

# **MINUTES OF THE SAFER STRONGER COMMUNITIES SELECT COMMITTEE**

**Wednesday, 13 December 2017 at 7.00 pm**

**PRESENT:** Councillors Pauline Morrison (Chair), James-J Walsh (Vice-Chair), Brenda Dacres, Colin Elliott, Sue Hordijkenko, Jim Mallory, Pat Raven and Paul Upex

**APOLOGIES:** Councillors David Michael

**ALSO PRESENT:** Councillor Janet Daby (Cabinet Member Community Safety), Paul Aladenika (Service Group Manager, Policy Development and Analytical Insight), James Lee (Service Manager, Inclusion and Prevention and Head of Cultural and Community Development), Barrie Neal (Head of Corporate Policy and Governance), Geeta Subramaniam-Mooney (Head of Crime Reduction and Supporting People) and Katie Wood (Scrutiny Manager)

## **1. Minutes of the meeting held on 2 November 2017**

### **RESOLVED:**

That the minutes of the meeting held on the 2<sup>nd</sup> November 2017 be agreed as an accurate record of proceedings.

## **2. Declarations of interest**

Councillor James-J Walsh declared a personal interest in item 7 as he was a founding member of the London Borough of Lewisham LGBT staff forum.

Councillor Brenda Dacres declared a personal interest in item 6 as she had been working with the Ministry of Justice.

## **3. Response to Referrals due at this Committee**

There were no response to referrals considered at this meeting.

## **4. Capacity in the Voluntary Sector - 6 month update on the response to the Committee's recommendations**

4.1 James Lee, Head of Service, Culture and Community Development, presented the 6-month update to the Committee. During the discussion that followed, the following key points were raised:

- Voluntary Action Lewisham's new role included sign-posting support to voluntary sector organisations.
- Corporate Social Responsibility could be looked at in more detail for example through companies that have interests in the borough such as City Bank who own land.
- Using the Social Value Act as part of the procurement process was positive.

## **RESOLVED:**

That the report be noted.

## **5. Demographic Change - Response to recommendations**

5.1 Paul Aladenika, Service Group Manager, Policy Development and Analytical Insight, presented the report to the Committee. He highlighted an amendment to paragraph 6.2 which should read that the London Living Wage was £10.22. During the discussion that followed, the following key points were raised:

- Members of the Committee welcomed the report and thanked officers for their work.
- An update from Human Resources would be provided on the apprenticeship scheme.
- An update from the Council's Housing Team would be provided on when the first homes under the Council's Besson Street Development were scheduled to become available.
- The Council mostly used ONS data for analysing demographics. There were sometimes differences between data projections from different sources such as the GLA versus ONS.

## **5.2 RESOLVED:**

That the report be noted.

## **6. YOS Inspection Report**

6.1 Geeta Subramaniam-Mooney, Head of Crime Reduction and Supporting People, presented the report to the Committee. During the presentation, the following key points were highlighted.

- More work was being done to ensure that there was a greater link to outcomes when looking at the interventions by the Youth Offending Service.
- There was a strong focus on partnerships working and governance. There was an independent Chair of the Partnership Board and lead roles had been allocated.
- Work had been done on speech, communication and language to provide the skills to staff to help them access the services needed.
- Risk and vulnerability management had been reviewed with clearer thresholds and actions, and escalation and learning frameworks.
- The trauma informed approach had been very positive and was being embedded across the service.
- Interventions were taking place such as through "Street Doctors" who were delivering sessions on the impact of trauma and first aid instructions for young people.
- In terms of the Key Performance Indicators for the Improvement Plan – "reducing the number of first time entrants to the Youth Justice

Service” was still red, however improvements had been made and Lewisham had had the biggest reduction across London.

- “Reducing the numbers of reoffenders” had now moved from red to amber.
- Episodes of youth custody was in the highest quartile in London. This did not reflect the number of children but the number of incidences. This had started to reduce which would hopefully be shown in the next set of statistics.
- A pilot scheme similar to the Virtual Schools had been launched for the Youth Offending Service that flagged up those not attending school. The team were working hard to improve outcomes.
- There was a new inspection regime that would come into effect from April 2018.

6.2 During the discussion that followed, the following key points were noted:

- The new processes to monitor and track missing, exploited and trafficked young people were now more joined up across service areas and embedded in the work being done.
- There were opportunities for young people in the YOS to do work linked to community groups but it was essential it was for a suitable project with the right supervision. Assessors checked each placement rigorously to ensure proper safeguarding for the young people.
- For adult offenders the Community Rehabilitation Service managed the process.
- Graffiti removal was an example of work that could not be carried out by young people in the YOS because of the toxins involved. Adults could carry out this work and the Head of Crime Reduction and Supporting People would provide details to the Committee on who to contact to discuss this in more detail.
- The reoffending statistics were prepared by the Ministry of Justice. The statistics are based on a 12 month period and evaluated which is why there is a delay in those versus the live statistics.
- Members of the Committee were informed that additional details on variance from targets could be provided in relation to the RAG (Red, Amber, Green) ratings and shared with the Committee in future reports. Looking at details of ages and ethnicities could, however, be very challenging but consideration could be given as to whether it was possible.
- It could be beneficial for the trauma-informed approach to be extended to other Council services working with children and to schools.
- Lewisham’s “stop and search” strategy was based on intelligence and had a 34% “conversion rate” meaning 1 in 3 stop and searches resulted in weapons being found. This was above the London average of 26%.
- A member of the committee raised the issue that once a child offended it could be easier to access services such as speech and language and that it would be good if all young people had access to essential services when they needed them.

- The Executive Member for Community Safety reported that there had been a backlog in SEND assessments at Kaleidoscope due to recruitment issues and IT problems, but that this was being monitored closely and showing improvement.
- In future reports on stop and search numbers would include details of ethnicity.

### 6.3 **RESOLVED:**

That the report be noted.

That the Chair of the Safer Neighbourhood Board be invited to attend the next meeting of the Safer Stronger Select Committee for the item: "Local Police Update".

## 7. **LGBT+ Provision in Lewisham - Draft Report**

7.1 Katie Wood, Scrutiny Manager, presented the draft report to the Committee.

7.2 Cllr James-J Walsh tabled suggested recommendations a copy of which will be included in the agenda documentation. During the discussion that followed the following key points were highlighted:

- Consideration of all protected characteristics was important.
- Recommendations should be inserted throughout the body of the report in a different colour to the main text.
- It would be helpful to separate the background information from the recommendation to make them clearer for the purpose of the report.
- It was important to ensure that it was made clear to people why data was being collected when individuals were asked for details on equalities monitoring forms.
- Equalities training should be mandatory for Councillors. There were cost and time constraints for officers but it was important that training should be undertaken where it was appropriate.
- It was a positive use of staff forums when they were consulted on for relevant policies such as the End of Life Care Policy being taken to the LGBT+ staff forum.
- There was a Lewisham Community Forum event being held on the 15 February 2015 on "*Working Together to Challenge Homophobia and Reduce Hate Crime in Lewisham*".
- A vote was held as to whether tabled recommendation 19 should remain as some members of the committee had concerns regarding "ghettoization" and protecting other disadvantaged groups. It was agreed by majority that the recommendation should remain but include reference to concerns regarding integration.
- Councillor Walsh thanked Cllr Jacca for her support throughout the review and attending the visit to Manchester, and Katie Wood for her support throughout the review.

### 7.3 **RESOLVED:**

That the following recommendations be agreed to be included with the draft report and submitted to the Mayor and Cabinet for consideration at a meeting in February:

**Recommendation 1:** That the London Borough of Lewisham should resource, produce and adopt a Lewisham LGBT+ Community Action Plan. The Action Plan should be annually reported back to the SSSC throughout the next administration.

**Context:** That in recognition of the broad and diverse nature of this topic, the fact that Lewisham has 2.4 times the national average of LGB residents (para 4.5) and the limited time and resource available through Scrutiny, that we should draw on similar authorities' approaches, in developing in partnership with the LGBT+ Community and other key stakeholders an action plan that should align with the Councils Comprehensive Equality Strategy.

**Recommendation 2:** That the Mayor should work to ensure that through the Council's internal and external communications, the Council includes positive and celebratory stories and imagery that reflect all protected characteristics, including LGBT+ people, with these woven through specific interest pieces, and also through more generic topics.

**Context:** Although the report highlights areas where inequalities exist, it is important to consider the LGBT+ community, and all communities, particularly those with protected characteristics, in terms of a "community asset model", empowering and facilitating them to use their inherent skills as a resource to form sustainable, community owned solutions.

**Recommendation 3:** That a consistent and 'whole-organisation' approach (including via contractors/commissioned partners) to equalities data gathering/monitoring be implemented.

**Context:** Equalities monitoring was found to be lacking on some casework systems, and in routine questions to service users. This should be corrected at the earliest opportunity. Monitoring questions should be aligned to latest ONS 'questions and guidance' on equality and diversity across all protected characteristics and be omitted only on the rarest exceptions. The Council should ensure it is clear to service users why the information is being sought, and how it will be used. Collecting this information will inform and enhance the decision-making process within the borough and the allocation of resources and service provisions.

**Recommendation 4:** Service provision across the Council should look at the "whole person" and consider multiple characteristics when ensuring the best options for individuals. This may necessitate reviews of screening questions as well as additional learning and development for staff to understand any barriers or issues that their service users/customers may face.

**Context:** Paragraph 10.13 of the report

**Recommendation 5:** That the Council’s workforce should match where possible the community it serves, consideration should be given by the Mayor on how to identify any protected characteristics where this is not the case, and the causes for it, and seek to improve the levels of representation.

**Context:** 1.8% of LBL staff identify as being LGB on staff surveys (para 9.2) and 2% of the UK population identify as LGB (ONS, Sexual Identity, UK: 2016). The Lewisham Residents’ Survey (2015) identified 4% of Lewisham’s population as being LGB. In terms of having a workforce that reflects the community it serves, Lewisham’s workforce figure is therefore below the national and local estimated LGB population.

**Recommendation 6:** That during staff induction, new staff should be informed about the different staff forums available and HR should include new starter information/staff packs with clear information and signposting about support and staff forums. Councillors also should receive copies of the staff pack for information. Equalities training should be mandatory for all Councillors, and where appropriate for staff. Human Resources should look at the best practice provided by Leicester County Council and apply it locally in consultation with the LGBT+ staff forum. This should include producing: a “Managing LGBT+ Staff Guide”; auditing Council policies to be more LGBT+ inclusive (i.e. family leave, and removing gender-based pronouns); and creating a pan-organisation network of forums to support and join up good practice and joint LGBT+ initiatives.

**Context for recommendation 6:** Paragraphs 5.27, 9.15. 9.22 and 9.26 of the report.

**Recommendation 7:** That the LGBT+ Staff forum and other staff forums (and the staff that facilitate them) be given the time and resources to bring their communities’ interests and knowledge as a resource to embed across the Council. The Council should see these forums as a rich resource for canvassing opinion on policies and proposals and should introduce processes to support and embed this across the Council.

**Context:** Paragraph 9.26. The End of Life Care Policy where views from the LGBT staff forum were sought and used to help shape policy.

**Recommendation 8:** That the Council should adopt a system where there is an elected member appointed Council Lead/Champion for each protected characteristics under the Equalities Act 2010. The appointment should be made through Full Council.

**Context:** Paragraph 9.20

**Recommendation 9:** That the Council should ensure there is a specific joint strategic needs assessment (JSNA) for the LGBT+ community. This review by the Safer Stronger Select Committee should be used as part of the evidence base. The Health and Wellbeing Board should be instructed to consider this as an urgent priority, making use of the evidence from this review.

**Context:** The Committee were concerned that there was a lack of evidence on the LGBT+ Community in the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) given the complex health and wellbeing needs of this community and the vital role the JSNA has in the commissioning of services.

**Recommendation 10:** The Committee also noted that not all Equalities Act protected characteristics had a specific JSNA needs assessments. The Committee felt that the Mayor should also look into this further, to ensure commissioning is based on the needs of all residents.

**Recommendation 11:** That the Council facilitates a meeting with the Lewisham clinical commissioning groups (CCG's), the LGBT+ Foundation and other key stakeholders, with the aspiration of Lewisham being the first London Borough to launch the 'Pride in Practice' or similar LGBT+ health quality assurance scheme.

**Context (10 & 11):** From feedback received during the evidence sessions and from research undertaken by the LGBT+ Foundation; NHS service users identified significant barriers to accessing LGBT+ inclusive healthcare provision in Borough. The Committee were impressed with the LGBT Foundation's, Royal College of GPs endorsed, 'Pride in Practice' quality assurance mark for primary care services.

**Recommendation 12:** That to begin to tackle the issue of LGBT+ substance misuse, the council should review and take lessons from the recommendations outlined in the [National LGB Drug and Alcohol Database "Part of the Picture" Briefing Sheet](#) for Commissioners and Policy Makers and Department of Health funded [London Friend's "Out of your mind" research](#), and advocate for other health partners to do similarly.

**Context:** It was of concern that LGB People are more likely than their heterosexual peers to partake in alcohol and substance misuse. The Committee heard how some jointly commissioned services were being delivered at considerable distance from the Borough and that future commissioned services outside of Borough should make an assessment of accessibility and cost to users, given the evidence from Metro about the LGBT community facing poorer income and employment outcomes (page 22 of the report).

**Recommendation 13:** That the Mayor should ask the Council's Public Health Team to carry out a review of LGBT facing sexual health services in the borough. This should include, where appropriate, focus groups with LGBT+ communities to ascertain why so many choose to access services out of Borough and to better understand their views of LB Lewisham commissioned health services in the borough. An action plan should be generated to help LB Lewisham and where appropriate NHS partners to improve services to better meet needs.

**Recommendation 14:** That the Mayor and Council seek to support the LGBT+ Community by setting a clear Council aspiration for attracting and supporting LGBT+ services to the Borough and, where appropriate,

protecting LGBT+ spaces through planning policies and other instruments available to it. Should appropriate LGBT+ operators come forward, the Council should give significant consideration to using community assets to enable the provision of an LGBT+ centric community space.

**Context:** The Committee had concerns about the lack of spaces for the LGBT+ community, the closure of LGBT+ spaces in the Borough over recent years, and the impact and need for the provision of such spaces, for both adults and children.

**Recommendation 15:** That the following reports be reviewed by the Public Health Team and other key departments to evaluate whether findings can be incorporated into Council policy, and that of partner organisations: the DoH/Public Health England endorsed [LGBT+ Public Health Outcomes Framework companion](#); [The LGBT Adult Social Care Outcomes Framework Companion](#) and Public Health England's research on [promoting the health and wellbeing of gay and bisexual men and other men who have sex with men \(MSM\)](#).

**Recommendation 16:** When receiving reports on the Safer Lewisham Plan, the Committee request that a specific sub-report is included on hate crime statistics affecting the LGBT+ community as well as all other communities with protected characteristics.

**Context:** The Committee understands that the LGBT+ community are disproportionately affected by crime compared to the population as a whole.

**Recommendation 17:** That the Council emulate good practice from Manchester City Council and Leicestershire County Council in respect to their excellent partnership working with other statutory service authorities, public bodies and universities.

**Context:** Paragraph 9.21. Sharing expertise and resources was seen to be cost-effective and ensured a joined up approach to service delivery and a commitment to innovation and excellence.

**Recommendation 18:** That the Council ensures its social care providers have a commitment to equalities including a specific LGBT+ Policy and that their staff have completed equalities training. The Council should look at ways it can assist signposting and embedding the [Opening Doors London checklist for Social Care providers](#) as a resource for providers who are unsure of how to improve provision.

**Context:** Paragraph 10.24. The Committee were concerned about the experience of some older members of the LGBT+ community accessing services and in care homes.

**Recommendation 19:** That the Strategic Housing Team and the Cabinet Member for Housing should progress the work with Tonic Housing to scrutinise the viability of an LGBT+ Extra Care facility, and if appropriate, support progressing the project. This should be considered in the context of ensuring groups are integrated well with the Lewisham Community.



**Context:** Safer Stronger Communities Select Committee welcomed the idea of extra care housing facilities for the LGBT+ community given the concerns raised during evidence sessions and in recommendation 18.

**Recommendation 20:** That the Council increase the awareness of the specific LGBT+ youth provision in the borough by requesting other commissioned youth work providers and schools regularly communicate details to their students/young people. The Council should encourage schools to reach out to the LGBT community to ensure their services are as robust an offer as possible. The Council should ensure it has a thorough understanding of the distances young people are travelling to access LGBT youth groups in order to identify if distance of provision is a hidden barrier to access. The Council should work with LGBT young people and commissioned providers to ensure that the provision available is meeting their needs.

**Context:** The Committee celebrated the fact that the Mayor and Lewisham Council continue to acknowledge the need for dedicated LGBT Youth Work provision and took a two-pronged approach to it through offering bespoke LGBT youth services in the borough and by ensuring an inclusive environment within other youth provisions.

**Recommendation 21:** That the Mayor should request further work be undertaken to better understand the specific experiences and needs of Lewisham's Trans+ Community.

**Context:** The committee noted the limited evidence that was available locally on Trans+ needs and issues and that further work should be undertaken to ensure the needs and services of Trans+ people were fully met.

## **8. Select Committee work programme**

8.1 Katie Wood, Scrutiny Manager, presented the work programme report to the Committee and highlighted two requested additions to the work programme. During the discussion that following the following key points be noted:

- Members of the Committee requested that the final meeting of the municipal year be used in part to celebrate the contribution of community groups and others who have supported the Committee with their work over the course of the administration.
- Members of the Committee requested that the Chair of the Safer Neighbourhood Board be invited to attend the next meeting.

### **8.2 RESOLVED:**

- 1) That an item be added to the work programme at the meeting of 25<sup>th</sup> January entitled "Review of the Assembly Co-Group Guidelines".
- 2) That a report on the work of the Safer Stronger Select Committee over the course of the 2014-2018 administration be added to the work programme for the meeting of 7th March 2018.

- 3) That the meeting of the Committee on the 7<sup>th</sup> March be dedicated in part to celebrating the work of community groups and individuals who have supported the Committee over the course of the last administration.

**9. Items to be referred to Mayor and Cabinet**

There were no referrals to Mayor and Cabinet other than the in-depth review as listed in item 7.

The meeting ended at 9.15 pm

Chair:

-----

Date:

-----