MANAGING FAR RIGHT ACTIVITY

A toolkit to support local authorities
This toolkit has been produced in partnership by Blackburn with Darwen Borough Council and Luton Borough Council and is supported by the Local Government Association.
INTRODUCTION
FOREWORD

At this time more than ever, local authorities are alive to the pressures of managing extremism and the impact of this extremism on our communities.

Tackling this issue and minimising the effect of marches and rallies, along with other far right activity, on our local economies and community togetherness is a challenging and complex issue.

Therefore, when our local authorities, Blackburn with Darwen BC and Luton BC, were asked by the Department for Communities and Local Government to establish a national special interest group we were extremely keen to do so. The purpose of the Special Interest Group has been to promote this agenda and drive action; learn from one another and establish a benchmark for good practice; and to overcome intolerance and to challenge extremism with a coherent single voice for local government.

We recognised that the best way to come up with innovative solutions and overcome these challenges was for all local authorities who have dealt with the far right to come together and share their experiences, knowledge and good practice.
This conference provides an opportunity for colleagues to impart the learning from the Special Interest Group; participate in discussions around the wider issues connected with extremist activity in local areas; and build towards clear policy recommendations for Government and the wider Local Government sector.

The Special Interest Group has allowed us to share our experiences in Luton and Blackburn with Darwen but equally allowed us to learn from our colleagues nationwide. We would like to take this opportunity to thank all the participants who have contributed to the work of the Special Interest Group.

We are passionate about tackling far right extremism and the Special Interest Group has provided the perfect vehicle through which we can make a difference.

Cllr Kate Hollern,
Leader,
Blackburn with Darwen BC

Cllr Hazel Simmons,
Leader,
Luton BC
BACKGROUND
Following the publication of ‘Creating the conditions for integration,’ the Department for Communities and Local Government asked Blackburn with Darwen Borough Council and Luton Borough Council to jointly establish and lead a national Special Interest Group.

The purpose of the group was to help areas share experiences, best practice and to promote locally driven action aimed at developing a national learning culture around far-right activity, understanding what works and finding ways of reducing support for the movement. The membership of the SIG is made up of 42 local authorities with over 100 attendees at the seminars coming from across the Country.

The Special Interest Group was launched in January 2013 when the first seminar for Local Authority Leaders took place. Five seminars have been delivered discussing a range of themes including:

- Community leadership;
- Managing EDL activity;
- Communications and intelligence;
- The role of research in mitigating the impact of these groups; and
- The use of the law in managing the far right
In addition, the group:

- Has established a knowledge hub via the Local Government Association to facilitate knowledge sharing across the SIG members and to support councils in learning from each other;

- In agreement with CLG established a commissioning hub, co-ordinated by Blackburn with Darwen Borough Council, to identify common themes and promote a co-working approach in areas where there are similar threats;

- Is shortly due to pilot a training and mentoring programme for elected members.

The group has also commissioned an action research project to inform and support the wider learning from the seminars. The group made a number of suggestions as to the focus of the research and it was suggested that a primary research focus should be supplemented with secondary lines of enquiry.

PLACE

**Primary**

Does the demographic and socio-economic profile of an area have a bearing on the nature of EDL activity and is there scope to test whether rapid change increases the perception that local identity is threatened?

**Secondary**

Are the current austerity measures a contributing factor on the nature of EDL activity?
**PEOPLE**

*Primary*
Can we chart the similarities and differences between areas targeted by the EDL in respect of recruitment and the causal factors behind membership?

*Secondary*
What is the profile of EDL sympathisers and why are they attracted to this group?

**POLITICAL**

*Primary*
What are the future political intentions and dynamics of the EDL?

*Secondary*
Would an increase in political engagement and community leadership divert people away from the EDL?

The Special Interest Group also proposed the development of a commissioning hub co-ordinated by Blackburn with Darwen. The purpose of the hub would be to offer group members an opportunity to submit joint bids for external funding. It was felt that joint bids from the Special Interest Group local authorities would portray a strengthened approach and enable us to identify common themes, promoting a co-working approach in areas where there are similar threats.
The first seminar was attended by The Rt. Hon. Don Foster and Baroness Sayeeda Warsi who called on local authorities and their partners to help the government tackle far right extremism. It was highlighted that tackling this issue is a focus for the government but ultimately it is local authorities who hold the power to create change.

There was a lively discussion around the extent of far-right activity in some local authorities, the unsustainability of current management methods in relation to protests and demonstrations, resource implications and PR and media management.

A number of suggestions were made about future discussion areas and this informed the structure of the seminar programme.
This seminar focused on the management of English Defence League (and other far right) activity and was aimed at frontline Local Authority officers.

The main discussion points and challenges identified were:

- The impact of the changing public services landscape on the ability to respond effectively to future far right activity
- The degree to which socio-economic disadvantage creates the ‘pre-conditions’ within which extremist narratives can thrive, and the impact of policy agendas (including welfare reform) in mitigating or reinforcing these conditions
- The potential for groups like the English Defence League to politicise in time for the 2015 General Election
- The important role of the community and the need for a consistent approach
- The need for greater understanding of what activity would qualify for a banning order and the need for clear communication to communities when this is not possible

It was clear that there were a number of recurrent themes in managing activity:

- Strong partnership working at a local level and across boundaries – including those services that are traditionally not associated with managing such activity i.e. local authority planning services
- Importance of a clear communications strategy
- The need to horizon scan so potential issues can be quickly picked up and mitigated
Flexibility of approach to adequately respond to incoming intelligence

A number of current challenges were also identified:

- Inadequate information sharing and communication strategies
- Utilising existing legislation to its maximum potential
- The role of the media in exacerbating community tensions
- The need for effective social media monitoring for intelligence

3 / THE ROLE OF RESEARCH IN MITIGATING THE IMPACT OF THESE GROUPS

This seminar took place a day after the tragic event in Woolwich. The agenda was amended to give participants time to feedback initial reactions and local concerns. Attendees expressed concern over the implications for local areas and the potential to damage community relations.

The seminar focused on agreeing an action research brief to work with academics to explore contrasting geographical areas of risk to compare and contrast the different socio-economic dynamics, and the effectiveness of management strategies. The research will contribute to developing intellectual capital across the partnerships and support the transfer of knowledge across local areas.
This seminar focused on the role of PR/Communications and police intelligence in the management of English Defence League (and other far right) activity. The key audience for the session was Leaders and supporting strategic staff.

The following were key discussion points:

- The inconsistency of levels of information sharing, particularly between the police, local authority, elected members and the community.

- The requirement for the equivalent level of engagement and agreement about key messages and expected behaviour with protest and counter protest groups. The importance of a robust Memorandum of Understanding was highlighted and where possible this to be partnership document between the local authority and police force.

- The cost to public services of managing demonstrations. The group explored the potential for charging organisers for certain aspects of the demonstrations as well as the encouragement of volunteer stewards from the local community.

- Proactive communication – pre, during and post the event – using a range of mediums including direct dialogue with communities. This includes information on the cost of demonstrations to the public purse.
The seminar focused on the use of the law in managing the far right. The key audience for this seminar was Leaders, and local authority officers [including legal] who manage far right activity. Prevent colleagues were also in attendance.

The following were key discussion points:

- A group explored the advantages and disadvantages of seeking a ban on marches. Whilst banning a march may seem preferential there was experience in the room of where this had a wider negative impact. An example was given which outlined that once a ban is in place it applies to ALL marches for the designated time period, even those organised by the local authority for community events. There was general agreement in the room that where protests could be managed with minimal impact on the local community it would be preferential to seeking a ban which can be costly and time consuming. However, it was recognised that there are instances when pursuing a ban is the most appropriate sort of action.

- The location of the majority of demonstrations being in city/town centres - protesters want to make the most impact with their activities and want visibility. Local agencies need to consider Human Rights legislation alongside the impact on communities when agreeing the location for the protest.
The use of byelaws - the potential for byelaws to support the imposition of insurance requirements and licensing issues was debated however, it was recognised that it may be difficult to have the byelaw approved as no new byelaws are approved where there are existing statutory powers. A deficit of powers would need to be evidenced and this may prove difficult with the variety of existing legislation available to manage activity. It was suggested that if new byelaws were to be explored then this would be more beneficial if undertaken collectively as opposed to each local authority pursuing individually.

The group explored the potential for asking organisers to contribute to the costs of demonstrations – the potential is limited, however, some local authorities have attempted to bill organisers using legislation such as the Road Traffic Regulation Act 2004 and Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005 but the amount recoverable is minimal.

Proving racially or religiously aggravated offences during demonstrations. Group members discussed how offences, such as assault and disorder, are dealt with when there are clear negative racial or religious overtones during demonstrations. There appeared to be difference in the application of this part of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 in relation to this.

6 / BEYOND THE EDL

A sixth seminar will be held following the national conference to consider the future direction of the Special Interest Group.
CONFERENCE PROGRAMME
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Main Room</th>
<th>Activity Room 1</th>
<th>Activity Room 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09:45am</td>
<td>Registration and refreshments</td>
<td>Councillor Mehboob Khan, Chairman (LGA Safer Communities Board [TBC])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30am</td>
<td>Welcome and introduction</td>
<td>Councillor Kate Hallam, Leader, Blackburn with Darwen Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45am</td>
<td>Keynote address</td>
<td>Councillor Hazel Simmons, Leader, Luton Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00am</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15am</td>
<td>Move to break out sessions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30am</td>
<td>Session 1 - Churchill Auditorium: Are the lines with Prevent blurring?</td>
<td>Siobhan Peters, Director, Prevent and RICU, Home Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45am</td>
<td>Session 2 - Albert Suite: The role of social media in encouraging and managing extremist activity</td>
<td>Amanda Coleman, Head of Corporate Communications, Greater Manchester Police</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00pm</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15pm</td>
<td>Session 3 - Victoria Suite: Looking ahead: The role of place-based leadership in managing extremist activity</td>
<td>Andrew Rhodes, Assistant Chief Constable, Lancashire Constabulary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:45pm</td>
<td>Regroup and feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00pm</td>
<td>Session 1 - Churchill Auditorium: Are the lines with Prevent blurring?</td>
<td>Siobhan Peters, Director, Prevent and RICU, Home Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15pm</td>
<td>Session 2 - Albert Suite: The role of social media in encouraging and managing extremist activity</td>
<td>Amanda Coleman, Head of Corporate Communications, Greater Manchester Police</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30pm</td>
<td>Session 3 - Victoria Suite: Looking ahead: The role of place-based leadership in managing extremist activity</td>
<td>Andrew Rhodes, Assistant Chief Constable, Lancashire Constabulary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:45pm</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30pm</td>
<td>Session 1 - Churchill Auditorium: Are the lines with Prevent blurring?</td>
<td>Siobhan Peters, Director, Prevent and RICU, Home Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:45pm</td>
<td>Session 2 - Albert Suite: The role of social media in encouraging and managing extremist activity</td>
<td>Amanda Coleman, Head of Corporate Communications, Greater Manchester Police</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00pm</td>
<td>Session 3 - Victoria Suite: Looking ahead: The role of place-based leadership in managing extremist activity</td>
<td>Andrew Rhodes, Assistant Chief Constable, Lancashire Constabulary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15pm</td>
<td>Regroup and feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30pm</td>
<td>Launch of Special Interest Group Toolkit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:45pm</td>
<td>Closing Address</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00pm</td>
<td>Conference closes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The conference is an opportunity to share the learning from the Special Interest Group seminars whilst also allowing a wider audience to participate in the debates connected with extremist activity in local areas.

This section includes the conference programme along with an outline of what each breakout session will cover. The sessions are based on key outcomes from the seminar programme and will provide a foundation for the future direction of the Special Interest Group and its policy recommendations to the Department for Communities and Local Government.
BIOGRAPHIES
COUNCILLOR KATE HOLLERN
Leader of Blackburn with Darwen Borough Council

Kate has been a Labour Councillor in the Borough for over 16 years and is responsible for providing community leadership for the Council. She works with residents and organisations from across all sectors to improve the quality of life and satisfaction in the Borough. Kate is also Chair of PLACE (Pennine Lancashire) where she works with district leaders from across the area on tackling local challenges and is committed to sub-regional and regional working.

In her role as Chair of the BwD Health and Wellbeing Board she brings health agencies together with wider community representatives to agree on local health and well-being priorities. She leads the formal scrutiny process of the Clinical Commissioning Board whilst also taking responsibility for the development and delivery of the BwD Health and Wellbeing Strategy. As Chair of the Lancashire Police and Crime Panel (PCP) she convenes a group of 15 Council Leaders, and is responsible for supporting, and holding to account the Lancashire Police and Crime Commissioner.
COUNCILLOR HAZEL SIMMONS
Leader of Luton Borough Council

Hazel moved to Luton in 1984 and became a Councillor for Lewsey Ward, Luton in 1991. She carried out a number of roles within the Council including Chair of Leisure, Equalities, Standards Board and Area Board. She was also an Executive Member and Deputy Leader before becoming Leader in 2007. Hazel has over 35 years Trade Union and political experience as well as Voluntary and Community Sector involvement. This includes the setting up of a Youth Café in Lewsey for young people at risk of offending.

Hazel is passionate about the involvement of local people in the democratic process and was also one of the first members of the Luton All Women’s Centre. Hazel is determined to provide excellent quality and accessible services for the people of Luton. Hazel has been Chair of Luton Forum; Luton’s Local Strategic Partnership, since becoming Leader and is now Chair of the Health and Wellbeing Board. Hazel has always been keen for provision of Sports and Arts in Luton and led on the Inspire Sport’s Village.
Eric Pickles was appointed Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government in May 2010. He is the Conservative MP for Brentwood and Ongar. Eric was Leader of Bradford City Council from 1988 to 1990. He held a number of positions while in opposition, including Shadow Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government from 2007 to 2009 and Chairman of the Conservative Party from 2009 to 2010.

He worked as a consultant in employment practice and as Local Government Editor for Conservative Newsline before becoming an MP in 1992. He is a trustee of 2 local charities - Brentwood Foyer and Brentwood Theatre.

As Secretary of State he is responsible for the overall strategic direction of the Department for Communities and Local Government and his main areas of responsibility include:

- Supporting local government
- Communities and neighbourhoods
- Local economic growth
- Housing
- Planning and building
- Fire
JAMES BROKENSHIRE MP
Security Minister for the Home Office

James Brokenshire has responsibility for domestic national security and counter terrorism. He was the Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Crime and Security for the same department between 2010 and 2011. He is the Member of Parliament for Old Bexley & Sidcup.

James was the Member of Parliament for Hornchurch and Rainham from 2005 to 2010; a member of the House of Commons Constitutional Affairs Select Committee from 2005 to 2006; and Shadow Minister for Crime Reduction from 2006 to 2010.

Before entering Parliament, James was a partner at a large international law firm where he advised a range of companies, businesses and financial institutions on company law, mergers and acquisitions and corporate finance transactions.

Born in 1968 in Southend-on-Sea, James went to Davenant Foundation Grammar School, Loughton, Essex. James also attended the Cambridge Centre for Sixth Form Studies before going to university in Exeter where he graduated with an honours degree in law.
Mark Carroll
Director, Decentralisation and Big Society, Department for Communities and Local Government

Mark is responsible for the implementation of the new community rights in the Localism Act, the government’s drive to decentralise more power to neighbourhoods and the government’s work on race equality and integration and its relationship with faith communities.

Previously, he established the Department’s Programme Team, a flexible pool of analytical and policy staff who work on Ministers’ key strategic priorities following the election. Prior to this role he was Director for Housing (Management and Support) responsible for taking forward the government’s work on social housing reform, housing management, the private rented sector, tenant involvement and vulnerable households.

From 2002 until November 2007, he was the Director in HM Government responsible for the government’s strategies for tackling extremism, building community cohesion and integration, and for increasing race equality. Before joining the Civil Service Mark worked in consultancy and prior to this he worked in the third sector and in local government.
Siobhan Peters is Director, Prevent and RICU following her previous role as Director of Strategy and Resources at OSCT. Before joining the Home Office, she worked for the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, including two postings to the British Embassy Beijing, and for HM Treasury where she was Director for the Stern Review on the Economics of Climate Change.
AMANDA COLEMAN

Head of Corporate Communications,
Greater Manchester Police

Amanda has 20 years’ experience both as a journalist and in communication roles. For the past 13 years she has worked in senior communication roles within the police service and is currently responsible for Corporate Communications at Greater Manchester Police (GMP).

Initially, Amanda worked on local newspapers throughout the North West of England before moving into public relations working for a number of public sector organisations.

She has led the communications team at Greater Manchester Police during some challenging times including the murder of two police officers, August 2011 riots, death of the former Chief Constable and numerous counter terrorism investigations. Amanda has been part of the Force’s work to improve community engagement and communication. She was also responsible for the development of the GMP Twitter Day activity in October 2010 where the Force published details of all calls received in a 24 hour period.

In January 2013, Amanda was elected as chair of the national Association of Police Communicators (APComm).
Andy Rhodes joined Lancashire Constabulary in 1991 and began his career in the Western Division. He has since policed in a variety of roles in Central and Northern Division including geographic policing, public order and emergency response.

In 2002, he returned to Western Division after he was promoted to Superintendent Operations Manager, a role he enjoyed for four years. He was promoted to Chief Superintendent in March 2006 whilst based at Lancashire Constabulary Headquarters. After completing a secondment to the Home Office Mr Rhodes returned to take up command of Eastern Division, a position he held for 2 years.

As Assistant Chief Constable Andy Rhodes has undertaken the portfolio for Territorial Divisions, Criminal Justice and Contact Management and currently holds the Specialist Operations portfolio.
Jack was elected as the MP for Blackburn in 1979. Prior to being elected to parliament he was a practising barrister and before that was an assistant to Blackburn’s last MP, Barbara Castle. He served on the opposition benches for eighteen years against the governments of Margaret Thatcher and John Major.

Following Labour’s landslide in 1997 he was appointed Home Secretary and has since served as Foreign Secretary [2001 – 2006] and Leader of the House of Commons [2006 – 2007]. Jack served as Lord Chancellor and Secretary of State for Justice from 2007 - 2010. He was the first Lord Chancellor since the seventeenth century not to be a peer.

Despite having held high office for many years Jack continues to be a committed and visible constituency MP, regularly taking questions on all issues standing on his soapbox in the town centre, holding several surgeries a month around the town and running many neighbourhood residents meetings throughout Blackburn.
CASE STUDIES
ACTIVE CITIZENS

Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council (RMBC)

Which partners were involved?
- Youth Service
- Community Centres
- Faith communities
- Voluntary sector

What did you do?
Rochdale Active Citizens was initiated in 2011 following a Far Right Demonstration in the borough. The purpose of the project was to create a register of community volunteers that would provide a link between RMBC Community Safety Unit, in particular the Community Cohesion Team, and the local community. Active Citizens were recruited from a broad range of backgrounds to ensure local communities were represented.

Key tasks of the Active Citizens were identified as being:
- Assisting with significant local events such as emergencies and demonstrations that may impact on cohesion within the borough
Working alongside Greater Manchester Police (GMP) and the Local Authority to engage with local community members and using peer mentoring skills to deliver key messages and facilitating discussions with the aim of diffusing any tensions

Providing a community voice and participating in open forums to discuss sensitive and controversial issues

Being an informal contact for members of the local community. Addressing rumours and myth-busting was also identified as being a key part of the role

Updating the council on significant areas of concern for local residents including tensions and cohesion issues

Raising awareness of campaigns and community safety issues and encouraging local residents to engage with services (e.g. drug/alcohol awareness, hate crime, domestic violence)

Active Citizens participated in training to prepare them for the role and are asked to attend two strategic meetings per annum. A number of Active Citizens have completed the Peer Mentor training and are qualified to Level 1 Philosophy for Communities [SAPERE].

What benefits were identified?

Active Citizens are trusted members of their local community and therefore are best placed to effectively ease any community tensions. Active Citizens work at a grassroots level and therefore, are best placed to inform the Community Cohesion team and partners about any community issues.

Since the start of the project in 2011, Active Citizens have been effective in dispelling myths and rumours during several key events and demonstrations within the borough.
What barriers were faced?

A significant barrier has been keeping volunteers engaged with the project because:

- Active Citizens are volunteering their time and the work can be intense
- Opportunities can be intermittent due to the nature of the role

These barriers have been overcome by ensuring that the active citizens are provided with information regarding training opportunities and given regular updates with a targeted newsletter.

What was the outcome?

The Cohesion Team now have a well-established, trusted register of active citizens who can be contacted during times of increased tensions within their communities. Some Active Citizens are also participating in other community activities such as school governorship.
BANNING A MARCH
London Borough of Tower Hamlets

Which partners were involved?
- London Borough of Tower Hamlets
- Youth Offending Team
- Metropolitan Police

Community groups:
- Account3 (local women’s organisation)
- Brick Lane Business Association
- Council of Mosques Tower Hamlets
- Council of Somali Organisations
- Rainbow Hamlets (local LGBT community forum)
- Tower Hamlets Interfaith Forum
- Tower Hamlets Small Business Centre

What did you do?
In July 2011 the English Defence League (EDL) announced their intention to march in Tower Hamlets on 3rd September 2011. Provocative videos were uploaded onto the internet which focused on birth rates within the Bangladeshi community and the existence of alleged ‘militant Islamic’ groups within the borough.

This announcement caused significant concern amongst the local community which were further heightened following the bombing and mass shootings by Anders Breivik in Norway on 22nd July.
What we did

Following the announcement by the EDL, we proactively sought information from a wide range of community, faith, business and statutory organisations and groups on how they felt about the prospect of the demonstration. A number of these groups in turn carried out survey and engagement activities with their members and networks. This information was collated to produce a community impact assessment. This assessment revealed widespread concern about the disruption that a march would cause in the borough.

Concerns included:

► The disruption to business and commerce if people stay away from the area on the day of the protest

► The impact on religious life if the Muslim community were to be a specific target especially for violent activity. The language and imagery used by the EDL in their advertising of the demonstration caused a fear of violent attacks

► The effect on community cohesion and the breakdown in relationships between communities. There was concern that an attack on the borough’s Muslim community would threaten positive relations between people from different backgrounds in the community

► A violent response from counter protestors. In June 2010 rumours of a demonstration by the EDL had led to large numbers of people gathering ‘to defend the mosques’ from perceived attack. This had led to a volatile situation with heightened fears about damage to property and attacks on people.
**Seeking a banning order**

The Executive Mayor of Tower Hamlets expressed his strong opposition to EDL demonstrations at the outset and wrote to the Home Secretary requesting a ban on the protest. Councillors from across the borough expressed similar sentiments and a motion was passed at Full Council in mid-July calling on the Home Secretary to ban the demonstration. In addition, a petition calling a ban was also presented to the Assistant Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police by the MP for Bethnal Green and Bow in August.

The outcome of the community impact assessment and the information on the EDL’s social media channels led to a meeting to scope the possibility of imposing conditions on the march with the Metropolitan Police Public Order Unit. However, on-going assessments of community tension suggested that even if conditions were imposed, these would be insufficient to prevent the march causing serious public disorder. Concerns around disorder were again heightened with the unrest and rioting that took place during August 2011 in London and other UK cities.

On this basis a letter was sent to the Home Secretary and Assistant Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police in mid-August requesting a ban on the march to be issued under Section 13 of the Public Order Act 1986. This letter included a dossier of evidence gathered to demonstrate the impact any march by the EDL on the life of the community and potential for serious disorder. It also highlighted the impact of recent EDL demonstrations in other areas which had led to violence and damage to shops, as well as the targeting of mosques.
However, the Metropolitan Police (MPS) felt that a ban was unnecessary and that the imposition of conditions under section 12 of the Public Order Act 1986 prohibiting them entering a specific route would suffice. Ultimately, the Borough’s Chief Legal Officer wrote a pre-action protocol letter for Judicial Review asking the Assistant Commissioner for the MPS to make a banning order and the Secretary of State to consent to the Order.

The Council were prepared to use section 222 of the Local Government Act 1972 which empowers a local authority to institute civil proceedings where it considers it expedient for the promotion or protection of the interest of the inhabitants of the area and to seek an injunction to require the MPS to act.

On 25th August the Assistant Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police applied to the Home Secretary for consent to ban all marches in the borough for three months from 2nd September. The Home Secretary agreed and a banning order was issued on 26th August.

**What benefits were identified?**

The success of the campaign in banning the march had an extremely positive effect on community tension and the relationship between local people and the Police. It signalled that serious concerns about the targeting of the borough’s Muslim community and its attempts to cause division between sections of the community were understood and taken seriously by local and national politicians and senior Police officers. Despite the fact that a static demonstration went ahead on the boundary of the borough on 3rd September, community tensions by this point had been calmed.
What barriers were faced?

The EDL announced their intention to march in early July but the decision to ban the march was taken just eight days before it was due to take place. This delay led to significant uncertainty and anxiety about what would take place on the day. Much attention and time was spent on applying for the ban which could perhaps have been usefully directed at proactive engagement and activities to strengthen relationships between members of the community.

In operational terms, banning the march at this late stage led to increased uncertainty about the plans of the EDL who were much less engaged with Public Order planning officers following the notification of the banning order.
COMMUNITY TENSION MANAGEMENT PROCESS

Leicester City Council

Which partners were involved?

- Leicester Anti-Social Behaviour Unit (LASBU)
- Community Safety Team (CST)
- Community Services
- Housing Services
- Planning Services
- Schools
- Youth Services
- Wardens
- Libraries
- Parks
- Community Health
- Sports Centres
- Fire Services
- Community group – St Philips’ Centre

What did you do?

A Community Tension Management (CTM) process was established through which perceived tensions could be identified, understood and managed to a state of normality.

The CTM allows staff to:

- Identify, record and understand an issue;
- Inform the relevant partners and
- Employ authority to drive action on the basis that when relevant teams take appropriate action the identified tension can be avoided or reduced.
It is an on-line electronic reporting and information handling system which allows staff to input information around community concerns or issues that could create tensions.

The process is three-fold:

1. The collation and analysis of potential or actual tension
2. The allocation of responsibility to a ‘problem owner’ who is usually a Head of Service at the City Council
3. The development and implementation of an action plan which spans across relevant services, to mitigate and manage the tension. This is considered the most important step.

Using this system allows a greater number of staff to use their skills and knowledge to help alleviate the tensions, either by action or, more commonly, communication.

The CTM is held on a secure, shared drive and notifications are sent to a selection of HoS so that they can self-brief immediately and create actions for their staff to complete.

Within the system there is a severity assessment phase which mirrors that of the National Community Tension Team (NCTT). The Strategic Director for City Development & Neighbourhoods, Regeneration & Culture monitors the CTMs that are open and escalates issues to the ‘Community Gold’ meeting with Police Basic Command Unit Commander (Area Chief Superintendent). This creates the opportunity for wider issues to be considered and for strategic matters to be addressed by the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership.
What benefits were identified?

- The process cuts across organisational and service ‘silos’
- It creates broad capability without the need for a specialist team
- The Local Authority is in a stronger position to manage threats to community cohesion.

What barriers were faced?

- The necessity for information sharing agreements was met with some reservation from organisations due to the nature of information that was being held in a shared document.
- The process to introduce the system has been difficult and time-consuming due to the number of stake-holders involved. Alongside this, an additional difficulty has been that none of the services involved has specific responsibility for dealing with community cohesion and tensions.

What was the outcome?

The outcomes have been positive and include the following:

- Horizon scanning is encouraged
- Threats to cohesion are identified early
- The costs of managing Anti-Social Behaviour and crimes from inter-community tensions are reduced.
- The Local Authority can report and contribute to national reporting (NCTT).
**Additional information**

All the partner organisations involved in the CTM are also in contact with the Leicestershire Police intelligence team whose role includes scanning and collating information from teams to inform the submission of the ‘local return.’ This in turn informs the NCTT which builds the national picture. It is envisaged that when instances of tension are reported from source and then also put into a CTM for local management, it will eventually negate the need for the Intelligence team to contact teams directly and they will source their information directly from the CTM.
DEVELOPING A TOWN CENTRE POLICY – A RESPONSE TO FAR RIGHT ACTIVITY

Luton Borough Council

Which partners were involved?

- Luton Borough Council
- Bedfordshire Police
- Community Cohesion Contingency Planning Group
- Local businesses
- Local residents

Various community groups were also involved

What did you do?

Luton’s St George’s Square and the surrounding area are the emblematic heart of the town, providing access to the town’s commercial centre and hosting the Annual Carnival and Love Luton Festival. The use of public space in Luton has been contested in recent years around large scale protests and rallies. This is a recent development and prior to 2010 it was not foreseen that Luton would become a centre for national protests by the English Defence League and associated counter protests. These events have been managed at huge cost to budgets across the partnership and have had an impact on the reputation of the town.
Following the first protest which took place on St George’s Square, the local authority undertook an extensive public consultation exercise to identify resident’s views on the following:

- The use of town centre spaces being used for large scale protests (88% were opposed)
- The effect on the reputation of the town (82% were concerned)
- The safety of residents (70% were concerned)
- Access to the town centre during demonstrations
- The cost and impact on local services (63% said it was unacceptable).

In response to the findings the council developed a new policy on the use of town centre public space. The policy was approved by the Council’s Executive on 4th February 2013. Local media coverage has been supportive of the new policy, highlighting resident’s views and concerns around the disruption that these events cause. Associated with factions such as the English Defence League (EDL) resulted in additional risks to inciting opposing criminal behaviour. Direct stigmatisation and provocation of our Muslim community was a factor in excusing support for direct action, indirect action or fundraising for Al-Qaeda.
**Policy**

The main purpose of this policy is to provide a clear, positive statement of activities that will be permitted in town centre public spaces. It is based on the fundamental, and reasonable, notion that a town’s public spaces should be available for all communities to utilise and enjoy at all times.

The Council holds St George’s Square for the use and recreation of the people of Luton and will normally allow its use for funfairs, concerts, festivals and public information stands that do not disrupt local commerce.

This principle can also be applied to other town centre spaces mentioned above.

The Council is dedicated to doing everything it can to promote and maintain cohesion in Luton and strives to ensure this is embedded within all aspects of local and community life, therefore the Council will not support any events which may cause or lead to a breach of the peace, disrupt local commerce, effect community cohesion or have a detrimental impact on the reputation of Luton.

Where proper notice of a public procession or event has been served on the Police [pursuant to section 11 of the Public Order Act 1986] the Council will do everything in its power to minimise the impact and disruption on the community. This may include facilitating the procession or event away from key town centre spaces where there might be community safety issues or a disproportionate effect on local commerce.
**Application**

The principles and approach set out in this policy will be applied through the use of a Town Centre Usage Procedure with advice provided by the Council led Safety Advisory Group.

**Review**

Co-ordination of the implementation of this policy will be led by the Safety Advisory Group.

This policy will be reviewed after 12 months in light of experience and the views of Luton’s diverse communities.

**What benefits were identified?**

The policy provides clarity to the public and the Council’s partners regarding the use of town centre space. It also highlights what will be supported by the local authority and what activities will not.

**What barriers were faced?**

The main difficulty for the local authority was to ensure that the policy did not breach existing legislation, in particular the Human Rights Act 1998, Article 11. The Council sought legal advice on this matter to overcome any possible future challenge.

**What was the outcome?**

The policy is fully operational and has resulted in ‘controversial’ processions being directed away from the town centre therefore fulfilling its aim.
INCREASING AWARENESS OF THE FAR RIGHT – 18 – 88 TRAINING PACKAGE

Lancashire Constabulary

Which partners were involved?
- Lancashire Constabulary
- Blackburn with Darwen Borough Council

What did you do?
The training package (18-88) aims to increase awareness of front line staff of indicators of extreme right wing ideologies and behaviours to enable them to identify potential offenders and vulnerable individuals. The training focuses on how far right ideology can promote grievance amongst non-white communities which may lead to a greater empathy for Al Qaida [AQ] ideologies.

A two hour training package was developed on far right history, symbols, ideologies and the local context. This complements the Prevent WRAP 2 package by providing a greater insight into extreme right wing ideologies.

Locally we recognised that this package was needed due to our specific demographics and changing population in recent years. Increasing threats such as the rise of Far Right activity and propaganda, combined with emerging challenges associated with factions such as the English Defence League [EDL] resulted in additional risks to inciting opposing criminal behaviour. Direct stigmatisation and provocation of our Muslim community was a factor in excusing support for direct action, indirect action or fundraising for AQ.
The training aims are:

- To develop the capacity of front line staff to recognise XRW ideologies and symbols;
- To empower staff to share information and make appropriate referrals regarding concerning behaviours or observations.

What benefits were identified?

Feedback on the training has been extremely positive and resulted in additional sessions being requested. Examples of the impact are as follows:

Following attendance by a representative from UKBA, based at Manchester Airport, they have requested a 18-88 training session for staff at the airport;

A Probation Officer who is currently supervising a case in the community felt that the materials would be helpful to use during supervision sessions with the intention of educating the offender about some of these groups and maybe assist in identifying any possible extreme right wing views he holds;

Staff from Social Care / Family Intervention teams who conduct weekly bedroom checks felt that the training would assist in recognising what material to look for to raise concerns about extremist views.
What barriers were faced?

Although it hasn’t proved to be a barrier, we currently only have one member of staff who is able to deliver the training. As demand increases, we are looking at a potential train-the-trainer model for the package.

What was the outcome?

The package has attracted significant interest from a range of organisations including: Drug and Alcohol Services; Safeguarding teams; Housing Needs; Registered Social Landlords; Prison Service; Women’s Aid and YMCA. In total, representatives from 33 organisations have attended the training to date.

Feedback from participants has highlighted the lack of knowledge around this subject and reinforced the need for the package.
THE LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

The Tim Parry Johnathan Ball Foundation for Peace

Which partners were involved?

- Local authorities
- Schools
- Youth / Community services
- Youth Offending Team
- Police
- Faith sector – Churches and Mosques
- Youth and Community groups

What did you do?

The Leadership Development Programme was specifically designed to work with participants who may be at risk of, or already involved in, ‘low level’ extreme behaviour and who may be vulnerable to radicalisation.

It is a ‘process-driven’ programme which is flexible and responsive to participants’ needs but focuses on challenging ideas and attitudes to alter the behaviour and motivations of vulnerable individuals. It is most effective when delivered to mixed identity groups.
An education-based approach is employed with participatory learning focused on exploring key themes: conflict resolution; self-awareness and identity; prejudice and discrimination; and human rights. The ultimate aim is to enable participants to feel confident and empowered in dealing with conflict in their lives, enabling them to influence more positively and ‘lead’ more confidently. The programme is designed to ‘bust myths’, promote dialogue, encourage inclusion and develop critical thinking skills. Topics including ‘The War on Terror’ and ‘The origins of extremism’ feature amongst those explored to directly confront the challenges of extremism and extreme narratives.

The programme uses participatory methodologies to engage and to increase awareness of extremist behaviour. The content challenges ideas but also increases understanding and awareness of such behaviour and its impact. It allows for rehearsing of alternative responses and practising ‘doing things differently’ and includes ‘dialogue’ elements designed to promote understanding and empathy between parties. ‘Holding difficult conversations’ is a key facet of the programme where participants are encouraged to share experiences, perspectives and understanding but also to listen to ‘the other’. Former members of ‘extreme’ groups and victims of terrorism are often introduced to groups during these processes.

Beneficiaries of the staff training element of the course have included youth workers, teachers, social workers, police, housing association staff and religious leaders. Courses have varied depending upon need but all include a specific ‘Holding Difficult Conversations’ course.
What benefits were identified?

- The programme has a strong track record of success in diverse delivery contexts across Great Britain and Northern Ireland including schools, youth centres and youth organisations.

- It provides on-going engagement with participants thereby encouraging trust and confidence in the facilitators and the process.

- Rather than to simply provide ‘counter-narrative’ - the programme works to address the root causes of conflicts and opposition to the ‘other’. Participants develop the skills, understanding and confidence to move beyond their current positions and worldviews.

- Longer-term engagement allows personalised support and guidance allowing individual ‘plans’ to be developed based on a high degree of participant input. This enhances and increases sustainability of the outcomes.

- This programme includes training, advice and capacity building for professionals and staff involved thereby strengthening the organisations.

The Foundation is an impartial, non-political, non-sectarian, secular organisation that takes no sides. Its role is to promote dialogue and understanding between parties and as such it can engage with groups, causes and individuals that others may find difficult to reach.
**What barriers were faced?**

- The programme requires engagement with some difficult-to-reach cohorts. As such, it requires effective partnership working with referring agencies and extensive pre-implementation contacts.

- Retaining participants can be a challenge therefore flexibility in terms of schedule and partner working is key.

**What was the outcome?**

The programme works with both the target cohort and wider agencies to tackle individual attitudes and behaviours to effect profound and lasting change. Participants:

- Increase self-awareness around attitudes and behaviour
- Increase self-esteem and confidence
- Increase understanding and knowledge of links between extreme ideology and terrorism
- Develop confidence in dealing with conflict constructively
- Increase empathy and understanding of the impact of politically motivated violence and terrorism
- Have increased skills and confidence to lead and influence in their communities and own settings

Following the programme, the Foundation’s extended alumni network offers longer term opportunities for engagement and participation. This has a substantial multiplier effect, delivering considerable social value over time, with positive spillovers well outside the target population.
PARTNERSHIP WORKING - AGENCIES AND COMMUNITIES

City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council

Which partners were involved?

» Elected Members and Council Leadership

» Council departments:
   • Stronger communities
   • Neighbourhood Services
   • Youth Services
   • Emergency Planning

» West Yorkshire Police

» Educational Establishments including University of Bradford [Programme for a Peaceful City]

» Voluntary and Faith Sector organisations

What did you do?

Background
In 2001 Bradford suffered a major civil disorder. In July of that year a planned march by the National Front triggered a chain of events culminating in a night of violence and criminal damage. Therefore there was significant anxiety when the English Defence League [EDL] requested to demonstrate in Bradford in 2010. Sensitivities were high as it was also the month of Ramadan and the ten year anniversary of the ‘Bradford Riot.’ EDL described the demonstration as ‘the big one’ which added to anxieties.
The response was led by the Council and Elected members. A ban against an EDL march was obtained (led by Elected Members, Hope not Hate and local media) however a static demonstration still had to be managed. A strong partnership approach was established through the Gold and Silver groups and a joint communications, community engagement and reassurance plan and operational planning was developed between the council and police. Voluntary and faith groups were also engaged very early on in the process.

The partnership undertook a series of engagement activities and worked with people in all localities and from all backgrounds as well as local businesses. Members played a significant role in reassuring and engaging with communities including many who do not normally engage with the Council or Police. Methods included meetings at religious venues and messages delivered during night prayers at local mosques.

One of the key challenges was to ensure that young people did not rise to provocation from the EDL. Statutory and voluntary youth services organised a variety of diversionary activities for those felt to be most at risk from both white and Asian communities.

We also learnt that different sections of the community wanted to be involved in the response to the EDL. The challenge was to keep communities safe, utilise minimal resources and minimise the reaction. This was whilst ensuring that the communities felt engaged, listened to and part of the solution.

It became apparent that certain individuals, unaffiliated to any counter-protest or mainstream groups could be provoked into a negative reaction by the EDL. We used people with street influence to engage with these individuals for a more co-ordinated response and to work on the principle ‘better a little bit in [planning processes] than all the way out’ (vigilante activity).
We also initiated a ‘Stop it Kicking Off’ network where street level influencers liaised with Programme for a Peaceful City [University of Bradford] staff and volunteers. The staff and volunteers, in turn, maintained regular contact with Local Authority staff. A telephone tree was established to allow people to keep in touch with other partners across the district and this was useful for myth-busting, quashing rumours and mobilising the community to assist with the response. An example of this working was when it was planned to deploy the Police in protective safety equipment, to move on a group of local Asian young people. Our strong relationship with the police allowed us to facilitate an alternative whereby we utilised our network of local influencers to assist in moving the young people on and mitigate the potential risk.

During the 2012 demonstration a ‘Keep it Kalm for Keighley’ Network was led by a community worker and Parish Councillor. We worked with local members and community influencers to develop a system where community activists were paired with local authority staff [youth service] and police officers to steward key access points into the demonstration area and to encourage people to turn away and not rise to provocation. Many times during the day, youth service staff had to be moved to different locations and in each case community activists replaced them in the key locations. They also undertook interventions and mediations with residents and elected members were on the ground in 2012 helping to manage community anxiety and ask people to leave the area of the demonstration.
What benefits were identified?

- Key negotiations took place and actions were secured which would not have been possible by individual organisations working alone
- The importance of finding innovative ways of engaging with people who are normally disengaged from the mainstream responses. This provided an alternative channel for disseminating key messages
- Utilising key influencers from the community, outside of the usual partners and residents, who are respected by young people and provided a credible voice
- This asset based approach, recognising communities have a lot to offer, had significant positive impacts. Risks had to be managed and trust established in a limited timeframe. However, these relationships have been sustained and the skills and knowledge the community members (and officers) acquired in the process have contributed to community resilience.

What barriers were faced?

- Health and safety regulations and requirements for emergency management risk assessments

Unaffiliated community activists expressed their intention to be involved on the day. However, despite engaging with them there were still concerns regarding their health and safety requirements.
Lack of clarity around staff deployment and roles on the day

The role and deployment of youth service staff became an area of contention with the community. The youth workers were all local residents who were trusted by residents to intervene and mediate where essential and therefore their presence was requested across the borough.

Lack of understanding by some staff about the asset based approach and its effectiveness

Those working with community development, participation and influence principles recognised the need to engage with the wider community; however this was difficult for those unaccustomed to working within these principles.

Balancing command and control versus influence and guidance

All agency staff accepted that management of the demonstration had to be led by the Police supported by Local Authority Emergency Management Service. However, staff had to recognise that command and control principles could not be employed with the key influencers, community activists or wider community. A partnership approach had to be used with them as we sought to secure cooperation and influence.

Managing the counter protests took significant planning and diverted resources from the main event.
**What was the outcome?**

This approach enabled us to work with trusted individuals during the demonstrations and the planning process. As they were from different sections of the community they were able to highlight community concerns and provide information. Where necessary they undertook mediation and intervention activity which helped prevent disorder and violence. In many instances they secured outcomes the Police or Local authority staff may have been unable to.

Utilising this approach lowered the risk of the local community’s involvement in violence and disorder. The events passed relatively peacefully and relationships were maintained. Existing community resilience was strengthened and continues to be through the ‘Safer Keighley Initiative’ and other approaches in Bradford.

The relationships established and strengthened during the EDL demonstrations have assisted us in managing other complex and sensitive issues.
PR / COMMUNICATIONS

Lancashire Constabulary

Which partners were involved?
- Lancashire Constabulary
- Blackburn with Darwen Borough Council
- British Transport Police

What did you do?

In early 2011, Lancashire Constabulary was advised by the English Defence League (EDL) that it intended to hold a demonstration in Blackburn town centre on Saturday 2nd April.

Intelligence suggested that potentially 2000 EDL demonstrators may come to Blackburn to take part in the event. It was also believed that a counter demonstration which would take place at the same time was being planned by several groups and this could attract in the region of 3000 protestors.

Both the EDL and the counter-protestors were granted permission to demonstrate in Blackburn town centre but in locations where they would not have sight of each other.

A multi-agency Gold group was established to prepare for the event and part of the group’s remit was to develop a Communications and Community Engagement plan.

The plan was drafted in partnership with key organisations and community groups. The group agreed it was imperative that all stakeholders agreed to the strategy and key messages during both the planning stages and the demonstrations.
The aims of the Communications strategy were:

1. To ensure key stakeholders, communities and the wider public of Blackburn and Lancashire were aware of all agencies’ roles in:
   a. facilitating peaceful protest
   b. preventing or dealing with disorder and
   c. keeping Blackburn open for ‘business as usual’

2. To ensure that the media were fully informed of the situation and the partnership approach to the event. This was to ensure balanced and responsible reporting before, during and after the event

3. To provide public reassurance and maintain public trust and confidence in the responding agencies through the communication of clear and consistent information before, during and after the event

4. To ensure that consistent messages were communicated internally and externally from all the responding agencies

5. To ensure that the reputation of Blackburn as a diverse place in which to live, work and visit remained intact through clear communication of key messages before, during and after the event.

In order to deliver the aims, the following mechanisms for sharing key messages were put into place:

a) Direct face to face communication with the local community:
   - Audiences identified in the Community Engagement Plan
b) Leaflet drops (where appropriate):

- Local communities
- Businesses
- Visitors to the town centre on the day
- Asian community
- Additional audiences as identified in the Community Engagement Plan

c) Digital media communications channels and uploading operational developments to:

- Partner websites
- Partner Twitter / Facebook sites

d) Media briefings:

- Before the event
- Provision of a rendezvous point for media interviews on the day
- Interviews post event

Dedicated communications staff from Lancashire Constabulary, Blackburn with Darwen Borough Council and British Transport Police worked together on the day of the demonstrations to ensure information was available at all times to the public and the media in line with the strategy.
What benefits were identified?
Partnership communications working ensured organisations understood each other’s key messages and the products which needed to be delivered to meet the aims of the strategy.

Having sufficient planning time allowed messages to be delivered, explained and reinforced over a longer period of time to key audiences.

What barriers were faced?
No barriers were identified.

What was the outcome?
The aims of the strategy were delivered as key messages were well disseminated and used appropriately by all agencies and the media.
FACILITATING PEACEFUL PROTEST

PUBLIC ASSEMBLY

- NO advance written notice required for public assemblies

PUBLIC PROCESSION

- Is the public procession intended to:
  - a. demonstrate support for or opposition to the views or actions of any person or body of persons; OR
  - b. publicise a cause or campaign; OR
  - c. mark or commemorate an event?

EXEMPTION from notification requirement [POA s1(4)]]

- NO advance written notice required

- Has advance written notice been given?

- Organiser of public procession may be guilty of an offence: POA s1(7). Participants NOT guilty of any offence.

Conditions that can be imposed on a public procession under POA 1986 s12 include:
- a. the route the procession can take
- b. prohibiting the procession from entering a particular public area.

POA ss.12(4)-(6) and ss.14(4)-(6).

A person who organises or takes part in a public procession or assembly and knowingly fails to comply with a condition or restriction imposed under POA s12 or s14 or incites others taking part to fail to comply is guilty of an offence. BUT it is a defence to prove that the failure arose from circumstances beyond the person’s control: POA ss12(4)-(6) and ss14(4)-(6).

A person who organises, takes part in, or incites another to take part in a public procession the holding of which he or she knows to be prohibited is guilty of an offence: POA 1986, ss13(7)-(9).

Police can impose conditions or restrictions on the public procession or assembly provided such restrictions:
- are lawful e.g. imposed in accordance with POA 1986 ss12 or 14 AND
- pursue one or more legitimate aims:
  - a. national security
  - b. public safety
  - c. prevention of disorder or crime
  - d. protection of the rights and freedoms of others AND
- are necessary and proportionate.

Consider the following:
- a. Is the purpose sufficiently important to justify the restriction?
- b. Will the measures you propose to take achieve that purpose?
- c. Are the measures you are taking the least restrictive measures you could take to achieve your purpose?
- d. Do the measures maintain a fair balance between the rights of the protesters and the general interest of the community?

Restrictions may be unlawful and in violation of ECHR Article 11.
HOW TO GUIDES

This section includes a number of (sample) documents for use by local authorities during the management of far right activity.

The documents have been used to positive effect during previous demonstrations in local authorities involved in the Special Interest Group. Further information on any of the documents is available via the organisations outlined in the Contacts and Bibliographies section.
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INTRODUCTION

This consequence management plan has been specifically developed for the protest in {local authority} on {date}. The Plan outlines the operational approach to be adopted in terms of community engagement, community intelligence development, tension monitoring, communication and reassurance. It also provides details of the resources employed to achieve the operational plan and the roles they will adopt, before, during and after the {date}.

The {organisation} have organised protests throughout the UK since {date}. {Insert information about the group and its activities}.

{Insert information about previous demonstrations that have been held by the group and the potential implications to the borough}.

GOLD STRATEGY

The plan is designed to support achievement of the Gold Strategy agreed by {insert key leads from Police Authority and Local Authority}.

{List key outcomes}
UNDERSTANDING COMMUNITY COHESION

In order to manage the impact of this event on community cohesion we will build upon the existing understanding of communities in {insert} and:

{Insert additional cohesion activities here}

It is essential we are in a position to identify and manage community tension from the outset. If tension is allowed to manifest the impact on residents, our communities, and the demand on policing is significantly increased. The plan is split into pre, during, and post phases:

PHASE 1: PRE EVENT

Consequence Management Meetings
A weekly consequence management and tension monitoring process will be established incorporating key police and partnership roles. This will oversee the consequence management process and report into the Gold group via the Silver Commander.

Community Inputs
Members of {Police Force} led by {insert name} will be working with key partners from the local authority to deliver inputs to a wide variety of key audiences including:

- Educational establishments
- Businesses
- Faith groups
- Elected Members
- Neighbouring Local Authorities
- Voluntary and Community sector groups

Community tension monitoring will be a vital element in this process; with weekly update reports.
**Community Engagement activities**
The Council in conjunction with local partners and key community members will work actively on engaging with local residents to help dispel myths and tackle emerging community tensions.

Prior to the event the team will focus on utilising existing channels such as Multi-Agency Panel’s, Partners And Communities Together, and a wide range of community meetings with residents and groups in the neighbourhoods to disseminate key consistent messages about the protest.

Influential members of the community, including religious leaders, local ward councillors and volunteers will be supported in promoting key messages and gathering intelligence on initial tensions and disorder at a ward and local community level. Further bespoke engagement will need to be explored in order to ensure counter protests could be mitigated / minimised.

Key engagement activities with community and Faith groups will also take place in the run up to the event.

**Plan – logistics / consequence management**
To ensure an integrated approach, {sponsors} will act as coordinators and ‘owners’ of the consequence management plan. This plan will be sponsored by {Owners} with direction via weekly liaison meetings.

**Traffic management**
Make contact with external traffic management contractors, bus companies and other public transport providers.
**Licensing**
- To look at specific licensing plan and any conditions to attach to licenses
- Identify potential muster points
- Possible liaison with pubs to encourage closure after the event to be considered as part of licensing plan.

**Town Centre / Business liaison**
Arrange an event with businesses in advance of the event to have a discussion to help reduce concerns and feeling of vulnerability and identify safety issues for the day.

**College & Young People**
Initiate meeting with student union president and other youth networks.

**Emergency planning**
Build emergency planning elements into this plan.

Combine Communications/Contact lists.

Council's Emergency Control Centre location & arrangements to be finalised and attached to the Consequence Management Plan.

Council's Emergency Control Centre to be prepared and brought to readiness in preparation for use on the day.

**Media plan**
On-going engagement with the local media is a valuable mechanism to circulate key messages to local residents and visitors to the area.

Develop an initial key message briefing sheet to support colleagues in key meetings with community groups and local residents.
**Political liaison**
Arrange briefings for elected Members.

Arrange a briefing for the local MP[s].

**Neighbouring local authorities**
Extend relevant information sharing with neighbouring councils.

**Environment**
Ensure post-event clean up planning.

**Confidence Patrols & Neighbourhood Engagement**
Continue normal business but take all opportunities to deliver reassurance and key messages to communities.

The success of this element of the operation lies in the close working relationships authorities already have with communities. A fundamental principle is that before, during, and after the event communities will see the same neighbourhood staff patrolling their areas as they are used to.

Ensure key significant and / or vulnerable premises are identified across the town and special attention paid to these sites. Officers visiting these sites should speak to occupants, establish a rapport, provide reassurance and react to any concerns or incidents of significance. This should not be just ‘passing attention.’

**Provision of Diversionary Activities**
Utilise existing youth activity providers.

**Resources**
Maintain an account / log of on-going costs to use as part of post-event media messages.
**Administration**
Co-ordinate a briefing to take place on the day of the operation at a community venue.

Complaints from residents in relation to this aspect of the operation should be managed in line with the standard complaints procedure.

**Risk assessment**
All appropriate individual and joint risk assessments must be undertaken.

**Communications**
Whilst the partner agencies have some common key messages to communicate, they also each have their own points to reiterate about their specific response to the event.

**General key messages**
- Our top priority is the safety of the community, people visiting {area} on the day, demonstrators and counter demonstrators.
- The right to peacefully protest is a fundamental democratic right and we have a collective duty to facilitate that.
- The police have no powers to ban a peaceful public assembly or protest, which is what {the group} has requested to stage. If we need to, we can impose conditions or restrictions on the demonstration such as where and when it takes place, for how long and how many people.
- Although powers exist to ban a march, {Police Authority and Local Authority} would prefer to work hard to facilitate a peaceful protest and to reassure those communities that may feel vulnerable as a result.
We will retain a strictly impartial position on the nature of protest issues and causes.

We want to make sure that {area} remains open for business as usual on the day and that there is no disruption to daily life although obviously there will be a highly visible police presence throughout the day. We would urge local people to go about their business as normal.

**Constabulary key messages**

- The Constabulary will facilitate any protest which is peaceful but will deal firmly with those committing crime and disorder.
- Our role in this operation is about fair and balanced policing - we’re here to keep the peace, treat people with respect and dignity and uphold the law.
- Where the law is broken we will make arrests and pursue cases through to prosecution where appropriate.
- Officers may be overtly filming the protest and if there is any unlawful action that footage will be used as part of a prosecution case.

**Local Authority key messages**

- {Local authority} has a strong track record of good community relations and will continue to support all our community groups and representatives should they have any concerns about this demonstration.
- The vast majority of those attending this demonstration will be coming from outside of the borough which is recognition of the strong sense of belonging people living in the borough have.
- Our priority remains to ensure that the town centre economy is not damaged by this event and that people that wish to shop in the town centre can continue to do so.
**Community Impact**
An overarching Community Impact Assessment can be completed.

**CCTV**
**Prior to event**
Liaise with CCTV maintenance provider to ensure appropriate cameras are working once routes and affected areas are identified.

**On the day**
Ensure that the CCTV control room is fully staffed and request any extra required feeds. Maintenance staff should be available throughout the day.

**Role of the Police Community Cohesion Team**
- Assess initial / current community tension
- Where appropriate act as a tactical advisor to community issues / response
- When necessary engage / consult with relevant external contacts [Community opinion formers] from all relevant communities to use their influence to reduce community tension and reassure local communities
- Update community impact assessment as necessary
- Liaise with the National Community Tension Team to identify any associated patterns of crime nationally and obtain any relevant best practice from other police forces.

**Priority Actions & Community Engagement Activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audience &amp; Key Actions</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Venue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Diversionary Activities: Pre, during and post event**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>When</th>
<th>By</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**PHASE 2: ON THE DAY**

**Command and Control**

**Gold Commanders/Co-ordinators**
Gold Commanders/Co-ordinators are expected to be active on the day from their respective organisations.

**Multi-Agency Tactical Control**
This will be based at {insert} and will be established from {time} until {time}.

**Council’s Control Centre**
The Control Centre will be established by {organisation} from {time} until {time}.

**Structure Charts**
The local authority and police force may find it useful to include diagrams outlining the command and control structures for the operation.

**Agreed timetable**
{Insert agreed timetable}

**Roles & Responsibilities**
Outline the roles and responsibilities of the Police.

Outline the roles and responsibilities of the local authority.
Multi-Agency Tactical Liaison Officer
The Council’s designated Multi-Agency Tactical Liaison for this event is {name and duties}.

The Tactical Co-ordinator is responsible for the co-ordination of all Council services/activities in liaison with Multi-Agency Tactical Command to ensure an effective response to an incident/emergency and should liaise fully with the Council’s Tactical Co-ordinator to ensure actions are undertaken. This role must ensure that all conversations, decisions, actions, etc. are recorded in an emergency log.

Tactical Co-ordinator
The Council’s designated Tactical Co-ordinator for this event is {name} who will be located in the Council’s Emergency Control Centre.

The Tactical Co-ordinator is responsible for the co-ordination of all Council services/activities to ensure an effective response to an incident/emergency and should liaise fully with the Council’s Multi-Agency Tactical Liaison.

The Tactical Co-ordinator is responsible for co-ordinating and managing the Emergency Control Centre and its staff to ensure a co-ordinated approach in responding to any incident. Regular briefings of all staff within the Emergency Control Centre should be held by the Tactical Co-ordinator. This role must ensure that all conversations, decisions, actions, etc. are recorded in an emergency log.
Civil Contingencies
Civil Contingencies staff will be based in the Emergency Control Centre and will be responsible for supporting the {title} and {title} in managing council resources on the day. Staff will be responsible for the effective running of the Council’s Emergency Operations Centre, including contact with all relevant staff required there.

Functional Co-ordinators
Functional Co-ordinators will undertake their roles as set out in their respective plans covering the area for which they are responsible (i.e. traffic management, transport provision) under the direction of the Council’s Tactical Co-ordinator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Town Centre Management
Town Centre Management will be represented within the Council’s Control Centre by {name}.

Community Safety
The Community Safety Team will be represented within the Council’s Control Centre by {name}.

Neighbourhood Services
Neighbourhood’s staff will be available to coordinate community mediators.

Neighbourhood Engagement
On {date of event} resources will be aligned to specific neighbourhood areas. Allocated staff will monitor the site throughout their duty period and any issues of note must be reported to their supervisor as a matter of urgency.
All opportunities should be taken to provide reassurance. Early intervention in any aspects of disorder and anti-social behaviour is vital if community confidence is to be maintained.

Officers must be vigilant around the activities of any individuals or groups which may be relevant to the protest, for example groups developing, movement of individuals towards the town centre, offences of damage and suspicious incidents around locations or individuals who can be classed as vulnerable.

Some neighbourhood staff will be assigned roles as part of a team of community monitors. These individuals from the community have a vital role to play in facilitating effective engagement with the public and dissipating tensions before a policing response is required. On {date} shared neighbourhood teams could support local engagement activities at a community level.

Where possible, existing engagement processes should be used and enhanced. Therefore the lead for community engagement will come from the relevant shared neighbourhood policing team with Community Cohesion monitoring wider tension through usual processes.

The recommendations contained within this document are not intended to be a comprehensive register of all options for the monitoring of community tension and the reassurance of affected communities. The recommendations should serve as a starting point for new actions and / or an endorsement of current practices.

Ensuring maximum transparency about the policing and partnership response during and after the operation will help to build the trust and confidence of local communities and may also help to improve the flow of intelligence into the police.
**Operation Staysafe (if applicable)**

**Information**
Operation Staysafe is a multi-agency operation which facilitates the provision of protection for vulnerable children and young persons [up to the age of 18 years]. Operation Staysafe involves the legitimate removal of children and young people from the streets and public areas who may be classed as vulnerable and at risk of significant harm.

Operation Staysafe will take place from {insert times} on {insert dates} as a tactical response to protect children and young persons who may become involved in the demonstration and are at risk of offending or injury.

The operation will cover {identify location} and surrounding area and specifically respond to intelligence about protest hot spots.

Operation Staysafe and the welfare service provision that it provides, presents an opportunity to reduce or remove the risk of harm to such children and young persons in a real time situation and, after assessment, offer options for positive activities or support.

**Intelligence**
To endeavour to:

- **Safeguard vulnerable children and young people** whose behaviour or whereabouts places them at risk of significant harm.
- **Prevent youth crime and anti-social behaviour** in locations around the town.
- **Work with parents and guardians** to improve parental care and supervision.
- **Work with partner agencies** to divert children and young persons from crime or anti-social behaviour.
Gather intelligence to support Acceptable Behaviour Contracts; Anti-Social Behaviour Orders or criminal prosecutions as appropriate.

Reassure communities and provide confidence in local policing and partners to support them.

**Method**

If a child or young person is identified as being vulnerable or at risk of significant harm the initiating officer should consider removing the child or young person to a place of safety.

Children and young people should be removed to a place of safety by officers working on Operation Staysafe and using vehicles designated for this purpose.

If officers not assigned to Operation Staysafe identify a child or young person they deem to be vulnerable or at risk of significant harm they should request, via the control room, Operation Staysafe officers to attend.

{Venue} has been identified as a place of Safety and has a number of rooms so that the young person can be taken to the appropriate room depending on which faction the young person is sympathetic towards.

An officer should remain with parents in the waiting room to ensure the safety of the Young People and others at the venue.

The decision to take a child or young person to a place of safety is based on a subjective judgment by the individual officer and the perceived risk.
Factors which could be considered include:
- A child or young person in possession of or having consumed alcohol
- A child perceived to be involved in incidents of disorder
- A child or young person involved in anti-social behaviour and/or crime
- A child or young person in possession of a firework or weapons
- A child or young person at risk of physical or emotional injury.

Multi agency staff working at the places of safety will take responsibility for a detailed assessment of the child or young person. Parents/guardians will be requested to attend.

If the parent/carer is unable to attend, the child or young person should be taken home by the police and a multi-agency colleague. The parent/guardian will be told the circumstances and any support or advice offered.

If a Police Protection Order is taken out the designated officer [inspector] should be informed and will assume responsibility for overseeing the procedure. Police protection powers under this act should only be used when the officer forms the belief that there is an imminent threat to the child’s welfare. No child should be taken into police protection until the investigating officer has seen the child and assessed his or her circumstances.
PHASE 3: POST EVENT

Any identified vulnerable sites should continue to have staff directed to patrol them until {time} on {date}.

It is essential that together with partner agencies and communities a ‘return to normality’ is managed as quickly as Possible. If practicable this process should commence on {day of event} as soon as the protest and counter protest groups have dispersed. The success or otherwise of the partnership / community operation on the day will dictate the post event response.

In any event it is crucial community engagement continues with the three key aims in mind:

- Tension monitoring
- Community engagement and reassurance
- Gathering community Intelligence

In the days after the event all community staff should:

- Provide reassurance through visible patrols where appropriate
- Liaise with key individuals/networks and community contacts
- Deliver key reassurance measures to communities
- Identify, respond to and address any concerns within our communities
- Deliver community briefings where necessary
- Seek feedback re operational planning and delivery
- Continue to monitor Hate Crimes and identify any such crime which could be attributed to the events.
When engagement indicates tensions and concerns within our local communities have returned to a ‘state of normality’ community engagement can be managed through the usual daily processes.

**Communications**

Radio Communications will operate on {insert name}.

{Name of organisation} are leading the communications up to and including the {date of event}.

All press to be referred to the police. {Named leads} will act as Council media liaison officers. {Named lead} will act as the Council’s spokesman.

A set of key messages should be circulated for key audiences. Headline messages from a local authority perspective are:

- **{Local Authority} has a strong track record of good community relations and will continue to support all our community groups and representatives should they have any concerns about this march.**

- The vast majority of those attending this march will be coming from outside of the borough which is recognition of the strong sense of belonging people living in the borough have.

- Our priority remains to ensure that the local economy is not damaged by this march and that people that wish to shop in the town centre can continue to do so.
The communications channels we are using:

**Direct face to face communication with the local community using the key messages;**
- Audiences identified in a Community Engagement Plan

**Leaflet drops, where appropriate, using the key messages;**
- Local communities
- Businesses
- Visitors in the city centre on the day
- Specific communities targeted by the protest group
- Additional audiences as identified in a Community Engagement Plan

**Digital media communications channels using key messages and uploading operational developments to;**
- Partner websites
- Partners’ Twitter / Facebook sites

**Media briefings**
- Before the event
- Provision of a rendezvous point for media interviews on the day
- Interviews post event

**Emergency Media Response**
A Media Plan will be utilised in co-ordination of a response to dealing with the media for any necessary emergency response. Likewise, the Council’s Media Functional Plan can be activated if required to mobilise in response to increasing media attention on the Council.
APPENDICES

The following are including for information purposes only and should be included in the CMP as appropriate:

Appendix A – Role of Shared Neighbourhood Volunteers
The purpose of Shared Neighbourhood Volunteers is summarised below:

- To act as recognisable members of the public working with partner agencies on behalf of their respective communities. To provide reassurance within their communities, ensure emerging community concerns are addressed and where practicable defuse emerging community tension and prevent community members from being drawn into criminality.

- In advance of the protest to express concerns on the part of communities and deliver key messages in agreement with the Police and local authority.

- To act as recognisable members of local communities present on the day of the protest. To work in partnership with relevant agencies for the benefit of their own and other communities.

- To work at either fixed strategic points; or with an ability to be transported to areas where their presence is needed.

- To work in teams alongside Police staff and officers from the Local Authority.

- To listen to concerns of individuals, groups and communities and provide initial reassurance.

- To feedback the concerns identified to Police and local authority and advise how any immediate concerns can be best addressed.

- To advise on the content and communicate key messages in agreement with the Police and Local authority.
Where practicable to defuse tensions in communities where there is the risk of tensions leading to direct action (confrontation between opposing groups) being taken.

Where practicable to influence the behaviour of community activists if their behaviour is likely to lead to disorder, damage being caused or unnecessary disruption to community life.

Following the demonstration to monitor tensions and deliver key messages post incident.

Monitors to provide feedback to partner agencies and be represented within appropriate debrief processes.

### Appendix B - Neighbourhood policing teams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Contact Details</th>
<th>Sgt</th>
<th>Sub Area’s</th>
<th>PC’s</th>
<th>PCSO’s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Appendix C – Vulnerable Premises

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Premises</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Nature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Appendix D – Contact Details

#### Police Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Contact Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Council Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Contact Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Appendix E – Road closure maps

Appendix F - Police powers handout
Public Order Offences Guide
- S4 POA 1986
- S4A POA 1986
- S5 POA 1986
- S60AA CJPOA 1994
- S12 POA 1986
- S14 POA 1986
- S50 PRA 2002

PACE and Powers Of Arrest
Section 24 of the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 provides for the power of arrest for constables and SOCA designated persons for all offences.

24(1) A constable [or SOCA designated person] may arrest without a warrant -
(a) anyone who is about to commit an offence;
(b) anyone who is in the act of committing an offence;
(c) anyone whom he has reasonable grounds for suspecting to be about to commit an offence;
(d) anyone whom he has reasonable grounds for suspecting to be committing an offence.

24(2) If a constable [or SOCA designated person] has reasonable grounds for suspecting that an offence has been committed, he may arrest without a warrant anyone whom he has reasonable grounds to suspect of being guilty of it.
24[3] If an offence has been committed, a constable [or SOCA designated person] may arrest without a warrant -
(a) anyone who is guilty of the offence;
(b) anyone whom he has reasonable grounds for suspecting to be guilty of it.

24[4] But the power of summary arrest conferred by subsection [1], [2] or [3] is exercisable only if the constable [or SOCA designated person] has reasonable grounds for believing that for any of the reasons mentioned in subsection [5] it is necessary to arrest the person in question.

24[5] The reasons are -
(a) to enable the name of the person in question to be ascertained (in the case where the constable does not know, and cannot readily ascertain, the person’s name, or has reasonable grounds for doubting whether a name given by the person as his name is his real name);
(b) correspondingly as regards the person’s address;
(c) to prevent the person in question -
   (i) causing physical injury to himself or any other person;
   (ii) suffering physical injury;
   (iii) causing loss of or damage to property;
   (iv) committing an offence against public decency [subject to subsection [6]; or
   (v) causing an unlawful obstruction of the highway;
(d) to protect a child or other vulnerable person from the person in question;
(e) to allow the prompt and effective investigation of the offence or of the conduct of the person in question;
(f) to prevent any prosecution for the offence from being hindered by the disappearance of the person in question.
Section 4 Public Order Act 1986: Causing fear or provocation of violence:

An offence is committed:

• If a person uses towards another person threatening, abusive or insulting words or behaviour

Or

• Distributes or displays to another person any writing, sign or other visible representation which is threatening, abusive or insulting

And

With intent to cause that person to believe that immediate unlawful violence will be used against him or another by any person, or to provoke the immediate use of unlawful violence by that person or another, or whereby that person is likely to believe that such violence will be used or it is likely that such violence will be provoked.

A person is guilty of an offence under Section 4 only if he intends his words or behaviour, or the writing, sign or other visible representation, to be threatening, abusive or insulting. It is also necessary to show intent to provoke or cause belief that immediate violence will be used or a likelihood that such violence will be used or a person will believe such violence will be used.
Section 4A Public Order Act 1986: Intentional harassment, alarm or distress:

An offence is committed if with intent to cause another harassment, alarm or distress, a person:

- Uses threatening, abusive or insulting words or behaviour, or disorderly behaviour

Or

- Displays any writing, sign or other visible representation which is threatening, abusive or insulting

And

This causes that or another person harassment, alarm or distress.

An offence under this section may be committed in a public or private place, except that no offence is committed by a person inside a dwelling and the person who is harassed, alarmed or distressed is also inside that or another dwelling.
Section 5 Public Order Act 1986: Being threatening, abusive or insulting in a way likely to cause harassment, alarm or distress:

An offence is committed if a person:
• Uses threatening, abusive or insulting words or behaviour, or disorderly behaviour

Or
• Displays any writing, sign or other visible representation which is threatening, abusive or insulting

And
Within the hearing or sight of a person likely to be caused harassment, alarm or distress thereby.

An offence under this section may be committed in a public or private place except that no offence is committed by a person inside a dwelling and the other person is also inside that or another dwelling.

Section 60AA Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994 - Power to require the removal of disguises:

A police officer of the rank or above the rank of Inspector may authorise the removal of items worn to conceal identity in a specified locality for up to 24 hours.

The authorisation may only be given if there are reasonable grounds to believe that such an authorisation is required to prevent or control the committal of offences within the locality.

Before exercising the power, the Officer MUST reasonably believe that the person is wearing the disguise or facial covering in order to conceal their identity.

The authorisation must be recorded in writing.
Section 12 Public Order Act 1986 – Imposing conditions on public processions

If the senior police officer reasonably believes that the time or the place at which, and the circumstances in which, any public procession is being held, or is intended to be held and its route or proposed route may result in:

- Serious public disorder, or
- Serious damage to property, or
- Serious disruption to the life of the community, or
- The purpose of the procession is to intimidate others with a view to compelling them not to do an act that they have a right to do or compelling them to do an act they have a right not to do.

The senior police officer may give directions imposing such conditions that appear necessary to prevent disorder, damage, disruption or intimidation by persons organising or taking part in the procession.

The directions may include conditions as to the route and prohibitions on entering specified public places.

For **pre-planned processions** the Chief Constable by way of a written authority may impose conditions for the above reasons and in order to prevent the above offences taking place.
Section 14 Public Order Act 1986 – Imposing conditions on public assemblies:

If the senior police officer present reasonably believes that the time or the place at which, and the circumstances in which, any public assembly is being held, or is intended to be held may result in:

- Serious public disorder, or
- Serious damage to property, or
- Serious disruption to the life of the community, or
- Organisers of the assembly intend to intimidate others with a view to compelling them not to do an act that they have a right to do or compelling them to do an act they have a right not to do.

The senior police officer present may give directions imposing conditions on the persons organising or taking part in the assembly, which relate to:

- The place where such an assembly is being held, or
- The maximum number of persons who may constitute it, or
- The maximum duration of the assembly, as may be necessary to prevent disorder, damage, disruption or intimidation.

For pre-planned processions the Chief Constable by way of a written authority may impose the above conditions in order to prevent the above offences taking place.
Section 50 Police Reform Act 2002 - Power to require name and address of persons acting in an anti-social manner:

A constable in uniform may require the name and address from a person who the constable has reasonable grounds to believe has been acting or is acting in an anti-social manner.

Note:
There is no power to request a date of birth within this legislation.

Hate Incident:
Any incident, which may or may not constitute a criminal offence, which is perceived by the victim or any other person, as being motivated by prejudice or hate.

Hate Crime:
Any crime, which constitutes a criminal offence, which is perceived by the victim or any other person, as being motivated by prejudice or hate.

Scope of ‘Hate Crime’
- Racist
- Religious or Faith
- Homophobic
- Transphobic
- Disability Related.

Any crime becomes aggravated when there is HOSTILITY SHOWN towards the victim’s race, religion or membership of a group, or perceived race, religion or membership of a group.
Appendix G - Licensing Plan

Human Rights
Consideration will be given to the compatibility of this order and its related procedures, with the Human Rights Act 1988, particularly with reference to the legal basis of its precepts; the legitimacy of its aims; the justification of its proportionality of the actions intended by it is the least intrusive and damaging option necessary to achieve the aims; and that it defines the need to document the relevant decision making process and outcomes of action.

Community Impact
Community Impact issues will be considered with regard to the planning of this operation and a Community Impact Assessment will be completed.

Operational Order to be developed by police force. To include:
1. Information
2. Intention
3. Method
4. Administration
5. Communications
6. Command

Appendix H - Hate Crime Incident / Crime Car
1. Information
2. Intention
3. Method
4. Administration
5. Communications
6. Command
Appendix I - Town Centre Business Plan

Human Rights
Consideration will be given to the compatibility of this order and its related procedures, with the Human Rights Act 1988, particularly with reference to the legal basis of its precepts; the legitimacy of its aims; the justification of its proportionality of the actions intended by it is the least intrusive and damaging option necessary to achieve the aims; and that it defines the need to document the relevant decision making process and outcomes of action.

Community Impact
Community Impact issues will be considered with regard to the planning of this operation and a Community Impact Assessment will be completed.

Operational Order to be developed by police force. To include:
1. Information
2. Intention
3. Method: The operation will be achieved in three phases: Pre event; During event and Post event
4. Administration
5. Communications
6. Command

Appendix J - Community Reassurance and Engagement Strategy

Reassurance Policing
Phase 1 Pre event: visits by senior management team and diversity team and high visibility patrols
Phase 2 On the day: licensing visits and city centre security
Phase 3 Post event: iconic and vulnerable sites; management of hate crime; hate crime/ incident car and youth diversion.
MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
BETWEEN THE (PROTEST GROUP), (POLICE FORCE) AND (LOCAL AUTHORITY)

This Statement of Intent does not create a legally binding contract or agreement between (Police Force), (Local Authority) and the (Protest Group).

The purpose of this document is to establish an agreed position as to the roles and responsibilities of (Police Force) and the (Protest Group) during the planning and implementation of the [event] and assembly in [location and date]. References to ‘the organiser’ (Protest Group) will include companies, organisations or individuals working on behalf of the organiser whether employed or on a voluntary basis. The (Protest Group) ‘organiser’ and link will be through [named individuals].

This document aims to give clarity to all parties involved in accordance with the guidelines provided by the HSE Event Safety Guide (‘The Purple Guide’).
1. **RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE (PROTEST GROUP)**

All aspects of the running of the event are the sole responsibilities of the (Protest Group). The (Protest Group) agree to act in compliance with the HSE Event Safety Guide (and any subsequent amendments), the Management of Health & Safety at Work Regulations 1999 (Management regulations) and in particular be responsible for:

- Health & Safety
- Application for and compliance with any safety certificates/licences
- Arrangements of medical and fire & rescue provision
- Stewarding
- Traffic Management
- Contingency planning
- Obtaining adequate public liability insurance

Through discussions between (Police Force), (Local Authority) and the (Protest Group) the following limitations have been agreed:

- The times agreed for the procession and assembly will [agreed times]. Due consideration should be given to the forming up and dispersal of all persons within this agreed time frame.

- The agreed route for the Processions (insert detailed route information and assembly point)

- There will be no stopping during the procession.

- A notional [specify number] stewards per [specify number] demonstrators has been agreed with the organisers. These stewards who will fulfil the criteria detailed within this document will assist the organiser in managing the safety of this event. These stewards will be readily identifiable through the wearing of high visibility jackets.
Sufficient stewards will be made available for the following locations:
(Key points along the route)

- Banners/Flags: Whilst the use of banners will be permitted the organisers will take steps to ensure the content of these is appropriate and could not be seen as being racially inflammatory, threatening, abusive or insulting as per the provisions of the Public Order Act. Where such banners are seen the organisers will take every possible step to have these removed and bring them to the attention of (Police Force).

- No flags will be permitted except with the agreement of the Police prior to the Procession setting of.

- No banners depicting any flags will be allowed except with the agreement of the Police prior to the Procession setting off.

-Whilst [assembly point] has been designated as a suitable site for this protest every care and consideration will be given to respecting the site and its neighbours.

- Due consideration should be given to the content of any speeches which may be seen as racially inflammatory and that could potentially generate community tensions within multi-cultural and multi faith community of [town / city].

- The organisers will ensure there is suitable provision for the administration of first aid should the need arise. These individuals should be easily identifiable.
2. RESPONSIBILITIES OF (POLICE FORCE)

Subject to agreement as to appropriate levels and standards of stewarding and appropriate levels of police resources, (Police Force) will support the event organiser in meeting its responsibilities in relation to crowd management, crime prevention and public protection within the event site and associated parking areas.

(Police Force) will comply with Home Office publications (where appropriate) and the Core Police roles as defined by the Association of Chief Police Officers Sub-committee for public order and published in the ‘Keeping the Peace’ Manual.

a) Prevention and detection of crime.

b) Prevention or stopping of a Breach of the Peace.

c) Traffic regulation within the legal powers provided by statute.

d) Activation of contingency plans where there is an immediate threat to life and property, and the co-ordination of the resultant Emergency Services available.

The deployment or use of any of these police powers remains at the discretion of (Police Force).

A more detailed breakdown of responsibilities is contained in Schedule 1.
3. DECISIONS AS TO PRIMACY

The event organiser will identify a responsible ‘Safety Officer’ for the event to the police commander no later than the day before the event. Safety will be the primary consideration of the Safety Officer whilst public disorder or the possibility thereof will be the prime consideration of the police commander.

Where there is serious concern for public safety during the processions or within the event site, and the police commander decides, by virtue of their duty to preserve life and protect property, that it is necessary for them to take overall control of public safety, they will assume responsibility together with primacy of control for all or part of the event site and surrounding area.

Wherever possible, transfer of authority will only occur after consultation with the organiser, although the right to assume control will be delegated to all police officers in cases of urgency. In cases of a substantial handover of responsibility, the transfer of authority should be in writing [see Appendix A], save when an immediate handover is necessary in an emergency.

During the period of police primacy, the organisers and persons working on their behalf will support and work under the direction of the police commander. When a situation exists where the police commander decides that police primacy is no longer necessary, the divisions of responsibility will revert to those outlined above. Return to normal conditions will be carried out in consultation with the organiser and should be confirmed in writing.
4. **CHANGE OF AGREED ROUTE**

In the event of significantly larger numbers of demonstrators attending than the organiser have planned for a decision may be taken that such numbers cannot safely be accommodated within the (initial location) and as a result an alternative route to (alternative location) will be agreed following a dynamic assessment on the day.

5. **EVACUATION**

The decision to evacuate all or part of the event area will rest with the organiser, based upon advice from the police commander. If a full evacuation becomes necessary, the organiser will consider if the event should be abandoned from the outset. If it is considered that the event should be abandoned and immediate announcement will be made to that effect. During any evacuation of all or part of the event area, the responsibility for ensuring that areas are searched to ensure all persons have evacuated from them will be that of the event organiser unless the area is too dangerous for this to be done.

When an evacuation is necessary for security reasons the evacuation procedure will be co-ordinated by the police, supported by the organiser. The subsequent procedures and timescales for searching of areas for devices or offenders will be determined by the police commander and no persons will be allowed to return to the site until the area has been declared safe.

[Police Force] will not accept responsibility for personal property or vehicles left in or adjacent to the event throughout the evacuation.
6. ACCESS TO THE SITE

In order to carry out police duties, authorised personnel working for or on behalf of [Police Force], including officers or agents of other agencies who are present at the request of the [Protest Group] will have unrestricted access to all areas in and around the procession and event site. In addition, provision will be made for control facilities on or adjacent to the event site.

7. OPENING THE EVENT SITE TO THE PUBLIC

The commencement of the event will be subject to both the responsible safety officer and the police commander being satisfied that adequate numbers of stewards and police officers are in position at every agreed location.

8. POLICE SUPPORT

The organisers and persons working on their behalf will provide assistance to police officers when requested to do so.

9. STAFF AND PARTICIPANT BRIEFING

The organiser will arrange for their staff to be briefed prior to the event to ensure they have a full understanding of;

- Command & control
- Communication methods
- Roles & responsibilities
- Safety requirements
- Any security issues & related search procedures
- Evacuation routes
- Divisions of responsibility, and
- Transfer of authority procedure
10. SAFETY OFFICER

The responsible safety officer will ensure that the stewarding arrangements are fully implemented and that he/she shall have no other duties on the day of the event which are likely to detract from this primary function.

The safety officer or a suitably trained deputy will be present in the control facility throughout the event.

11. STEWARDS

The organiser will ensure that all stewards are allocated their specific duties in accordance with a detailed, pre-arranged schedule and will be briefed in full regarding them. Stewards must be readily identifiable by dress. They should not be less than 18 years old and fully capable of carrying out the duties allocated to them.

12. VARIATION

Any variations as to the division of responsibility will be agreed in writing between the organiser and (Police Force) and will be appended to this document, signed by the same representative/authorised representative identified below.

Signed:
Authorised to sign for and on behalf of The [Protest Group]
Dated:

Signed:
[Police Force] Operational Commander
Dated:

Signed:
[Local Authority] Designated Officer
Dated:
MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
BETWEEN THE (PROTEST GROUP),
(POLICE FORCE) AND (LOCAL AUTHORITY)

Schedule 1- Schedule of Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Police</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communications</strong></td>
<td>To provide a method of communication for all staff deployed at the event, with all staff fully briefed in methods of communication.</td>
<td>To establish an independent command, control and communications structure to provide for contingencies and the co-ordination of emergency services personnel during a major incident.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contingency Plans</strong></td>
<td>To prepare plans compatible with the emergency services to cater for contingencies including pedestrian and vehicle evacuation.</td>
<td>To prepare contingency plans to cater for the operational risks identified in the risk assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control of Entry</strong></td>
<td>To provide staff to manage admission, ejection and departure, including conditions of entry, charges and access to secure areas. Conditions of entry must be clearly displayed and stewards must be prepared to enforce them where practicable. A decision to eject is one for the event organiser or their staff and police will not become directly involved in ejections from the site, although their presence may be requested by the organiser to prevent substantive offences being committed or to take action if they are committed.</td>
<td>To support event staff and deal with any substantive offences. Where appropriate to provide a presence to prevent substantive offences being committed during an ejection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crowd Safety Barriers</strong></td>
<td>Arrange the supply of crowd safety barriers as agreed in consultation with the police and local authority in identified public areas. To ensure a suitable contractor is available in respect of any adjustments or changes to the agreed layout.</td>
<td>To support the assigned contractor where necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crime Prevention</strong></td>
<td>To provide high visibility patrols inside the event site and in car parking areas to prevent crime.</td>
<td>To provide high visibility patrols in and around the event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lost &amp; Found</strong></td>
<td>To provide an effective procedure and suitable location for dealing with reports of lost and found people and property.</td>
<td>To support the organiser’s procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major Incident</strong></td>
<td>To support the police in managing emergency and major incidents by contributing to a co-ordinated multi-agency response.</td>
<td>To co-ordinate the multi-agency response to a major incident and manage emergencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedestrians</strong></td>
<td>To provide sufficient stewards during the event to ensure the safety of pedestrians at the venue.</td>
<td>To support the event organiser in minimising the risk to all persons at the venue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Detained Persons / Prosecutions</strong></td>
<td>To support the police in the provision of evidence to assist in any subsequent criminal prosecutions. Stewards to be informed that they may be called as witnesses and will be expected to attend court if necessary.</td>
<td>To manage all aspects of detained persons and processing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Order</strong></td>
<td>To employ properly trained staff to monitor crowd behaviour and identify and move to prevent the potential for disorder.</td>
<td>To support the event organiser with preventative measures, and where appropriate intervene to deal with substantive offences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Risk Assessment</strong></td>
<td>To complete a risk assessment to identify hazards and introduce the control measures necessary to remove or mitigate risk. This must be reviewed prior to the event and details of it and any revisions notified to the police.</td>
<td>To complete an operational and police related health &amp; safety risk assessment to identify hazards and guide the development of control measures and contingency plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Certificate / Licence</td>
<td>To take the primary responsibility for the safety of all persons at the event. Implement the provisions of and secure compliance with any relevant certificates/licences.</td>
<td>To support the organiser in implementing the provisions of certificates/licences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sectoring</td>
<td>To divide spectator areas into sectors and provide dedicated supervisors and resources to manage the crowd.</td>
<td>To support the organiser’s procedures if required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>To implement a ‘security awareness’ policy including regular checks within sectors to identify unfamiliar items or equipment.</td>
<td>To provide specialist support and advice to deal with suspicious people, devices or vehicles and attendant evacuation decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spectator, Steward &amp; Emergency Service Parking</td>
<td>To provided dedicated, high visibility staff to manage optimum parking in allocated car parks.</td>
<td>To support stewards and where appropriate deal with any substantive offences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Management</td>
<td>To work with the Responsible Traffic Management Authority [Highways] to provide an effective traffic management system which ensures attendees arrive and leave the event site in good time and the area is inconvenienced as little as possible. To manage the parking areas and control and direct traffic on internal access and emergency routes.</td>
<td>To fully co-operate with the Responsible Traffic Management Authority [Highways] to allow them to fulfil their obligations under Section 16 of The Traffic Management Act 2004.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX A

Transfer of Authority between [Police Force] & Event Organiser

Transfer from Organiser to Police Commander
At [time] on [date] an emergency occurred during the event, namely [specify relevant event] and, as police commander, I am assuming control. During the period of police primacy, the organisers and persons working on their behalf have agreed to work under my direction.

NAME & RANK:  
SIGNED:  
DATE:  
[Police Force]

NAME:  
SIGNED:  
DATE:  
[Organiser]

Transfer from Police Commander back to Organiser
At [time] on [date] the emergency mentioned above has been resolved and as police commander I am returning control of the event back to the organiser.

NAME & RANK:  
SIGNED:  
DATE:  
[Police Force]

NAME:  
SIGNED:  
DATE:  
[Organiser]
SAMPLE LETTER TO PROTEST ORGANISERS

Organiser name
Organiser address
Date

Dear Sir/ Madam,

PROPOSED PROCESSION AND ASSEMBLY IN [TOWN / CITY] ON [DATE]

I attach two Notices of Conditions I impose on the proposed [organisation] procession on [date]. I regret having to impose these conditions on your planned procession and assembly and I write now to explain why I believe the conditions are necessary.

As [rank] I welcome all law-abiding people to [town / city] and support their right to peaceful protest. However, protesters’ rights to liberty and freedom of assembly and expression have to yield to the public interest in the protection of disorder and crime and the rights of others to life, security and property.

Where a balance has to be struck between competing rights, I have to make a reasoned decision as [rank] on the basis of a considered assessment of the available intelligence and make tactical policing decisions on how to maintain public tranquillity and avoid public disorder.
The [organiser’s] purpose as directed in conversation is to demonstrate against [insert]. The experience of the police both nationally and locally, is that [organiser] demonstrations often result in heightened community tensions and serious disorder.

In light of this it is clear to me that the purpose of the [organiser] assembly may lead to ‘serious public disorder, serious damage to property or serious disruption to the life of the community’ in accordance with section 14 of the Public Order Act 1986. I have given much consideration to the European Convention on Human Rights. I know the exercise of my power to impose conditions in accordance with the Public Order Act 1986 will impose restriction on the activity of others. I have considered Article 9, The Right to Freedom of Thought, Conscience and Religion, Article 10. The right to Freedom of Expression and Article 11, The Right to Freedom of Assembly and Association.

For the reasons set out above, I consider the conditions are lawful, for a legitimate aim, are necessary in a democratic society, are proportionate to the aims the conditions are intended to achieve and are non-discriminatory.

I am anxious not to prevent you from legitimate protest and I am aware that an area [assembly point] has been made available to you.

[Name]
[Rank]
USEFUL INFORMATION
A training package for Leaders and elected members is being developed which will help to increase their knowledge and understanding of all forms of extremism. This is currently being piloted by Luton Borough Council and following evaluation, will be offered to all Special Interest Group Leaders.

Alongside this, a member mentoring programme is being explored for the Special Interest Group which will increase the amount of support available to Leaders during far right activity in their boroughs. It is recognised there are varying levels of experience in managing far right activity within the Group and the programme will acknowledge this.

The LGA Knowledge Hub has been used to create a facility where discussions around far right activity can take place in a safe and secure space. Supporting material from seminars and additional reports / research is also uploaded to the site. The provision of an online resource where learning, ideas and concerns can be shared will be increasingly important following the completion of the seminar programme.

Access to the Knowledge Hub for the Special Interest Group can be gained via anisa.patel@blackburn.gov.uk
TOP TIPS

- Continuous intelligence gathering and tensions monitoring will provide you with time to intervene at the earliest opportunity and if necessary prepare and respond.
- Try to pre-empt potential issues based on experiences from within the borough and those of neighbouring and regional authorities. Map out scenarios and a likely timeline of activity.
- Information sharing is central to mitigating the impact of any far right activity. Formalise the arrangement if necessary.
- Maximise the utilisation of existing partnership working arrangements.
- It is worth investing in a strong strategic relationship with the local constabulary as this will ease the management of any demonstration activity.
- Involve the right people and organisations. This may mean engaging with individuals and groups who are not part of usual engagement procedures. Utilise existing community contacts to facilitate this.
- Use local and national research including surveys and Census returns to ensure you are engaged with all affected individuals.
- Community buy-in is central for successful management so utilise staff resources to build resilience at a grassroots level.
- Keep local communities informed via regular and consistent key messages through a variety of channels.
- There is a crucial, personal role for Leaders and elected members in being visible, confident and clear regarding their personal position on extremism.
- Ensure there is no long term impact on cohesion by continuing to monitor community tensions after the event.
- Do not be afraid to try new approaches. Ensure legal and police advice is taken prior to roll-out.
CONTACTS AND BIBLIOGRAPHY
CONTACTS

- Blackburn with Darwen Borough Council
  anisa.patel@blackburn.gov.uk

- Luton Borough Council
  HOPP@luton.gov.uk

- Department for Communities and Local Government
  Andrew.Jordan@communities.gsi.gov.uk

- Home Office
  PreventLocalDelivery@homeoffice.x.gsi.gov.uk

ASSOCIATED READING MATERIAL

- “Creating the Conditions for Integration,”
  Department for Communities and Local Government, 2012

- “Prevent Strategy,”
  HM Government, 2011
This toolkit has been produced in partnership by Blackburn with Darwen Borough council and Luton Borough council and is supported by the Local government association.
MANAGING FAR RIGHT ACTIVITY