived neighbourhoods. The strategy stated that problems could be tackled more effectively through better local co-ordination and community empowerment, with the wardens providing a key link between local agency partnerships that can result in joined-up solutions at a local level.¹
- 1.2 The national wardens programme awarded £91 million, spread over three schemes each lasting for three and a half years. The programme funded 245 schemes nationally with funding ending in March 2006.²
- 1.3 The street warden teams were given the central goal of improving the liveability of deprived areas, specifically through:
- improving the physical appearance of streets;
 - fostering social inclusion;
 - reducing crime and fear of crime; and
 - deterring anti-social behaviour (ASB).
- 1.4 Funding for a number of wardens schemes in Lambeth was agreed by the Council for 2006/07-2007/08 from a number of sources, with the presumption of a roll out and expansion from the existing schemes to a borough wide one.

Extract from Lambeth Corporate Plan 2006-2009 ³

Safer and stronger communities		
Projects that are shown in bold are our top strategic projects.		
Projects with a star relate to the commitments of the new administration		
Project/initiative	Milestones	Priority outcomes
*SSC5 Review and revise the street wardens scheme	1. Develop a master plan for consolidating all existing schemes (31/10/2006) 2. Undertake consultation on proposals (31/12/2006) 3. Review infrastructure and support facilities to maximise synergies (31/03/2007) 4. Implement new scheme (01/04/2007)	Tackling inequality and social exclusion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximise the effectiveness of the various warden schemes • Consolidate warden schemes by April 2007 • Joint working between wardens and safer neighbourhood teams

¹ DCLG, *National Evaluation of the Street Wardens Programme*, (August 2006), p17

² Lambeth Cabinet Report 265/06-07, *Review of Council Wardens Services*, (8 January 2007), p1

³ London Borough of Lambeth, *Lambeth Corporate Plan 2006-2009: Delivering quality, tackling inequality*, (September 2006), page 49

- 1.5 The Lambeth Corporate Plan 2006-2009 stated that existing schemes would be subject to review and revision, with consultation by 31 December 2006, and an implementation date of 1 April 2007.
- 1.6 Members suggested that an early review of wardens could help deliver an effective roll-out of warden schemes across the borough. It was also felt this provided an opportunity to explore links with other street presences and could help develop joined-up working with partners in the community and residents to further address the above liveability issues.

Terms of reference

- 1.7 In addition to street wardens, the commission recognised that large numbers of council employees such, street care operatives and traffic wardens are also involved in patrolling our streets.
- 1.8 There are also many people who have a street presence who are employed by our partners such as the police and police community support officers. Less obvious are postal workers and our waste management contractor's staff
- 1.9 It was felt by members that a commission was needed to explore the different roles and relationships between these various individuals and organisations that have a presence on the streets of the borough.
- 1.10 The Commission proposed:
- In the first instance to scrutinise the project which is reviewing existing borough warden schemes and the future of such service provision.
 - To examine more broadly the roles and relationship of those individuals and organisations patrolling Lambeth's streets and to suggest ways of improving them.

Methodology

- 1.11 The commission, which had its first meeting in October 2006 was chaired by Councillor Darren Sanders (Liberal Democrat Party) and had two other members; Councillor Clare Whelan (Conservative Party) and Councillor Stephen Morgan (Labour Party)
- 1.12 Initial intentions were to carry out investigations into the effective deployment of warden schemes in order to develop recommendation which would assist the eventual roll-out of a borough wide wardens scheme.
- 1.13 It was planned to develop a programme of commission sessions gather evidence from a wide range of sources. However events overtook the Commission following a Cabinet decision in January 2007. Most Lambeth warden schemes were ceased with effect from 1 April 2007, with the exception of a small cohort of South Bank Wardens. The Streatham Rangers, a scheme funded out of the Housing Revenue Account (HRA), was also abolished later in the year following a review by Regeneration and Housing.

- 1.14 These decisions and subsequent call-in decisions caused the commission's plans to be interrupted at an early stage and created significant delays and difficulties in arranging a suitable way forward.
- 1.15 The commission was able to ascertain useful information from the officers and Cabinet members it was able to interview, from the call-in proceedings, and from the participation of members of the local community it engaged in a public consultation.
- 1.16 It also asked to examine major public realm project developments such as Operation Freshview and the Public Realm Integrated Services Model (PRISM) projects, which are specified in the current corporate plan.
- 1.17 The full timeline of events is listed below.

Timeline

Key Dates	Description
22 August 2006	<p>Briefing meeting for wardens on a borough-wide wardens scheme held by Environment, Culture and Community Safety Department</p> <p>Attended by: Byron Green, Lead Scrutiny Officer</p>
17 October 2006	<p>Commission Meeting</p> <p>Witnesses: John Edwards, DD Public Realm Doug Perry, Street Care Service Manager Henry Hislop, Wardens Strategic Development & Planning Manager Barbara Emanuel, Wardens Consultation Specialist Simon Harding, AD Community Safety</p>
30 October 2006	<p>Commission Meeting</p> <p>To understand leadership expectations on the delivery of the warden's review</p> <p>Witnesses: Cllr Mark Bennett, Cabinet Member for Community Safety.</p>
5 December 2006	<p>Lambeth Community Policing Consultative Group (CPCG)</p> <p>To inform and involve the CPCG in the commission Commission members in attendance at the CPCG meeting</p>
7 January 2007	<p>Cabinet Meeting</p> <p><i>Decision taken to abolish wardens schemes</i></p>

Key Dates	Description
30 January 2007	<p>Public Consultation Session Public perceptions of patrolling forces in the borough Carried out by the Commission with scrutiny officer support</p> <p>Contributions: 12 members of the public attended, 4 written responses</p>
6 February 2007	<p>Environment and Community Safety Scrutiny Sub-committee – extraordinary meeting <i>Call-in of Warden’s Decision (rejected)</i></p>
15 March 2007	<p>Cabinet Meeting <i>Reference arising from Call-in considered</i></p>
21 May 2007	<p>Commission Meeting Developments with the Communities First proposals and Safer Neighbourhood Teams</p> <p>Witnesses: Councillor Mark Bennett, Cabinet member Community Safety Councillor Jackie Meldrum, Deputy Leader Paul McCann, Principal Community Safety Coordinator John Kerridge, Assistant Director Area Services Ian Jackson, Head of Policy, Partnership & Inclusion Chief Inspector Pat Beynon, Metropolitan Police Lambeth John Roberts, Metropolitan Police Authority</p> <p>Other attendees: Mr Richard Moore, Lambeth Resident Councillor Graham Pycock</p>
3 October 2007	<p>Delegated Officer Decision – Executive Director of Regeneration and Housing <i>Abolition of Streatham Rangers</i></p>
31 October 2007	<p>Housing Scrutiny Sub-committee – extraordinary meeting <i>Call-in of Streatham Rangers Decision (rejected)</i></p>
14 November 2007	<p>Commission Meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The outcomes of Operation Freshview – Overview of the Public Realm Integrated Services Model or PRISM project <p>Final Recommendations</p> <p>Witnesses: John Edwards, Divisional Director of Public Realm</p>

Acknowledgments

Commission Members:

Councillor Darren Sanders (Chair),
Councillor Stephen Morgan, and
Councillor Clare Whelan

Cabinet members:

Councillor Mark Bennett (Community Safety)
Councillor Jackie Meldrum (Deputy Leader)

External contributors:

Chief Inspector Pat Beynon, Metropolitan Police Service (Lambeth)
John Roberts, Metropolitan Police Authority

Public Consultees:

The Commission would like to thank the Lambeth Community Police Consultative Group (CPCG) for its assistance in consulting members of the public, and those who gave their time to contribute to the public meeting or return the questionnaire.

Chris Adamson, LBL Housing representative on CPCG
Ivelaw Bowman, Brixton Hill resident, Lambeth CPCG
P. Castaing, Brixton Hill resident, Brixton Business Forum
Neil Flanagan, Clapham Resident, West-Indian ex-serviceman association
Irena Kowalseska, Brixton Hill resident, Arlington Lodge Residents Association
Ben McKendrick, Clapham Old Town resident , CPCG Secretariat
Nabil Mezoughi, Streatham Community Safety Officer
Richard Moore, Norwood resident, Lambeth Crime Reduction Panel
Peter O'Connell, Clapham Common resident, Community Safety Panel
Rebecca Payne, Lambeth SW9 resident
Sean Price, Lambeth resident
Paul Reynolds, Herne Hill resident, Herne Hill Forum
David Tomlinson, Stockwell Resident, Stockwell Park Neighbourhood Watch
Jim Toohill, Ferndale Resident, Lambeth Victim Support and CPCG
Hazel Watson, Herne Hill resident, Popular Youth Association
Vanessa Wood, Vassall resident

Officers:

Jacqueline Davy, Democratic Services Officer
John Edwards, Divisional Director of Public Realm
Paul McCann, Principal Community Safety Coordinator
Byron Green, Lead Scrutiny Officer
Simon Harding, Assistant Director Community Safety
Ian Jackson, Head of Policy, Partnership & Inclusion
John Kerridge, Assistant Director Area Services

Section 2 - Commission Findings

Initial research

- 2.1 By June 2006, just prior to the commencement of this review, Lambeth had established wardens schemes across the borough in Clapham Park, Norwood, Kennington & Vauxhall, St Leonard's, Streatham and South Bank.
- 2.2 However there had not been a consistent approach to implementing the schemes, being funded by different streams, with different remits, and set up with different management structures and reporting lines.

Lambeth warden schemes as at June 2006

Scheme	Number of staff
Clapham Park Funded though NDC	6 Wardens 2 Team Leaders 1 Wardens Manager 1 p/t Admin
Norwood	10 Wardens 2 Supervisors 1 Wardens Manager (shared with St Leonard's)
Kennington and Vauxhall	4 Wardens 1 Wardens Manager
Peripatetic team The peripatetic team patrolled the wards not covered by wardens or full SNTs on a rotational basis: Brixton Hill Clapham Common Larkhall Stockwell Streatham Hill Streatham South Thornton Tulse Hill	24 wardens across two teams Current staffing: 10 (Further recruitment on hold)
St Leonard's Street Crime Wardens	10 Wardens 2 Supervisors 1 Wardens Manager (shared with Norwood scheme)
Streatham Community Rangers	5 Wardens 1 Supervisor 1 Scheme Manager 1 Admin
South Bank Wardens	Average 7 wardens (more or fewer dependant on seasonal variations such as festive period or Summer) 1 Wardens Manager

Rationale for consolidation and expansion of wardens schemes

- 2.3 A national evaluation of the Neighbourhood Wardens Programme was carried out between June 2001 and May 2003. The evaluation was undertaken by Social Development Direct (SDDirect), in collaboration with NOP and Crime Concern, on behalf of the Neighbourhood Renewal Unit at the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister⁴. Its key findings published in April 2004 are summarised below.
- 2.4 Wardens have a unique role to play in neighbourhood renewal. They are a new generation of officials who know the problems, face the people and take the action. Wardens' success lies in their accessibility and ability to link people and agencies together.
- 2.5 The overriding message from the evaluation is that in successful schemes, wardens can and are having an impact nationally. Key impacts include: increased resident satisfaction; reduced fear of crime, particularly for older people; considerable decline in the overall rate of residents experiencing crime; perceived improvement in environmental problems such as graffiti, fly-tipping, litter and dog fouling; a small decline in residents perceiving youth anti-social behaviour (ASB) as a problem.
- 2.6 Schemes that are working well have a number of common features: tailored and flexible approaches; involvement of a wide variety of stakeholders; resident participation; active and representative steering groups; consistent scheme management; ability to develop and nurture partnerships; ability to maximise wardens' visibility; targeted approach to the vulnerable; high-quality wardens; and ongoing practical training.
- 2.7 Neighbourhood Wardens schemes represent value for money. Even assuming that only 10 percent of the reduction in crime rates can be attributed to wardens, there is still an overall saving. There are also important, but uncoded, additional benefits: improved quality of life; reduced fear of crime, improvements in environmental problems and anti-social behaviour.
- 2.8 The most important policy message arising from the evaluation is that wardens schemes are effective and their further promotion should be encouraged. Other policy implications include: support flexible, tailored responses; share good practice between Government departments; provide assistance to schemes requiring additional support; and help managers improve the recruitment and retention of women and BME wardens.
- 2.9 Of the 84 schemes funded, over 70 percent had sustainable funding in place and 20 percent fully expect to do so. Of the five schemes that not expected to continue beyond March 2004, two are converting to Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs).

⁴ Research Summary 8: Neighbourhood Wardens Scheme Evaluation, ODPM, 2004

What the consolidation of wardens could achieve in Lambeth.

2.10 It was suggested to the commission that consolidation of the wardens' service could provide added value in terms of the following:

- Value for money and synergy with existing service provision
- Consistent service standards
- Enhance the image and offer one Council approach
- Management and staffing structures improvement
- Under Local Area Agreements pooling and integration of on-street resources
- Improved intelligence gathering and sharing, better community engagement

2.11 A borough-wide wardens scheme could assist Lambeth in achieving the following key community strategy aims:

Creating a cleaner and greener environment – Wardens can play a key role in tackling enviro-crime across the borough in partnership with the council, the community and key agencies.

Making safer communities - Increased patrolling and better links with statutory partners including the Police SNTs would contribute considerably to the borough's reassurance agenda. The scheme would also seek to progress the Community Strategy's aim of better support for victims and witnesses through the development of wardens' bases as third party reporting sites where possible.

Investing in children and young people –The possibility of working with young people and established agencies and groups could also be considered as part of the scheme's objectives. St Leonard's Street Crime Wardens, Clapham Park wardens and Streatham Hill Rangers participate in and lead on a number of initiatives targeted at young people.

Encouraging Enterprise, Employment, Skills and Culture – a key factor to a successful wardens scheme is in employing and developing local people to take ownership of their area. There is an opportunity to seek to employ Lambeth residents as wardens where possible and expand opportunities through employment and skills.

Delivering results at a local level – Wardens can help to deliver services close to where people live.

2.12 Wardens could patrol across the whole borough, attempting to tackle problems but also the root causes of problems through engagement with different groups, and by developing strong relationships with the police, particularly Safer Neighbourhood teams, and other agencies.

2.13 The wardens could be deployed to work across Lambeth, taking in the borough's most deprived wards. A centrally-managed service, rather than working to different objectives and funding streams, would work as a

borough-wide resource, concentrating on local issues, but working to a common remit and performance framework, engendering team working, allowing for economies of scale, and the option for deploying wardens to borough-wide events, forward planning and concentrating coverage where it is most needed.

2.14 Wardens could also contribute to achievement of the targets such as those in the local Public Service Agreement (PSA):

2.15 **PSA 1** – To reduce crime by 15% and further in high crime areas, by 2007-08.

2.16 For example, by

- Undertaking awareness exercises on specific priority crimes, including vehicle crime
- Property marking and crime prevention advice
- Joint operations with the Police (e.g. at stations/ transport interchanges)
- Contributing to partnership activities

2.17 **PSA 2** - Reassure the public, reducing the fear of crime and anti-social behaviour, and building confidence in the Criminal Justice System without compromising fairness.

2.18 For example, by

2.19 Reducing the fear of crime through visible patrolling and awareness campaigns (as evidenced through the fear of crime data collected as part of the ALG survey)

2.20 **PSA 6** – Increase voluntary and community engagement, especially amongst those at risk of social exclusion.

2.21 For example, by

- Undertake/ participate in youth and community activities
- Presence at council events, including Country Show
- Help young people access the services they need through referrals
- Engagement with schools and establishing junior citizens/junior wardens' initiatives

2.22 **PSA 8 (Liveability)** - Lead the delivery of cleaner, safer, greener public spaces, and improvement of the quality of the built environment in deprived areas and across the country, with measurable improvement by 2008.

2.23 For example, by

- Increase reporting and turnaround times for responses to environmental nuisance, graffiti etc

Moving forward with rolling-out wardens schemes

- 2.24 Commitment had been secured from the Strategic Management Board and Executive prior to elections in May 2006 to roll out wardens schemes borough-wide. An Improvement Plan priority was adopted for 2006/07 to consolidate existing wardens schemes
- 2.25 Funding had been secured for the borough-wide wardens scheme until 31/03/08 (to coincide with delivery of the current Community Safety Strategy) and Temporary Wardens Project team and Operations team in place were in place to begin this work.
- 2.26 As mentioned previously funding for wardens schemes in Lambeth was agreed by the Council for 2006/07-2007/08 from a number of sources, with the presumption of a roll out and expansion from the existing schemes to a borough wide one. These are set out below.

Summary of funding secured for wardens schemes for 2006-07

Funding source	Amount (£)	Details
London Borough of Lambeth (LBL) capital	500,000	Towards borough-wide scheme
General Fund (GF) revenue	750,000	Towards borough-wide scheme
Neighbourhood Renewal Fund (NRF)	730,000	NRF contribution towards borough-wide scheme
Housing Revenue Account (HRA)	250,000	Towards borough-wide scheme (<i>in addition to Streatham Community Rangers costs</i>)
Housing Revenue Account (HRA)	300,000	Annual cost for Streatham Community Rangers
Environment	280,000	Funding secured through Star Chamber for continuation of St Leonard's SCW (Condition of funding from ODPM for 05-06).
Section 106 (S106)	132,000	Annual staffing costs of £132,000 for South Bank Wardens
Lambeth Opportunities Fund (LOF) funding	120,000	For capital expenditure
Total funding for wardens for 06-07	3,062,000	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> £440,000 New Deal for Communities (NDS) funding per year for Clapham Park Wardens 		

Summary of funding sources for wardens proposed for 2007-08

Funding source	Amount (£)	Details
London Borough of Lambeth (LBL) capital	500,000	Towards borough-wide scheme
General Fund (GF) revenue	750,000	Towards borough-wide scheme
Neighbourhood Renewal Fund (NRF)	1,250,000 (indicative)	NRF contribution towards borough-wide scheme
Housing Revenue Account (HRA)	£250,000	Towards borough-wide scheme (<i>in addition to Streatham Community Rangers costs</i>)
HRA	300,000	Annual cost for Streatham Community Rangers
Section 106 (S106)	132,000	South Bank Wardens staffing costs
Total funding for wardens for 07-08	3,182,000	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> £440,000 New Deal for Communities (NDS) funding per year for Clapham Park Wardens 		

2.27 A more detailed breakdown of how the different schemes were funded is listed below.

An outline of Lambeth warden schemes and costs as at June 2006

Warden scheme	Status of the scheme	Approximate costs
Clapham Park	CPP Project Board approved funding for Phase II on 15.11.05 Scheme now potentially funded until 31.03.11 (subject to NDC agreement).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •£440,000 (all costs including staffing) •NDC
Norwood (Knight's Hill, Gipsy Hill and Thurlow Park)	Pilot scheme funded until 31.03.06 with agency staff Agency staff currently extended until 30.06.06	<p>Wardens remunerated at c.£15.18 per hour (including agency commission), 35 hours per week = £531.30 per week</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GF funded until 31/03/06 • Staffing costs for current year being funded via NRF
Kennington and Vauxhall (Prince's)	Pilot scheme funded until 31.03.06 with agency staff Agency staff currently extended until 30.06.06	<p>Wardens remunerated at c.£15.18 per hour (including agency commission), 35 hours per week = £531.30 per week</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GF funded until 31/03/06 • Staffing costs for current year being funded via NRF

Warden scheme	Status of the scheme	Approximate costs
Peripatetic team	Scheme launched May 2006. 10 wardens out of 24 originally envisaged mean that patrols only take place currently between 10am and 6pm rather than 8am to 6pm	Agency staff paid £15.18 per hour (including agency costs) Cost per warden per 35 hour week: £531.30 Supervisor costs of £3,129.77 per month
South Bank Wardens	Funded from S106 New staff recently recruited	£132,000 (staffing costs) S106
St Leonard's Street Crime Wardens	Staffing costs currently funded from Environment and Culture budgets (ODPM funding requirement for release of funds for 2005-06 was agreement for the council to fund the scheme for 2006-07).	£280,000 (staffing costs) ODPM/ GF
Streatham Community Rangers	Originally a pilot scheme until 31.03.06 following an unsuccessful bid for ODPM funding, This is being continued.	£300,000 (staffing plus some capital costs) HRA

What describes successful foot patrol initiatives?

A theoretical approach

- 2.28 There is probably not one single answer to this. However recent research published in January 2007 conducted on behalf of the Police Foundation⁵ does provide a good review of existing studies. The research was conducted by a lecturer in criminology at City University, London.
- 2.29 The full report⁶ called *The Value of Foot Patrol* assesses current evidence to explore whether foot patrol can meet the high expectations of citizens and policy makers.
- 2.30 Specifically, it addresses the following questions:
- What does the public expect from foot patrol?
 - What models of foot patrol can be identified from the research evidence?
 - What should be the main objectives of foot patrol, based on public expectations?
 - Are these objectives being achieved?
- 2.31 This review found thirteen published studies of foot patrol initiatives in the UK, US and Australia involving a range of public and private agencies. It

⁵ **The Police Foundation** is an independent charity focused entirely on developing knowledge and understanding of policing and challenging the police service and the government to improve policing for the benefit of the public. It describes itself as a bridge between the police service, the communities they serve and the government, while being owned by none of them.

⁶ Wakefield, Dr Alison (2007), '**The Value of Foot Patrol: A Review of Research**', Police Foundation

employed four criteria for evaluating the schemes in accordance with public expectations:

- Outcomes: to make policing more visible, accessible, familiar and knowledgeable about local people and problems (reassurance).
- Interventions: to incorporate into the patrol task additional activities expected by the public (enhancement of patrol).
- Approach: responsiveness to the contrasting expectations of different social groups (responsiveness).
- Ensuring sustainability: the likelihood that the initiative will remain in place for the foreseeable future (sustainability).

2.32 The study identified six different models of foot control which demonstrates that public expectations can be addressed in a number of different ways by police or non-police bodies. In particular it found that the most successful in meeting the criteria were:

- police forces which used a community engagement model, and
- PCSOs or Neighbourhood Wardens which used a strategic model i.e. closely integrated with broader policing arrangements and external agencies, either through a directive, 'top down' approach, or a 'bottom up' method with patrollers engaged in problem-solving and instigating follow-up interventions

2.33 Appendix 1 lists additional examples drawn from the thirteen foot patrol initiatives showing how foot patrol can be 'enhanced' to provide reassurance and promote 'responsiveness' to the community.

Local opinion of effective street presence – what the consultation found

2.34 The detailed findings of the consultation can be found in appendix 3. Messages included the following:

2.35 It was stated that many people around the borough do want wardens, or at least reassurance that the good results they produced will continue. Work with young people for example, it was felt, has been successful, as has the befriending projects.

2.36 Visible street presences of many kinds provide a reassuring presence whether they are police anti-crime operations or operatives out carrying out cleaning projects such as the Aardvark project. But it was also important to have a familiar face you can approach who knows about a wide range of council services.

2.37 There was a feeling that better intelligence links need to be developed closer to communities, and that better links between agencies needed to be developed.

2.38 People perceived that the physical appearance of the borough's streets and neighbourhoods had improved significantly in recent.

The abolition of warden schemes and redirection of funding to PCSOs

The initial decision

- 2.39 At its meeting of 8 January 2007, Cabinet opted to cease the majority of Lambeth's warden schemes. The full list of recommendations can be found in appendix 2.
- 2.40 The report⁷ highlighted key concerns about the financial sustainability of the current and expanded options, and the aim to shift the Council's priorities to a stronger position on tackling crime, including through enforcement.
- 2.41 It was argued that "although potential sources of funding have been identified for any of the options, they have a limited life and significant parts of the funds could not necessarily be sustained or guaranteed beyond April 2008. The option to cease the services provides the opportunity to use the resources in different ways to meet the objectives of the Council."⁸
- 2.42 The Cabinet Member for Community Safety reiterated at the call-in of the decision in February that "wardens were not a long term solution to addressing the more serious crime and community safety issues." However he also paid tribute to the efforts of wardens who had played an invaluable contribution to the Streetscape.
- 2.43 The Borough Commander Martin Bridger expressed his view "by allowing the partnership to purchase additional PCSOs seem to be the appropriate way forward for addressing the needs of our community". He also stated that he "had seen first hand the valuable service that Street Wardens have provided to the community "and was confident "that the issues that wardens have addressed up until now can be appropriately picked up as we develop the joint delivery concept."⁹
- 2.44 John Edwards, Assistant Director of Public Realm, advised that in the circumstances, increasing the number of PCSOs was the most viable option and there had been extensive consultation throughout the review process. The review had produced projected savings of £1.2m which would be diverted to other projects and an enhanced role for Streetcare Agents. He also agreed that although wardens had a community engagement role, this could be absorbed by other areas of the Council. He felt confident that a satisfactory protocol for setting and influencing the job priorities for PCSOs could also be achieved.

Streatham Rangers

- 2.45 At the time that the Cabinet decision was made officers were also requested to review the Housing Revenue Account funded Streatham Rangers scheme. The pressure on the HRA meant that drastic measures were required to address the deficit and the Council had a legal duty to balance the HRA.

⁷ Cabinet Report 265/06-07, 8 January 2007

⁸ Environment and Community Scrutiny Subcommittee (ECS) Minutes, item, 5 February 2007

⁹ Bridger, Martin (Lambeth MPS Borough Commander) Letter to Steve Reed, LB Lambeth Council Leader, 11 December 2006

- 2.46 In October 2007 it was acknowledged that although the Streatham Community Rangers Scheme provided a valuable service to residents, the dire HRA position meant that it was no longer feasible for the scheme to be funded by the HRA in view of the £2m deficit in 2006/7 and the projected deficit of £11m for 2007/8.
- 2.47 The commission heard from Cabinet Members for Housing and Community Safety that the success of the service was not disputed but the HRA could not fund a service that did not benefit all Council tenants. Officers argued that it was not fair that all council tenants should pay for a service that only operates in a small part of the borough. It was also problematic that the HRA was also subsidising a scheme which was also benefiting non-tenants
- 2.48 Officers felt that as the Rangers responsibilities were being subsumed by the PCSOs, their impact on frontline services would be minimal.
- 2.49 The Police also acknowledged the benefits of the Streatham Community Rangers Scheme but felt that they could adapt their own working practices to build on the success of the scheme.

The views of the commission

- 2.50 Councillor Morgan felt that wardens had not been effective in Princes Ward and were not visible. The role of wardens and PCSOs needed to be clarified and the many of the current duties of wardens could be performed by other areas of the Council.
- 2.51 Councillor Darren Sanders agreed that warden schemes did not suit all areas but emphasised there had been successes and the Council needed to work with residents and other partners to ensure the best mix of provision in future. He felt that there was currently a lack of detail on the effectiveness of the current schemes and also around the governance arrangements.
- 2.52 Councillor Clare Whelan had some sympathy with the comments made by residents lamenting the loss of wardens. She also acknowledged that there had been successes with wardens and also with existing PCSOs. It was regrettable that the review had been completed prior to the conclusion of the Patrolling the Streets Commission and there were also concerns that adequate notice of the proposed decision had not been given in the Forward Plan.

Members welcomed the widespread recognition that the positive impacts of wardens schemes need to be picked up by other programmes of the Council and its partners.

Recommendation 1: A review of how the positive impacts of warden schemes have now been taken up by new arrangements since their abolition.

Recommendation 2: That there is particular focus in the review on the impact of abolition on estates in Streatham Hill and Streatham Wells wards.

Recommendation 3: With the diversion of funds to introduce additional PCSOs across the borough, the commission recommends that a detailed analysis of their functions and effectiveness of PCSOs across the borough as a whole is undertaken and reported to back to ECS Scrutiny.

Other patrolling forces

- 2.53 Although there is an immediate tendency to think of patrolling forces as having a significant “policing” role, there already exists enforcement and intelligence gathering activities beyond police, PCSO and warden schemes. There also exists the potential for expanding these further.
- 2.54 The commission has an obvious interest in examining and improving arrangements for good joined-up working internally and with partners who have a presence on the streets in Lambeth's neighbourhoods.
- 2.55 The commission notes that people patrolling the streets are the probably the key people who are providing services. They could also be key in reporting back what immediate issues and local priorities are. A short discussion identified an extensive but by no means complete list of internal and partner individuals who could contribute (see opposite).
- 2.56 The commission heard evidence from two major projects now being undertaken as part of the borough Corporate Plan.
- Operation Freshview, a project set up to tackle environmental hotspots around the borough by bring together a wide range of local partners; and
 - The PRISM: Public Realm Integrated Services Model, a key corporate priority to significantly improve the streetscape.
- 2.57 These projects are described in more detail below.

Lambeth on-street presences

<p>Within Environment, Culture and Community Safety</p> <p>Building control Dangerous structures engineers Site surveyors Temporary structures surveyor</p> <p>Community Safety Anti-social behaviour officers Community safety officers</p> <p>Consumer protection Food safety officers Health and safety enforcement Trading standards officers</p> <p>Environmental health Animal welfare officer Enforcement officers Licensing officers Pest control officers Public health officers Sex and drugs paraphernalia pick up</p> <p>Housing Estate caretakers</p> <p>Parking CCTV mobile enforcement officers Monitoring officers Parking attendants Pay and display technicians Signs and lines officer</p> <p>Parks Area parks officers Events officers Park contractors Park rangers Tree officers Tree surgeons</p>	<p>Street care Abandoned vehicle officers Cleansing wardens Commercial waste and sales enforcement team Envirocrime enforcement officers Grimebusters Market officers Recycling crew Refuse collectors Refuse monitoring officer Street cleaners Untaxed vehicles officer</p> <p>Transport and highways Area engineers Clark of works Highway inspectors Lighting electricians School crossing patrol</p> <p>Other department and partner examples Safer Neighbourhood Teams (SNTs) Metropolitan Police Service PCSOs Estate caretakers Housing anti-nuisance officers Social workers Youth workers Cleaning contractor TfL Fire brigade Community nurses Postal workers Businesses Community groups BME groups LGBT groups Tenants and residents associations Faith groups</p>
--	--

Operation Freshview

- 2.58 Operation Freshview started in September 2006 as a 12 month pilot targeting the five most deprived wards in Lambeth. The partnership initiative blitzed selected wards by combining and focusing their resources for one day a month to address environmental issues and anti social behaviour. The operations cover a wide range of activities from information stalls to area clean ups, inspections and enforcement.
- 2.59 The objectives agreed for the pilot were to improve community safety, improve the quality of life by targeting deprived areas, improve the environmental quality, increase partnership working, educate the public and improve the public perception of the council. These objectives set the basis of the performance framework. The five targeted wards, Coldharbour, Vassal, Herne Hill, Oval and Princes were selected in line with the Index of Deprivation published in 2004 by the ODPM with the following indicators;
- Most Deprived Ward based (overall score) of Multiple Deprivation(Income, Employment, Health and Disability, Education, Skills and Training, Barriers to Housing Services, Living Environment)
 - Most Deprived Ward within the Living Environment
 - Most Deprived Ward within Crime and Disorder
- 2.60 The name Freshview was chosen as it encompassed a fresh approach to delivering services in partnership as well as encouraging residents and businesses to take a fresh view of their area.
- 2.61 Coordinated by Lambeth Street Care, the operation involves council departments such as Community Safety, Environmental Health, Housing, Parks, Youth Offending Team, and Building Control. Members were please to hear that this was a good example of joined-up working through the active involvement of external agencies like the Metropolitan Police, British Transport Police, Transport for London and the Fire Brigade, which have also been important partners in the pilot.

Members were very positive about the Freshview concept but felt there was a further need to look at the environmental needs of the area, such as community safety, crime and deprivation.

Recommendation 4: Members welcome the adoption of the mini-Freshview approach and recommended that there are future refinements of Freshview which are community and evidenced based.

Recommendation 5: Members recommended that officers investigate working with Groundwork when carrying out Freshview exercises.

Recommendation 6: Members welcome the December 2007 review of Freshview and the inclusion of community safety criteria into the concept and ask that regular reviews of Freshview be undertaken to see how it is working and which include more analysis of the outcomes and impact of Freshview activities.

PRISM: Public Realm Integrated Services Model

- 2.62 This major project which began late in 2007 is a priority area set out in the corporate plan. It sets out its vision “to deliver excellent public realm services to all customers and so help make Lambeth a great place to live.”
- 2.63 There are four objective areas in the project.
- 2.64 The first is to agree a common approach to customer service across public realm services to ensure a consistent experience by customers from the first point of contact to the completion of the service request supporting “right first time” and “one and done”. The main actions for this objective are described as defining a consistent customer journey across all services; reviewing and updating customer service standards; and monitoring customer satisfaction levels.
- 2.65 Secondly, identifying and implementing process improvements to provide consistent, efficient and effective service delivery across public realm services through a review of service level requirements between front and back office; improving knowledge sharing and management; to review and improve BVPI related processes; and to ensure IT systems are fit for purpose in meeting business requirements now and in the future.
- 2.66 Another key objective is to identify and deliver efficiencies across public realm services. In order to achieve this there are plans to carry out a review of organisational structure to identify ways of helping teams work better together; joining-up and sharing resources across public realm; and analysing key processes and identifying where benefits can be realised.
- 2.67 Finally it also aims to help make Lambeth the employer of choice by supporting staff during the cultural change required to deliver joined-up service. Necessary actions include a communications plan to ensure affected staff are engaged and consulted throughout the project; and setting up an internal consultancy group to drive small changes across public realm services.

Members are encouraged by the commencement of the PRISM project as a key priority in the borough corporate plan.

Recommendation 7: It is recommended that the PRISM project takes account of non-Public Realm members of patrolling forces in the borough, both those across departments and those belonging to partner organisations in the community in order to encourage their engagement in and ease of communication with the reporting systems around problems with the physical environment, anti-social behaviour, crime and similar issues.

Recommendation 8: Members requested that the development and implementation of the PRISM project is monitored in the future work programme of the ECS Scrutiny Committee

Section 3 - Conclusion

- 3.1 The work of the Patrolling the Streets commission has only just begun to scratch the surface of what is possible to achieve with patrolling forces.
- 3.2 It is a positive outcome that many of the suggestions and recommendations considered by the commission have been taken on board and acted before the completion of this report.
- 3.3 There is also recognition in the work continuing elsewhere in the council and with partners that issues considered by the commission remain high on the agenda.
- 3.4 What the commission hopes is that these continuing efforts succeed in achieving a model of patrolling forces which are fit for purpose and contribute meaningfully, efficiently and in a more joined-up way to reducing crime and the fear of crime, fostering social inclusion and community cohesion, deterring anti-social behaviour, and improving the physical appearance of our streets.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Additional activities found in successful patrolling forces¹⁰

'Enhancement' Activities Checklist

Problem solving:

- Make proactive contacts with residents and local businesses and record any problems reported (e.g. suspicious incidents, minor crime and nuisance);
- Follow up on reported problems (e.g. through targeted patrols);
- Note and report environmental problems (e.g. fly tipping, graffiti, discarded needles);
- Refer individuals to other agencies and council services where appropriate (e.g. drug rehabilitation);
- Respond to calls for service;
- Issue fixed penalty notices;
- Integrate patrol initiatives with broader policy frameworks to facilitate a strategic approach.

Preventing crime:

- Carry out security checks of unoccupied premises;
- Check on strangers and groups of youths in public places;
- Perform directed patrols (e.g. in conjunction with truancy officers);
- Provide crime prevention advice in person and through leafleting;
- Maintain a visible presence without 'flooding' the beat area.

Encouraging participation, communication and community cohesion:

- Encourage familiarity through dedicated beats and patrolling singly during the daytime;
- Initiate local projects to encourage community pride and participation, provide support and improve the environment (e.g. 'walking bus' initiative to escort children to school; youth activities and programmes to provide peer support, role models or counselling; recruiting children to paint people's scuffed front doors);
- Befriend and assist vulnerable people.

'Responsiveness' Activities Checklist

Promoting local ownership of patrol initiatives:

- Hold community meetings prior to the launch of an initiative to gauge local expectations in advance;
- Establish resident/community advisory committees;
- Hold regular community meetings that are open to all and attended by patrollers;
- Involve community representatives in the recruitment of patrollers;
- Adopt a range of strategies to mobilise community participation and organisation (see above);
- Provide for ongoing evaluation of the initiative by community members.

Responding to the diverse community:

- Identify groups within the local population requiring different relationships (e.g. residents, shop workers, office workers, street workers, visitors/shoppers/tourists, street people);
- Make special efforts to identify and engage with minority and disengaged groups including the young;
- Ensure that consultative groups are representative of the diverse community;
- Make special efforts to bridge gaps between different community groups;
- Make informal contacts with local people in the course of patrols;
- Contact a representative of each household in the beat area during the course of a year.

Keeping people informed:

- Create a patrollers' mandate setting out what residents can expect;
- Ensure that all issues raised are responded to, and that community members are informed of resulting action (or reasons for lack of action);
- Work with other agencies and services to address problems and answer questions;
- Work with community members to produce a regular neighbourhood newsletter keeping the community informed about what the police are doing.

¹⁰ Police Foundation Leaflet extract, 'The Value of the Footpatrol'
Patrolling the Streets Commission

Appendix 2: Decisions to cease wardens and divert funds to finance additional PCSOs

Cabinet decision, recommendations to cease wardens, January 2008

1. That, in principle, the Council diverts resources allocated to those current warden schemes funded by the General Fund and Neighbourhood Renewal Fund into other methods of achieving safer communities.
2. That the current warden schemes are ceased with effect from 1 April 2007, with the exception of the South Bank Wardens.
3. That the Executive Director for Housing and Regeneration works with the Cabinet Member for Housing to consider the future of the HRA funded scheme in light of the decision to move away from a council wide warden scheme, including the consultation of tenants.
4. That the Executive Director of Environment, Culture and Community Safety, in liaison with the Cabinet Member for Community Safety, negotiates with the Metropolitan Police, the provision of additional Police Community Support Officers.
5. That the Executive Director of Environment, Culture and Community Safety works with other colleagues to determine ways to continue the positive initiatives started by the wardens schemes.
6. That this report is referred to the Local Strategic Partnership Executive for consideration of how unused Neighbourhood Renewal Fund for this year and next year could be re- allocated

Officer delegated decision, closure of Streatham Community Rangers, 3 October 2007

1. It is recommended that the (Streatham Community Rangers) project be closed.
2. It is further recommended that the Housing Service liaises with the Metropolitan Police and with ECCS to ensure adequate provision of local service for community safety and for supervision of local parks.

The reallocation of Neighbourhood Renewal Funds¹¹

Lambeth First Executive, on 25 January 2007, gave delegated authority to the Performance Board to reallocate the Warden Scheme project's £1.2m budget. The Performance Board met on 22 February and agreed the reallocation proposals presented by Cllr Heywood.

The Lambeth First Executive endorsed the reallocation of the Neighbourhood Renewal Funds on 23 March 2007.

The key points of the reallocation were:

- Over two thirds of the budget (£815K) will be reallocated to support better performance against key floor targets.
- £240K will go towards the establishment of the newly formed Active Communities and Neighbourhoods Board which will help build a visible response in designated neighbourhoods.
- The domestic violence stretch target will be allocated £40K to support initial work (the £40K allocation is for year one of the LAA only, pump priming for years two and three will need to be funded from LAA top-slicing).
- £105K will be reallocated to the LSP core budget to support the development of the Community Strategy and performance and communications.

Area for reallocation	Amount
Key floor target areas:	
Community Safety	£415,000
Health Inequalities	£200,000
Key Stage Three	£200,000
Active Communities and Neighbourhoods:	
CEN SLA	£140,000
Neighbourhoods Initiative Fund	£100,000
LAA additional pump-priming	
Domestic Violence	£40,000
LSP Core Budget	
Community Strategy development, performance support and communications	£105,000
Total	£1,200,000

¹¹ Lambeth First Executive, agenda item 5 a & b, 15 March 2007

Appendix 3: Commission Consultation Responses

A. Reducing crime and the fear of crime

In recent years resident surveys have shown the crime remains the issue of greatest personal concern to Lambeth residents.

A1. Can you describe some examples where patrolling forces have been successful in reducing crime and the fear of crime on the streets of Lambeth?

- *No Deal in 2006 – there was an increase in police presence and a decrease in drug dealing and taking in our street (Rushcroft Road), and a decrease in threatening characters hanging around.*
- *Operation Aardvark provided a reassuring presence.*

A2. Can you describe some examples where you feel there are still problems? What do you think are the hindering factors or barriers for patrolling forces in reducing crime and the fear of crime?

- *Before and after No Deal, the reverse was true.*
- *No police presence in the evenings and at night when clubs on Coldharbour Lane are open and dealers are operating.*
- *Impossible to contact police*
- *No British Transport police presence at Brixton police station*
- *Fear expressed that PCSO teams have focused on office work.*
- *Passing funding to police takes them away from Lambeth control*
- *Don't seem to see anyone patrolling outside of normal office hours*
- *24hr drinking and all night opening of large venues (e.g. Mass and Fridge)*
- *Police seem reluctant to take action for fear of being accused of using excessive force.*
- *Local authority seems to overlook that certain "hot food" takeaways are trading all night as do some off-licences*

A3. Now make some recommendations on breaking down the barriers and hindering factors facing patrolling forces in reducing crime and the fear of crime. What do you think the solutions are?

- *There is not a one size fits all solution – a local approach is needed to reflect differing needs.*
- *Increase jurisdiction of transport police around stations and other agencies.*
- *Street presence needs to balance enforcement with reassurance.*
- *Role and linkages for people patrolling the streets.*
- *Scope to improve roles of people who patrol streets but have different functions. May want revised job descriptions to increase roles and responsibilities*
- *Need to set operational standards across the spectrum of officers patrolling the streets.*
- *Improve understanding between agencies e.g. link transport (night buses) and the metropolitan police.*

- *More police 24 hours in Brixton town centre.*
- *Use of bicycles to enable them to cover greater areas faster.*
- *Mobile phone contact numbers to contact police on patrol.*
- *Would like to see people around patrolling more in the evenings, especially times around when people are arriving home from work in the evenings.*
- *Phone number of nearest patrol that we could put in our mobiles so that we can call if something happens would be useful.*
- *Officers to be given their own patches to police on foot*
- *Officers to get to know members of the community and in particular young people*
- *More CCTV*
- *Patrolling teams need more officers – at least two per team, at least one who has the power of arrest.*
- *More frequent patrols.*

B. Fostering social inclusion and community building (or cohesion)

This area is about developing an understanding of the many groups in the community which are most vulnerable to social exclusion whether they be young people, older people, LGBT, black and ethnic minority groups, people with disabilities, or those isolated by poverty.

It can include developing community spirit, supporting local activities for local people, providing things to do for young people, addressing tensions between communities, and ensuring collaborative relationships between agencies.

It requires good intelligence about the different problems facing different communities and individuals; the services that are available and how they can be directed at the right people to address problems effectively.

B1. Can you describe some examples where patrolling forces have been successful at fostering social inclusion and community building on the streets of Lambeth?

- *PCSOs visiting youth clubs etc. – not just patrolling the street is an important role*
- *Some wardens were good at communicating with community groups – need to ensure this is not lost.*

B2. Can you describe some examples where you feel there are still problems? What do you think are the hindering factors or barriers for patrolling forces in fostering social inclusion and community building?

- *Myatt's fields – feel victimised because no visible presence*
- *Some people are prisoners in their own estates.*
- *Dogs not muzzled.*
- *Lack of law and order leads to conflict between groups*

B3. Now make some recommendations on breaking down the barriers and hindering factors facing patrolling forces in fostering social inclusion and community building. What do you think the solutions are?

- *CCTV – opportunity to get good tenant interaction*
- *More things for young people to do*

C. Deterring anti-social behaviour

Graffiti, fly-tipping, begging, rowdy behaviour and vandalism, and threatening or noisy neighbours can seriously diminish the quality of life for individuals or whole communities.

For many people, this is the issue of greatest local concern.

C1. Can you describe some examples where patrolling forces have been successful in deterring anti-social behaviour on the streets of Lambeth?

- *Drug dealing in Brixton in the Markets*
- *Aardvark programme (compost collection) – a uniformed presence providing a friendly face.*

C2. Can you describe some examples where you feel there are still problems? What do you think are the hindering factors or barriers for patrolling forces in deterring anti-social behaviour?

- *Good kids anti-social behaviour escalates*
- *Lack of familiarity (on the police-side)*
- *Large amount of ASB/crime comes from outside of local authority.*
- *Traffic wardens in cars, loses familiarity.*
- *People don't know who their Safer Neighbourhood Teams or PCSOs are*
- *Lack of visible patrolling forces on estates*
- *ASB of groups of youngster creates real fear.*
- *Lack of response when residents do report problems – means that victims end up feeling that police do not deserve cooperation*

C3. Now make some recommendations on breaking down the barriers and hindering factors facing patrolling forces in deterring anti-social behaviour. What do you think the solutions are?

- *Need to address a large range of issues to promote good “social” behaviour*
- *Patrolling forces need a link to the community – local recruitment*
- *Need to look at how councils engage with people.*
- *There is a fear of attending meetings*
- *Look at better ways of consulting (e.g. e-voting on issues in libraries)*
- *SNTs have an opportunity to present the familiar face*
- *There is need to “mingle”, e.g. in shops etc.*
- *Rapid response to clearing up of graffiti*
- *Action against noisy and menacing behaviour*
- *CCTV in areas where residents suffer repeated vandalism or harassment.*
- *Pavement clear of litter*

D. Improving the physical appearance of the streets

The physical appearance of our streets has a direct impact about how safe we feel in our neighbourhoods. Research suggests that it can also have a direct influence on the levels of crime and anti-social behaviour we experience.

Identifying, reporting and dealing with the environmental problems around the borough are a key duty of patrolling forces. They can also play an important role in communicating environmental issues on behalf of residents and feeding back how they will be dealt with.

D1. Can you describe some examples where patrolling forces have been successful at improving the physical appearance of the streets of Lambeth?

- *Aardvark also provides a uniformed presence in the community*
- *There has definitely been a huge improvement in the physical appearance over the years.*
- *We don't see so much graffiti, rubbish, vacant homes*
- *Things are dealt with much quicker*
- *You see staff more*
- *Park rangers in Clapham have made a difference - increase in feeling of safety.*
- *Street cleaners do a good job.*
- *Refresh teams are a good idea*
- *Streets I walk down are reasonable clean, now only the odd 'blackspot'*

D2. Can you describe some examples where you feel there are still problems? What do you think are the hindering factors or barriers for improving the physical appearance of the streets?

- *There can be a lack of continuity – e.g. lost an excellent street care agent.*
- *Pavements and road repair*
- *Developers cause damage which goes unrepaired for long periods.*
- *Uneven application of recycling – still seems to be gaps.*

D3. Now make some recommendations on breaking down the barriers and hindering factors facing patrolling forces in improving the physical appearance of the streets. What do you think the solutions are?

- *You need a familiar face you can approach who knows about a wide range of council services*
- *Customer service needs to be more accessible*
- *Are joint service centres local enough?*
- *Further linkages with park rangers.*
- *More street furniture (bins)*
- *Removal of gum*
- *Fines for those who don't recycle properly*
- *Simplify ways of identifying and reporting these blackspots to relevant teams so that they seem to be dealt with more quickly.*

- *Police, PCSOs and other patrolling forces should report all problems with physical environment to a designated centre for remedial action.*

E. Are there any other observations or suggestions you would like to make?

*Need to make sure patrolling forces are an effective set of eyes and ears
Passing funding to police takes them away from Lambeth control*

Wardens filled a gap where other services were lacking e.g. youth work

- *instead of intelligence gathering, acting as a link*

What should PCSOs be asked to do?

- *commit them to Lambeth/specific areas*

PCSOs will probably be seen as an extension of police.

How should they be deployed?

- *a local presence?*
- *Deployed to hot spots?*

Need:

- *enhanced communication*
- *3rd party reporting*
- *A friendly face*

Targeting causes of ASB/crime:

- *need to provide alternative activities*
- *require the right training*

Keep warden but give them more thorough training:

- *to support local kids*
- *to take the appropriate response to more serious incidents*

Police

- *there is a problem of mistrust*

Wardens

- *don't suffer with the stigma of authority and are therefore more approachable*
- *are good at data collection whereas councils are dependent on police information*

Council

- *needs to be better at looking at the bigger picture and linking up of wider range of council functions e.g. regeneration, mental health etc*
- *Debriefings of patrollers/wardens regularly with central senior officers would be useful.*
- *Competition between estates to encourage recycling.*

- *Street cleaners at night in some cities providing a visible street presence at night, increasing the feeling of safety.*
- *Encourage businesses to take more responsibility for street cleanliness e.g. recycling bins on Acre Lane move onto the Tesco car-park.*
- *Should KFC be required to clean-up more outside?*
- *Why do people litter outside KFC?*
- *Why are they so cavalier? Mostly youth?*
 - o *Don't feel part of the community*
 - o *Need to educate people/youth that they are stakeholders in the community.*
 - o *More work with schools to build a sense of community*
 - o *Send people into schools or other educational programmes to inform*
- *Charge business for their litter?*
- *Encourage businesses to publicise cleanliness*