

Managing the Public Realm (Orpington) Meeting Monday 23 August 2010

Minutes

Present:

Councillor Tim Stevens JP (Chairman), James Cleverley (GLA Member), Nigel Davis (LBB Environmental Services), Ch Supt Charles Griggs (Metropolitan Police), Simon Norton (Orpington College), Graham Daly (Transport for London) Clive Davison (LBB Environmental Services), Dave Prebble (Metropolitan Police), Paul King (LBB Children and Young People Department), Steven Heeley (LBB Environmental Services), Colin Newman (LBB Environmental Services) (*Notes*)

Apologies:

Councillor Peter Morgan (Portfolio Holder for Public Protection and Safety), George Searle (LBB Children and Young People Department), Marc Hume (LBB Renewal and Recreation Department), Terry Rich (LBB Adult and Community Services Department).

1 INTRODUCTIONS

- 1.1 Councillor Stevens welcomed all to the meeting and explained that the Portfolio Holder was unable to attend. Those present introduced themselves.
- 1.2 It was noted that the meeting had been arranged as a follow-up to the meeting held between stakeholders following a significant public disorder incident in the area of Orpington High Street in November 2009. Copies of a report for the Safer Bromley Partnership summarising that meeting and setting out the agreed actions was tabled for information (copy of action table attached at Appendix 1).

2 LEVELS OF CRIME AND DISORDER

- 2.1 Charles Griggs provided a brief overview of crime and disorder levels since the initial incident in November 2009. The incident of Affray in Orpington in November 2009 had resulted in the arrest and conviction of 6 individuals. Since that time, analysis of crime levels within the area did not identify any significant cause for concern in terms of the number of offences.
- 2.2 Simon Norton agreed that there had been very few incidents. He acknowledged that, with approximately 1,300 young people aged 16-18 years old, there would always be some issues in relation to managing behaviour. However, he noted that there had previously been an element of "seasonality" in disorder with the period between November and January being key. Simon emphasised the importance of bearing this in mind when planning for the new intake in the next few months.

3 INTERVENTION REVIEW

- 3.1 Those present were invited to reflect on the interventions that had been put in place since November and assess their impact. Many of these interventions had been summarised in the report that was presented to the Safer Bromley Partnership:

Enforcement/Policing

- 3.2 The appointment of a PC to work with both Orpington and Bromley Colleges was identified as a significant positive intervention for both sites. Simon reflected on the positive impact that the PC had been able to have, reflecting that relations were much improved and based on interaction and respect.
- 3.3 Charles noted that he had made the decision to base one of the borough's Safer Transport Teams at Orpington, making that the key location of their activity. However, it was noted that this was a significant drain on resources and would be assisted by the provision of an additional team for the borough. A review of "hub" locations was underway but the current budgetary restraints faced by much of the public sector were liable to be a very serious consideration. James Cleverly will look at getting clarification that the existing "hub" team will remain.

Action: James Cleverly undertook to seek a clarification in relation to the hub team.

- 3.4 Charles informed the meeting that, where possible, the Police had been utilising central resources to support activity within Orpington. He also highlighted the role of the Safer Neighbourhood Team and use of interventions such as metal detecting arches and the Apollo mobile phone scanner etc.
- 3.5 The Safety & Citizenship team from TfL had been engaged with the College and plans were in place for them to deliver a number of sessions as part of the enrolment days in mid-September.

College Design

- 3.6 Simon noted that the re-design of the College had produced a positive effect in that the students had been provided with their own communal area, rather than the only option being the market square. The dispersal routes from the college were now greater and this had a positive effect on the surrounding area. The CCTV coverage within the College had also been approved, with over 70 cameras now operation in operation and a turnstile barrier system to control entry and exit etc.
- 3.7 One of the issues that had been raised at the previous meeting was that of staggered starting and finishing times for the College. Simon noted that this was a difficult area for a range of different reasons but that, in reality, there was already a considerable variation in the start and

finishing times for many students. It was not likely that very much more could be done to affect this area.

Information Exchange

- 3.7 All students enrolling for the College were now asked to disclose previous involvement with the Police and there was a greater exchange of information between the Police and the College. In those cases that had been deemed as high risk, individuals were refused a place at the College. In other cases, and where there was no disclosure from students, the information exchange between the College and the Police enabled better planning of any necessary interventions to reduce risk.
- 3.8 A significant area of information exchange that was yet to happen related to was in relation to the legal requirement on Education authorities to supply information on the “Behavioural Background” of pupils to those enrolling at College. This was felt to be of particular benefit to Orpington College in light of the fact that a significant proportion (75%) of students were from out of the borough. Simon noted that the lack of this information had been something that was highlighted during a recent Ofsted inspection, particularly because of the relevance to broader safeguarding issues.

ACTION: Simon to write a letter to the Chair of the Bromley Safeguarding Children Board, raising this as an area of concern.

ACTION: Paul King to investigate the issue and report back on how the exchange of this information could be ensured.

Communications

- 3.8 Meetings had taken place between the College Communication team and Communications officers from LBB and this had focused on the importance of celebrating the positive impact that the College has in the Orpington area and beyond. It was noted that recent changes in allocation of “portfolios” amongst the LBB team would need to be picked up as part of a handover of ongoing projects.

ACTION: Colin Newman to pick of the issue of joint work with Orpington College as part of the “handover” of communications tasks at LBB.

- 3.9 College Youth workers had been engaged in work on the High Street. Whilst there were usually three workers on duty at any one time, the main focus of work would be in the College but engagement in the public areas was also part of there regular tasking.

4 TRANSPORT INTERVENTIONS

- 4.1 In light of the fact that transport issues had played a significant role in the previous incident, particular attention was paid to interventions in this area. Steve Heeley provided an update for the group on progress in agreeing a dedicated Travel Plan for the College. Steve noted that, following a meeting in December at the College, three subsequent meetings had been held. In addition, a survey had been undertaken in May of this year with 630 responses received. The survey focused on issues such as mode of travel to College and also reflected broader issues such as feelings about safety and other perceived concerns.
- 4.2 The survey highlighted that respondents were more likely to use public transport but also raised an issue about a reliance of travel to and from St Mary Cray train station and the inadequate capacity of the 51 bus route. Steve noted that it was important that the action plan that was being developed was implemented soon but stated that engagement from TfL Buses and Policy (Better Routes and Places had proved difficult in some cases. However, their engagement was seen as crucial in providing support for students in making choices about how they get to and from college and how to simplify journeys etc. Engagement of TfL Safety and Citizenship team had taken place and they would be visiting the school between the 10-14th September.

ACTION: Graham Daly to ensure engagement of TfL Buses and BRaP, particularly for next meeting in October.

- 4.3 The capacity issue on bus routes was raised as significant concern and it was felt that, in particular, the issues of capacity for the 51 route should not be allowed to undermine the positive progress that had been made in other interventions. Graham noted that it should not be accepted that overcrowding in itself resulted in bad behaviour but accepted that work could be done in relation to achieving an appropriate balance of interventions that looked, for example, at distinct pinch points.
- 4.4 Finally, with regard to transportation issues, the lack of barriers at St Mary Cray station was identified as an issue. James agreed to write to the relevant network provider and request barriers be considered as a matter of priority.

ACTION: James Cleverly to write in support of ticket barriers at St Mary Cray station.

5 FORWARD PLANNING/ IDENTIFYING RISKS

- 5.1 It was agreed that much had been done and there was now a strong basis from which to move forward and minimise any further incidents. The period between November and January was noted as crucial in terms of maintaining the progress made. It was acknowledged that the induction period would be of great importance and the work planned by the Safety and Citizenship team at TfL was welcomed.
- 5.2 A final area for consideration was raised relating to the location of bus stops. It was proposed that the placing of a bus stop on Homefield Rise would alleviate some of the issues caused by

the current pinch point outside Boots on the High Street. It was acknowledged that this would require further investigation but could be considered as part of the package of interventions contained within the travel plan.

ACTION: Feasibility of bus stop for route 51 on Homefield Rise to be explored for feasibility.

6 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

- 6.1 Simon welcomed the work that had been undertaken by all partners to address the issues that had been identified and reaffirmed the College's commitment to taking action to maintain the progress made.
- 6.2 It was agreed that the next meeting would take place on Monday 22 November at 10:00. Location would be room P11 at the Civic Centre.

APPENDIX 1 – INITIAL AREAS IDENTIFIED FROM MEETING 24/11/09

Priority Area	Issues Identified/ Actions Proposed	Lead Agency	Update
Transport Issues (Localised)	Identify need for Travel Plan	Transport for London/ Seltrans	Initial meeting regarding travel plan held on 17/12/09. Plan in development with key stakeholders.
	“Bottle-necks” – Location of Bus Stops. College entrance etc.	TfL/College	Meeting held between TfL and College regarding bus stops. College entrance addressed as part of redevelopment. Further addressed by Travel Plan
	Routing of Buses	TfL	New route for 51 bus implemented from 28/11/12
Transport Issues (Surround)	“Peripheral” locations – Lobby for installation of ticket barriers at two key “feeder” Petts Wood, St Mary Cray stations”	Police, TfL, LBB	Formal approach still to be finalised but support for move from most stakeholders.

<p>Enforcement Issues (College and Others)</p>	<p>Withdrawal of Oyster Cards</p> <p>Promote Responsible Behaviour College Sanctions for “Trouble Makers”</p>	<p>TfL</p> <p>College, TfL</p>	<p>Suspension of Oyster Cards only implemented in extreme circumstances.</p> <p>Possible use of TfL Safety & Citizenship team.</p>
<p>Place Management</p>	<p>CCTV</p> <p>Staggered Timetable</p> <p>Expected Standards of Behaviour</p>	<p>College, LBB</p> <p>College</p> <p>College/TfL</p>	<p>Agree formal protocol for College request to view CCTV (via Police team). College students can be made aware of CCTV footage but students should not be allowed to view if charges are pending.</p> <p>Identified as an area for further examination. Acknowledged that this represents a major task with regard timetabling demands etc.</p> <p>College Youth Workers to “patrol” High Street. Commitment to robust internal discipline process and proportional punishment.</p>

Communication (Public Facing)	Managing Press Enquiries (reactive) Managing press activity (pro-active)	College, Police, LBB College, Police, LBB	Coordination of press response in aftermath of incident. Meeting between College, LBB and Police Comms leads to identify an ongoing package of communication messages that address reputational issues and build strong message of College's role and partner management of area.
Communication (Partners)	Information Exchange Student Profile Ongoing Liaison	College, Police College College, Police LBB	Improved protocols agreed to ensure timely exchange of information and intelligence. College is working on developing a risk assessment tool for applicants and linkages are made to utilise Police resources to assist. Agreed as useful and to be timetabled at least termly.
Information Exchange	Identified need for improvement as noted above	Police, College	Agreement secured for full database provided to Police for 2009/2010 intake.

saferbromley
partnership