

## European Crime Prevention Award (ECPA)

### Annex I

Approved by the EUCPN Management Board in 2018

Please complete the template in English in compliance with the ECPA criteria contained in the Rules and procedures for awarding and presenting the European Crime Prevention Award (Par.2 §3).

#### General information

1. Please specify your country.

Denmark

2. Is this your country's ECPA entry or an additional project?

This is the Danish ECPA entry

3. What is the title of the project?

Safe Neighbourhoods in Køge

4. Who is responsible for the project? Contact details.

Boligsocial helhedsplan i Køge / att. Mikkel Pedersen

E-mail [mpe@bosj.dk](mailto:mpe@bosj.dk) / 0045 2498 2255

5. Start date of the project (dd/mm/yyyy)? Is the project still running (Yes/No)? If not, please provide the end date of the project.

Yes, starting date was August, the 1<sup>st</sup> 2017

6. Where can we find more information about the project? Please provide links to the project's website or online reports or publications (preferably in English).

The project is a part of the greater social community development project in Køge [www.helhedsplanen.dk](http://www.helhedsplanen.dk) (only in Danish)

The effort of getting youngsters into employment (Jobplaneten) has been playing a vital role in the project and has a separate website: [www.jobplaneten.dk](http://www.jobplaneten.dk) (only in Danish)

7. Please give a **one page** description of the project (**Max. 600 words**)

In spring and summer 2017, the administration and the Social Housing project began receiving disturbing reports of gang activities in the neighbourhood, Karlemoseparken, a Social Housing Estate with 640 dwellings in the city of Køge. Karlemoseparken has always had smaller problems with drug dealing and related criminal activities, but these reports were different. The gang of Loyal to Familia (LTF) was targeting Køge, and especially Karlemoseparken.

During a few month LTF succeeded in taking over most of the drug business in the city of Køge, turning Karlemoseparken into a headquarter. 30-40 gang members turned the cellars and storage rooms into their hideaways. They even threatened some families to move out and took over a few apartments. Soon they were controlling and patrolling a whole section of the Estate. The local administration was also threatened, and they eventually refused to provide service to this part of the Estate.

The Social Housing project facilitated a meeting between the Police and the local administration, a meeting that was followed by weekly meetings and briefings, building up a relationship, and a common strategy towards the Gang. Normally, the administration only conducts green services, renovation and the like, but this administration wanted to be a vital part of the strategy.

Their specific role was and still is to be the eyes and ears in the effort, noting license plates, installing security cameras, encouraging the residents and reporting all observations weekly to the Police. The specific role of the Social Housing project was to offer moral support and educational and job-related advice to the younger hang-arounds.

The residents began reporting back to the local administration, the Social Housing project and to the Police officers who appeared much more frequently in the area. During the project a public meeting was held in the Community House. The Police were telling the residents about the new strategy towards the Gang, and they underlined that the Police needed the participation from the residents, to be able to build up solid criminal cases on each gang member.

During 2017 and start 2018, the Police were building up solid cases on all the high-profiled members, in great part thanks to the participation of the local administration and the Social Housing project. Arrests were made and 20 of the higher profiled gang members are now in custody expecting long-term sentences from 3-8 years for threats, drug dealing, violence and other charges.

The project is now in a phase, working with the rest of the youngsters living in the neighbourhood. After the high-profiled gang members were arrested, the lower profiled affiliated members were much easier to cooperate with and they are now seeking assistance and support for education and jobs. The Social Housing project founded [www.jobplaneten.dk](http://www.jobplaneten.dk) matching youngsters and local business (stores) in need of part-time labour. The project continues as a prevention effort, where the local Police are part of a monthly crime prevention meeting in cooperation with local stakeholders, and an event with the 'Mobile Police station', where they meet local residents.

**I. The project shall focus on prevention and/or reduction of everyday crime and fear of crime within the theme.**

8. How does the project contribute to crime prevention and/or the reduction of crime or the fear of crime? Does it focus on raising citizens' awareness or does it apply other mechanisms? (**Max. 200 words**)

The LTF caused crime and fear among the residents and the local administration. It has been important to be able to control the situation, by removing gang members from the Estate.

The cooperation has ensured a flexible procedure in the exchange of information within the regulatory framework. The increased and coordinated flow of information and observations has been contributing to the creation of a more comprehensive picture of the situation in Karlemosen and the gang related activities, thus contributing to a broader strategic overview. This was a crucial part of building criminal cases and arresting gang members.

The new phase of the project is continuing the focus on crime prevention e.g. job/ educational support and mentoring. The Police are paying monthly visits to the Estate, using a "Mobile Police station". Police officers are meeting youngsters and other residents in a relaxed manor, addressing their concerns and alongside this, children can try to sit in a Police car and other fun Police stuff. The residents are becoming part of the solution process as they are in dialogue with the Police identifying activities that might influence the subjective sense of security at the Estate.

**II. The project shall have been evaluated and have achieved most or all of its objectives.<sup>1</sup>**

9. What were the reasons for setting up the project? Was this context analysed before the project was initiated and in what way (How, and by whom? Which data were used)? In what way did this analysis inform the set-up of the project? (**Max. 150 words**)

It was extremely important to solve the problems of the LTF gang in order to get the greater Social Community project to work better. All the stakeholders involved – the Chief of Police, John Jensen, the Chief of the administration of the Estate, Niels Bannergaard and the project managers of the Community project, came together and promised to dedicate all efforts to bring the gang related crimes to a halt. In this process they also cooperated with the municipality, especially with social workers, the IRS and the employment officers. The effort was based on both data from the police regarding the gang members involved, data from the administration of the Estate (BOSJ) on

<sup>1</sup> For more information on evaluation, see Guidelines on the evaluation of crime prevention initiatives (EUCPN Toolbox No.3): <http://www.eucpn.org/library/results.asp?category=32&pubdate>

tenants and from the video surveillance and data on the specific youngsters from the local community project.

10. What were the objective(s) of the project? Please, if applicable, distinguish between main and secondary objectives. (**Max. 150 words**)

- The main objective was to build up solid criminal cases on the prominent members of the gang, using the environment, the local administration unit and the residents.
- Secondary, involving the residents in the effort and making them feel safe reporting incidents to the project and the police.
- To be able to work with the larger 'grey area' of youngsters, after the gang, with all the pressure and temptations are gone (job/education).
- Another secondary objective was to show a way of continuing the local preventive policework in the aftermath. This is done in two ways: Firstly, the participants are still meeting regularly to report about the current situation in the area. Secondly, the Police are now coming in each of the deprived areas in Køge once a month with their local Mobile Police station. This should help forming the framework for an informal meeting between residents and the Police.

11. Has there been a process evaluation? Who conducted the evaluation (internally or externally?) and what were the main results? Which indicators were used to measure the process? Did you make changes accordingly? (**max. 300 words**) - *for more information on process evaluation, see EUCPN Toolbox No.3, p.9-10 & part 2 - section 2A*

The group behind the project has been doing an internal evaluation of the project. It has been so successful, that the method is now called the 'Karlemose-model' and has spread to other residential areas of Køge. Therefore, we now have a pre-emptive model of corporation between Police and the civil society (local administration, service providers for the social housing and local residents).

The focal point has been increasing the presence of local Police, increasing the dialogue between residents, local institutions and organizations (through meetings and the 'Mobile Police station'). The focus is both the objective and subjective safety (view of the residents) of Karlemoseparken as a larger residential area.

The police consider it important that the cooperation was carried out at the level of both management and employees. The holistic focus in the cooperation has resulted in the exchange of information about observations, experiences

and the monitoring, that all together supported the investigation and the safety of the residents, regardless of the band-related activities in the area.

12. Has there been an outcome or impact evaluation? Who conducted the evaluation (internally or externally?), which data and evaluation method were used and what were the main results? Which indicators were used to measure the impact? (**Max. 300 words**) - for more information on outcome or impact evaluation, see EUCPN Toolbox No.3, p.7-9 & part 2 - section 2A

There has not been an outcome evaluation. But there are observations that indicate an improvement in both crime and fear:

At the height of the crisis, the elderly and the children were afraid to go out, since the LTF was threatening people daily. We even have had a woman bitten by a Pitbull, and other residents were too scared to take matters to the Police.

Today, it's another thing altogether: The elderly has reclaimed the area, the children are playing outside, and the youngsters are no longer afraid to be seen in the neighbourhood. The service employees of the local administration have a much better work environment and can move freely in all parts of the neighbourhood. The local administration has not registered any graffiti at all since LFT was arrested.

The Social Housing company are reporting that the amount of people moving out are now back to normal. During the crisis, the housing administration had monthly documented cases where tenants had given up gang-related crime as specific reason for wanting to relocate, none since then.

Since LTF was driven out of the area, the Social Housing project have had 5 former lower ranking older gang members in a project, where a mentor was assigned to help them with jobs and education. 15 youngsters from the group are now in part-time jobs and other activities. After the high-profile members of the gang was arrested, the lower profiled affiliated members became much easier to work with.

From 2016 until February 2018 there were 85 police reports regarding gang related crimes in Karlemosen. In 2018 (from February until September) there have been 9 police reports regarding gang related crimes. This indicate a reduction in gang related activities at the Estate. The indication is supported by information from the stakeholders.

**III. The project shall, as far as possible, be innovative, involving new methods or new approaches.**

16. How is the project innovative in its methods and/or approaches? (**Max. 150 words**)

The project is innovative since the level of corporation between Police and local stakeholders was, and still is, very intense. They shared information within the boundaries of legislation and there were weekly meetings where information was shared, and the strategy was discussed. Normally this is NOT a part of the work schedule of the local housing administrations, so it was really cutting edge. Normally the Police is not aware of how much that can be gained through the cooperation with the local stakeholders, in relation to problems concerning serious crime.

The local administration also learned how important it is having local partners from other professions, like the Police, social workers and local institutions. The Housing administration are now more than ever aware that doing a good job is more than bricks and services. It is also about community, social activities, and how to involve the residents in changing their Estate.

**IV. The project shall be based on cooperation between partners, where possible.**

18. Which partners or stakeholders were involved in the project and what was their involvement? (**Max. 200 words**)

The partners were:

Midt- og Vestsjællands politi (Regional Police)

Gathering evidence, maintaining order, patrolling, weekly meetings with the local administration of the Housing Organization, institutions and the Municipality. The Police were reacting very quickly on reports, having meetings with concerned residents.

Boligselskabet Sjælland (Housing Organization)

Producing evidence from video surveillance, local residents, records of license plates etc. Reacting swiftly in changing locks when certain buildings were compromised by the gang, removing graffiti etc.

Boligsocial helhedsplan Køge (Social Community project)

Setting up the meetings, holding Police and others informed of activities among gang-members, reaching out to the affected families, getting the youngsters into jobs and education.

Municipality of Køge contributed among other things with a gang strategy, focusing on the money, the individual member earns and spend, thus looking for inconsistencies between official/legal income and the lifestyle of the individual. The Municipality also supplied a professional mentor, with the task to support and follow the youngsters most at risk in their plans for job and education.

**V. The project shall be capable of replication in other Member States.**

19. How and by whom is the project funded? (**Max. 150 words**)

The project was initiated by the Social Housing project for a 4-year period funded by 'Landsbyggefonden', but the main effort was conducted by using resources already at hand by the stakeholders. Landsbyggefonden is a Social Housing Foundation, that funds renewal projects as well as Community work in Social Housing Estates in Denmark.

This project was mainly based on 'internal resources', making it easier to anchor or replicate. The Police focused extra resources into the project as well, but we are confident that results in terms of indictments and a much safer environment at the Estate will be surpassing the expenditures.

20. What were the costs of the project in terms of finances, material and human resources? (**Max. 150 words**)

See #19. Besides these resources, the Social Housing project used 1-2 employees to work with the group of youngsters as part of a larger effort of getting all youngsters in jobs or education.

21. Has a cost-benefit analysis been carried out? If so, describe the analysis, including how and by whom it was carried out and list the main findings of the analysis. (**Max. 150 words**)

No, there have not been a cost-benefit analysis.

Each partner used their own efforts, so that it was all a matter of new ways to establish partnerships.

The extra resources used by the Police will be evaluated when everything is settled. However, it can be pointed out that the task in this cooperation has been a highly complementary element of information that has increased the strength of the ongoing investigations. The increased flow of information has thus contributed to a broader and possibly a more detailed monitoring perspective.

22. Are there adjustments to be made to the project to ensure a successful replication in another Member State?

It all depends of the specific context in the member states, especially how the different types of Social Housing are organized, but also on what other Community Organisations that are in the affected areas. So, we are looking for a model that combines Housing Administrations, Civil Society, perhaps even in some cases local Mosques, institutions and employees from the Municipality

with the local Police. It's important that the same Police officers, that the residents know and trust already, are involved, and that the Police are given a task of crime prevention through cooperation, combined with the usual tasks of the Police.

It's considered important that the cooperation is carried out at both management and employee level as the cooperation needs strategical legitimacy and focus.

It's very important to have the resources at hand to reach out with jobs and/or education to the youngsters and the young residents in the area.

23. How is the project relevant for other Member States? Please explain the European dimension of your project.

It is very relevant, it is a prime example of the needed corporation between the Police, municipality and especially Housing Organizations and other local Community groups. This is also an example of how the Police can work with other professionals. Patience is most important, investing time, building up networks and taking the local stakeholders serious. The Police should also be willing to pass certain information back as well as receiving information (within the limits of legislation). In that way the Police can empower the local stakeholders to grow within their roles as guardians of their community. Gang-related crime can only be stopped through traditional means of Police-work in symbiosis with this kind of cooperation between all necessary stakeholders.

Please provide a short general description of the project (abstract for inclusion in the conference booklet – **max. 150 words**).

Safe Neighbourhoods in Køge is a project, where the Police have been cooperating to a much higher degree than they usually do. The Police have been cooperating with local professionals and residents in a Social Housing organization, to be able to crack gang-related crime and reshaping a safe environment in a socially deprived area, thus preventing social unrest, and the moving out of residents. The stakeholders have been using inside knowledge about individuals and families and have been gaining access to mutual data, including the use of observations from the residents to dissolve the gang.

The project continues as a crime prevention effort, where the local Police are paying the neighbourhood a monthly visit, having a crime prevention meeting with local stakeholders, and using the 'Mobile Police station', when meeting local residents. The project reaches out with job and educational support to the boys and young men in the area.