

MINUTES OF THE SAFER STRONGER COMMUNITIES SELECT COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 17 January 2017 at 7.00 pm

PRESENT: Councillors David Michael (Chair), James-J Walsh (Vice-Chair), Brenda Dacres, Colin Elliott, Councillor Joyce Jacca, Stella Jeffrey, Jim Mallory, John Paschoud, Luke Sorba and Paul Upex

ALSO PRESENT: Councillor Liam Curran (Chair Sustainable Development Select Committee), Councillor Janet Daby (Cabinet Member Community Safety), Councillor Hilary Moore (Chair Children & Young People Select Committee), Monsignor N Rotheron (Roman Catholic Church), Chief Inspector Andy Carter (Chief Inspector,), Aileen Buckton (Executive Director for Community Services) (London Borough of Lewisham), Keith Cohen (South London Resettlement Consortium Manager), Salena Mulhere (Overview and Scrutiny Manager), Barrie Neal (Head of Corporate Policy and Governance), Geeta Subramaniam-Mooney (Head of Crime Reduction and Supporting People), Peter Vittles (Head of Community Engagement) (Metro) and Katie Wood (Scrutiny Manager)

1. Minutes of the meeting held on 10 November 2016

That the minutes of the meeting on 28 November be agreed as an accurate record of proceedings and the Chair be authorised to sign them.

2. Declarations of interest

Cllr Elliot declared a personal interest in item 8 as he was a Director of Lewisham Disability Coalition.

Cllr Michael declared a personal interest in item 8 as he was Chair of Equaliteam and a member of the Marshall Phoenix Memorial Trust.

Cllr Walsh declared a personal interest in item 8 as he was a member of Lewisham Disability Coalition and in item 7 as he was a member of the LGBT forum.

3. Response to referrals from this Committee

There were no referrals to the Committee.

4. Youth Offending Service - Inspection report

4.1 Cllr Michael, Chair of the Safer, Stronger Communities Select Committee welcomed members of the Children and Young People Select Committee to the meeting for this item.

4.2 Councillor Janet Daby, Executive Member for Community Safety introduced the report. In her presentation to the Committee the following key points were highlighted:

- The inspection was a partnership inspection including looking at the Police and the Probation service.
- The “unsatisfactory” result had been a surprise and disappointment. The final result was very close to being “satisfactory” and work was commencing on a robust action plan to ensure improvements could be delivered as quickly as possible.

4.3 Geeta Subramaniam, Head of Crime Reduction and Supporting People, presented the report to the Committee. Keith Cohen, South London Resettlement Consortium Manager and incoming interim Youth Offending Service Manager was also in attendance. During her presentation the following key points were highlighted:

- The areas of the inspection included: reducing reoffending; protecting the public; protecting children and young people; making sure the sentence is served; and interventions. All received 2 stars/unsatisfactory except “sentence served” which received 3 stars.
- Many of the areas of inspection were scored very closely to the threshold of 65% which was the threshold for the “satisfactory” grading.
- There would be a greater focus on key performance indicators going forward to ensure that they were being met and that there was a greater understanding of their relevance in practice in terms of improved outcomes for children and young people.
- The Improvement Plan will be monitored by the Youth Justice Board and be reported to the Safer Lewisham Partnership. Updates on progress would also be submitted to the Safer Stronger Select Committee from September 2017.

4.4 In response to questions from members of the Committee, the following key points were highlighted:

- Lewisham had an increase in the number of young people in custody and higher numbers of reoffenders than previously. Other London boroughs were facing similar challenges in terms of levels of reoffending.
- Across London, budgets had fallen year on year for youth offending services causing additional pressures for the service. Staffing issues were also a factor and high turn-over of staff and an over-reliance on agency staff could be a problem. There would be a focus on developing a workforce strategy as part of the improvement plan.
- Performance indicators prior to the inspection were not being met which had been part of the reason for an inspection taking place.
- There had been some very positive feedback as part of the inspection, in particular the feedback on some officers’ determination to improve outcomes for the children and young people and the work in courts had been very positive.
- There would be a review of the financial resource allocation in light of the inspection and the resulting action plan.

- Patterns of reoffending had changed and this needed to be carefully looked at. It was understood before the inspection that offending rates were going up.
- The volume of young people in the youth justice system had fallen but the complexity of cases had increased. It was essential that the Council was working proactively with other agencies and the new Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH) should help this work.
- When responding to any follow up questions to Council on the inspection, budget reductions should be noted in the response.
- Multi-agency auditing was an important tool to ensuring a thorough understanding of the Council's own performance.
- Supporting and investing in staff was essential. LB Southwark had done some very successful work in developing their workforce and Lewisham would be looking at that and focusing strongly on workforce development.

4.5 **RESOLVED:**

That the report be noted and that the Committee receive quarterly updates on the delivery of the improvement plan.

5. Local Police Service update

5.1 Chief Inspector Andy Carter, Lewisham Police gave a presentation to the Committee, a copy of which will be added to the agenda documentation. During his presentation, the following key points were raised:

- Over the next 12 months the Metropolitan Police would be developing a new model for neighbourhood policing.
- The strategic priorities were: delivering “real” Neighbourhood policing; Protecting children and young people; Reducing violence against women and girls; A criminal Justice system for all Londoners; combatting hate crime, terrorism and extremism.
- Borough policing would be based on 4 pillars: Neighbourhoods; protecting vulnerable people; response teams and local investigations.
- There would be a minimum of 2 Dedicated Ward Officers (DWO) and one PCSO per ward with additional DWOs for higher demand wards.
- There would be 281 Youth and Schools Officers rising to 600 to prevent crime and protect young people. There would also be partnership and prevention teams in every Borough Command Unit (BCU).
- The leadership model would change slightly. There would be one BCU Commander with 4 Superintendents to match the 4 areas of focus as outlined above.
- The model is for between 11 and 16 BCUs across London with commands being of similar size and an even workload to make resource distribution fair.
- The proposals are that Lewisham would merge with LB Bexley and Royal Borough of Greenwich to form the BCU.

5.2 Following questions from members, the following key points were highlighted:

- The BCUs had been allocated based on volumes of crime, size and geographical area so as to ensure BCUs were of similar size and need across London.
- It would remain important to focus on local issues and local policing. The model aimed to balance the strategic work with the local demand.
- Schools officers and youth engagement work remained a pivotal part of local policing in the BCU model.
- The Chief Inspector and Commander rank would go from the staffing model by 2018 under the new BCU model.
- A decision had not yet been reached on where the BCUs would be based.

5.3 **RESOLVED:**

That the presentation be noted and Chief Inspector Andy Carter be thanked for attending.

6. MOPAC Police and Crime Plan

6.1 Geeta Subramaniam, Head of Crime Reduction and Supporting People introduced the report to the Committee. Chief Inspector Andy Carter was also in attendance for this item. During the presentation to the Committee, the following key points were highlighted:

- The Mayor's Office for Police and Crime (MOPAC) had launched their consultation on the Police and Crime Plan 2017-2021.
- Key priorities included: focusing on reducing the inequalities in terms of the impact of crime affecting some groups/areas disproportionately; challenges to the criminal justice system such as budget reductions and increased complexity of cases; and pressure on the budgets across the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS).
- Themes of the plan included: keeping children and young people safe; a knife crime strategy for London; tackling violence against women and girls; education; and tackling extremism.
- The Safer Stronger Community Select Committee was invited to feed in their views as part of the consultation either in combination with the views of the Safer Lewisham Partnership or as a separate response from the Committee.

6.2 In response to questions from members of the Committee, the following key points were highlighted:

- Discussions regarding the London Crime Prevention Fund top slice of 30% would take place from 2018. These would include the principals for bidding/commissioning with this money and how it could be reinvested into local areas.
- The Council would continue to work in collaboration with other boroughs. The merges that form the BCU were not necessarily the

same as other collaborations such as the NHS and CCG clusters. The Council would proactively work with all partners to ensure the best results for their residents.

- Regional commissioning would be studied closely to ensure it was always in the best interests of the borough. Sometimes London-wide purchasing would be advantageous but there would be incidences where individualised contracts could be better.
- There would be an extra 400 firearms officers across the MPS. They would be a central resource but delivered locally as and when a need was identified.
- The first part of budget savings that the MPS had faced had been addressed through their estate strategy – with some buildings being sold. Future savings could come from personnel or through improvements to IT provision.
- Cllr Daby Executive Member for Community Safety would circulate copies of the Casey Review to members of the Committee.

6.3 Members of the Safer Stronger Select Committee highlighted the following:

- The importance of engaging with parents, families and schools should be highlighted as it helped parents and families to feel safe and secure and have trust in the Police.
- There should be a focus on recruiting and retaining police officers from the BAME community and women so the police force reflected the population of London.
- The importance of the uniform youth group should be stressed. This was positive for building connections to the Police and strengthening community links.
- Encouraging victims of violence against women and girls to come forward was important but there needed to also be a focus on assuring continuity of officers supporting them. Lack of support through the process was felt to be a major barrier to women coming forward and pursuing cases.
- The Committee were concerned regarding the cuts to the Police budget overall and also the 30% cut of the London Crime Prevention Fund to local areas. Members of the Committee stressed it was important to ensure that money was fed back in to supporting the local community.

RESOLVED:

That the following views of the Committee be submitted as part of the submission with the response from the Safer Lewisham Partnership:

That the importance of engaging with parents, families and schools should be highlighted; helping parents and families to feel safe and secure and have trust in the Police.

There should be a focus on recruiting and retaining police officers from the BAME community and women so the police force reflected the population of London.

The importance of the uniform youth group should be stressed. This was felt by the Committee to be very positive for building connections to the Police and strengthening community links.

Encouraging victims of violence against women and girls to come forward was important but there needed to also be a focus on assuring continuity of officers supporting them. Lack of support through the process was a major barrier to women coming forward and pursuing cases.

The Committee were concerned regarding the cuts to the Police budget overall and also the 30% cut of the London Crime Prevention Fund to local areas. It was important to ensure that money was fed back in to supporting the local community.

7. Provision for the LGBT Community

7.1 Katie Wood, Scrutiny Manager introduced the report to the Committee. In the discussion that followed, members of the Committee highlighted the following key points:

- Cllr Walsh tabled an item listing possible recommendations that could be made through a referral or as part of a future in-depth review by the Committee. A copy will be included in the agenda documentation.
- There was a wide range of areas covered and the report was welcomed, however, themes crossed a range of areas and it would be important not to duplicate work done by other select committees if the committee looked at this further. Sexual Health and mental health were of high importance to investigate however the Committee recognised that Healthier Communities Select Committee had undertaken work on sexual health for example and there was cross-over on many of the themes.
- An in-depth review into LGBT provision could be put on the 2017/18 work programme for Safer Stronger Communities Select Committee. Work Programmes would be agreed by Overview and Scrutiny Business Panel who could ensure no duplication across the select committees.
- Specific training for providers of social care on LGBT issues could be looked at in more detail as part of any review the Committee carried out.

7.2 Cllr Michael, Chair of Safer Stronger Communities Select Committee, introduced Peter Vittles, Head of Community Engagement, Metro and invited him to address the Committee. In the discussion that followed the following key points were highlighted:

- Peter Vittles tabled a document produced by Metro, a copy of which will be included in the agenda documentation.
- Metro provided a youth group and at least 10 young people attend each session with 19 per quarter. Metro also provide an over 50s group.
- Metro provided a very successful residents forum space which was still growing in numbers.

- Metro felt that housing was a big issue for their community – older people ageing with no support networks for example meant that some could feel alienated and struggle with high costs of housing.
- It could be investigated as part of an in-depth review as to whether some LGBT pubs and venues could be included as assets of community value.
- Faith groups could be consulted and invited to participate in discussions on LGBT provision and the LGBT community.
- **Standing orders were suspended at 9.25pm.**

7.3 RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

That LGBT provision in Lewisham be added to the draft work programme for the 2017/18 municipal year and suggested as an in-depth review.

8. Recommendations - Capacity in the Voluntary Sector Review

8.1 Katie Wood, Scrutiny Manager, introduced the report to the Committee and invited members to agree their recommendations from the review.

8.2 RESOLVED:

That the following recommendations be included in the report for submission to Mayor and Cabinet:

1. That the Council continue to work with voluntary organisations in Lewisham to help them adapt to changes in funding and reductions in grants from the Council. Support should be timely and tailored to the needs of organisations.
2. When the Council reviews the grant-making process, the Council should ensure it considers assessments of skills and opportunities available in an area and not just look at need. This could be considered as an assets model rather than a uniquely deficits model.
3. LB Lewisham's commissioning models should reflect "The Social Value Act (2013)". Real consideration should be given to the benefits to the community of tenders by local voluntary and SME organisations during the valuation process as a means of countering contract-based culture.
4. The Council should consider the possibility of supporting the development of a "brokerage" system between voluntary sector organisations and employers to support increased numbers of and more effective volunteering opportunities.
5. That the potential for setting up a liaison support network specifically for Chief Executives in the Community and Voluntary Sector in Lewisham be investigated.

6. That the Council understands the importance of volunteering and the need for organisations to get support to develop their networks. Larger charities have access to substantial sets of data which enables them to target activities to local demographics. The Council should investigate the possibility of facilitating intelligence and data support to smaller organisations in the sector, for example through purchasing data systems such as MOSAIC and sharing data. In its consideration the Council should consider cost and maintaining and upholding the highest standards of data protection.
7. The Committee welcomes the involvement of civic society and empowering people to be involved in their communities. The advocacy role voluntary groups deliver was welcomed but work carried out to meet social need was vital.
8. The Main Grants Programme should be sustained including providing the opportunity to fund core costs in some circumstances. The value of funding core costs should be recognised both when the Council funds organisations and when it is bidding for external funding itself.
9. The role of local assemblies should include community development and capacity building.
10. Following the review, there was a concern to ensure infrastructure support organisations provide a greater voice for the voluntary sector.

9. Select Committee work programme

- 9.1 Katie Wood, Scrutiny Manager introduced the report to the Committee. During the discussion that followed, members of the Committee highlighted the following key points:
- The Safer Lewisham Plan should be added to the agenda for the March meeting.
 - The evidence session on Demographics could be postponed until the April meeting.
 - There should be an update on the library and information service at the March meeting but it did not need to be an extensive report.
 - As the work programme was very full, agendas could be timed in future to ensure business was carried out within standing orders.
 - In future, officers could be asked to only present any significant issues not included in the reports rather than provide a general overview, as all members would have thoroughly read papers.
 - As far as possible, there should be no addendums to reports handed round at meetings as this did not allow members adequate time for scrutiny of documents.

9.2 RESOLVED:

That a report on the “Safer Lewisham Plan” be added to the work programme in March.

That the evidence session on Demographics be postponed until the April meeting.

10. Items to be referred to Mayor and Cabinet

There were no referrals to Mayor and Cabinet.

The meeting ended at 9.50 pm

Chair:

Date:
