



Leicester
City Council

Minutes of the Meeting of the
NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT
SCRUTINY COMMISSION

Held: WEDNESDAY, 5 DECEMBER 2018 at 5:30 pm

P R E S E N T :

Councillor Gugnani (Chair)
Councillor Thalukdar (Vice Chair)

Councillor Aqbany
Councillor Govind
Councillor Halford

Councillor Hunter
Councillor Waddington

In Attendance

Councillor Clarke, Deputy City Mayor with responsibility for
Environment, Public Health and Health Integration
Councillor Master, Assistant City Mayor - Neighbourhood Services

* * * * *

37. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

38. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations were made.

39. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

AGREED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Neighbourhood Services and
Community Involvement Scrutiny Commission held on 17 October
2018 be confirmed as a correct record.

40. PROGRESS ON ACTIONS AGREED AT THE LAST MEETING

Further to minute 29, “Minutes of the Previous Meeting”, the Chair reported verbally that the CCTV suite within the data centre would be available to visit any time after the week beginning 11 February 2019.

AGREED:

That the Scrutiny Policy Officer be asked to liaise with members of this Commission to arrange a visit, or visits, to the CCTV suite within the data centre, on a date, or dates, of mutual convenience.

41. CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chair reported verbally on developments in relation to stakes for Fixed Odds Betting Terminals (FOBTs), about which the Commission had expressed concerns over a period of time. He noted with pleasure that the government would be introducing a £2 limit on stakes on FOBTs, as this Commission and many other organisations had been urging.

The Chair reminded Members that a presentation had been made at the Commission's last meeting on the city's response to the explosion on Hinckley Road. Unfortunately, since then, another serious incident had occurred, with the helicopter crash at the King Power Stadium, in which Vichai Sriaddhanapreabha, the owner of Leicester City Football Club, and four others, had died.

As a result, the city had again been required to react to a major incident and, as far as was known, had responded very well in difficult circumstances. The Football Club had reacted with grace and dignity and the reaction of football fans around the country had been touching and sincere.

AGREED:

That this Commission wishes to thank the City Council for its work within the community in response to the helicopter crash on 27 October 2018 and Leicester City Football Club for its excellent response in a time of great stress.

42. PETITIONS

The Monitoring Officer reported that no petitions had been received.

43. QUESTIONS, REPRESENTATIONS AND STATEMENTS OF CASE

The Monitoring Officer reported that no questions, representations or statements of case had been received.

44. WASTE MINIMISATION COMMUNICATIONS - UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

The Director of Neighbourhood and Environmental Services submitted a report setting out details of the work undertaken by Waste Management services to

engage university students living in private housing in the city with using waste management services correctly.

Councillor Clarke, Deputy City Mayor with responsibility for Environment, Public Health and Health Integration, introduced the report, reminding Members of the need to work with students, due to the high level of turnover and the pressure the waste left behind this created on the authority.

The Service Development Manager (Waste Management) advised the Commission that the Council had engaged with students regarding waste collection for many years, so the work detailed in the report was additional to that. It was recognised that waste was unlikely to be a high priority for students, but the volume produced at the end of a university year potentially could have a big impact on the city. Work undertaken therefore included:

- When attending events at the universities, hundreds of students were spoken to and over 300 rolls of orange recycling bags were issued;
- Work with estate agents to include waste services literature in welcome packs given to student tenants; and
- Two key pieces of work at the end of the university year were extending the bulky waste collection service and work done with the British Heart Foundation, which already worked with the universities to encourage students to donate unwanted items to the charity, to install temporary donation banks in certain areas.

Waste Management officers perceived that a limit of five items for bulky waste collections could be a potential barrier to students using the service at the end of the academic year. As a trial, just under 300 properties were identified to receive an extended bulky waste collection service. These were selected by mapping areas to identify where student accommodation was concentrated. A control group also was identified, which did not receive the extended service. Both groups were monitored over the time that students were moving out of their properties, but uptake of the additional bulky collection service was very limited, suggesting that the item limit was not a barrier to take up of the service.

It was calculated that approximately 48% of excess waste left outside properties during this time was attributable to students. However, approximately 52% was found to be from other residents. This finding challenged the popular opinion that students were largely, or wholly, responsible for excess waste on the streets, particularly at this time of year. This was the only time in which this waste was monitored in this way, so it was not known how this compared to other times. Waste Management services worked with the City Warden service, by providing information on waste collection bookings to assist with the City Wardens' investigations in to excess waste.

The Commission welcomed the initiatives, but queried how students outside the trial areas would be contacted. In reply, it was noted that work had been

done in conjunction with Council Tax services to identify student properties. The residents of all student properties of which the Council was aware had been contacted with information about bulky waste collection services and three areas were given the option of an extended service. Literature about waste collection also had been circulated in university halls of residence and work had been undertaken with the Council Tax service to identify as many student properties as possible.

Members noted that the most successful part of this campaign had been the temporary donation banks operated in conjunction with the British Heart Foundation. The banks had been located in Victoria Park, Queens Road, Thurlow Road, Briton Street and Jarrom Street for eight weeks. It was not known if people other than students used these banks, as they could not be monitored continuously.

A good infrastructure of donation banks, bring banks and waste collection services already existed across the city, along with enforcement services, so any potential future provision of additional donation banks would need to be carefully considered and, if though appropriate, targeted to ensure that resources were applied as effectively as possible. It was anticipated that, as the extended bulky waste collection service for students had not been well used, the existing service of five items collected free of charge would be promoted at the end of the next university year, as in previous years, rather than repeating the enhanced scheme.

The Director of Neighbourhood and Environmental Services noted that useful information, including on techniques and approaches, had been gathered from these campaigns, that it could be useful for the Commission to scrutinise. This could be combined with the report on fly tipping that was scheduled to be considered at the Commission's next meeting.

AGREED:

- 1) That the work undertaken on student waste minimisation be noted and welcomed; and
- 2) That the Director of Neighbourhood and Environmental Services be asked to include information gathered from the work undertaken on student waste minimisation, including on techniques and approaches and on the number of penalty notices issued, in the report on fly tipping to be considered at the next meeting of this Commission.

45. COMMUNITY SAFETY PLAN: KNIFE CRIME UPDATE

Superintendent Shane O'Neill from Leicestershire Police gave a presentation on Knife Crime, a copy of which is attached at the end of these minutes for information.

During the presentation, Superintendent O'Neill drew particular attention to the following points:

- Knife crime was a national problem, with people in the age range 12 to 24 years being the most likely people to be affected. However, the figures shown in slide 3 were Home Office numbers, which used selected criteria of crimes involving a knife and so were compiled in a different way to that used by the Police;
- Slide 4 showed the crime figures collated by Leicestershire Police, which included any crime when a knife was threatened, seen or used. From this, it could be seen that there had been a very sharp increase in knife crime over the last four years in Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland, but this had levelled off since April 2018;
- There had been some reduction in the number of knife crimes in the New Parks / Western Park area. When the figures in slide 7 had been compiled there had been issues between groups of youths in those areas, but these had now reduced. However, the figures for that area were still relatively high;
- Habitual knife carriers were people known or believed to have carried a knife three times in the last year;
- The Community Safety Partnership Group shared information on matters such as who was likely to be carrying a knife with partners and other agencies. This included services such as the City Council's Housing services;
- It was recognised that people carried knives for many different reasons and not all reached the threshold for service intervention. However, when young people were identified as potentially likely to carry knives the Police tried to provide or facilitate diversionary activities;
- Feedback from education partners indicated the benefit of early intervention. As a result, Year 6 pupils were provided with prevention advice through an interactive wall at the Warning Zone, which was visited by a significant number of schools. In this way, the message reached over 11,000 young people every year; and
- It was hoped that connections could be made with faith groups in relation to knife crime during the coming year.

Members noted that more knife crimes were being reported, which could partly explain the increase in crime numbers, although it was known that many people did not report crimes, (for example, due to fear of repercussions of doing so). However, the number of violent crimes was increasing and the Police also felt that they were generating a greater number of reports of incidences of knife carrying by increasing the number of times people were stopped and searched. It was recognised that although a Police initiative in a certain area led to a short-term reduction in knife crime in that area, other initiatives were needed to maintain that decrease.

The Police had limited resources, so although they could go in to schools to pass on the message about knife crime, they needed schools to embed such messages in the curriculum. It was important to recognise that knife crime was a Leicestershire-wide issue and schools could be encouraged to assist in informing young people without any stigma. However, it could be difficult to reach young people being educated in alternative ways, (such as through home education and those in exclusion units).

It was noted that the Police and Crime Commissioner for Leicestershire had established a fund of £100,000 for anti-knife crime initiatives. Councillor Master, Assistant City Mayor – Neighbourhood Services, explained that the funding was held by the Commissioner's Office and that voluntary and other groups needed to bid for funding.

Members suggested that one use for this funding could be to train people such as ex-offenders and/or victims to deliver anti-knife crime messages, as this could have significant impact. Support from local Councillors to schools to consider any innovative methods for delivery of prevention messages on knife crime would be welcomed. Any funding suggestions needed to be made to the Police or Safer Leicester Partnership.

Members noted with regret that youth services were having to be curtailed, due to the financial constraints currently faced by many organisations. This removed a potential source of support for the work being undertaken to address knife crime. The Commission therefore suggested that youth services should be increased, not reduced, especially in areas where young people potentially could be considered to be more vulnerable.

AGREED:

- 1) That the Commission's thanks be passed to all those working to combat knife crime in the city;
- 2) That all Councillors be asked to promote the following page on the Leicestershire Police website and the information contained on it: [Knife Crime Prevention Resources](#);
- 3) That the slides from the presentation on knife crime, and when available a minute extract on the ensuing discussion, be circulated to all Members of the Council; and
- 4) That this Commission asks the Children, Young People and Schools Scrutiny Commission and the Deputy City Mayor with responsibility for Children and Young People's Services to look in to how the problems associated with knife crime in the city and its consequences can be addressed city-wide through the City Council's education and other services for young people, this to include consideration of activities that can be used to divert young people from engaging in knife crime.

Councillor Thalukdar left the meeting during the discussion on this item.

46. WORK PROGRAMME

The current work programme for the Commission was received and noted.

47. CLOSE OF MEETING

The meeting closed at 7.00 pm



Leicestershire
Police

Protecting our communities

Knife Crime

Scrutiny Commission Briefing

leics.police.uk


Version 4 | 15 November 2018
Author: Supt Shane O'Neill

What we will be covered:

- Number of knife crime incidents in the city
- Leicester approach
- Examples of projects
- What more we can do?

A4b: ESTIMATED KNIFE OR SHARP INSTRUMENT OFFENCES RECORDED BY THE POLICE FOR SELECTED OFFENCES¹

	2015/16		2016/17		2017/18	
	Number	Offences per 100,000 population	Number	Offences per 100,000 population	Number	Offences per 100,000 population
Derbyshire	356	34	405	39	494	48
Leicestershire	396	38	498	48	725	67
Lincolnshire	211	29	185	25	231	31
Northamptonshire	347	49	417	58	452	61
Nottinghamshire	585	52	742	67	822	72
East Midlands Region	1,895	41	2,247	48	2,724	57



Knife Crime – Leicester Leicestershire and Rutland


Graph 2: Overall Knife and Bladed Instrument Crime (October 2016 - October 2018)



The facts and figures

Knife Crime is present across Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland.

- Three hotspot areas
 - City Centre
 - Robbery
 - Alcohol Related
 - East Leicester
 - Drug
 - Urban Street Gangs
 - Domestic Incident
 - West Leicester
 - Young People
 - Urban Street Gang




The facts and figures: Under 17 years

City Wards: April 2017 – March 2018


Suspect

Victim



Knife Crime – Leicester City

OVERALL KNIFE AND BLADED INSTRUMENT CRIME BY CITY WARD
(APRIL 2017-FEBRUARY 2018)



Knife Crime – Leicester City continued

Offence Location Involving Those Under 17 based upon Suspect and Victim Data				
Neighbourhood Policing Area	Occurrence Location Ward	April 2016 - March 2017	April 2017 - March 2018	April 2018 - October 2018
NIC	CITY CENTRE / CASTLE	17	30	10
	CLAREDDON PARK UNIVERSITY	6	2	3
	CULTURAL QUARTER	11	15	13
	RIVERSIDE	4	5	4
NE	BELGRAVE	6	5	0
	CHARNWOOD	3	12	12
	COLEMAN	8	7	13
	ELVINGTON	7	13	7
	HUMBERSTONE	7	12	11
	LATIMER	6	1	7
	RUSHEY MEAD	10	10	6
	SPINNEY HILLS	11	11	7
	STONEYGATE	7	7	3
	THURMOUR	7	5	1
NIS	AYLESTONE	7	7	3
	EYRES MONSELL	6	22	25
	FREEMAN	8	13	6
	KNIGHTON	3	4	4
NIW	ABBAY	11	18	11
	BEAUMONT LEYS	24	20	14
	BRAUNSTONE AND ROWLEY FIELDS	15	13	17
	FOSSE	3	11	3
	NEW PARKS	24	26	20
	WESTCOTES	3	3	3
Total		220	272	216

Who is likely to be affected?

Demographics	Victims		Offenders	
	Raw	Per 1000 Population	Raw	Per 1000 Population
Gender				
Male	412	0.8	642	1.3
Female	199	0.4	108	0.2
Unknown	396	N/A	9	N/A
Age Range				
<12	11	0.1	14	0.1
12-17	72	0.9	135	1.8
18-24	142	1.3	165	1.5
25-34	163	1.3	183	1.4
35-44	98	0.7	140	1
45-54	72	0.5	77	0.6
55-64	32	0.3	23	0.2
>64	16	0.1	9	0.1
Not Stated	401	N/A	13	N/A

Male

12-24 years

West Leicester
and East Leicester

Who is likely to be carrying a knife?

Chart 1: The Proportion of Male and Female Habitual Knife Carriers





Chart 1: Proportion of Male and Female Habitual Knife Carriers



Habitual Knife Carriers	
Age Range	Frequency
<12	0
12-17	14
18-24	19
25-34	13
35-44	7
45-54	3
55-64	0
>64	0
Total	56

Table 6: Habitual Knife Carriers Age Demographics

Habitual Knife Carriers	
NPA	Frequency
NE	14
NW	13
NL	12
NS	11
NC	5
NH	3
DOFB	1
NM	1
NR	1
Total	56

Table 7: Habitual Knife Carriers by Residing NPA

Partnership In Place



Social Pressures, gangs and drugs supply



bestknivesofig

4,400 posts 14.9k followers 500 following

Best Knives Of Instagram - The coolest/best knife pictures - Tag your best knife picture for a post



Measures in place to tackle the increase

A Slice of Reality

Rage, Coerced, The Gamble, Joint enterprise, Impact & Aftermath

If you were Prime Ministers what would you do to reduce knife crime?

- Charge everyone that carries a knife
- Stop people from buying knives and check their house and check
- Stop people bringing knives out
- Life (in prison) for carrying a knife



- What is one thing you are taking away from this session?
- More understanding of knife crime
 - Not to bring a knife out
 - Not to carry a knife
 - Don't carry stuff

Measures in place: Year 6 onwards

LIFE OR A KNIFE MAKE THE RIGHT CHOICE

Best Practice: National Scanning

No knives, better lives.

f t v Search

FOR YOUNG PEOPLE FOR PARENTS FOR PRACTITIONERS



If someone you're with kills or injures someone with a knife, you could go to prison too.

KNOW THE FACTS

FOR YOUNG PEOPLE FOR PARENTS FOR PRACTITIONERS

What Next? What can we all do?

A Slice of Reality

Rage, Coerced, The Gamble, Joint enterprise, Imp...



LIFE OR KNIFE MAKE THE RIGHT CHOICE

SMART MOVE FORWARD RESPECT!

SO YOU DON'T GET YOUR BAR HIT BY THE POLICE

NO WISER THAN THE TRAVELER

AT SCHOOL ASK YOUR TEACHER

BE A TRAITOR TO YOUR FRIENDS

CLASS MATE

TEACHER

PROBABLE TO GET INTO PRISON

TRAVELER

LOSER!

BELOW THIS WITH EVERYONE WHO HAS A KNIFE

#knifefree

Carrying a knife could cost you four years in prison.

#LivesNotKnives

What Next? What can we all do?

- **Recognise that carrying a knife is usually a symptom of other issues**
- **Encourage young people to challenge and discuss knife crime and causes with trusted adults**
- **Share information to help prevent harm and intervene early**
- **Help with continuous messages to embed an alternative narrative to violence**

