



---

**Kirklees**  
METROPOLITAN COUNCIL

---

**KIRKLEES METROPOLITAN COUNCIL**

**AD HOC SCRUTINY PANEL – ANTI SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR**

**JULY 2003**

**PANEL:**

- Councillor David Beetham (Chair until May 2003)**
- Councillor Margaret Fearnley**
- Councillor Mary Granger**
- Councillor Sheila Hey**
- Assistant Chief Constable Greg Wilkinson -**  
**West Yorkshire Police (Co opted Member)**

## **1. CONTACTS**

**The Overview and Scrutiny Office  
The Town Hall  
Huddersfield  
HD1 2TA**

**Telephone: 01484 221908**

**Chair of Overview and Scrutiny: Councillor Andrew L Palfreeman**

**Support Officers: Christopher Rowe  
Penny Bunker**

**Administrative Support: Mary Brooks**

## CONTENTS

<b>PAGE NO.</b>	<b>ITEM</b>
1.	Cover page
2.	Contacts
3.	Contents page
4.	Recommendations
6.	Background and Terms of Reference
7.	Context
9.	Methodology
10.	The Evidence
13.	The Findings
22.	Conclusions
23.	Source Documents
24.	Action Plan

## RECOMMENDATIONS

- R1.** The Panel recommends that the Council, with the support of Kirklees Community Safety Partnership, establish a dedicated multi-agency, cross tenure team, located within the Community Safety Strategy Unit, dedicated to the co-ordination of Council Services and their partners in dealing with anti social behaviour issues effectively.
- R2.** That consideration is given to the most appropriate location for the Community Safety Strategy Unit within Council structures, in order to promote corporate responsibility for dealing with anti social issues.
- R3.** The Panel recommends that the funding of Anti Social Behaviour Orders be reviewed to ensure contributions from partner agencies are appropriate.
- R4.** That an extensive, baseline audit of anti social behaviour across Kirklees be undertaken to inform the work priorities of the dedicated Anti Social Behaviour Team and effectively prioritise action across Kirklees. This work should be undertaken whether or not it is agreed to establish a dedicated team .
- R5.** The Panel recommends the extension of the Neighbourhood Warden Scheme, with their deployment being informed by the outcomes of the audit of anti social behaviour in Kirklees. Funding and development in this area is critical.
- R6.** The Panel recommends that there should be a thorough investigation of the possibilities of providing more places for young people to go. The multi court facility at Almondbury and skate park facilities at Holmfirth and Greenhead Park were cited as good examples of youth provision. However, young people should be fully involved in the planning process of any facility to ensure that it meets their needs.
- R7.** The Panel recommends the coordinated instigation of sustainable diversionary activities for young people in areas worst affected by anti social behaviour.
- R8.** The Panel recommends the following in respect of educational provision and parental responsibility:
- i) The further use of Attendance Watch measures to target truancy from schools in areas with particular problems of anti social behaviour.
  - ii) That officers of the Education Service play an active role in the Anti Social Behaviour Team to effectively target social education schemes.
  - iii) That there be a review of the provision of educational opportunities for young people who have been excluded from school and the transfer arrangements to minimise the time when young people are not attending any form of educational provision.
  - iv) That education about the dangers of anti social behaviour be targeted at a much younger age group.
  - v) That the Council run a publicity campaign centred on the theme, “Do you know where your child is tonight?” in order to highlight the responsibilities of parents in this area.

vi) That the provision of Parenting classes be reviewed to ensure that support is effectively targeted to help parents “feel confident in establishing and maintaining a sense of responsibility, decency and respect in their children”. (Home Office White Paper)

vii) Mindful of the role of all Councillors as Corporate Parents, the Council review the Corporate Parenting Strategy to ensure that all possible support for looked after children at risk of engaging in anti social behaviour, is in place.

viii) Investigate the option of a vocational curriculum unsuited to the traditional academic choices .

ix) That parental support packages be tied to Acceptable Behaviour Contracts as the pre ASBO stage.

**R9.** Subject to the evaluation of Wakefield Proof of Age Scheme, the Panel recommends that the Council implement a Proof of Age Scheme across the Kirklees district.

**R10.** The Panel recommends the following to maximise the effectiveness of enforcement action:

Streamline the process for granting ASBOs and include responsibility for the processes in the duties of the dedicated Anti Social Behaviour Team;

Have a solicitor dedicated to work on anti social behaviour issues;

Use the full range of anti social behaviour legislation i.e. ASB Contracts, injunctions, warning letters, Fixed Penalty Notices;

Maximise publicity about the granting of ASBOs to inform and reassure communities that action is being taken. This should also apply when an ASBO is breached;

That complaints regarding anti social behaviour are taken into account when granting or renewing licenses for pubs and clubs.

**R11.** The Panel recommends that a scheme, similar to that developed by Coventry City Council, be implemented in Kirklees to ensure that magistrates are fully aware of the serious impact of anti social behaviour.

**R12.** The Panel recommends that the Council undertake a programme of visual audits, directly involving the community, and seek to develop responsive services to deal with the issues of environmental decline, including abandoned vehicles.

**R13.** The Panel recommends that the Council give consideration to an alternative approach to evicted tenants, to try and address the causes of their anti social behaviour and rehabilitate them, rather than transferring the problem to other areas of Kirklees.

## **2. BACKGROUND**

### **Reasons for the Ad Hoc Scrutiny Panel into Anti Social Behaviour in Kirklees**

- 2.1 In October 2002 the Overview and Scrutiny Management Group agreed to a request, submitted by former Councillor David Beetham, to establish an Ad Hoc Panel to look at issues around anti social behaviour in the Kirklees district.
- 2.2 Anti Social behaviour is clearly a growing issue affecting all communities in Kirklees, be it noise nuisance, litter, graffiti, vandalism or out of control young people. It is often this low level behaviour and crime, rather than serious crime that affects the quality of life for citizens living in Kirklees.
- 2.3 The Council has been proactive in working with partner agencies and the voluntary sector to develop projects and strategies to address aspects of anti social behaviour. The Council has also been among national leaders in using the power of Anti Social Behaviour Orders to deal with individual offenders.
- 2.4 However, it was considered an appropriate time for a Scrutiny Panel to review what was currently in place, what the issues were for the people of Kirklees and how the Council and partner agencies were responding to anti social behaviour.

### **TERMS OF REFERENCE**

- 2.5 The Terms of Reference of the Panel were as follows:

“To identify, discuss and analyse issues surrounding anti-social behaviour in residential areas of Kirklees, and to make such recommendations to Council, Partners and other agencies as are deemed necessary. “

## 3. CONTEXT

### 3.1 Definition of Anti Social Behaviour

In the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, anti social behaviour, as relevant to Anti Social Behaviour Orders (ASBO) was described in the following terms;

***“... the person has acted in a manner that caused or was likely to cause harassment, alarm or distress to one or more persons not of the same household as himself. ...”***

The above definition describes the consequences of anti social behaviour rather than the behaviour itself. When looking at anti social behaviour the Home Office have included the following behaviour;

***Harassment, threats, verbal abuse, intimidation, graffiti and criminal damage, assault, noise, public disturbance, arson, racial harassment or abuse, criminal behaviour, drunk and disorderly, prostitution, shoplifting, throwing missiles, trespass and harassing a specific person.***

One of the difficulties encountered by Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships in developing overall strategies and packages of measures to address the issue, are imprecise definitions of what counts as anti social behaviour.

### 3.2 The National Context

3.2 Evidence gathered as part of the British Crime Survey 2001/2002 indicated that anti social behaviour was a real and growing problem throughout Britain. A third of adults identified specific anti social behaviour in their locality that had a negative impact on their quality of life.

The type of behaviour identified included;

- Drug using or dealing
- Vandalism
- Teenagers hanging around
- Litter

3.3 Local Government Association research published in July 2002 indicated that nine out of ten Local Authorities had identified anti social behaviour as an important issue in promoting community safety.

3.4 Most recently, Central Government has made the fight against anti social behaviour a key priority. This has been reflected in both the National Policing Plan, published in November 2002 and the White Paper “Respect and Responsibility – Taking a Stand Against Anti-Social Behaviour “. The White Paper aims to increase the powers of both local authorities and the police to deal with anti social behaviour.

3.5 In his foreword to this White Paper, the Home Secretary underlines the Government's commitment to tackling anti social behaviour by stating;

***".... This white paper is all about a sense of responsibility: an acceptance that anti social behaviour in whatever guise, is not acceptable and that together we will take responsibility to stamp it out, whenever we come across it. This responsibility starts in the family, where parents are accountable for the actions of their children and the standards they live by. It extends to neighbours, who should not have to endure noise nuisance. It continues into local communities, where people take pride in the appearance of estates and do not tolerate vandalism, litter or yobbish behaviour ..... The anti social behaviour of a few, damages the lives of many. We should never underestimate its impact ....It's time to stop thinking of anti social behaviour as something that we can just ignore. Anti-social behaviour blights people's lives, destroys families and ruins communities ....We must be much tougher about forcing people not to behave anti-socially. ...."***

3.6 Central government has made it quite clear that it expects Local Authorities to make full use of the range of existing and new measures to tackle anti-social behaviour. Local Authorities have a duty to provide for the social, economic and environmental well-being of their communities and tackling anti social behaviour is central to the well-being of communities.

### **3.7 The Local Situation**

There is little evidence to suggest that trends in Kirklees do anything other than mirror national trends. Residents questioned for the Crime and Disorder Public Consultation Process 2002, carried out by Kirklees Community Safety Partnership, confirmed that the most frequently experienced or witnessed anti social behaviour problems were:

- Young people congregating in groups
- Litter
- Abandoned vehicles

71% of Kirklees residents felt that levels of anti social behaviour are high (15%) or medium (56%). This belief was reinforced by the fact that throughout the 2002/2003 municipal year, anti social behaviour was a priority issue for discussion at Area Committees throughout Kirklees.

The Kirklees Community Safety Partnership has identified anti social behaviour as one of its key priorities and has developed an action plan, to address specific aspects of anti social behaviour.



## 4. METHODOLOGY

- 4.1 The Panel Members were:
- Councillor David Beetham (Chair until May 2003)
  - Councillor Margaret Fearnley
  - Councillor Mary Granger
  - Councillor Sheila Hey
  - Assistant Chief Constable Greg Wilkinson (West Yorkshire Police)
- 4.2 The Officer support for the Panel was provided by Christopher Rowe (Corporate Development Unit), Penny Bunker (Overview and Scrutiny Officer) and Mary Brooks (Secretary Scrutiny Office)
- 4.3 In a series of meetings held between December 2002 and May 2003, the Panel heard evidence from Councillors, Council Officers, West Yorkshire Police and Trading Standards.
- 4.4 As part of their investigations the Panel also undertook two site visits to areas where anti social behaviour was particularly problematic. The Panel met with tenants and residents, Neighbourhood Wardens, Community Police Officers and local officials to discuss the type of problems being experienced and the effectiveness of the Council and its partners in implementing solutions.
- 4.5 The Panel also worked with Julie Walker of the Involving Young Citizens Equally Project (IYCE) to meet with a group of young people who had direct experience of anti social behaviour as both perpetrators and victims.
- 4.6 The evidence gathered by the Panel was supplemented by examples of national good practice and information gathered by Scrutiny Panels and various professional bodies across the country.

## 5. THE EVIDENCE

- 5.1 In gathering evidence on Anti Social Behaviour the Panel interviewed the following;
- David Bennett and Pat Hemingway , Kirklees Neighbourhood Housing , Area Housing Managers for Newsome and Thornhill
  - Simon Massey and Wendy Ashleigh Reynolds from Kirklees Community Safety Strategy Unit
  - Sharon Heels of KMC Legal Services
  - Chief Superintendent John Holt of West Yorkshire Police (Huddersfield Division)
  - Superintendent John Cocliffe of West Yorkshire Police (Dewsbury Division)
  - Joe Wilson KMC Education Service
  - Carol Hallett West Yorkshire Trading Standards
  - Jon Bradnum Youth Offending Team
  - Paul Johnson KMC Social Services
  - Andrew Cannon KMC Environmental Services
  - Councillor Ann Raistrick – KMC Cabinet Member
- 5.2 The Panel also undertook site visits to Aldonley at Almondbury and London Park Estate at Mirfield to talk to tenants and residents, neighbourhood wardens, ward councillors and community police officers about their experience of anti social behaviour. The visits were coordinated by Mal Shields, Neighbourhood Wardens Manager.
- 5.3 The Panel also met young people from Nortonthorpe School who had been excluded from mainstream provision. Julie Walker of Involving Young Citizen's Equally arranged the visit.

**The Panel is most grateful to all those mentioned above for their cooperation in giving evidence to assist the Panel in their work.**

### **Summary of key points of evidence**

- 5.4 The following is a summary of the key points of evidence identified by the Panel, many of which were highlighted by several witnesses.
- 5.5 Anti social behaviour is not restricted to council tenants and the streets of council housing estates. Mechanisms are in place to deal with council tenants who repeatedly behave in an anti social manner, ultimately through the eviction of the perpetrator and his/her family. However, in evicting the perpetrator are we simply moving the problem into the private rented sector where no such formal structures are in place?
- 5.6 Although the Panel acknowledged that not all anti social behaviour is carried out by young people, the experience of Housing Managers was that the core of anti social activity is undertaken by the 10 to 15 age group and tends to be low level but persistent nuisance. There is a need to effectively coordinate

the work of Education, Housing, West Yorkshire Police, Social Services, the Youth Service, Environmental Services and other agencies to develop responses and preventative remedies.

- 5.7 The definition and perception of what constitutes anti social behaviour is very subjective. The perception of many older people is that groups of young people hanging around on street corners constitutes anti social behaviour. The perception is that such groups of young people cause a noise nuisance and anti social behaviour can escalate if they have access to drugs and alcohol. These perceptions are very real to many people, in particular elderly people who see it as a serious threat to their quality of life.
- 5.8 The reality is that most young people believe that they simply have nowhere to go in their leisure time. They want to spend time with their friends and often congregate in groups so that they themselves do not become a victim of crime. Many of the Officers and agencies spoken to agreed that there was insufficient provision for young people. Formal youth clubs were not seen as appropriate but a “pub without beer” was suggested as an alternative environment where young people could gather to relax.
- 5.9 The young people that Panel Members spoke to made reference to peer pressure and how anti social behaviour can arise because of the need to “fit in”. The sort of anti social behaviour that occurs is generally acts of petty vandalism, graffiti and in some cases criminal damage.
- 5.10 Reference was made to the physical appearance of a neighbourhood having an impact on behaviour. For example, if one vacant property becomes vandalised then there is a strong likelihood that other property in the same area will be vandalised. There is a need to develop a prompt coordinated response to these issues to stop a downward spiral in the physical appearance of neighbourhoods. Neighbourhood Wardens have a leading role in identifying areas that need a swift response.
- 5.11 There are areas where the lines of responsibility are blurred, for example dealing with untaxed or abandoned vehicles, and better coordination and communication between services would help to eradicate the grey areas of responsibility to deliver positive results.
- 5.12 The Panel heard about the anti social nuisance of fireworks and how underage drinking can fuel anti social behaviour. West Yorkshire Trading Standards spoke to the Panel about the Proof of Age Scheme which helps address these issues.

## Strategic Issues

- 5.13 Evidence submitted by Officers of the Community Safety Strategy Unit indicated that, at that time, there was no lead officer or service responsible for coordinating anti social behaviour strategy and interventions across the council. The varying forms of anti social behaviour were dealt with across a wide range of council services, including Environmental Services, Building Services, Youth Offending Team, Social Services, Housing Services, Community Safety Strategy Unit etc.
- 5.14 There was also no central contact point for the public to report anti social behaviour incidents or complaints to, such as behaviour originating from pubs and clubs.
- 5.15 A cross service group is responsible for the co ordination of Anti Social Behaviour Orders. The work of the group has significantly increased to the point where there is an urgent need to review the whole system and Legal Officers strongly recommended that a dedicated resource be set up to administer and co ordinate the ASBO process.
- 5.16 Officers suggested that there needed to be a corporate pot for funding of ASBOs, to ensure that no service budget is unduly burdened with the cost of ASBOs, particularly to the point where the granting of an ASBO is restricted due to budgetary limitations. To date the majority of ASBOs were the result of a police request, but West Yorkshire Police did not contribute towards the cost of the legal processing of Orders.
- 5.17 West Yorkshire Police also felt that there was a lack of coordinated approach and advocated a multi agency approach to dealing with anti social behaviour issues. There were cases where the action of one partner to deal with anti social behaviour cut across the steps being taken by another agency, for example returning truants to school for them to be immediately suspended and free to roam the neighbourhood until the system identified alternative provision.
- 5.18 The need to develop preventative work with pre teenage children, through education and youth work was also highlighted. Social Education Schemes like Project Nexus, Peer Counselling Schemes and the Transition Group Scheme were highlighted as good practice.
- 5.19 The role of Neighbourhood Wardens was identified as central to dealing with fear of crime issues in communities and providing intelligence to assist other agencies. Wardens have not only helped to release police time to deal with more serious problems but addressed community frustrations about the perceived lack of response to low level nuisance behaviour. When Police Community Support Officers come on stream later in 2003 they should also help to address these issues.

## 6. FINDINGS

The findings of the Panel can be broadly divided into four categories;

- Operational
- Preventative
- Enforcement
- Miscellaneous

### 6.1 Operational – Coordinating the Anti Social Behaviour agenda

6.2 Throughout their investigations the Panel found examples of good practice to combat anti social behaviour already existing in Kirklees. However, this work was of an ad hoc and unstructured nature, involving a broad range of Council services and external agencies. The Panel acknowledge that part of the reason for this, is that the anti social behaviour agenda is still in its infancy and it is only recently local government has been recognising the need to coordinate responses to anti social behaviour.

6.3 The effect of the current arrangements is as follows;

- A lack of knowledge about what other Service areas are doing thereby increasing the risk of duplication, both in the allocation of officer time and financial resources.
- A dilution of effectiveness in dealing with anti social behaviour issues, instead of maximising and coordinating effort on key priorities, spreading resources thinly across a number of projects.
- An increase in the difficulty of working effectively with our partners, as they also try to prioritise their involvement across service areas rather than responding to an overarching, coordinated approach.
- The lack of an identifiable contact point for the public to report anti social behaviour concerns to.

6.4 The Panel heard from all the witnesses interviewed about the frustrations of the current ad hoc, "bolt on" arrangements for dealing with anti social behaviour issues. Many officers had an aspect of anti social behaviour work added on to their responsibilities and the work load involved had continued to escalate to the detriment of their core duties. Without exception, it was recommended that the coordination of anti social behaviour issues should be the responsibility of a full time dedicated officer or team of officers.

6.5 From the evidence gathered, the Panel shares the concerns expressed by witnesses about the current uncoordinated approach to dealing with anti social behaviour issues. The Panel welcomed the examples of good practice that already existed and the Council's proactive approach in utilising Anti Social Behaviour Orders. However, the Panel felt that there would be clear benefits to establishing a coordinated approach to anti social behaviour issues and joining up services, particularly in the development and coordination of preventative work, prior to utilising formal legal approaches.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

The Panel recommends that the Council, with the support of Kirklees Community Safety Partnership, establish a dedicated multi agency, cross tenure team, located within the Community Safety Strategy Unit, dedicated to the coordination of Council Services and their partners in dealing with anti social behaviour issues effectively.

**6.6 Functions of the Team could include:**

- Coordinating action against anti social behaviour in Kirklees
- Providing an obvious contact point for any Kirklees resident suffering because of anti social behaviour
- Coordinating alternative, diversionary activities for young people in the areas they are needed most
- Providing support for witnesses wherever needed
- Providing dedicated legal support for enforcement procedures
- Ensuring that low level anti social behaviour (graffiti, abandoned cars, litter, noise etc) is dealt with promptly
- Facilitating innovative community based schemes aimed at reducing anti social behaviour
- Providing specialist Housing expertise for tenants suffering from anti social behaviour.
- Coordinating and researching bids to fund the work of the team
- Coordinating educational and diversionary activities aimed at reducing anti social behaviour
- Ensuring that arrangements are in place to monitor the effectiveness of measures to tackle anti social behaviour
- Having regular briefings with the Cabinet Member and the Community Safety Partnership so that progress can be monitored.

6.7 The Panel emphasised the importance of dealing with anti social behaviour as a corporate issue and an integral part of service delivery considerations. To support this, the Panel felt it was appropriate when establishing a coordinating unit within the Community Safety Strategy Unit, to consider the location of the Community Safety Strategy Unit within council structures. Witnesses emphasised the need for the corporate identity and ownership of the Unit and seriously questioned whether the current location within Social Services was appropriate. The profile and budgetary requirements suggest that an alternative location would be more appropriate.

**RECOMMENDATION**

That consideration is given to the most appropriate location for the Community Safety Strategy Unit within Council structures, in order to promote corporate responsibility for dealing with anti social behaviour issues.

6.8 The Panel further emphasised the need for a corporate approach to the funding of Anti Social Behaviour Orders. ASBO's had cost on average between £3k to £5k each. When statistics were given in December 2002, the Council had 10 ASBOs in operation. The majority of ASBOs in Kirklees were as result of requests from West Yorkshire Police who did not contribute to the cost of the legal process. The Panel felt it was important that the funding of ASBOs was a shared responsibility.

**RECOMMENDATION**

The Panel recommends that the funding of Anti Social Behaviour Orders be reviewed to ensure contributions from partner agencies are appropriate.

6.9 In order to properly focus the work of a dedicated Anti Social Behaviour Team, the Panel agreed with the suggestion put forward by Chief Superintendent Holt, that a first priority should be to undertake a baseline audit of anti social behaviour across Kirklees. This would allow an appreciation of the range, extent and patterns of anti social behaviour across the district in order to identify priorities and target resources.

As part of the Audit, methods should be used that allow for the involvement of local community groups, tenants and residents associations etc in identifying the issues that affect their communities.

Area Committees should also be involved in the audit process.

Local agencies and West Yorkshire Police should be seen as a primary source of data and local knowledge to inform the audit.

**RECOMMENDATION**

That an extensive, baseline audit of anti social behaviour across Kirklees be undertaken to inform the work priorities of the dedicated Anti Social Behaviour Team and effectively prioritise action across Kirklees. This work should be undertaken whether or not it is agreed to establish a dedicated team.

6.10 The Panel are supportive of the role performed by Neighbourhood Wardens who have been successful in a number of roles including;

- Providing a reassuring presence to help counter fear of crime
- Providing a presence to deter anti social behaviour
- Dealing with issues of low level nuisance
- Providing intelligence and collecting evidence to assist the police in dealing with more serious incidents
- Releasing police time to focus on other crime
- In some cases working with young people to establish diversionary activities and advocate on their behalf

6.11 On site visits to London Park Estate, Mirfield and Aldonley, Almondbury, the Panel heard about the positive effects of the Neighbourhood Warden Scheme and residents were vocal in their support of the scheme.

The Panel supported the expansion of the scheme and suggested that those areas with the highest levels of anti social behaviour, as identified by the baseline audit, should be prioritised for the allocation of wardens.

The expansion of the Police Community Support Officer Scheme should complement the work being carried out by the neighbourhood wardens and the Panel strongly suggested that there should be discussions between West Yorkshire Police and the Council officers regarding the targeted deployment of PCSOs.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

The Panel recommends the extension of the Neighbourhood Warden Scheme, with their deployment being informed by the outcomes of the audit of anti social behaviour in Kirklees. Funding and development in this area is critical.

### **Preventative – Diversionary and Educational approaches**

6.12 The Home Office White Paper “Respect and Responsibility – Taking a Stand against Anti Social Behaviour”, states the following;

***“.... We know that when young people have diversionary activities to keep them occupied, anti social behaviour and crime are often reduced. ...”***

Panel discussions with witnesses and in particular with residents, showed that many felt there was a lack of provision for young people. In Almondbury, the Neighbourhood Warden has negotiated the use of a multi court for young people in the evenings. Within the court is a graffiti wall and the Wardens have organised junior football practice. Young people who are congregating in other locations within the vicinity are encouraged by the Wardens to move to the multi court area.

6.13 The Panel were concerned at the lack of provision for young people, in particular teenagers. Maidstone Borough Council undertook a Scrutiny Review of Services for Young People and found that young people wanted somewhere to sit and talk with friends with a minimum of adult supervision. Young people did not want organised activities but would like to see pool tables and internet access available at meeting places. Skate parks and youth shelters in play areas were also features that acted as a focal point for young people. Maidstone Borough Council had agreed to be proactive in seeking the provision of equipment for older children in Section 106 Agreement negotiations and include provision for older young people as part of any play ground refurbishments. (Section 106 Agreements relate to terms agreed with developers about the provision of additional community facilities as part of a development, these often include play areas)

6.14 The Kirklees Panel met with young people attending Nortonthorpe School who suggested there should be more clubs for young people. These would offer somewhere to meet friends, listen to music and generally “hang out”. The under 18 nights at town centre clubs were good and should be held more often.



**RECOMMENDATION**

The Panel recommends that there should be a thorough investigation of the possibilities of providing more places for young people to go. The multi court facility at Almondbury and skate park facilities at Holmfirth and Greenhead Park were cited as good examples of youth provision. However young people should be fully involved in the planning process of any facility to ensure it meets their needs, is accessible to them and at a cost they can afford.

- 6.15 In addition to the provision of leisure facilities and meeting places, the Panel recognised the benefits of targeting diversionary activities in areas worst affected by anti social behaviour. These were often delivered in partnership with the voluntary sector or other agencies. It was felt the targeting of diversionary activities would be part of the remit of the Anti Social Behaviour Team

**RECOMMENDATION**

The Panel recommends the coordinated instigation of sustainable diversionary activities for young people in areas worst affected by anti social behaviour.

- 6.16 Throughout their investigations the Panel identified a common thread regarding education provision and parental support.
- 6.17 Young people themselves felt it important to show children and young people the consequences of anti social behaviour, to the point of shocking them. Young people should be involved in making videos and other educational aids to warn others about the consequences of anti social behaviour, such as drug taking, joy riding and truancy.

The young people who the Panel spoke to had found school repetitive and wanted to see opportunities to learn life skills and be more creative, for example more opportunities to do drama and learn practical skills such as plastering. They have responded to the way they were treated at Nortonthorpe Hall School and felt they had now changed their behaviour and were making plans for the future.

- 6.18 The Panel recognised the key role that the education system has to play in alerting children to the dangers and potential consequences of anti social behaviour. This is included in the citizenship curriculum but the Panel felt that children should also be targeted at a much earlier age before they have already become involved in anti social behaviour.
- 6.19 In addition to receiving the message loud and clear at school, the Panel believed that the influences at home, particularly of parents, were paramount. Some schools ran voluntary parenting classes, but they were not always successful in reaching those who needed the greatest help. It was suggested that parental support packages should be tied to

Acceptable Behaviour Contracts at a pre ASBO stage. The Panel also believe that parents have a responsibility to know where their child is and what they are doing.

6.20 The Panel noted the correlation between truancy levels and levels of anti social behaviour. The Panel were pleased to learn that the truancy levels in Kirklees are significantly lower than in similar authorities, but aware of the need to avoid complacency. The Panel were concerned at the period of time, once suspended and excluded, that children were not in any sort of provision and free to roam the streets.

6.21 The Panel agreed a raft of recommendations regarding educational provision and parental responsibility, aimed at continuing to build on many of the existing schemes that are having positive results.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Panel recommends the following in respect of educational provision and parental responsibility;

(i) The further use of Attendance Watch measures to target truancy from schools in areas with particular problems of anti social behaviour.

(ii) That officers from the Education Service play an active role in the Anti Social Behaviour Team to effectively target social education schemes.

(iii) That there be a review of the provision of educational opportunities for young people who have been excluded from school and the transfer arrangements to minimise the time when young people are not attending any form of educational provision.

(iv) That education about the dangers of anti social behaviour be targeted at a much younger age group.

(v) That the Council run a publicity campaign centred on the theme, "Do you know where your child is tonight?", in order to highlight the responsibilities of parents in this area.

(vi) That the provision of Parenting classes be reviewed to ensure that support is effectively targeted to help parents "feel confident in establishing and maintaining a sense of responsibility, decency and respect in their children." (Home Office White Paper).

(vii) Mindful of the role of all Councillors as Corporate Parents, the Council review the Corporate Parenting Strategy to ensure that all possible support for looked after children at risk of engaging in anti social behaviour, is in place.

(viii) Investigate the option of a vocational curriculum for young people unsuited to the traditional academic choices.

(iv) That parental support packages be tied to Acceptable Behaviour Contracts at the pre ASBO stage.

- 6.22 The Panel also felt that it would be worth while looking at implementing a Proof Of Age Scheme in the Kirklees area. As well as preventing underage sales, the scheme had some positive benefits for young people, in particular those who did not look over 18 and struggled to gain legitimate access to clubs, pubs etc.

The Scheme is currently being piloted by Wakefield MD Council and the Panel recommend that once the evaluation of the Wakefield scheme is available, the Council consider the findings and the possibility of implementing a scheme in Kirklees.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

Subject to the evaluation of the Wakefield Proof of Age Scheme, the Panel recommends that the Council implement a Proof of Age Scheme across the Kirklees District

### **6.23 Enforcement**

The main thrust of work is aimed at preventing anti social behaviour happening in the first place. However, there are occasions when it does occur and communities need visible reassurance and the confidence to know that it is being dealt with. Communities affected by anti social behaviour and the perpetrators must receive the message that anti social behaviour warrants serious sanctions and that breaching those sanctions will have further serious consequences.

Above all, the Panel believe that to achieve this, action must be taken swiftly and effectively. For this reason the Panel recommends the following;

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Panel recommends the following to maximise the effectiveness of enforcement action;

- Streamline the process for granting ASBOs and include responsibility for the processes in the duties of the dedicated Anti Social Behaviour Team
- Have a solicitor dedicated to work on anti social behaviour issues
- Second Police Officers to the ASB Team to work on anti social behaviour issues
- Use the full range of anti social behaviour legislation i.e. Anti Social Behaviour Contracts, Injunctions, Warning letters, Fixed Penalty Notices.
- Maximise publicity about the granting of ASBOs to inform and reassure communities that action is being taken. This should also apply when an ASBO is breached.
- That complaints regarding anti social behaviour are taken into account when granting or renewing licenses for pubs and clubs.

- 6.24 One of the concerns raised by members of the community was that the courts did not take anti social behaviour seriously. In some cases where ASBOs have been breached, the court has not enforced any further penalty. This sends out a very negative message to the community.

Within Kirklees there were similar concerns about the how the courts were dealing with perpetrators of domestic violence. A training course was developed for local magistrates so that they could develop a fuller understanding of the impact of domestic violence and the options for the courts to more effectively address the problem, both in helping offenders to learn to control their behaviour and in supporting victims and their families.

A scheme has been introduced by Coventry City Council to ensure that magistrates have a full understanding of the serious impact that anti social behaviour can have on the community. The scheme included a seminar where video footage, taken by professional witnesses on local estates, was used to give to magistrates a better understanding of the effects of anti social behaviour on local people.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

The Panel recommends that a scheme, similar to that developed by Coventry City Council, be implemented in Kirklees to ensure that magistrates are fully aware of the serious impact of anti social behaviour.

#### **6.25 Miscellaneous**

According to the Home Office White Paper,

***“...If a window is broken or a wall is covered in graffiti, it can contribute to an environment in which crime takes hold, particularly if intervention is not prompt and effective .... Environmental decline, anti social behaviour and crime go hand in hand and create a sense of helplessness that nothing can be done. “***

The Estate Management Officers, tenants and residents all provided evidence that this was the reality that they faced. The Panel believed that there were ways of addressing these issues, including the following;

- Following the evaluation of the Pilot Visual Audit Areas, the Council roll out a programme of visual audits across the Kirklees district, utilizing the Area Committees, to identify the areas worst affected.
- Organising “Clear Up” campaigns in these areas, including the free provision of skips.
- Working to design out the features that assist perpetrators of anti social behaviour, for example extensive networks of ginnels and blind spots on estates, fences that can easily be dismantled for use as weapons, broken perimeter fencing allowing easy access to open areas by joy riders etc.
- Respond promptly to the problem of abandoned and untaxed vehicles and consider good practice in other areas, eg Bradford and Newham.

**RECOMMENDATION**

The Panel recommends that the Council undertake a programme of visual audits, directly involving the community, and seek to develop responsive services to deal with issues of environmental decline, including abandoned vehicles.

- 6.26 Whilst supporting the eviction of council tenants who are guilty of persistent anti social behaviour, the Panel are concerned that this could be seen as simply moving the problem elsewhere. The Panel considered information on a project that has been piloted in Dundee, which involved rehousing the worst families, in cases where the Council still felt there was the possibility of changing behaviour patterns. These families were relocated in a special block, where they received intensive inter-agency support to help them to address their problems and rehabilitate them.

The Panel felt that in the fight against anti social behaviour, simply moving the problem elsewhere did not always succeed in stopping the anti social behaviour. The Dundee model, whilst not having a 100% success rate, has succeeded in reintegrating some of the families it has worked with and breaking the cycle of anti social behaviour.

**RECOMMENDATION**

The Panel recommends that the Council give consideration to an alternative approach to evicted tenants, to try and address the causes of their anti social behaviour and rehabilitate them rather than transferring the problem to other areas of Kirklees.

## 7. CONCLUSIONS

7.1 From the evidence gathered by the Panel talking to council officers, West Yorkshire Police, local residents and young people and supporting statistical information, it is clear that anti social behaviour is increasing across the country.

In presenting this report and its recommendations, the Panel emphasises that the report reflects the position when evidence was gathered and that since then the Council, West Yorkshire Police and other agencies have continued to make progress in tackling anti social behaviour.

7.2 Although the Council and its Partners have identified it as a priority theme in the Crime and Disorder Reduction Strategy and there is evidence of pockets of good practice across the Authority, it has become clear to the Panel that there needs to be a better resourced, dedicated Team to co ordinate the whole anti social behaviour agenda. It is important that the overarching Anti Social Behaviour Strategy permeates through all areas of Council responsibility, as well as partner agencies.

7.3 The reasons for trying to tackle anti social behaviour were broadly summarised in the National Association for the Care and Resettlement of Offenders (Nacro) Community Safety Briefing Paper "Tackling Anti Social Behaviour – what really works" :

- Anti social behaviour acts as a catalyst for more serious crime and disorder
- Anti social behaviour inhibits communities
- Anti social behaviour is costly
- Anti social behaviour can result in social exclusion

It is for these reasons that the Ad Hoc Panel are presenting the above recommendations as a means by which to continue to tackle the growing problem of anti social behaviour in the Kirklees Area.

## 8. SOURCE DOCUMENTS

The following documents have been used as reference sources in the production of this report:-

1. Breaking New Ground in Tackling Anti-Social Behaviour- Evaluation of the Dundee Families Project  
Jennifer Dillane, Suzie Scott, Malcolm Hill and Jon Bannister – Department of Urban Studies, University of Glasgow.
2. Anti-social behaviour-Discussion Paper  
Wendy Ashleigh Reynolds – KMC Community Safety Unit
3. Visual Audits – Thornhill and Botham Hall - West Yorkshire Audits
4. The Respect Campaign - London Borough of Newham
5. Tackling anti-social behaviour – information and case studies  
Local Government Association
6. Anti-social Behaviour in Kirklees  
Research by West Yorkshire Police Performance and Strategic Planning Unit
7. Anti-Social Behaviour in Kirklees - Discussion Paper  
Sharon Heels – KMC Legal Services
8. Proof of Age Partnership Paper - West Yorkshire Trading Standards
9. Respect and Responsibility – Taking a Stand Against Anti-Social Behaviour  
Government White Paper.
10. Crime Reduction Basics –Tackling crime and anti-social behaviour in the Community - Home Office
11. Tackling Anti-Social Behaviour in Mixed Tenure Areas  
Office of the Deputy Prime Minister
12. Kirklees Crime and Disorder Reduction Strategy 2002 – 2005
13. Kirklees Crime and Disorder Audit Report 2001
14. Services For Young People  
Overview and Scrutiny Committee Culture and Leisure, Maidstone Borough Council
15. Preventing Anti Social Behaviour - Article by NACRO, Edges Magazine
16. Tackling Anti Social Behaviour – What Really Works  
NACRO Briefing ( National Association for the Care and Rehabilitation of Offenders)

## AD HOC SCRUTINY PANEL ANTI SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR – ACTION PLAN

Cabinet Members and Directors support the majority of the recommendations made by the Ad Hoc Scrutiny Panel. Councillor Raistrick, Cabinet Member for Safer Communities, has indicated that many of the recommendations made by the Panel were already being worked on at the time the Panel was gathering evidence. Many have been implemented and work is ongoing on others. Significant budget implications are likely from the recommendations and these will be considered as part of the budget setting process.

Recommendation	Responsibility	Agreed	Comments	Implementation Date
<p><b>R1. The Panel recommends that the Council, with the support of Kirklees Community Safety Partnership, establish a dedicated multi agency, cross tenure team, located within the Community Safety Strategy Unit, dedicated to the co ordination of Council Services and their partners in dealing with anti social behaviour issues effectively</b></p>	<p>Cllr Ann Raistrick</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>The Community Safety Strategy Unit established an ASB Team to co-ordinate and manage the ASBO process and early interventions. The Team currently consists of Police Officers and Community Safety Staff. It is intended that additional YOT and Education staff be established with the Unit in the near future. All agencies would support the idea of establishing a dedicated cross-tenure team to look at ASB issues. However, early intervention and local problem solving groups may help to reduce the need for an ASBO. There are budget implications for this and these will be discussed in the budget setting process.</p>	<p>Work ongoing</p>



Recommendation	Responsibility	Agreed	Comments	Implementation Date
<p><b>R2. That consideration is given to the most appropriate location for the Community Safety Strategy Unit within Council structures, in order to promote corporate responsibility for dealing with anti social issues.</b></p>	<p>Cllr Ann Raistrick</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>Community Safety has clear links with YOT and DAT as well as other "social" issues. Government want to strengthen these links so it seems appropriate to leave CS within the wider Social Affairs and Health Dept. However, new partnerships and new government initiatives would mean that the location of the CS Unit is kept under regular review.</p>	<p>Maintain current position but keep under regular review</p>
<p><b>R3. The Panel recommends that the funding of Anti Social Behaviour Orders be reviewed to ensure contributions from partner agencies are appropriate.</b></p>	<p>Cllr Ann Raistrick / Philip Cotterill</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>Some funding is available from the Council central reserves for the application of ASBO's however, there is no core funding for a dedicated ASB Team. At present the CS ASB Unit is funded by short-term Gov Grant. There is a need to review funding in order to identify a permanent source. Many agencies feel that a dedicated corporate pot of funding should be established for ASB. However there are budget implications here and these will be looked at as part of the budget setting process.</p>	<p>Work Ongoing</p>
<p><b>R4. That an extensive, baseline audit of anti social behaviour across Kirklees be undertaken to inform the work priorities of the dedicated Anti Social Behaviour Team and effectively prioritise action across Kirklees. This work should be undertaken whether or not it is agreed to establish a dedicated team.</b></p>	<p>Cllr Ann Raistrick / Philip Cotterill</p>	<p><b>Not Agreed</b></p>	<p>An audit of concerns regarding ASB was carried out during 2001 as part of the C&amp;D Audit Process. In addition the police weekly monitor ASB issues and crime trends. Both the CS Unit and the police feel that it would not be necessary to carry out a further audit. The current weekly briefings can be fed into any specifically dedicated ASB Unit to inform their work priorities.</p>	

Recommendation	Responsibility	Agreed	Comments	Implementation Date
<p><b>R5. The Panel recommends the extension of the Neighbourhood Warden Scheme, with their deployment being informed by the outcomes of the audit of anti social behaviour in Kirklees. Funding and development in this area is critical.</b></p>	<p><b>Councillor Andrew Cooper / Tony Hood</b></p>	<p><b>Agreed</b></p>	<p>There is a need to review the roles and funding sources of the current Warden Schemes. KNH have indicated their wish to retain a specific Warden function, but with closer co-ordination with other schemes. A review meeting is currently planned to establish a strategic way forward. There are likely to be budget implications and these will be considered as part of the budget setting process.</p>	<p><b>Work ongoing</b></p>
<p><b>R6. The Panel recommends that there should be a thorough investigation of the possibilities of providing more places for young people to go. The multi court facility at Almondbury and skate park facilities at Holmfirth and Greenhead Park were cited as good examples of youth provision. However young people should be fully involved in the planning process of any facility to ensure that it meets their needs.</b></p>	<p><b>Cllr John Smithson / Gavin Tonkin</b></p>	<p><b>Agreed</b></p>	<p>There is agreement that where possible increased provision for young people should be established. However there is also a note of caution. Services such as Social Services and YOT may not currently have the capacity to get involved with additional early prevention work. This is a fact beyond the control of anybody at this stage, due to the pressure of supporting the current number of young people who are in need. Plans are being drawn up to better link these services with the ASB Unit to try and reduce the number of meetings that they are expected to attend. In addition, the Young People's Service is currently developing specific plans around enhanced support for young people and definite links to these plans should be established.</p>	<p><b>Work Ongoing</b></p>
<p><b>R7. The Panel recommends the coordinated instigation of sustainable diversionary activities for young people in areas worst affected by anti social behaviour.</b></p>	<p><b>Cllr John Smithson /Gavin Tonkin</b></p>	<p><b>Agreed</b></p>	<p>See above</p>	

Recommendation	Responsibility	Agreed	Comments	Implementation Date
<p><b>R8. The Panel recommends the following in respect of educational provision and parental responsibility:</b></p> <p>(i) The further use of Attendance Watch measures to target truancy from schools in areas with particular problems of anti social behaviour.</p> <p>(ii) That officers of the Education Service play an active role in the Anti Social Behaviour Team to effectively target social education schemes.</p> <p>(iii) That there be a review of the provision of educational opportunities for young people who have been excluded from school and the transfer arrangements to minimise the time when young people are not attending any form of educational provision.</p> <p>(iv) That education about the dangers of anti social behaviour be targeted at a much younger age group.</p> <p>(v) That the Council run a publicity campaign centred on the theme, "Do you know where your child is tonight?" in order to highlight the responsibilities of parents in this area.</p> <p>(vi) That the provision of Parenting classes be reviewed to ensure that support is effectively targeted to help parents "feel confident in establishing and maintaining a sense of responsibility, decency and respect in their children". (Home Office White Paper)</p> <p>(vii) Mindful of the role of all Councillors as Corporate Parents, the Council review the Corporate Parenting Strategy to ensure that all possible support for looked after children at risk of engaging in anti social behaviour, is in place.</p> <p>(viii) Investigate the option of a vocational curriculum unsuited to the traditional academic choices.</p>	<p>Cllr John Smithson / Gavin Tonkin</p> <p>Cllr John Smithson / Gavin Tonkin</p> <p>Cllr John Smithson / Gavin Tonkin</p> <p>Cllr John Smithson / Gavin Tonkin</p> <p>To be identified</p> <p>To be identified</p> <p>Cllr Sylvia Smithson / P Cotterill</p> <p>Cllr John Smithson / Gavin Tonkin</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p>	<p>i) This is currently being developed</p> <p>ii) This is currently being developed</p> <p>iii) Already in hand with Headteacher reps</p> <p>iv) Further work needs to be carried out to look at the implications of this</p> <p>v) Already in hand with Headteacher reps</p> <p>This is currently being dealt with by the Childrens Strategic Group</p> <p>Further work needs to be carried out to look at the implications of this</p>	<p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Work Ongoing</p>

Recommendation	Responsibility	Agreed	Comments	Implementation Date
(ix) That parental support packages be tied to Acceptable Behaviour Contracts at the pre ASBO stage.	CLlr Ann Raistrick / Philip Cotterill		This is already being carried out	Measures in place
R9. Subject to the evaluation of Wakefield Proof of Age Scheme, the Panel recommends that the Council implement a Proof of Age Scheme across the Kirklees district.	To be identified	Agreed	This can be looked at as part of the overall Crime & Disorder Strategy. Preliminary discussions have already taken place with West Yorkshire Trading Standards and, subject to positive evaluation of the pilots running in Wakefield and Leeds, there is a wish to see this scheme rolled out across Kirklees. However, there are budget implications and this will be considered within the budget setting process.	Discussions Ongoing – Action determined by the Budget Process
R10. The Panel recommends the following to maximise the effectiveness of enforcement action; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Streamline the process for granting ASBOs and include responsibility for the processes in the duties of the dedicated Anti Social Behaviour Team</li> <li>▪ Have a solicitor dedicated to work on antisocial behaviour issues</li> <li>▪ Use the full range of anti social behaviour legislation i.e. ASB Contracts, injunctions, warning letters, Fixed Penalty Notices.</li> <li>▪ Maximise publicity about the granting of ASBOs to inform and reassure communities that action is being taken. This should also apply when an ASBO is breached.</li> </ul> <p>That complaints regarding anti social behaviour are taken into account when granting or renewing licenses for pubs and clubs.</p>	<p>CLlr Ann Raistrick / Philip Cotterill</p> <p>CLlr Ann Raistrick / John Emms</p> <p>John Emms</p> <p>CLlr Ann Raistrick / Philip Cotterill</p> <p>CLlr Andrew Pinnock / Kevin Kendall</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p><b>Not Agreed</b></p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p>	<p>This is already being carried out</p> <p>Legal Services have suggested that it would be better to maintain the current status quo with the ability to draw upon the services of any one of 3 solicitors capable of carrying this work out.</p> <p>The full range of ASB tools and appropriate publicity is currently being used.</p> <p>This action is included as part of the C&amp;D Strategy Action Plans for Town Centres.</p>	<p>Implemented</p> <p>Implemented</p> <p>Work ongoing</p>

<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Agreed</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Implementation Date</b>
<b>R11. The Panel recommends that a scheme, similar to that developed by Coventry City Council, be implemented in Kirklees to ensure that magistrates are fully aware of the serious impact of antisocial behaviour.</b>	To be identified	Agreed	Training for Magistrates has already been carried out, with a programme of ongoing training sessions planned.	Implemented and ongoing
<b>R.12 The Panel recommends that the Council undertake a programme of visual audits, directly involving the community, and seek to develop responsive services to deal with the issues of environmental decline, including abandoned vehicles.</b>	Cllr Ann Raistrick/Philip Cotterill	Agreed	A series of visual audits is currently planned as part of the C&D Strategy, and can be used for identifying further ASB problems within specific geographical sites. Environmental Services already have a "fast track" system linked to DVLA which deals with abandoned vehicles. Further interventions are being worked on.	Implemented in part and other work programmed
<b>R13. The Panel recommends that the Council give consideration to an alternative approach to evicted tenants, to try and address the causes of their anti social behaviour and rehabilitate them, rather than transferring the problem to other areas of Kirklees.</b>	Cllr Andrew Cooper / Tony Hood	Agreed	This already happens via KNH's Nuisance & Harassment Team.	Work Ongoing

**NOTE:** Progress against the action plan will be monitored by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Group.