

---

# COMMUNITIES AND WELLBEING OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

---

**Tuesday, 4th March, 2025**

**Present:** Councillor Heather Anderson (in the Chair),  
Councillors Jodi Clements, Loraine Cox, Clare McKenna, Ethan Rawcliffe  
and Judith Addison  
Co-optees Jean Battle and Sandie Dent

**In Attendance:**

**Apologies:** Jackie Rawstron, Tina Walker and Clare Yates

---

## **368 Apologies for Absence and Substitutions**

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Walker and Yates and Co-optee Member, Jackie Rawstron.

Councillor Addison acted as substitute representative for Councillor Walker.

## **369 Declarations of Interest and Dispensations**

There were no interests or dispensations declared at the meeting.

## **370 Minutes of Last Meeting - 3rd December 2024**

The Minutes of the meeting of the Communities and Wellbeing Overview & Scrutiny Committee held on 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2024, were submitted for approval as a correct record.

**Resolved** - **That the Minutes be received and approved as a correct record.**

## **371 Community Safety Partnership Update**

Councillor Kimberley Whitehead, Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Culture, Heritage and Arts submitted a report to the Communities and Wellbeing Overview & Scrutiny Committee to inform them of the work on the Community Safety Partnership in the borough. The report included appendices as follows:

Appendix 1 – CSP Structures

Appendix 2 – Hyndburn District Needs Assessment

Appendix 3 – Serious Violence Profile – Hyndburn

The Committee was requested to review the work of the Community Safety Partnership and to suggest areas of improvement.

Councillor Whitehead reported that the Community Safety Partnership was an important feature of the network of partnerships that helped to tackle crime and reduce reoffending and had been set up under Sections 5-7 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998. This had

placed a statutory duty on a number of responsible authorities to work in partnership to reduce crime and disorder and these included:

- Lancashire Police
- Hyndburn Borough Council
- Lancashire County Council
- Lancashire Fire and Rescue Service
- Clinical Commissioning Group
- National Probation Service

She also informed the meeting of the structure of the Partnership including a Lancashire Community Safety Partnership, a Pennine Lancashire Community Safety Partnership and Hyndburn's Community Safety Partnership. She briefly set out the structure for each partnership and informed the Committee that the Hyndburn CSP was chaired by the Council's Head of Policy and Organisational Development and that much of the work was co-ordinated by the Community Safety Manager.

Councillor Whitehead informed the Committee that the Hyndburn CSP priorities were:

Environmental Crime  
Violent Crime  
Acquisitive Crime  
Youth Related Crime  
Organised Crime

Information was provided on how each priority was tackled, the multi-agency operations that Hyndburn had benefited from, serious violence duty, domestic homicide reviews, community cohesion and resilience, crime and disorder, road safety and Lancashire Talking. The Committee was also referred to the information appended to the report for further details on the district needs assessment and the serious violence profile of Hyndburn.

The Committee submitted a number of questions in advance of the meeting. These were responded to by the Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Resources, the Community Safety Manager and the Head of Policy and Organisational Development, as follows:

1. With reference to 3.10 of the report and Hyndburn's local CSP priorities, Members had requested an explanation regarding the priority categories and why youth related crime was a separate category.

Response – youth related crime had its own category due to the Serious Violence duty to tackle youth related violence. The Committee was informed that crime involving young people varied, as well as most victims of serious crime, also being young people. Action was taken to prevent this and the escalation of crime. Anti-social behaviour traversed across all priorities and varied in type. It was, therefore, captured in all CSP priorities.

2. Was there any formal tally of estimated unreported crimes?

Response - the CSP gauged the levels of unreported crime and incidents through member contribution and through 'Lancashire Talking' surveys of residents and from this information they created their priorities. The Partnership also encouraged the reporting of crimes but understood the reasons why people did not report crimes/incidents. Both domestic abuse and hate crime were considered unreported but there was great Charity work which supported these areas. There was no formal number of unreported crimes.

#### Member Questions:

- How the surveys were carried out.

Responses: Surveys were carried out online and partners were used effectively.

#### Members suggested:

- Placing promotions, in relation to domestic violence, in ladies toilets.
- that paper copies of any surveys were placed in libraries so that elderly people and people without access to technology, also had the opportunity to feedback.
- Jean Battle, reported that the Over 50's Forum would like to become a partner or feedback to the CSP.

Inspector Lorgat referred to signing up more third party reporting centres. He explained that there was no criteria attached to becoming a third party reporting centre and that individuals could also do it.

#### 3. Drug related crime was a key issue so why was it not listed as a priority?

Response – Drug related crime fell under the priority of Organised Crime and traversed across youth-related crime and the Serious Violence duty. This linked to the way the Police recorded their data. Inspector Lorgat gave an overview of how the Police dealt with organised crime and reassured the Committee that drug related crime was very much a priority.

#### Member Questions:

- Could Councillors be kept informed of intelligence relating to drug dealing within their wards?
- Concern about shops selling vapes and Turkish barbers being used as a cover for crimes.

#### Response:

- Intelligence was sensitive and graded but once a warrant had been executed this would be shared on social media.
- Councillors should share any information they have with the Police, in relation to businesses being a cover for crimes.

Advanced questions 4 – 7 and question 10 could not be responded to as these were issues that the Community Safety Partnership did not have responsibility for.

#### 8. Do the areas with the greatest number of HMOs correlate with the areas with the highest level of crime?

Response – Most HMOs were primarily in commercial districts, however, there was a piece of work currently looking at how policies could be reviewed, in respect of managing these processes more effectively. The work involved the creation of a national register.

#### Member Questions:

- Concern about HMOs opening in the location of schools and family homes due to individuals being unknown and largely single males.

- Request for resident involvement on the CSP to enable effective feedback and community engagement from all areas of the community.

Responses:

- The concern was noted and, in respect of greater community engagement in the CSP, the Committee was informed that surveys were being held and feedback was taken from these. In addition, the link with the Neighbourhood Policing Team and Councillors was also very beneficial. The Neighbourhood Watch Scheme was still running but not as popular as it had been.
- The Police reported on the value and importance of feedback from the community and how they were trying to create communication channels to enable this. He indicated that working with the community was of great value.

9.1 Has the closure of youth clubs had an impact on anti-social behaviour and is this considered when setting priorities on how to prevent anti-social behaviour?

Response – Hyndburn had a great youth offer with all areas covered by outreach services and charity-led diversionary activities. They had recently won a CAP Award for innovation in tackling issues with disadvantaged youth. Hyndburn was also the highest level bidder for funding for youth services across the district and had large levels of young people who were funded through further and higher education. Work was also carried out with schools to engage youths in decision making.

Members comments:

- Many youth clubs had closed so there had been an impact on anti-social behaviour.
- The pandemic had impacted many youth who were now fearful of being in large groups.

Responses:

- Youth Clubs had been run by volunteers and were now moving around targeting areas of need. As mentioned previously, there was already a good offering of youth activities in Hyndburn.

11. After the Home Office review of Community Safety Partnerships in 2023/24, how has the CSP improved their transparency, accountability and effectiveness or how is it planning to do this?

Response – The Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC) together with Lancashire County Council (LCC) were leading on the recommendations from the Review. In Hyndburn, surveys are undertaken to gauge public opinion and promote good practice.

Member Comments:

- Concern that residents did not feel included and, consequently, were unable to feedback, especially, elderly residents or residents who were unable to use technology to communicate.

Responses:

- Community Champions were being considered by Lancashire County Council.
- The Community Action Network (CAN) were used to feed resident's views back to the CSP.

12. Have the CSP given consideration to devolution and how this may impact their structures and priorities going forward?

Response – Hyndburn was part of the Pennine-wide Community Safety Partnership that encompassed Burnley, Pendle, Blackburn with Darwen and Rossendale where localised structures and processes were already in place for smooth transition to devolution. All Pennine locations had shared priorities to assist with the development of a devolved partnership going forward and therefore, there should be a smooth transition.

- Resolved**
- **That the report be noted: and**
  - **That, the Chief Officer of YNOT Aspire, informs the Community Action Network (CAN) of the request from other local organisations, to join and be included in feedback to the Community Safety Partnership.**

### **372 YNOT Aspire**

Sharon Hendrie, Chief Officer of YNOT Aspire, gave a presentation to inform the Community and Wellbeing Overview & Scrutiny Committee of the work that YNOT Aspire do. She outlined what the organisation did, their plans for the future and what they had achieved including:

- The organisation was a grassroots charity operating in Hyndburn for over 14 years focusing on prevention and early intervention.
- Had reached over 6500 young people in that time.
- Had independent evaluation reports estimating a social return on investment in excess of £10 million.
- Wellbeing Panel worked with local PCN's and partners to triage referrals and ensure that young people got the right intervention at the earliest possible opportunity.
- One-to-one mentoring for young people with low level mental health issues.
- Mental health ambassadors in schools.
- Volunteer training programme.

She reported that they had helped to reduce anti-social behaviour and youth related crime and gave details of how they had been funded for projects through Lottery Funding. She explained that their work centred around prevention and intervention and worked to reach as many young people as they could. They received referrals from parents, schools and GPs and offered a range of services to support young people. She explained that the waiting list for their services was increasing and reference was made to the role of social media on the mental health of young people.

The Committee thanked the Chief Officer of YNOT Aspire for the work they had been doing, their plans for the future and the impact they had on the community.

- Resolved** - **That the report be noted.**

Signed:.....

Date: .....

Chair of the meeting

At which the minutes were confirmed