

MINUTES OF THE SAFER STRONGER COMMUNITIES SELECT COMMITTEE

Wednesday, 4 March 2020 at 7.00 pm

PRESENT: Councillors Juliet Campbell (Chair), James Rathbone (Vice-Chair), Sophie Davis, Carl Handley, Jim Mallory, Lionel Openshaw, Stephen Penfold, Eva Stamirowski and James-J Walsh

APOLOGIES: None

ALSO PRESENT: Councillor Jonathan Slater (Cabinet Member for Community Sector), Jamie Hale (Chair of Lewisham Disabled People's Commission) (Lewisham Disabled People's Commission), Paul Aladenika (Service Group Manager, Policy Development and Analytical Insight), Winston Castello (Community Enterprise Manager), Gary Connors (Head of Crime, Enforcement and Regulation), Petra Der Man (Principal Lawyer), James Lee (Director of Strategy, Partnerships and Improvement, Director of Culture and Community Development (jobshare)) and Katie Wood (Scrutiny Manager)

1. Minutes of the meeting held on 16 January 2020

1.1 RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held on the 16th January be agreed as an accurate record of proceedings.

2. Declarations of interest

2.1 RESOLVED:

There were no declarations of interest.

3. Response to Referrals from this Committee

There were no response to referrals to be considered at this meeting.

4. Lewisham Disabled People's Commission

4.1 James Lee, Director of Strategy, Partnerships & Improvement, introduced the report to the Committee.

4.2 Jamie Hale, Chair of Lewisham Disabled People's Commission introduced the work of the Commission to the Committee. During the presentations and in the discussions that followed, the following key points were raised:

- The Committee were informed that very sadly, Lorraine Ogundiran, a member of the Disability Commission had recently passed away.

- The Commission was modelled on a very successful Disabled People's Commission in LB Hammersmith and Fulham.
- There was a very strong emphasis on the commission being collaborative and members of the Commission were keen to work, with Councillors, Council employers, partners and the public.
- The main focus was to research and produce a report on the situation for disabled people in Lewisham including making recommendations for the Council to improve the lives for the disabled community in Lewisham.
- Jamie was very keen to meet with anybody who felt their work overlapped to understand how they could work together whilst keeping a strong focus on the Commission's report.
- Jamie was keen that at the end of the Commission, that the group looked into becoming at least an informal representative network of disabled people to help ensure that the voice of disabled residents was central to decision-making.
- It was estimated that the final report would be ready in the Winter.
- Members of the Committee were keen to ensure that the Disabled People's Commission had the resources they needed to carry out their work. Members of the Committee invited Jamie Hale to attend a future meeting of Safer Stronger should he wish.

4.3 RESOLVED:

- 1) That the Committee noted their most sincere condolences to the family of Lorraine Ogundiran.
- 2) That Jamie Hale, Chair of the Lewisham Disabled People's Commission be thanked for his work and for attending and presenting at the meeting.

5. Local Assemblies Annual Report and NCIL

- 5.1 Winston Castello and James Lee introduced the report to the Committee. In the discussion that followed, the following key points were made:
- It was important to understand how far the engagement techniques were able to get a broad range of views representing the whole of the community.
 - Local Assemblies did not necessarily reflect the demographics of their area and therefore it could be problematic for them to be used as a consultation tool without broader engagement.
 - A number of members raised concerns that the methods of consultation used by Common Place did not work well for the NCIL process. For example the top priority in Catford South was listed as "transport and roads" but as a ward with only £20,000 there was very little that could be done towards transport and it may therefore look like people were not being listened to.
 - In response the Committee were informed that the consultation continued to be a learning process. It wasn't possible to have bespoke consultation mechanisms for each individual local assembly but it was important to have a mechanism that was broader than just individual attendees due to the sums of money involved in some

wards. It was acknowledged that the nature of the system that asked people to look at a map and drop a pin meant it led people to think of projects that were sometimes too broad for the sums of money involved.

- A member of the committee said that the data the local assembly had received from the consultation had been wrong and the numbers did not add up. The process forced people to think about particular themes. For example as it was a map based process if someone was thinking about poverty it would not be clear where to drop a pin. Also the pre-listed criteria that people were given was based on criteria such as air quality and roads without options for community themed ideas and there was very little meaningful and comparable equalities data collected.
- A member of the Committee stated that for the borough-wide money it would be good to have more consultation from a wide range of the community.
- A member of the Committee commented that it should be clear about from where the priorities for the borough-wide pot allocation were drawn up and the focus on mitigating the impact of local development should be maintained.
- A member of the committee was commented that the on-going sustainability of funds needed to be considered.
- A member of the Committee commented that the Common Place consultation website was a bit confusing and there had been confusion between the themes and the projects and the process in general unless they attended the assembly meeting. If the remit and details of the money was clearer as well as details of the decision-making it would improve the process.
- A member of the Committee was concerned that the allocation of NCIL money through the Local Assemblies was not appropriate as it was not representative enough of all communities and needs of residents.
- A member of the Committee commented that the proposals for the borough-wide pot seemed to not have been generated by public consultation or input and that therefore a referral should be made to ensure that the equalities implications were fully considered.
- The Committee were informed that consultation for the borough-wide money had included a range of different mechanisms but more work would continue to be done to streamline consultation mechanisms.

5.2 **RESOLVED:**

That the following comments be referred to Mayor and Cabinet and copied to Business Panel for information:

- 1) Safer Stronger Communities Select Committee have reviewed the proposed NCIL procedures at ward level and borough-wide level and have concerns about both the structure and the overall strategy. For example, the Committee is concerned regarding the engagement process having the ability to engage with a broad sector of the community. The Committee is

also concerned that there were data flaws and errors in the process.

- 2) The Committee therefore request that the decision on the NCIL borough-wide pot be paused in order that it can be reviewed more widely.

6. Single Equalities Framework

6.1 Paul Aladenika, presented the report to the Committee. Councillor Rathbone, Vice-Chair of the Safer Stronger Communities Select Committee tabled comments from himself and Cllr Campbell, a copy of which will be included in the agenda documentation. In the discussion that followed, the following key points were raised:

- A socio-economic focus had been incorporated into the draft Single Equalities Framework (SEF) in response in part to the on-going focus on this area by the Safer Stronger Communities Select Committee.
- A member of the committee asked how the equality objectives and prisms were arrived at. In response the committee heard that there had been a strong focus on looking at the borough data but also engagement with lots of different groups including the Equalities working group. In addition to this, looking at the findings of the Democracy Review, had led to the focus on the seldom heard group within the SEF.
- Members of the committee were concerned that the SEF objectives were too broad and it would be hard for success to be clearly measured and defined. Members commented that the Glasgow model had a similar style of objectives but they were worded in a clearer way that made success easier to measure and define.
- A member of the committee felt there should be a clear definition of "seldom heard" as it was not a term that was consistently used with the same meaning or understood by all. It was important that objectives and prisms be understood by all members of the local community to help them identify with and understand the importance of them as well as to understand their role in equalities in the borough.
- The Committee were informed that the SEF framework was a standard that all services would be held to and it would be their role to apply it to their service areas.
- Some members of the Committee felt there needed to be an associated action plan clearly defined to ensure implementation and compliance and consistency across the Council.
- A member of the committee felt that the language needed to be more specific. For example "promote" and "tackle" were not clearly measurable in terms of what outcomes would be expected.
- Some members of the Committee felt there should be an on-going discussion around terminology. In particular whether the term BAME was suitable or whether certain groups felt excluded or not represented within the term.
- Standing orders were suspended at 9.20pm.

6.2 RESOLVED:

That a referral be made to the Mayor and Cabinet highlighting the comments tabled at this meeting by Cllr Rathbone and that Safer Stronger communities Select Committee felt these should be considered prior to a decision by the Mayor and Cabinet.

7. How the Council embeds equalities across its service provision - evidence

7.1 Katie Wood, Scrutiny Manager, introduced the report to the Committee and highlighted that the report included a summary of all the evidence received since the last meeting of Safer Stronger.

- Councillor Campbell, Committee Chair and Councillor Rathbone, Vice-Chair highlighted their findings from their visit to Glasgow City Council and the excellent work that the council appeared to be doing on embedding equalities.
- Members of the Committee agreed that the review needed to be continued for the final report to be received in the new municipal year.
- Members of the committee felt that comments from the Committee's discussion on the SEF at item 6 and the referral to the Mayor and Cabinet should be included in the review.

7.2 RESOLVED:

That the referral on the Single Equalities Framework be included in the final report for the Committee's in-depth review on Equalities.

8. Select Committee work programme

8.1 Katie Wood, Scrutiny Manager, introduced the report to the Committee and highlighted the proposed new scrutiny structure for the 2020/21 municipal year.

8.2 RESOLVED:

- 1) That the Committee's review on "How the Council embeds equalities across its service provision" be included in the work programme for next year including monitoring responses and updates.
- 2) That current members of Safer Stronger Communities Select Committee be invited to participate in the discussion on the final report of the Committee's in-depth review into equalities should they wish.

9. Items to be referred to Mayor and Cabinet

RESOLVED:

That two referrals be made to Mayor and Cabinet as listed above in item 5 and item 6 of the decision note and minutes.

The meeting ended at 9.35 pm

Chair:

Date:
