London Crime Reduction Board

Extraordinary Meeting

Thursday 25 August 2011, 4pm at Committee Room 3, City Hall, GLA.

PRESENT:
Board: Mayor for London Boris Johnson, Kit Malthouse AM, Councillor Colin Barrow, Mayor Steve Bullock.

APOLOGIES:
Mayor Jules Pipe, Councillor Claire Kober

Lead Officers
Tim Godwin T/Commissioner MPS
Ian McPherson Assistant Commissioner MPS
Sue Fish Commander MPS
Jeff Jacobs Chief Executive GLA
Jane Harwood Deputy Chief Executive MPA
John O’Brien Chief Executive London Councils
Will Tuckley Chief Executive LB Bexley
Nick Walkley Chief Executive LB Barnet
Heather Munro Chief Executive London Probation Trust
David Robinson Deputy Chief Crown Prosecutor

Apologies:
Secretariat and supporting officers: Jude Sequeira (MPA), Maria Cordero (MPA) Joe Mitton and Roisha Hughes (Mayor’s Office), Kevin Taylor (London Councils), and Munira Mirza (GLA).

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS
1.1. The Mayor welcomed everyone to this extraordinary meeting to discuss the London disorder. The Mayor said that good things can come out of the unacceptable events of August and that now the pressure is to make sure that something similar does not happen again.

1.2. He reported there has been near 2,000 arrests and a further 4,000 suspects. The MPS has gone through only 20% of the CCTV footage and more arrests are to be expected. This will lead to big criminal justice issues.

1.3. The Mayor invited the Board to think about how to deal with these events and how to reinstate the offenders into society.
2. SCENE SETTING

2.1. Ian McPherson was due to provide a context for the meeting’s discussion but unfortunately was delayed. So the Mayor asked Nick Walkley to present the accompanying context.

2.2. Nick Walkley provided an outline of the work of the Recovery Co-ordination Group (RCG), a body set-up by representatives of the boroughs affected, London Councils, the GLA, the Metropolitan Police and the London Fire Brigade. It is a short-life group with terms of reference to help London get back on its feet in the wake of the disturbances. NW chairs the Group.

2.3. NW reported that the RCG has put together a website londonrecovers.org.uk. The website provides advice and references to assist victims and organisations. In particular it provides updates on ongoing community activities and has signposts to funding streams and compensation schemes.

2.4. The RCG is leading work on an impact assessment, to assess how the disorder has affected victims, businesses and communities and what is being done in each local area. NW said that at present the majority of businesses, many of whom are sole traders, are facing financial difficulties.

2.5. NW also referred to work that the group is doing with regards young people and the return to school in the coming term. The Association of Directors of Children Services has set a working group to assist.

2.6. The RCG is also developing a data set to be commonly used.

Discussion

2.7. The Mayor asked what is the anxiety about the return to school and what is being planned? NW replied that there are worries around tensions and disciplinary issues affecting those caught up with the disorder. He stressed the need for schools to determine their own local solutions and RCG is leaving this matter to schools and children services departments to handle. NW agreed the work will link into the Safer Learner Partnership too.

2.8. The Mayor said the website was an excellent development and urged partners to link into it. Overall he thought the response and co-ordination was going in exactly the right direction.

Action: All partners to link into, and support, the website londonrecovers.org.uk

3. POSITION STATEMENTS

- GLA funding and activity

3.1. Jeff Jacobs reported on the range of immediate actions that the Mayor, through the GLA has taken to assist recovery.

3.2. First, the Mayor has announced a £50m Regeneration Fund. This will
focus on assisting town centres and high streets most affected by the disturbances and drive long term improvements there. Initial discussions are underway with local councils to take this forward.

3.3. This will be supplemented by a £20m London Enterprise Fund which the Government is giving the GLA. This money will be directed at Croydon and Haringey, two of the worst affected areas. The Government’s £20m is in addition to the other funding announced by the Government to support clean up and businesses.

3.4. These funds are in addition to the £50m already announced by the Mayor for an Outer London Fund. £10m of this was allocated, following a bidding round, earlier this year. Bids for the £40m remaining will be considered in Round 2, currently running. Boroughs which have been less affected by the disturbances are invited to seek support under the Outer London Fund.

3.5. Finally, the Mayor has given strong support to a new High Street Fund charity set up by Sir William Castell (Chair of the Wellcome Trust). The Mayor has pledged £500,000 to support this and he has urged businesses and London boroughs to contribute to this cause. The High Street Fund is intended to support small businesses which have suffered with their immediate small cash needs. There have been donations from large businesses including Barclays, Santander, RBS Lloyds Banking Group, BP, Deloitte and Capita.

3.6. There are continuing activities within the GLA on community safety, children, youth and other issues which will contribute to the GLA’s follow-up work on the disturbances. Generally, the Mayor will seek to bring key work forward and expand this where possible. The Resettlement Brokers scheme was being expanded. The Mayor’s Mentoring Programme, support for YOU London and Met Voyage were also be implemented.

Discussion

3.7. The Mayor welcomed comments and views. The meeting appeared content with the outline. The Mayor concluded saying this shows London had a lot of good work already under way and not to lose sight of this.

- **Riots Damages Act compensation scheme**

3.8. Jane Harwood explained the Riot Damages Act places a liability for compensation for riots upon police authorities. She said the MPA is working with colleagues around the table, the Home Office, and the Treasury to form a compensation scheme. She outlined a number of complexities: the Act from 1886 doesn’t always cover modern society; compensation doesn’t apply to matters covered under insurance, and claims only apply where a riot has been declared. She confirmed the MPA had not as yet declared a riot occurred because it is still assessing the geographical zones where the definition of a riot will apply. This would not be the whole of London. She also referred to the care needed to be taken supporting claims in order to minimise
bogus and inflated claims and from doubling up compensation from various public funding streams.

Discussion

3.9. NW said the process of compensation was beginning to work. The initial assessment indicated that under-insurance could be an issue. He added that each borough has around 200 businesses, on average, affected by the riots.

3.10. CB said it is important to act as quickly as possible.

3.11. KM said discussions with the Home Office indicated it will fully fund uninsured losses but that discussions were continuing to establish the division of costs between the Home Office, Treasury and the MPA. He was pleased, meanwhile, to see business groups assisting with loans.

3.12. The Mayor recognised the merit of the scheme. He understood the Prime Minister to have said he will back the MPA with meeting the costs of the disorder. He stated that it is most important that we pro-actively deal with the people clearly affected and whose lives and businesses are at the edge. He wanted local authorities to engage with each affected business and he thought the number of cases involved in each borough was manageable and that this will assist the claims process. He also welcomed media support with their fund-raising campaigns.

• Borough responses

3.13. John O’Brien welcomed the overwhelming support given by Londoners in the clean-up of the areas affected as well as the support received from the police in the immediate aftermath. He said the attention was now turned to recovery. He said he hadn’t much more to add to what NW had earlier reported in Item 2.

Discussion

3.14. The Mayor praised councils for being so pro-active with the recovery and shared the plaudits he had received from Londoners about the clean-up, policing and other partner activity.

3.15. SB said he thought the communications worked extremely well including communications between central and local government. He felt that further down the road, the focus must be on early intervention and to examine more closely what works and how to up-scale these initiatives. He asserted what happened was different in different places, therefore the measures for some boroughs are not applicable to other boroughs and there cannot be a top down and one size fits all response. He referred to an initiative Second Wave which worked extremely well in Lewisham.

3.16. CB added the need to explore what is being done with disaffected young people.

3.17. The Mayor agreed that we have to look closely at what is being done with young people, some now being in a worse situation than before.
He said it was a good point to look at the links with central government.

- **The central government landscape**

  **Discussion**

  3.18. KM opened the discussion. In his view the recovery side is good but there was a need to sharpen the policing landscape debate. He outlined the discussion areas of policing that the disorder has brought to the fore:

  3.19. **Police resources**: KM said that over the next 2 or 3 months the debate will be on what the police service is going to look like in the next few years, not only in London. London needs a sharpening of the ask around police resources and budget planning. This also needs to take into consideration non-police budgets, such as the 60% reduction in the community safety fund and for which boroughs face further uncertainty in 2012/13. If the economic situation was a contributing factor here, the austerity measures haven’t fully unfolded. Specifically too, a new slice of the policing budget will have to be set aside for surge mobilization, police overtime and mutual aid measures.

  3.20. **Localism**: the Home Office has recently hosted a meeting about gangs. KM agreed that gangs is a local issue and the debate should be centred in local areas but he said he would be worried if the Home Office came up with non-locally owned solutions and if it didn’t engage partners who were around the table when assessing the situation.

  3.21. **Gang activity**: the cost of gang activity is £2.5 million this year. It features as the only current growth item in the MPA budget for next year to £5m. A menu of options is being prepared to assist boroughs but its use will be left as a local matter. KM added that 28% of those arrested were members of a gang or have some reported gang affiliation. However this figure is not yet definitive as the data is still being analysed.

  3.22. CB asked do we know what we need to lobby government for. The Mayor agreed we need to establish what is needed, what this will cost and how to articulate our ask.

  3.23. Tim Godwin was concerned that the solution with gangs isn’t solely an enforcement one. The Mayor agreed saying he was impressed with work the Leader from Lambeth recently highlighted, concerning action led by the community for dealing with gangs. TG followed on saying the key estates are known but communities need to be empowered. He offered Safer Neighbourhood teams as a resource to identify issues. He felt the public do want to get involved to help. KM said we do have most of the gangs mapped and we needed to ensure the data is shared with boroughs.

  3.24. Ian McPherson stated it needs a carrot and stick approach. Local authorities need to be incentivised to deal with the top end issues and the police do the enforcement. KM added that the intelligence gathering is already available. TG said that MPS teams are working closely with local authorities as to what direction to take in relation with gangs. TG agreed the MPS will share data about riot offenders with
partners to assist their projects.

**Action:** MPS to share disorder data and analysis to assist partners develop projects and local problem-solving.

3.25. The Mayor asked what needs to be done. He said he had to make a case for keeping police numbers high. He checked whether London had an anti-gangs strategy. CB added specific funding would need to be made available for an anti-gangs strategy.

3.26. KM replied that funding for gangs work may have to be drawn from the community safety fund.

3.27. CB suggested London could possibly trade-in the community safety fund, e.g. offer it to the Home Office as a saving in return for a specific fund for gangs work.

3.28. TG advised the work around gangs isn’t cheap and is a long-term endeavour.

3.29. The Mayor concluded by seeking the LCRB develop an anti-gangs strategy, identify the funding this would need and what outcomes it would achieve. He said London needs to work with the Home Office on a shared plan for addressing gangs.

3.30. IM offered to lead work on an anti-gangs strategy. CB said the local authority perspective was needed here too.

**Action:** MPS to develop a joint Anti-Gangs Strategy to inform London’s input into and asks from central government’s policies for tackling gangs.

4. **SERVICE DELIVERY UPDATES**

- **METROPOLITAN POLICE**

4.1. The Mayor asked TG how he saw the situation now and in a few weeks ahead. Did he feel this was a spasm or a virus in the bloodstream that could flare up again under the wrong circumstances?

4.2. TG said he couldn’t go into detail as there are lots of reviews underway and lots of people going to court. He outlined the timeline of the August events: the trigger point was the shooting of Mark Duggan in Haringey, which was followed by a demonstration a couple of days later. The looting of one shop then spread to other shops and copycat action in other boroughs. TG pointed to gangs as the causes of the riots and people losing the fear of getting caught. Once mobilization made it clear people would get caught, the disorder subsided.

4.3. TG praised the detective work that the various MPS teams are carrying out. So far this has resulted in the arrest of almost 2,000 suspects with further 4000 CCTV images being investigated. The process is testing MPS resources. The downside is the few visible sentences. The MPS will be consumed with paperwork to assist the sentencing process. Additional people are being assigned to the task. The process of arresting people is not yet finished. The key message from the MPS is that none of the participants in the riots are going to get away.

4.4. Another challenge for the MPS is the Notting Hill Carnival on the 28
and 29 August. Police resources from other boroughs will be needed to increase the police presence during the carnival as a consequence of the riots. The high level mobilization will remain for a further week until after a planned English Defence League march. Either event could trigger more disorder.

4.5. TG outlined three challenges.

4.5.1. Sustaining the investigation with 4000 further suspects in line.
4.5.2. Ensuring the attrition rate of cases going to court remains as low as possible.
4.5.3. Reducing the fear of crime and repeat victimization amongst young people. The riots have seen an increase in fear of crime nationally by 50%.

4.6. TG said that the new tactic that concerned him with the disorder was the distraction crimes, such as arson.

Discussion

4.7. The Mayor was pleased that the race issue did not bark in London and sought that it never does. He stressed work with the media is crucial here.

4.8. The Mayor remained worried that young people will end up worse from this and asked the board if there is a specific plan that London should be doing.

4.9. IM replied that Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hubs, which the Anti-Violence Partnership is developing, can be the smart move. These would provide intelligence of what we're facing, which young people are involved and what we then need to do together.

4.10. The Mayor asked why the work with young people wasn't done before. IM suggested the disorder has led to the reduction in youth services being denuded. The Mayor referred the issue of cuts in youth provision to the local authority representatives.

4.11. Will Tuckley offered the view that services for the vulnerable-end and targeted cohorts of under 18s have not been affected but that universal services have taken the brunt. NW reinforced this saying local authorities are effective in dealing with small cohorts and those in serious trouble. The cuts also wouldn't affect those already in the criminal justice system. However the disorder here mostly involved people 18 years old and over.

4.12. KM said we need to put together the multi-agency safeguarding information with the MPS data of who was involved with the disorder together with schools data. He said the chances are the young people that criss-cross these data sets are those who are both in the offending and victim cohorts that we need to work with.

4.13. IM agreed we could use the data provided from the disorder as a big opportunity and agreed to support data-sharing to this end.

4.14. TG was worried that the scale of the events could overwhelm local authorities in unravelling the problem. He cited different drivers in place such as gang kingpins, drugs, problem families, etc.
4.15. NW supported this saying authorities have not identified a shared problem family set. He felt data-sharing and joint mapping remains a big problem because of individual’s own and agency’s priorities.

4.16. IM offered to share a list of the boroughs signed up to MASH, but claimed that to get all 32 boroughs involved needs a rocket to make it happen.

4.17. The Mayor agreed ‘to put a rocket up MASH’.

4.18. TG asked that in doing so, consideration is given to the demand that risk identification would lead to in terms of resulting pathway resources.

4.19. KM argued it suggests we have to take a pan-London approach to the use of the community safety fund.

Action: The development of Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hubs is advanced as broadly and quickly as possible.

- CROWN PROSECUTION SERVICE

4.20. David Robinson hoped partners agreed that the CPS showed its resilience during the crisis. Magistrates’ Courts too coped well. He raised a number of forthcoming challenges:

4.21. The main challenge for the CJS is that over 1100 cases are in the system at the same point in their life cycle. This pulse of work will present challenges as it passes through the various CJS stages and progresses towards Crown court trials. The CPS is working with the police to progress these cases to ensure the impact of any bottlenecks is minimized.

4.22. Currently the CPS is charging an additional average of 10-20 offenders a day. MPS envisage that this may increase to 100 a week for a steady period as investigation teams are set up.

4.23. To date, 353 persons have been convicted – all by way of guilty pleas. The majority of these cases await sentencing hearings although some have now been dealt with. The first defendants are now appearing at Crown Court for sentence. On present data 46% remain remanded in custody; the majority have now been released on bail. Although less than during the first week defendants may only be remanded in custody if certain grounds are made out under the Bail Act. Bail issues are kept under review and as order has returned, individual’s circumstances as they relate to the Bail Act change and will be reconsidered by the courts. Nonetheless a high proportion remain in custody awaiting trial.

TG added that borough commanders lodged community impact statements to object to bail but that once the disorder was over, the argument for remand reduced.

4.24. DR did not anticipate significant trial capacity issues or extended waiting times when the first wave of cases reach Crown Court but it would depend on the proportions which plead guilty.

- LONDON PROBATION TRUST

4.25. Heather Munro referred to London Probation Trust’s response. It is dealing with the adult offenders and has had to prepare a high volume
of court reports. The challenge was how to be more responsive to local situations.

Discussion

4.26. The Mayor wanted to know how to balance competing interests here. If people are sent to prison, many will be in a worse position on release released which will cost the taxpayer more. However, the public will be aggrieved if offenders are given short sentences or walk out of court free, having served time on remand. He wanted the group to look at developing a payback scheme for London.

4.27. HM responded saying LPT has no had additional resources from the National Offender Management Service who commissions the work of probation trusts. She agreed community payback with offenders, for example their doing clean-up activity, is an opportunity. However, LPT is tied to the contracts under NOMS and boroughs vary in their support of payback. Also LPT could develop Restorative Justice schemes to bring offenders together with victims.

4.28. TG suggested he meets with Kit Malthouse and Heather Munro to develop a case to present to NOMS.

Action: TG, KM and HM to discuss LPT’s commissioning issues with NOMS to assist with the response to the current situation.

4.29. SB said many examples exist of the value of intensive schemes which demonstrate the turnaround that is possible with offenders.

4.30. The Mayor concluded requesting the board develop a plan for dealing with offenders involved with the disorder.

Action: LCRB to develop a London justice and payback plan for young offenders involved with the disorder.

5. MAYOR’S CLOSING REMARKS

5.1. The Mayor thanked everyone for attending and for the contributions to the meeting and also for everyone’s response to the disorder. He invited suggestions to take forward the following three key actions from the meeting:

5.2. ACTION 1: A London anti-gangs strategy and the ask to be made of central government.

5.3. ACTION 2: Further development of the work with problem families and launch of a London-wide MASH network.

5.4. ACTION 3: An offender payback plan for those coming out on release.

The meeting finished at 17.15

Date of next meeting: 12 September 2011, 3pm, City Hall