

**Annual General Meeting
Stockwell Resource Centre
19 October 2010**

Minutes of the 2009 AGM

- 1 The minutes of the 2009 AGM (held on 20 October 2009) were accepted without amendment, *nem con*.

Matters Arising

- 2 John Howard pointed out that in some of the communications from the CPCG office regarding the AGM, the date of the AGM was wrongly stated – being the 2009 date. He said that confusion had been reigning on the internet (Facebook etc).
- 3 Jim Toohill (Honorary Comptroller) apologised for the glitch but pointed out that members would have received (including prior monthly Briefings etc) several notifications of the meeting with the correct date – in particular (with regard to the internet) he said that all email correspondence was headed with the correct data and that only seven members were not on email. He added that there had only been one enquiry to the office double-checking the date.

Annual Report and Accounts

- 4 The Chair, Anna Tapsell, asked the meeting to receive the Annual Report and Accounts.
- 5 Speaking to the Annual Report, the Chair drew particular attention to:
 - 5.1 A largely successful year, with much work going on in between meetings, citing the work of the Stop and Search Group and the Mental Health Working Group.
 - 5.2 In the latter regard, she spoke of the particular position of Lambeth being positioned between two major mental health institutions and the impact that had, with large numbers of young men entering mental health services through the police, having been detained under Section 136.

- 5.3 Ms Tapsell gave an account of her recent experience of just such a young man who had been detained and had spent 24 hours in Streatham custody cells before being seen by an FME or social worker.
- 5.4 More generally, Anna spoke of the need to ensure that the Membership were kept informed of the work going on between meetings. It was also necessary to recognise the danger of 'burn-out' amongst individuals putting in a lot of voluntary effort for sustained periods and of the need to accept that they may need to take time-out for a year or so.
- 6 The Chair noted at this point that the meeting had become quorate.
- 7 Speaking to the Annual Report and Accounts, the Honorary Comptroller, Jim Toohill, highlighted:
 - 7.1 The main themes of the Report – the diversity of our membership and attendance, the broader participation of public agencies and other forums with CPCG acting as a hub, the responsiveness of CPCG to issues (exemplified by the CO19 patrols issue) and the capacity of CPCG to follow through on issues. Jim also pointed to the recognition, by the MPS, of Lambeth CPCG as an example of 'best practice' and by the MPA, as providing value for money.
 - 7.2 Turning to the 2009/10 Annual Accounts, Mr Toohill pointed to the underlying imbalance between core income and core costs which had resulted in a draw down of reserves. He added that in the then current year (2010/11) the gap in employment (of the Administrator) would allow CPCG to restore reserves to a level which would provide a cushion against anticipated funding cuts.
 - 7.3 He added that the peak of funding for CPCG was in 2002/3, when 1.6 fte staff were employed, and had amounted to around £82k, allowing for inflation. Funding was now £50k, providing for just 1 fte staff whilst CPCG had absorbed a threefold cost in rent over the period but nonetheless was taking on additional events and meetings, such as the Country Show. This had been achieved through relentless cost saving and considerable voluntary effort but neither were limitless.

- 8 Paul Andell (Vice-Chair) pointed out that the then impending Government Spending Review would not only have implications for CPCG resources but also the demand for CPCG response, pointing to anticipated changes in Youth provision, for example.
- 9 Fernando Senior asked about the Group's insurance, specifically against circumstances following from Board members offering advice to individuals which turned out to be erroneous. Jim Toohill responded that Board members were indemnified by the Company, which itself had limited liability, as long as they acted in good faith and within the law, taking advice where necessary. But whilst CPCG had public liability insurance, it did not have specific insurance for the circumstances to which Fernando had alluded.
- 10 The meeting agreed to receive the Annual Report and Accounts *nem con*.

Motions to the AGM

- 11 Two Motions had been put to the AGM, both on the subject of a proposal from the Board that CRB checks should be a requirement of Board Membership.
- 12 Copies of both Motions are attached.
- 13 In summary, one Motion (proposed by John Howard and seconded by Fernando Senior) was against CRB checks (for shorthand in these Minutes, the 'AGAINST' motion) and one proposed by Jim Toohill (Honorary Comptroller) and seconded by Paul Andell (Vice-Chair), on behalf of the Board (the 'FOR' motion).
- 14 Since these Motions were in direct opposition it was recognised that the order in which they were taken could be problematic. Whichever Motion was taken first could, in the event of it being carried, nullify the alternative Motion and exclude proper debate.
- 15 After some discussion, the Chair proposed, with agreement from the meeting, that:
- 15.1 The two Motions would effectively be debated together, with the arguments for and against CRB checks for the CPCG Board being put (respectively) by the Proposer and Secunder of the FOR Motion and by the Proposer and Secunder of AGAINST motion. Each speaker would be allowed 3 minutes.
- 15.2 The order of the debate was agreed as;
- 15.3 Proposer of the AGAINST Motion
- 15.4 Secunder of the AGAINST Motion
- 15.5 Proposer of the FOR Motion
- 15.6 Secunder of the FOR Motion
- 15.7 Speakers from the floor – 2 minutes each.
- 15.8 Summing up from the Proposer of the AGAINST Motion
- 15.9 Summing up from the Proposer of the FOR Motion.
- 15.10 Both Motions to be put to the vote.
- 16 Speakers generally reiterated some or all of, or drew the meeting's attention to, the content of their respective Motions. Additional points, or specific emphases, are minuted here.
- 17 John Howard, Proposer of AGAINST Motion, highlighted:
- 17.1 The altered layout to his original Motion, which had wrapped over a page;
- 17.2 He queried whether the Board's decision had been minuted;
- 17.3 John asserted that it was not the Board's job to engage with vulnerable individuals or information about them. Rather they should signpost such to appropriate agencies. He drew attention to Fernando Senior's point earlier concerning indemnity and insurance;
- 17.4 The proposed CRB checks are not specified in the Group's Memorandum and Articles and Rules and Regulations – the Membership should have had longer notice to consider and debate;
- 17.5 John felt the requirement could drive away young people, whom the Group should seek to involve, but who may have some criminal conviction in the past.
- 17.6 Mr Howard felt the proposal to be at odds with the ethos of the Group. He feared a slippery slope, ending in a CRB requirement for Group membership, not just the Board.

- 18 Fernando Senior, Seconder of the AGAINST Motion, chose not to speak but seconded formally.
- 19 Jim Toohill (Proposer of the FOR Motion) made the following points:
- 19.1 He spoke as the person on the Board who had been most sceptical of the proposal, based on a general suspicion of the 'database society' and the intrusion of the state into individuals' lives. He gave two instances, consideration of which had swung his view;
- 19.2 One was of a young man who had come to the Group, clearly very distressed by his treatment by the police. He had subsequently met with the Chair and the Administrator and came with his advocate from a local mental health network – he had already been sign-posted. Because Jim, as Honorary Comptroller, managed the Administrator he had inevitably gained information about the young man which a 'dodgy' person might use to malign effect.
- 19.3 The second example was an instance when the Group's office was contacted by Brixton Prison, which had been approached by a former CPCG member who had claimed to be a 'legal advisor' with CPCG and asking for access to a particular prisoner.
- 19.4 Reflection on these instances demonstrated that (1) CPCG Board members, whilst not undertaking 'case-work', may acquire information about vulnerable individuals and (2) the possibility exists that they could misuse the information they have, or which they imply they have, because of their position,
- 19.5 He felt the risk was small but the potential damage was great, both to individuals and to CPCG's reputation. It was necessary for CPCG to demonstrate it had taken every precaution.
- 19.6 He clarified the distinction between indemnity and insurance, reassuring Members that their individual liability was limited to £1.
- 19.7 He added that the position with other CPCG's around London was mixed – some did require CRB checks and others did not.
- 20 Paul Andell (Seconder of the FOR Motion) made the following points:
- 20.1 He shared a distaste for centrally held databases;
- 20.2 Paul had queries around the funding of the checks;
- 20.3 He saw the balance as being between civil liberties on the one hand and the protection of individuals' and of the Group's reputation on the other;
- 20.4 Mr Andell did not accept the distinction (made in the AGAINST Motion) between engaging with vulnerable people and sign-posting them; how could individuals be sign-posted without being engaged with?
- 21 The following points were made from the floor:
- 21.1 Lee Jasper spoke for the AGAINST Motion. He felt that concerns about central database issue were valid, the proposed checks may well give re-assurance to some, eg in the public agencies, but may have the opposite effect within the community, on the estates for example. There is a difference between the level of engagement required to sign-post and that needed to undertake case work, which required specialist skills and training and which the Group should shy away from. The CRB checks could become a sledge hammer to crack a nut.
- 21.2 Canon Ivelaw Bowman spoke for the FOR Motion. He disagreed that the proposed CRB checks would prove a disincentive to people becoming involved. He himself had been multiply checked – he had no qualms about what data was held on him. He regarded the checks like a fire-insurance – better to have it and not need it than the other way around.
- 21.3 Neil Flanigan supported the AGAINST motion, he felt that CPCG's job should be to sign-post and not advise. He was also concerned that the checks would dissuade people from becoming involved.
- 21.4 Lloyd Leon supported the FOR Motion. He argued that young people will always come to the CPCG when the issues were strong enough to bring them and cited examples – he felt the issue of CRB checks for the Board would not effect that. He added that he knew of two cases where individuals had used an association with CPCG to attempt to gain access in respect of vulnerable individuals.

21.5 Fernando Senior, in support of the AGAINST Motion, said that whilst he was CRB checked in his professional capacity, that was because he chose that profession. He did not consider the position of CPCG to be comparable – CPCG was set up to be a mediator. He did feel that the checks would dissuade young people from becoming involved.

22 John Howard, summing up for the AGAINST Motion, made the following points:

22.1 From his experience as Chair of Lambeth Law Center, he felt the issue of confidential information could be better dealt with by an agreed Code of Practice for the Board;

22.2 He agreed with concerns about state interference and pointed out the new government’s plans for a ‘bonfire’ of regulations and civil liberties restrictions implemented by the previous administration.

22.3 John said that sign-posting was easy – there was a plethora of organisations in Lambeth who were competent – it was not the CPCG Board’s job.

22.4 John cited Lloyd Leon’s concerns about the DNA database criminalising young black males (minuted at the 2009 AGM); John said that he had been told by young people, eg like those from Myatt’s Field, that they didn’t sustain attendance at CPCG meetings because they felt their issues were not being addressed. It was indeterminate whether CRB checks would further dissuade them since the Group had no experience of running such checks.

22.5 CPCG had always been a broad church, always reaching out. CRB checks were in contradiction to that.

23 Jim Toohill, summing up for the FOR Motion made the following points:

23.1 It was in no way implied by the FOR Motion that CPCG should become involved in case work. In addition to the arguments against such already given, CPCG simply did not have the means – case-work can consume enormous resource;

23.2 But sign-posting alone can give access to sensitive information, not least when the sign-posted agency comes back to CPCG as the community group with knowledge of policing issues;

23.3 Regarding the potential dis-incentive, Jim argued that anyone wanting to become a CPCG Board member was likely to have been in the Group for a time and could take the opportunity to sound out the implications of the checks from existing Board members. He added that he understood that the group on Myatt’s Field, to which John Howard had referred, had needed CRB checks (including of young people) in order to get financial assistance with their charity registration.

23.4 He did agree that it would have been better to have brought the issue, for general discussion, to a Business Meeting earlier in the year.

24 The voting was by show of hands, with Valerie Shawcross AM (and MPA link member) and Cllr Rachel Heywood (LBL Cabinet Member for Community Safety) acting as tellers:

24.1 Voting on the AGAINST Motion

For	6
Against	13
Stated Abstentions	1

The Chair declared that this Motion had fallen.

Voting on the FOR Motion

For	17
Against	5
Stated Abstentions	1

The Chair declared that this Motion was carried.

25 The Chair pointed out that a CRB check which revealed previous criminal offences would not in itself preclude membership of the Board, CPCG was not exempt from the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act. In response to a query from Ros Griffiths, Anna Tapsell clarified that the requirement for checks would apply to the whole Board and not just those newly elected. John Howard reminded the meeting that it was an offence for anyone with access to CRB

information to reveal such to any third party, and they could also be sued for such.

Thanks to Outgoing Chair

26 Lloyd Leon spoke for the meeting to thank Anna Taspell, who was retiring as Chair, for her work for the Group. He set his tribute in the context of the long time over which he had known Anna, going back to a time before he had entered politics. He said her commitment to serving the community was always apparent and had characterised the spirit in which she had served as Chair for four years.

27 He said she was in no way self-seeking and pointed to the long hours Anna had put in and also the occasions on which she had been called out late at night. He felt that Anna's attendance that evening, in spite of having been injured earlier in the day, was of a piece with this spirit of service.

28 After a small presentation, Anna recalled the very early days of CPCG and reassured the meeting that she would take her place on the 'back-benches' in an active way. In response, Jim Fairweather presented a short musical tribute.

29 At this point Paul Andell (Vice-Chair) took the Chair,

Elections for the Board - Results

30 Valerie Shawcross AM and Cllr Rachel Heywood acted as tellers.

31 Community And Voluntary Organisations

(3 places vacant)

Doye Akinlade	6
Myriam Hay	5
Sandra Moodie	7
Ros Munday	9
Clarence Thompson	7

Sandra Moodie, Ros Munday and Clarence Thompson were declared elected.

32 Individual Members

3 places vacant

33 Prior to the ballot, John Howard withdrew his candidature, on the principle of his opposition to CRB checks. He said this was in no way to disrespect those who had spoken in the debate or due to any personal concerns.

1st Ballot

Canon Ivelaw Bowman	10
Lee Jasper	10
Gill Keneally	10
Hannah Mir	4
Clovis Reid	11

Clovis Reid was declared elected and Hannah Mir eliminated from the ballot

2nd Ballot

Canon Ivelaw Bowman	7
Lee Jasper	10
Gill Keneally	5

Ivelaw Bowman and Lee Jasper were declared elected.

Policing and Engagement in London

34 Jim Toohill introduced this session by pointing to two developments which were likely to have significant impact on community engagement in policing in London, and on CPCGs in particular.

35 The first was the Government's proposals for locally elected policing Commissioners. The consultation document, released earlier in 2010, had been singularly opaque in respect of London. However, it was generally expected that the role of elected Commissioner in London would be taken on by the Mayor of London (or his/her nominee) and that the Metropolitan Police Authority (MPA) would be abolished, with its functions absorbed into the Mayor's office.

36 The second development would be the follow through from the results of the Government's

- Spending Review, which were scheduled to be announced the next day. This would clearly have funding implications, including for CPCGs. There was already talk of 40% cuts for CPCGs, and possibly all in one year. Jim added that Lambeth CPCG was probably in a stronger position to cushion any cuts, in the short term, than any other CPCG in London because it had taken the opportunity (provided by a staff vacancy) to bolster reserves.
- 37 Val Shawcross AM explained that, having been the Greater London Assembly (GLA) member for Lambeth and Southwark since 2000, chairing the Fire and Emergency Planning Authority between 2000 and 2008, she had joined the MPA as a GLA member. She had sought to become the MPA Link Member for Lambeth and Southwark, an appointment she anticipated would be ratified by the MPA in the near future.
- 38 She agreed that this was a time of turmoil – there had already been briefing to the MPA's Finance Committee that there would be a 25 per cent cut in the Government's core grant to the MPS over the three year period of the Spending Review. The detail was likely to be worked through by Christmas 2010.
- 39 Val expressed her fear that the progress and achievements in partnership working between the Police, Councils and the Community – in both Lambeth and Southwark – could be put at risk. She was also worried about the knock effects of cuts to the voluntary sector, into crime and disorder, and cited Domestic Violence as one such area.
- 40 In respect of the changes the Governance of policing, Val explained that the MPA, which came into being in 2000, is currently a functional body of the Greater London Authority, part elected (through the Assembly) and part appointed. The Government was keen to move quickly with legislation, with implementation likely in 2012.
- 41 There was cross-party agreement in the Assembly, which had written to the Home Secretary arguing for more than one elected Commissioner for London, given its size and complexity – effectively a Police Board. The Assembly had also argued that there should be a clear role for the Assembly in detailed scrutiny of such a Board.
- 42 One of the challenges will be around which bit of the system will be responsible for funding community engagement. Val said whatever the outcome, the Assembly was committed to ensuring that proper local engagement continued. She said that CPCG Lambeth's Annual Report showed what really good work was being delivered and what was at risk. To lose such would be very serious.
- 43 Ms Shawcross also related concerns amongst the MPA members over a current proposal to require entrants to the MPS to first serve as Special Constables, considering the impact that might have on diversity, or on low income groups, and the overall fear of 'policing on the cheap'.
- 44 The following comments were made from the floor:
- 44.1 Jane Warwick (Chair of Lambeth Panel of Independent Custody Visitors) related her concern over the changes which the MPA were introducing to the operation of the ICVs. This started in 2007, when the MPA took over administration of the Panels, something which Jane felt had probably increased cost. More recently, the MPA had withdrawn administrative support for each borough Panel's monthly meetings, offering to support only quarterly meetings. This reduced the opportunity for the Panel Chair to review the Custody Visitors' reports with the Visitors and to follow up issues with the local MPS. This was inadequate for a complex borough like Lambeth – one size didn't fit all.
- 44.2 Similarly, meetings of Panel Chair's from across London had been restricted to a quarterly timetable and to a strict agenda determined by the MPA, leaving no time for Panel Chairs to interact. Already, a number of Chairs and around 80 Custody Visitors had resigned. Val Shawcross agreed to meet with Jane outside the meeting.
- 44.3 John Wainwright suggested that perhaps Lambeth CPCG should be seen as a perfect example of the 'Big Society'. Val Shawcross felt that it was unclear yet what shape for engagement was envisaged, the need to save money appeared to be a prime driver.
- 44.4 Lee Jasper felt it would be the highest folly to undermine or get rid of a forum like Lambeth CPCG, which had such a track record of improving relationships between the police and the community. It was a message which should be taken back to the Mayor. Lee also

expressed a fear over the impact of public sector funding cuts, be it funding of the police or statutory and voluntary sector services (particularly to young people) on community safety and crime. Cllr Rachel Heywood responded that it was anticipated that there would be a raft of cuts facing Lambeth Council, amounting to some 25 per cent (or £63m) over the next three years. She was 'fighting tooth and nail' to retain as much funding as possible in Community Safety, a prime concern for residents. She said that Community Safety in Lambeth was meagerly funded (around £3m pa) relative to some other boroughs and half of that is time limited grant funding. Undoubtedly there would be cuts to services but also challenges to find better ways of working and Rachel said she would be looking to the experience and knowledge within CPCG to assist with that.

44.5 John Howard felt there were likewise challenges to CPCG in its own ways of working, arguing that the CPCG needed to become more bottom-up, regarding meetings of the membership as the sovereign body and this needed to be addressed. He questioned how successful partnership working had really been, given the upward trend in some categories of serious crime. He disagreed that CPCG was an example of the Big Society, rather it was a safety valve with could head off serious disorder. Cllr Heywood agreed there were some worrying trends in some types of crime, in part reflecting trends across London, but pointed also to some positive trends, for example in Domestic Violence, in Hate Crime and in Total Notifiable Offences in general. She pointed out the Safer Lambeth Partnership went wider than just the statutory agencies, and paid tribute to Anna Tapsell's contribution to the Partnership during her time as Chair of CPCG. but recognised the need to spread partnership more widely.

44.6 Lloyd Leon thanked both Val Shawcross and Cllr Heywood for their attendance and contributions. He pointed to the origins of CPCG, to the operation of the SUS law and to the sometimes flimsy bases for arrests – a situation the community was not prepared to return to. He objected to the notion that individuals wanting to join the MPS should give their time for free, as Special Constables when it came from a Home Secretary noted for an expensive taste in shoes and handbags. He felt that the differential dis-incentive this might cause could only worsen the current situation,

with so few black officers in senior positions within the MPS.

44.7 Clarence Thompson felt there was need for CPCGs to work together to develop a strategy and to present a combined front in terms of the community's preparedness to not to accept cuts or their implications. He cited his experience of the West Indian Standing Conference, under Harold Wilson's administration, in campaigning for the Race Relations Act and also the practice of regular meetings with the Met Commissioner and Home Secretary. There was a need to rekindle those skills. Val Shawcross said that people were yet to realise the implication of the cuts, making mobilisation difficult though cuts in the police service would surely raise widespread interest.

44.8 Canon Ivelaw Bowman likewise thanked Val Shawcross and Cllr Heywood for their attendance and contributions. He pointed out that the financial crisis was not the fault of the poor, but they would have to bear the brunt of the consequences. He argued that the prevention of crime was as important as enforcement and felt that employment was the best preventative and feared for the future, especially considering the current cross-border situation with gangs.

44.9 Myriam Aquilar Haye spoke of her worries for voluntary organisations within the borough. She said that there was a need for CPCG to address the ways in which it could better involve other voluntary organisations, especially those representing minority ethnic groups. Cllr Heywood said she had attended the Forum of Spanish and Portuguese Speaking People – Lambeth [which is affiliated to CPCG. and which Myriam represents] and looked forward to working with that forum in addressing its issues.

44.10 Ros Griffiths that CPCG did indeed need to consider how it could be more accessible, more open to engagement by different groups, perhaps providing less formal, less structured vehicles in order to provide more opportunities for, eg, young people or women with children. There was a particular need to mentor young people in structures and processes so they learn how to engage. In terms of diversity, she regretted that there were no longer BME officers in senior positions in Lambeth MPS, something which she felt would get worse as recruitment was restricted. Val Shawcross

agreed that an aging police service, with slower rates of promotion, would have implications for the opportunities to increase diversity. With regards to involving young people, there was a need to go where they were and to adopt their methods of communication (Facebook, Twitter etc) rather than expecting them to adapt to existing structures.

45 Paul Andell summarised the contributions from the floor, and the responses from Val Shawcross and Cllr Rachel Heywood and agreed of the need to ensure that the whole of CPCG work together in addressing the difficult issues ahead. He thanked Val and Rachel for the attendance, for their acting as tellers and for their contributions in helping CPCG to look ahead.

46 He announced, with regret, the death of Spartacus, who had in the past been an impassioned contributor to CPCG and extended CPCG's condolences to Spartacus' family and friends.

47 Paul invited Jim Fairweather (West Indian Ex-Service Men" Association) to update the meeting of the progress with the campaign to gain posthumous honour for Flight Lieutenant Ronald Hall, who had served with distinction in the Second World War, as a Flight Navigator and Bombadier. Jim reported that the campaign had recently gained wholehearted support from the Association of Guyanese Nurses and Allied Professionals in the United Kingdom.

48 At Paul's invitation, Sandra Moodie announced the inaugural meeting of the Lambeth Black Families Forum on 23rd October 2010.

DATE OF NEXT AGM

6. 00 p.m. TUESDAY, 15 October 2011

Lambeth Community-Police Consultative Group
Unit 58 Euro link Business Centre, 49 Effra Road
London SW2 1BZ,
T: 020 7733 0878 E: admin@lambethcpcg.org.uk
F: 020 7274 7623 W: www.lambethcpcg.org.uk

SIGNED IN MEMBERS

Name Organisation

Doye Akinlade Brixton Society

Paul	Andell	
Hope	Barrett	
Ivelaw	Bowman	
Rod	Brown	
Julia	Cordero	
Richard	Dutton	
G.		
Jim	Fairweather	West Indian Ex-Servicemen/Women Assoc.
		West Indian Ex-Servicemen/Women Assoc.
Neil	Flanigan	
	MBE	
Gloria	Gomez	
Myriam	Hay	Forum for Portuguese and Spanish Speaking Communities - Lambeth Brixton Market Traders Federation
Stuart	Horwood	
Lena	James	
Lee	Jasper	
Lloyd	Leon MBE	Brixton Domino Club
Anna	Long	Churches Together In Clapham
Mary Ann	Mhina	Lambeth Women's Aid
Sandra	Moodie	Cressingham Gardens T.R.A.
Clare	Moore	
Ros	Munday	Clapham Community Partnership
Clovis	Reid	
Fernando	Senior	
Anna	Tapsell	
Clarence	Thompson	Queen Mother Moore School
	MBE	
Jim	Toohill	
George	Tuson	Streatham Common Southside NW
		Clapham Town Neighbourhood Watch
Peggy	Tyler	
Steve	Wahab	
	Bolarinwa	
David	Warner	Brixton Society
Jane	Warwick	Lambeth Women's Aid
Valerie	Shawcross	MPA
	AM	

SIGNED IN VISITORS

Cllr	Heywood	Lambeth Council
Rachel		
Ros	Griffiths	
Elaine	Lilley	
Kelly	Ben Maimon	

Motion from the John Howard and Fernando Senior

Motion for the Community Police Consultative Group for Lambeth

Annual General Meeting 19 October 2010

CRB checks for individuals joining the Board.

This Annual General Meeting notes:

1. That the CPCGL Board has, for the first time, stipulated that individuals joining the Board will be expected to undergo a Criminal Records Bureau Check (CRB)
2. That the reason given for this is because Board members from time to time come in to contact with vulnerable individuals, or information about vulnerable individuals
3. That this stipulation has been introduced by the Board without reference or recourse to the opinions, wishes or guidance of the CPCGL general membership, albeit that there has been ample time and opportunity for the issue to be brought before the general membership for its consideration
4. That the stipulation that individuals joining, or indeed standing for, the Board must be prepared to undergo a CRB check is not explicitly stated in either the Rules and Regulations or the Memorandum of Association

This Annual General Meeting Believes:

1. That it is not the role of CPCGL Board members to engage with vulnerable individuals but instead to direct them to the appropriate authorities; and inasmuch as Board members may from time to time come in to contact with vulnerable individuals, or information about vulnerable individual, such contact or information will, or should, be governed by the Board's code of confidentiality
2. That, as far as it is known, Board members are not indemnified by the CPCGL to engage with vulnerable individuals and, irrespective of that, it must surely be the individual Board members' decision or prerogative to involve or exempt themselves with or from such contact or information
3. That the stipulation of CRB checks for individuals joining the Board is completely at odds with and against the ethos of the CPCGL and its much-vaunted claim of inclusiveness and strikes at the very reasons for which the CPCGL was founded
4. That the stipulated CRB checks are arguably against the Human Rights Act: Articles 8,11 and 14 Right to Respect for Privacy; Freedom of Association and Assembly; and Prohibition of Discrimination respectively - they may also be potentially in conflict with the Rehabilitation of the Offenders Act
5. That the CPCGL is and always has been a 'broad church' and as such has an important role to engage with, and promote involvement from, the people of Lambeth that it represents; CRB checks will only serve to deter, discourage and dishearten sections of the community that the CPCGL should be reaching out to and encouraging to join that 'broad church' and make an active and worthwhile contribution to their community and to the continuing work of the CPCGL
6. That many people have been wrongly or unjustly convicted of a criminal offence - the cases of major miscarriages of justice are legion and well-documented the minor ones less well-known - the imposition of CRB checks will serve to exacerbate that injustice and prevent people, through feelings of resentment or discomfit, from being part of the CPCGL or standing as a member of its Board
7. That the CPCGL Board does not stand or act in isolation of the CPCGL membership nor does it represent the people of Lambeth; that role resides with the CPCGL acting as a whole, it follows therefore that questions of the nature of CRB checks must necessarily be decided by the CPCGL membership

This Annual General Meeting Resolves:

1. That the grounds for imposing CRB checks for individuals joining the Board are not made out or supported by the facts and beliefs advanced above
2. That the stipulation that "individuals joining the CPCGL Board will be expected to undergo a Criminal Records Bureau check" is rejected and instructs the Board to remove it as a qualification for Board membership.

Motion from the Honorary Officers

That the AGM ratifies the CPCG for Lambeth Board's decision, made at its July meeting, to require that CPCG members serving on the Board should be prepared to declare any interests that might lead to a real or perceived conflict, and also that Board members agree to an up to date Criminal Records Bureau check which should be renewed at three yearly intervals, should they continue to be elected.

That the AGM agrees that CPCG seeks no exemption from the Rehabilitation of Offenders legislation and positively welcomes people who have experienced life as offenders and have managed to triumph over the challenges they will have faced. But the AGM recognises that there are some offences (related to crimes against women, children and vulnerable people generally), a history of which may indicate a direct or indirect risk to those who use our CPCG, in whatever way.

That the AGM supports the Board in seeking to ensure that every possible step is taken to ensure the safety of those of our community who use the CPCG. This is what the wider public expect of us. The AGM recognises the damage that could result, to both vulnerable people and to the CPCG, by falling short of that expectation.