

Date 18 March 2008
Place CPCG Office
Present Anna Tapsell (AT), Paul Andell (PA), Jim Toohill (JT), Shane Collins (SC), Gill Kenealy (GK), Paul Reynolds (PR), Wesley Walters-Stephenson (WS) Jane Warwick (JW), Ben McKendrick (BM)

1. Apologies Ivelaw Bowman (IB), Doye Akinlade (DA), Ros Munday (RM),

2. Minutes and Matters Arising from previous meeting 18 February 2008 **ACTIONS**

Minutes for 18 February were agreed.

Board

Matters arising

With the unavailability of mayoral candidates to attend a south London crime debate, AT suggested attending the meeting on mayoral issues at Herne Hill on 8 April.

PA said that he would look at contractual arrangements with regard to the Schools Pack Project, **PA**

PR to pursue information dispersal zones **PR**

Due to the late hour, other matters arising were deferred.

3. Finance and Funding

John Roberts (JR), MPA Link Member, and Nathan Oley (NO), MPA Link Officer, attended the meeting to discuss CPCG funding.

AT stated that CPCG Board was surprised that CPCG had been placed in the MPA's 'Problem Group' in respect of funding and would therefore only receive it on a quarterly basis. In terms of funding being released, CPCG had understood the importance of developing its relationship with the Safer Lambeth Partnership (SLP), which was ongoing, and CPCG would be implementing proposals by Simon Harding (SH), Head of Lambeth Community Safety Division. Despite being confident that CPCG and SLP relationship was developing in the right way, the proposal for funding did not offer CPCG the security it needed and CPCG felt slighted, despite the good work it had done over the past year, as a result of a public statement of failure.

Unaware that SH had already signed off CPCG's funding bid, JR said that he had agreed to do the same, alongside Borough Commander Sharon Rowe (SR), when he came back from holiday. JR said that CPCG was not a failing borough, nor subject of having to make significant improvements, but there may be a need for CPCG to re-work its action plan following a SLP/CDRP review being undertaken.

AT said that while there had been mention of the SLP/CDRP having its own consultative group, CPCG had not been consulted and there had been no item concerning the matter on SLP/CDRP agendas. However, AT said that SR had

spoken to her about developments of CPCG in line with MPA and Community Safety. AT also learned that a review, based on Nottingham CDRP, was being produced in the form of a paper written by an "Inspector Radcliff" an officer unknown to CPCG, supposedly in conjunction with Supt. Paul Wilson (PW). [In fact, this work is being undertaken by a Home Office secondee to MPS Lambeth – Russell Taylor – see below].

AT added that CPCG was in the process of writing its own paper for SLP/CDRP in relation to a consultation process.

JR said that he was not aware of PW being involved in a review but SLP/CDRP had to look at how it consulted. NO added that the review had been technically and formally commissioned by SLP/CDRP.

AT questioned the formality of the review as it would need to be paid for by someone. And in relation to it holding up core funding for CPCG, it was being done so by somebody that CPCG didn't know writing a paper on a subject of which CPCG had no knowledge.

Action. JR said that he would ask SR for a commissioning brief and ask the author of the paper to give a briefing to CPCG for Terms of Reference.

JR

JR said he valued CPCG but had to agree to a quarterly payment before he went away otherwise CPCG would have received no funding. However, he assured CPCG that it would receive its £50K funding and he would be happy to see that CPCG receives funding for the first six months, albeit with a caveat that it be subject to the outcome of the review.

Action. JR agreed to make a statement, as a matter arising at the next MPA COT meeting - that CPCG should not have been put in same bracket as those groups deemed to be failing and in need of significant improvement.

JR

In respect of funding, JR said that the MPA should not have to be the only source and that SLP/CDRP needed to contribute and be more joined up.

NO said that CPCG had a unique dynamic whilst the MPA was interested in a commissioning model for CPCGs, funding quarterly to deliver particular tasks at behest of the MPA.

JR said that the MPA had wanted to give funding to CDRPs but that it was too politically dangerous.

JR agreed to attend CPCG Board meetings on a quarterly basis and asked BM to send him dates of future meetings. He added that commissioning would take two years to imbed and, to some extent, depend on the mayoral election.

PR said that CPCG was going through a transitional period and without targeted, non-aligned funding he envisaged the disintegration of CPCG services, which would be detrimental to the fundamental issue of engagement with the public and coordinated engagement on a wider level.

At this point JR and NO departed and CPCG Board was joined by PW.

PW said that the SLP was looking at the potential of a CDRP consultative group and he was working with Home Office secondee, Russell Taylor on what an arrangement would look like. One such arrangement was in place in

Nottingham.

PW said that former DAC Alan Given was currently CEO at Nottingham and he had introduced a body of members of the public who provided feedback to its CDRP.

PW said that the impact the review would have on CPCGs work plan depended on an unestablished timescale and the SLP's appetite for having a CDRP consultative group. He added that it was uncharted territory and while there were some bullet points regarding the Nottingham model he was aware that CPCG was preparing a consultation paper.

JT proposed writing to Nottingham local authority to enquire about its CDRP consultative model.

In terms of using Safer Neighbourhood Panels (SNPS) for borough-wide consultation, JT said SNPs were really just concerned about their own wards and not strategic issues.

PR raised his concerns about Lambeth Council getting rid of community forums and that CPCG would go the same way if not for MPA funding.

PA said that CPCG was a model of good practice and that community engagement was driven by Highlight Standards, which gave recommendations of current good consultation and suggested not seeking to re-invent the wheel. He added that public consultation going into mosaic was not useful.

PW said that Lambeth wanted to introduce a neighbourhood management model in Clapham Park, Coldharbour and Waterloo with a view to each ward having its own forum with bottom up consultation driven by a manager with a community body holding service providers to account.

WS said he was sceptical about such an idea with no funds for CCTV and no capability to hold anyone to account.

PW suggested CPCG invite Conrad Hollingworth to give a briefing on delivery.

On other matters raised, PW said:

The murder in Myatt's field was a complicated matter with rumours and concerns about risks, not helped by the 'helicoptering in' of police from the centre. Upon PA's advice, police would consider using a Detached Youth Worker up to midnight to increase community confidence.

The shared use of road traffic CCTV was on the SLP's next agenda with a view for a cross agency protocol for best use of CCTV for the community.

Training for Gold Groups and Identity Cards for community leaders helping the police needed to be looked at afresh.

For information about Trident operations, CPCG Board should invite the Ch. Supt in charge to a meeting.
PW left the meeting at this point.

JT tabled a CPCG Budget and Cash Position at 18 March 2008

4. Community Engagement and SLP

JT tabled a draft document on Community Engagement and SLP.

AT said that the document represented growth of CPCG and showed the Group's expertise, scope of reputation and its focus on matters at grass roots level.

JT said that CPCG was best placed as the community vehicle for consultation.

Board agreed to take the Community/SLP document away and feedback with responses the following week

Board agreed to continue to seek other sources of funding.

Board

4. Previous and Future Group Meetings and Events

Board felt that the last CPCG meeting with its theme of Domestic Violence had been positive, with women handling the questions well whilst exposing failings.

PA said he would ask Prof. John Pitts if he would do a presentation, gratis, on the Council's Young and Safe in Lambeth strategy at the next CPCG meeting on 1 April, under the Gangs and Guns item.

PA

5. Sub-Groups

Stop and Search

Deferred.

Domestic Violence

See Previous CPCG meeting.

Youth

JT said that he was working on the Youth Event response.

Mental Health

IB was on holiday.

Publicity Strategy Group

SC tabled a Publicity Strategy document.

Board agreed a £1000 budget to finance the Strategy for a three month period

6. Safer Neighbourhoods

Deferred.

7. Board Members Report/Log

Board members were reminded to submit relevant details for CPCG Briefing Paper and Log.

8. A. O. B.

JR apologised to PA for having suggested at a public function that, from his personal perspective, PA's position on CPCG Board was a conflict of interest in respect of his current position as an employee of GLA, adding that he should have approached AT to state his view. JR said that he would also contact Commander Rod Jarman, who was present at the time he had aired his opinion, to inform him of his apology. As a matter of course, PA had registered all his interests with the GLA and there had been no challenge to his role with CPCG, just as there was no conflict recognised by CPCG.

JR

In response to GK, JT asked her to write a proposal for CPCG surgeries and put it on the next Board agenda

GK

JT reported that he had been appointed a Non-Executive Director of Lambeth Primary Care Trust. He pointed out the PCT were members of Safer Lambeth Partnership and the Lambeth Strategic Partnership. He undertook to declare his interest, when any issues which might lead to a conflict of interest, arose at the Board or at Group meetings.

9. Date of next CPCG Board Meeting

14 April 2008

Signed as a true record:

Date: