

**COMMUNITY-POLICE
CONSULTATIVE GROUP
for LAMBETH**

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

4 APRIL 2006

Lambeth Accord SW9

PRESENT: CPCG BOARD Greta Brooks (Churches Together in Brixton), Jim Toohill (Victim Support), Anna Tapsell, Cheryl Sealey, (Ind. Membs), Wesley Stephenson (Your Story), Abdul Sultan Virani (Lambeth Pensioners' Forum) **COMMUNITY AND VOLUNTARY MEMBERSHIP** Nick Abengowe **Herne Hill Forum**; Doye Akinlade **Brixton Society**; Pauline Bower **Churches Together in Clapham**; Rod Brown **Lambeth Leaseholders Forum**; Wally Channon, Peggy Tyler **Clapham Town N'hood Watch**; David Corderoy **Lambeth Chamber of Commerce**; Stuart Horwood, John Gordon **Brixton Market Traders Federation**; Dr Brian Mantell **Assoc. of Jewish Ex-Servicemen & Women**; Ros Munday **Clapham Community Partnership**; The Most Rev. Dr Bancroft McCarthy **HMP Brixton Independent Monitoring Board**; Paul Reynolds **Herne Hill Society**; Hazel Saunders **Lambeth Victim Support**; George Tuson **Streatham Southern Sector Working Group**, Cathy Valentine **Brixton Northern Sector Working Group**; John Wainwright **Clapham Sector Working Group**; David Warner **Brixton Society**; Hazel Watson **Milkwood Road Residents Assoc.** **INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS** Shane Collins, Peter Harris; Lena James; Gill Kenealy, Richard Moore, Fernando Senior, Jane Warwick **STATUTORY MEMBERSHIP: LAMBETH COUNCIL** Cllr. Peter O'Connell, Chris Lee (Asst. CH. Exec), Simon Harding AD CST **METROPOLITAN POLICE SERVICE** Brgh. Cmdr. Martin Bridger, Supt. Stewart Low (Brixton), Supt. Alistair Sutherland (Kennington); Supt. Paul Wilson (Community Partnership), Sgt. Ronnie Whelan **BRITISH TRANSPORT POLICE** Insp. Graham Croucher **SECRETARIAT** Ben McKendrick

Apologies: Paul Andell, PC Graham Allidus, Canon Ivelaw Bowman, Insp. Graham Croucher, Sheila Draper, Maude Estwick, Cllr. Bernard Gentry, Lee Japser, Cllr. Angie Meader, Bushy Kelly, Cllr. Robert S. McConnell, Sally Rance, John Roberts, Cllr. Darren Saunders, Hazel Saunders, David Tomlinson, Arulini Velmurugu, Andrew Viner, Martin Walsh

**Minutes of the Meeting 7
March 2006 and Matters**

1. The Minutes of the Meeting 7 March were accepted with the following amendment: Para 110 to read: *A briefing paper from LBL Housing was also tabled and John Howard and Ram questioned its honesty.*

**Matters Arising from the
Minutes 7 March 2006**

2. Jim Toohill said that he had met with Ram to arrange a prior meeting with CPCG Board members to discuss the issues he would wish to raise at a Special Meeting with Lambeth Council [Minute 6, 07/03/06].

3. Mr Toohill said that he had written to Cllr. Sanders in relation to Stuart Horwood's question about Lambeth Council's liability for drug dealing in Brixton Market, but had yet to receive a reply [Minute 11, 07/03/06].

4. In response to Lloyd Leon concerns about innocent people being stopped and search under Section 44 of the Terrorism Act, Mr Bridger said that after giving statistics on the number of Section 44 stop and searches in Lambeth at a previous Group meeting he had since been told by an MPS Assistant Commissioner that such borough information should not be divulged; for in his view it could give an indication to terrorists as to where activity was taking place [Minute 9, 07/03/06].

5. Ms Tapsell said that Mr Leon's concerns about S.44 were extremely important and the Group's Board needed to think about how it could address the issue, particularly as the legislation used to make the stops was not primarily down to Mr Bridger.

6. In response to Mr Horwood, Mr Bridger said he would provide statistics for the abstraction of officers from Brixton Town Centre to other duties but he questioned where the desire for more statistics and further breakdowns, which created a great demand on the police, would end. Mr Bridger said that he would wish to discuss

***the matter of the demand for
statistics at another time.***

7. In response to Fernando Senior, Mr Bridger said that as a result of a member of the public's complaint to police about two obscene pictures on display at a Brixton art gallery, two police officers suggested to a staff member of the gallery that the pictures should be removed from the window, which he said he would consider. Upon entering the gallery, the police saw paintings depicting police brutality but did not seek any action in respect of them and the paintings were not removed. Mr Bridger added that Sgt. McGarry of Brixton had offered to meet with those with any concerns to explain the police action if necessary [Minute 13 07/03/06]

8. In respect of the Territorial Support Group (TSG) stop and search figures, Supt. Paul Wilson said that at the February Group meeting it had been suggested that Lambeth police could learn something from the TSG 35% hit rate. However, he said the TSG recorded success as being arrests and seizures of cannabis from stop and search activities, whereas Lambeth police success rate was purely arrests from stop and searches. Nevertheless, he added this did not mean that the TSG was not more successful in terms of stop and search arrests, which it was, but the TSG was intelligence led, operating in a particular designated area targeting individuals about which they had information. [Minute 18, 07/03/06]

9. Ms Tapsell suggested the Group perhaps needed to take time to discuss the difference between arrests, charges and seizures and other data provided that would help to give a clearer picture of the stop and search success rate in Lambeth.

10. Mr Toohill said that, from memory, Lambeth MPS had a 15% success rate even when taking into account cannabis confiscations, so that there was still a large gap, compared to the TSG, to be explained. He added that it was important that if the police wanted people's confidence that Stop and Search was doing the job expected of it, Stop Slips, for example, should be issued on all occasions.

11. In response to Neil Flanigan, Mr Bridger said that the Police Performance Assessment Framework was a complex matter which he would not be able to do justice to at the present moment in terms of time. However, he said that it related to confidence, not just in the police but in the Lambeth Partnership and its delivery in terms of crime reduction [Minute 85, 07/03/06].

12. In terms of confidence in the police, Mr Horwood said that in some respects this related to the ease with which police could be contacted. As an example, he gave an account of an incident in Brixton market on 3 April to which police arrived almost 90 minutes after they had been called. Mr Horwood said that this did not inspire confidence.

13. In response, Mr Bridger said that he did not know the context in which the incident Mr Horwood described took place. However, he agreed that it would not appear to instill confidence and that he would look into matter and report back.

Information from the CPCG Board and Members

13. Mr Toohill referred the meeting to the Briefing Paper for April (tabled) for information from the CPCG Board.

15. Anna Tapsell thanked Sue Jacobs, who was moving to another post within CPS, for her strength and innovation in contributing to the work of the Group and the Domestic Violence Forum.

16. Sue Jacobs said that she was disappointed and sad that she would not be able to join the Group on its journey moving forward, and that she had gained a great deal from working in Lambeth, and she wished the Group all the best in the future.

Lambeth Police Report

17. Mr Bridger gave a PowerPoint presentation on Lambeth Police performance since the last Group meeting (attached).

18. Mr Bridger said that at the next Group meeting he would give a breakdown of the Partnership's crime reduction during the last financial year, which he said would be good news for Lambeth and a positive message that he would like to put into the public realm.

19. In response to John Howard, Mr Bridger said that it was the Home Office that devised the gun categories and that he agreed including chemical sprays and air weapons was anomalous and misleading.

20. In relation to an article in the Evening Standard about the MPS's race advisor being stopped 39 times by the police for being black, Mr Bridger said that he was neither aware of the story nor whether the stops had happened in Lambeth. However, he added that he instructed all his officers that stops and searches/accounts should be intelligence led and that there was a complaints process in place.

Lambeth Gun Crime Initiative Consortium (LGCIC)

21. Anna Tapsell thanked Leroy Jackson for his presence and participation at the meeting and expressed the Group's sympathy for the losses and injuries that his family had suffered.

22. Mr Bridger said that since arriving in Lambeth he had placed gun crime as a priority and having conducted a review of the borough's response to gun crime, the police and their partners had engaged with the community to devise a community led initiative.

23. Jan Foreson, Project Manager for the Lambeth gun crime programme gave a PowerPoint presentation on the formation of the LGCIC and its work up to the present time (see attached).

24. Ms Foreson gave an account of one young person who had come into contact with the Youth Offending Team, a 17 year male whose mother was a crack addict, and who had been taken into care at 18 months old. The youth was later placed in over 30 residential care units throughout the country, leading him to being out of school for three years. The youth was first convicted at the age of 12 years, receiving a custodial sentence a year later. Ms Foreson said that this was not an unusual story and there was a need to look at young peoples' lives from even pre-birth to adolescence.

25. Ms Foreson said that LGCIC had developed a gun crime programme for 50 youths identified by the Youth Offending Team, a multi-agency team including the police, probation service and social services. The youths had either been in firearms incidents themselves or had relatives involved in firearms offences.

Further information about young people was received from the police, which involved the sharing of data that had not taken place before.

26. Ms Foreson said that the attendance of young people on the 10 month programme was mandatory, as they would be subject of court orders. She added that the LGCIC would be giving a presentation to magistrates at Balham Youth Court as was it felt important that they should sign up to the programme and support it.

27. In response to Ms Tapsell's question about children's rights and confidentiality in sharing information, Ms Foreson that children's rights had to be respected though in terms of the Crime and Disorder Act there was a requirement to exchange information in the pursuit of crime reduction, and that there was a protocol through which this was done.

28. In response to Ros Munday concerns about time limit on funding, Chris Lee, LBL Asst. Ch. Executive, said that a funding package for at least two years had been put in place with £330,000 per annum from the Neighbourhood Renewal Fund (NRF) and further funding from the Borough Commander's fund. Mr Lee said that he hoped the initiative would be successful and that mainstream funding would assist its continuance when NRF money was no longer available. Mr Lee added that an exit strategy would be produced.

29. In response to Wesley Stephenson, Wayne Rowe said that although he appreciated the issues relating to cross borough work, the gun crime initiative in Lambeth was designed for 50 Lambeth youths identified as in possible danger of becoming involved in serious crime.

30. Lee Parker said that he ran the Intensive Surveillance Supervision Programme (ISSP) part of which was the use of tagging and curfews. When giving its presentation to magistrates, Mr Parker said that the LGCIC would ask that when youngsters were given their 10 month court orders that this would be part of the package. In terms of risk management, Mr Parker said all members of the LGCIC supported good training in terms of the risk of young people with whom they worked.

31. Mr Parker advocated the need to be proactive and not to wait for things to happen first. He commended the LGCIC for the speed that the local authority and voluntary sector had come together. However, he said that it was a new and innovative programme that was not a quick fix and would take time to come to fruition.

32. Leroy Jackson said that the LGCIC was one of the most exciting things so far to happen in Lambeth with community representatives having an equal voice on the LGCIC board. He added that the unity achieved by people putting individuality aside had led to some truly hard work from everyone. He said that he believed in the LGCIC's success in making a change with the backing of the community.

33. In response to a member of the public, Ms Foreson said that there was no intention to criminalize the younger siblings of those known to be involved in criminality but that intelligence had identified some as on the periphery of crime. Work with these youngsters was aimed at preventing them from going through the criminal justice system. Cheryl Sealey added that case studies undertaken demonstrated that early intervention did make a difference.

34. In response to Rod Brown, Jan Foreson said that it was hoped that funding could be secured to evaluate the programme from the outset and that things could be identified and adapted as the programme went along in order to make it more effective.

35. In terms of early intervention, Ms Foreson said that by the time a young person arrives at the door of the Youth Offending Team, it was sometimes too late to make any effective changes because of events that had happened in their lives and therefore it was important to capture and work with youngsters before it reached the crucial stage where a great deal more work was needed.

36. In response to Gill Kenealy, Ms Foreson said that some people underestimated that some youngsters would, given the choice, take the easier route and that the young people causing the most problems in the borough were quite often those not attending voluntary programmes. Ms Foreson added that she believed she had been around long enough to know that young people did respect boundaries and it was time as a community to say enough was enough and draw a line, because at the end of the day parents do not want to be burying their children.

37. In response to Lloyd Leon, Cheryl Sealey said that the LGCIC worked with a specific group of 50 youths but that other youths in difficulties or causing problems could be signposted to other suitable agencies.

38. In response to Ms Tapsell, Chris Lee said that the Council did everything possible to house children and find care for them as close as possible to their original home but trying to find residential and foster care was

very difficult for all local authorities, which sometimes meant not only looking outside of Lambeth but also London. However, he said that the gun crime programme would offer an opportunity to look at the impact on children facing extra special difficulties in terms of their involvement as victims and perpetrators of crime and take it in to account.

39. In terms of what the Council brought to the LGCIC Board, Mr Lee said that in order to add value to its services the Council was integrating its services for children and young people by bringing together the education service and social care services, whose Divisional Director was on the LGCIC Board. Apart from the LGCIC, he said the Council was also looking at how, through its mainstream services, it could serve young people much better. Mr Lee added that the funding for the LGCIC programme was a drop in the ocean compared to the amount of money that the Council and other agencies were spending on young people.

40. Speaking about the young people with whom they were working, Lee Parker said that they were not unique, unusual or unrealistic but just wanted realities, and it was how organizations and individuals made those realities happen for them that mattered. At a consultation exercise on 21 March, he said that some young people spoke of organizations that they felt did not support them as well as they could. Mr Parker said that consultation would continue over three month intervals and he suggested bringing some of young people to a Group meeting.

41. Mr Parker added that some of the young people needed a great deal of support and nurturing to provide them with life skills and helping them

acquire documents such a driving licence or passport that many people took for granted. However, Mr Parker said that some of them aspired to opening their own businesses or wanted support to enter reasonable, achievable education, all of which took time.

42. Abdul Sultan Virani said that he felt confident that the programme would not only help reduce gun crime but other serious crime, petty crimes and anti-social behaviour. He added that he hoped the Council and police would continue to support the programme, the costs of which he said would be more than returned. He asked what criteria, for success, had been set in terms of crime reduction.

43. In response to Mr Virani, Leroy Jackson said that the success of the programme would be highlighted through the monitoring and evaluation that would take place.

In response to Bishop Bancroft McCarthy, Tony Miller said that as a former gang member involved with gun crime it was up to the individual to choose to carry on with a life of crime or turn it around after all the support they would have received.

44. Ms Foreson added that statutory agencies have been working in isolation for far too long and there was now an opportunity for the them to work in collaboration with the community, which should be taking responsibility for the lives of young people,

45. George Tuson said that he wanted to express his shock and horror that a child should be shunted around the country over thirty times where he would have to learn new regimes. Mr Tuson said that such a case warranted publicity to highlight the matter.

46. Anna Tapsell said that Lambeth had failed its children, for which we were all responsible, and the only places that could be found for many children were well outside of London. She added that it was something for us all to think about.

47. In response to Anna Tapsell, Ms Foreson said that one way the commercial world could help young people who had been in trouble was by taking a chance in employing them.

48. In response to Jim Toohill, Mr Parker said that in six month's time, once the programme was up and running, the door would be open to other agencies that could contribute to the process. However, he said it would not have made sense at this point in time, after having gone through a long, hard process to produce a terms of reference and a compact between the voluntary and statutory sectors to be signed, to have opened up the process before it had chance to bed in.

49. Lloyd Leon said that he was proud to have attended the meeting and commended Borough Commander Martin Bridger for his work towards establishing the LGCIC and said that he believed it would be a success.

50. Tony Miller said that it took the community to help the community and the initiative would succeed if it was allowed to succeed. Mr Miller also said that he wished to thank Mr Bridger, not least for delivering what he said he would.

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

6:30 pm Tuesday, 2 May 2006

West Indian Ex-Servicemen's Association, Clapham Manor St

* Minutes in ***bold italic*** indicate action points