

London Crime Reduction Board

Minutes of Meeting

Monday 12 September 2011, 2pm at City Hall, GLA.

Present

Deputy Mayor for Policing	Kit Malthouse
Westminster City Council	Cllr Colin Barrow
LB Hackney	Mayor Jules Pipe

Apologies

Boris Johnson, Cllr. Claire Kober,
Tim Godwin, Heather Munro, Jane Harwood

Officers

Commander	Steve Rodhouse	Metropolitan Police Service
Chief Executive	John O'Brien	London Councils
Chief Executive	Will Tuckley	LB Bexley/London Councils
Chief Crown Prosecutor	Alison Saunders	Crown Prosecution Service
Director	Mary McFeely	London Probation Trust

Presenting

Assistant Chief Officer	Sara Robinson	London Probation Trust	5
Programme Manager	Jain Lemom	GLA	6
Engagement and Partnerships Manager	Natasha Plummer	MPA	7

Support

Joe Mitton, Jude Sequeira (LCRB Secretariat), Kevin Taylor (London Councils), Michael Taylor (MPA)

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

1.1. Kit Malthouse opened the meeting.

2. MINUTES OF LAST MEETING

Extraordinary Meeting - 25 August 2011

2.1. The minutes were agreed. Actions are covered within the agenda but on data-

sharing, KM asked if this was happening. The board felt there isn't a problem generally but that whilst the principle is widely supported, there are inconsistencies in practice and some challenges. With regards to data-sharing on the disturbances, it was felt that a directory of what information is available from each agency will be useful. Steve Rodhouse noted that whilst the MPS is willing to share information, data protection issues come into play with regards some aspects, such as victim-related details. He said that the MPS also has data on the mapping of gangs which will be useful for partners. KM asked the MPA to take this action forward.

Action 1: MPA to compile and circulate a directory of what data is available regarding the disturbances from different partners. MPA to consider data sharing issues more generally.

Meeting - 20 June 2011

- 2.2. The minutes were agreed. On the action regarding the Mayor engaging the health sector with the work of the board, KM understood that Dr. Simon Tanner, Director of Public Health, will act as a point of contact between the LCRB and health services. He asked that Dr. Tanner attends the next meeting to discuss follow-up. At a borough level, KM referred to the development of Health and Wellbeing Boards. Mary McFeely sought support for London Probation inclusion at the local boards; Colin Barrow explained the role and size of these boards needs to be managed and that these are led by Borough Leaders. Mary McFeely agreed LPT's role would suffice on the larger structures. He agreed to raise this matter at the London Health Transition Board.

Action 2: MPA to invite Simon Tanner to the next LCRB meeting.

Action 3: Colin Barrow to discuss Probation attendance on Health and Wellbeing Boards with the London Health Transition Board.

- 2.3. Alison Saunders reported that six boroughs have been identified to pilot the gang-related prosecutor's role as identified as an action relating to the Crown Prosecution Service at the last meeting. CPS will be sending letters of advice to local authorities, and is also holding public meetings in order to offer advice on gang related work.

3. LONDON ANTI-GANGS STRATEGY

- 3.1. Steve Rodhouse referred to data still unravelling about the London disturbances and the possible influence of gangs to the disorder. Whilst the data suggests that it is unlikely that gangs predominantly orchestrated the disturbances, gang offending remains a big challenge in London. AC McPherson has addressed an Inter-Ministerial Group on work on gangs in London. An London-wide anti-gangs programme is being developed through the Anti-Violence Partnership to build upon Operation Connect, which has been working to address gang-related issues in Waltham Forest. Operation Connect is a high contact operation intended to encourage gang offenders to

withdraw from the criminal lifestyle. Although an evaluation of CONNECT is still ongoing, early indications show an encouraging reduction in serious youth violence.

- 3.2. A common basis of this programme will be to identify young people who are at risk of joining gangs through the sharing of information between partners; therefore MASH will be important in developing joint working models. The MPS will utilise intelligence from local authorities on gang membership to deliver targeted intervention at people who are likely to cause the most harm through gang membership. This initiative will be developed on a borough by borough basis, and will utilise existing processes in boroughs, although it is recognised that additional resources will be required.
- 3.3. A three tier system has been proposed for the roll-out of the programme: Tier 1 will be directed at the five boroughs at most risk of harm from gangs, which will have a team of 20 police officers embedded within local authority teams to work specifically on dedicated anti-gang activity. Tier 2 will comprise nine medium risk boroughs which, whilst not having embedded teams, will have ready access to extra officers and be expected to work to the same systems. Further support will be provided by a quality assurance team to advise on their processes. Tier 3 will comprise the remaining boroughs – these will also be encouraged to apply the same processes through the quality assurance teams with access to additional resource on a request basis. Tier 1 comprises the priority boroughs that require additional resource. Tier 2 and 3 will adopt the lower cost methodology approach. Quality assurance support will aim to promote low cost initiatives and standard processes.
- 3.4. One key shift in emphasis is that these anti-gang initiatives will focus more on gang members involved with serious violence.
- 3.5. SR also outlined Operation Bite which uses police intelligence to support work to deal with offenders with challengeable immigration status. Data suggests 20-25% of criminal offenders will have challengeable immigration status, and Operation Bite will collate evidence from partners to support challenges.
- 3.6. The MPS has identified a budget requirement of £18m per year to deliver MASH, CONNECT and BITE.
- 3.7. In summary SR advised that London's multi-agency anti-gangs work seeks to go beyond an enforcement approach and will build upon the following components, as exemplified in the work in Waltham Forest:
 - 3.7.1. Sustainable capability;
 - 3.7.2. Resilient partnership approaches;
 - 3.7.3. Robust enforcement;
 - 3.7.4. Intensive case management where offenders know they are targeted but given a choice to change their lifestyle;
 - 3.7.5. Joint intelligence;
 - 3.7.6. Prioritising gangs and their leaders that cause violence and harm; and
 - 3.7.7. Early intervention.

Discussion

- 3.8. KM emphasized the intention to focus on the serious violence end of gang offending and prioritise this over gang size and disorder issues. The local authority role was to help identify the key individuals to target and develop the

pathway and family interventions.

- 3.9. CB noted the resonance with Family Recovery approach. He urged a mutual approach to the development of this work since councils have information and intelligence that the police service may not have. SR agreed and said this was why the police resource was being embedded in local authority teams. CB asked to have the tiered programme communicated to boroughs in time for the forthcoming budget planning cycle.

Action 4: MPS to provide boroughs with Operation Connect roll-out programme.

- 3.10. AS said the CPS programme to improve community impact statements would contribute to this work.
- 3.11. WT's main concern was cross-border overlaps. He felt that the tiered borough approach may miss the picture of gangs, victims and offenders impacting across boroughs as for example faced by Tier 3 boroughs who neighbour Tier 1 boroughs. He asked that the model considers how the wider consequences are dealt with.
- 3.12. JP was supportive of the proposals but recognised the huge issues that underpinned this, particularly the need for dedicated, skilled and financial resources. He argued Hackney, like many other boroughs, already has a team and substantial investment in place. He hoped the teams to be adopted would be developed in synergy with existing teams. Also, he said the approach needs to be able to fill the vacuum left when gangs and key gang leaders are picked off one at a time. In order for anti-gangs initiatives to be effective, gangs will need to be dismantled simultaneously.
- 3.13. KM summed up that the strategy will require activity to be sustained over a long term period in order to ensure effectiveness.

4. MASH IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

- 4.1. Steve Rodhouse outlined the current position with MASH. 11 boroughs are bought in, 3 have expressed a keen interest and another 3 are considering the proposal. The estimated MPS cost for implementing MASH across London is £9m. SR said MASH was closely linked to the Anti-Gangs work and family interventions. Implementing MASH will require set up time, and there are also resource issues which need to be addressed.
- 4.2. WT noted that council chief executives are enthusiastic about MASH, but they still require details on the investment needed. He said he was not convinced this had to be investment in a shared physical location for the benefits of joint intelligence. SR argued that secure, co-location of data was key to fast-time processing. WT added local authority teams had similar data sensitivities with their IT systems and challenging procurement processes to factor in.
- 4.3. CB said he still held the reservations as he raised at the last meeting, such as whether MASH could be housed in police stations and he questioned a one-size fits all approach. He wasn't clear about how the borough programme was devised and wondered whether some boroughs scheduled later could be moved up the order.
- 4.4. JP's view was there are lots of positives with the MASH proposal.
- 4.5. KM requested that the MPS review the programme in the light of comments

and provide a firmed up timetable of implementation.

Action 5: MPS to consult and determine the programme with all boroughs and prepare an implementation plan with dates and costs.

5. COMMUNITY JUSTICE PLAN FOR DISORDER-RELATED OFFENDERS

- 5.1. Sara Robinson outlined the work needed to address the issues pertaining to dealing with those being investigated, charged and convicted of offences during the disturbances. Steve Rodhouse advised on the latest figures of those arrested (2,500), charged (1,400), and being investigated (10,000). The modelling of demand upon courts and other services is being carried out. A joint working group comprising criminal justice partners has been set up to consider matters. He explained how the scale of the investigation is challenging due to the majority of perpetrators being masked at the incidents, thereby requiring CCTV footage to be followed back in sequence. Sara Robinson referred to the range of issues flagged up in the report and particularly highlighted the need for clear messaging about community payback.

Discussion

- 5.2. KM added the need to engage prison services and whether they communicate prisoner release information. It was reported that this isn't automatically done but some boroughs have made better links than others. It also varies for sentences over and under 12 months. Sara Robinson suggested that as boroughs are currently reviewing their Integrated Offender Management arrangements, this needs to be considered alongside these reviews.
- 5.3. KM requested that boroughs are given the data derived from the modeling to inform their planning.

Action 6: Working group to prepare reports containing modeling and timetable data borough-by-borough and to provide these to the boroughs.

6. VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN AND GIRLS: REFUGE PROVISION IN LONDON

- 6.1. Will Tuckley outlined the findings and conclusions of the report into refuge provision in London. He reported the strong evidence that showed women seek refuge outside their home boroughs. Overall, the report suggested that the system is not broke but that in order to improve efficiency, it recommended additional coordination between services across London. Specifically it proposes a central 'clearing house' to be used to process requests for bed space. One benefit of the clearing house would be to provide feedback to boroughs on actual commissioning needs to inform future planning of bed spaces, year on year, including specialist need and any imbalances in supply and demand between boroughs. The clearing house would therefore need to keep the link with local services. He recognised the constraints of looking at historic provision for planning purposes and advised that the proposal would not necessarily add more bed spaces in London. However, he emphasized

that the data gathered will be crucial to building a long-term picture of need.

Discussion

- 6.2. KM sought views. The board agreed with the proposals to proceed with the clearing house. KM actioned the clearing house system to be designed. WT commented that the design could be a 'virtual' model to keep it streamlined and focused on analysis rather than on administration.

Action 7: GLA to develop the clearing house proposal.

7. COMMUNITY SAFETY FUND OPTIONS

- 7.1. Natasha Plummer outlined the outcome of the review into the future disbursement of the Community Safety Fund. She reported that the review looked into a) the fit between the priorities currently supported and LCRB priorities; b) whether the allocation between boroughs could be targeted differently; c) if there was any value in attaching match funding conditions; and d) whether any specific project warranted pan-London investment through the fund.
- 7.2. The overall conclusion was that no case has been found for changing the current formula. Existing priorities were deemed sufficiently broad to fit with the LCRB's priorities as they stand and so no additional theming was proposed. The reduction from £10m to £5m in 2012/13 would not warrant a major shake-up to the formula at this time nor did the current budget context favour match funding as a lever for promoting local funding into community safety. Lastly, no investment case had arisen to divert the fund towards a specific pan-London project.

Discussion

- 7.3. KM sought views from the board whether the Mayor should focus the funding by themes e.g. violence, or introduce greater rigour in how it is used.
- 7.4. CB commented that boroughs would resist being told how the money is to be spent. He supported minimal bureaucracy.
- 7.5. JP questioned whether much gain will be made with new measures because of the relatively small and decreasing amounts involved in each borough. He sought clarity on the provision beyond 2012//13. This appears unlikely but KM said he would be making a case for new funds that the Mayor could use.
- 7.6. KM agreed that the existing approach is adopted for disbursement of the 2012/13 fund but that it should be acceptable to expect the Mayor to seek 'additionality' from the fund and that spend plans will again be examined.

8. ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOR PRIORITY WORKSTREAM PROPOSAL

- 8.1. Will Tuckley set out that Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB) has a high impact on the public's perception of safety, and remains a universal priority across London boroughs. On consideration of the proposals set out in the paper for a fourth workstream priority and new ASB board, he proposed that the workstreams

are left as they are but that a watching brief is kept on ASB to identify any specific issues that need LCRB involvement. He said it was important to maintain the sharing of best practice.

Discussion

- 8.2. JP noted that ASB has a relevance to crime reduction by providing a measure of the aggregate mood of the community towards crime and nuisance.
- 8.3. KM agreed that it was important to support share best practice pan-London amongst practitioners and that the Board would be willing to consider exceptional issues that come through this route. He understood its importance but also felt the phrase was becoming discredited through over-use.

9. MEETING CLOSE

No other business was notified and KM thanked everyone for their contributions.

The meeting finished at 15.25

Date of next meeting: Tuesday 6 December 2011, 3pm, City Hall
