

Lambeth Safer Neighbourhood Board

CPCG Comments on Terms of Reference v3

Introduction

This short note is in response to emails from Natasha Plummer (14 Aug and 8 Sept) together with Alistair Reid's notes of the 31 July Meeting and ToR v3.

In respect of Natasha's emails, key points are:

1. Whilst we are keen to have this matter resolved quickly, and we certainly don't want to have to delay our AGM by months for the second year running to accommodate the SNB developments, we're not clear that setting an arbitrary date of September end is realistic. For our part we would wish to take whatever proposals finally emerge to our AGM in December and so see that the backstop.
2. We have circulated our correspondence with the SNP SPOC in respect of our invitation to meet with the SNP Chairs.
3. Our understanding is that it has been agreed at more than one meeting of the working group that a simple tender should be used to commission administrative support for the SNB.
4. We agree that whatever ToRs are agreed for the SNB, these should not be considered to be set in stone and it would be sensible to review and revisit after a suitable interval. However, this should not be a basis for avoiding confronting the more difficult or contentious issues now. Whilst to do so may progress matters in the short term it is likely to render the SNB unstable and unsustainable in the longer term. In particular we cannot accept the notion that key aspects of the ToR should be left to SNB to develop as it goes along.

In respect of the meeting notes and the Revised ToR's:

1. Generally, at the last Extended Group Meeting, a number of specific points were raised by those attending - by ourselves in writing. In the ensuing discussion, we (SNP reps excepted) appeared to have reached a consensus on a number of points but this has not been reflected in the revised draft ToRs.
2. Two examples will suffice: the meeting was in agreement that the BCRP should have two voting members, this is not reflected in the ToR. Likewise the meeting appeared to agree that the anomalous treatment of the relationship with the Stop and Search Monitoring Group, compared with other community groups, was a drafting glitch but this has not been reflected in the ToR.
3. This also holds for the discussion relating to the designation of the SNPs as a gateway for engagement. This is included in the notes but not reflected in the draft ToR's.
4. For that reason, we set out again below (as an Appendix) our comments on the ToR, most of which we felt had been resolved at the July meeting of the Extended Working Group but

which have not been reflected in the revised ToR. It may be that this can only be resolved by thrashing out the drafting in a working meeting, tedious though the prospect is.

5. It is the case however that there was not an agreement regarding the broader community membership at the Extended Working Group meeting in July. The principle was acknowledged but various options discussed for the scale of that representation and the manner of its recruitment. We have given the matter careful consideration and, in order to progress matters, make the following proposal.
6. That there should be six such members and that they be elected by some open and transparent process at a borough crime summit held when the SNB has had a chance to demonstrate its working, in the winter of 2015/16 say. In the interim, CPCG shall provide 6 members who shall be elected at our next AGM which we would hope to hold in December of this year. Membership of CPCG is open to anyone who lives, works or studies in Lambeth.
7. Likewise, there was not agreement on what the relationship should be between the formal, quarterly SNB meetings and quarterly CPCG meetings which we shall continue hold. Below we reiterate our proposal that there should be a formal link, but will be happy to discuss issues of frequency and of potential transition to a more permanent arrangement.

CPCG

September 2014.

APPENDIX

Function 1	<p>The EWG meeting on the 10th agreed that SNB should be unconstrained in setting priorities whilst mindful of priority frameworks already set elsewhere (by the Mayor and the SLP). The wording here is more ambiguous. Suggested amendments:</p> <p>4 (1), 2nd para – change ‘by having regard to’ to ‘whilst having regard to’.</p> <p>Add 4 (1) (d) Such other priorities as the Board may identify and determine, which may be outwith the SLP, the Ward Panels or the Mayor’s pan-London priority set.</p>
Function 2	<p>Quarterly crime reporting is a considerably poorer service than the erstwhile monthly statistical reporting which Lambeth enjoyed. The format which has so far been floated (based we understand on a format in Lewisham) is minimal and in particular is poor in allowing trends to be discerned. Suggested amendment.</p> <p>‘To agree a crime reporting format with Lambeth MPS which will be published monthly (on the web) and reviewed quarterly.’</p> <p>In respect of the Strategic Assessment, the inference is that the SNB will comment <i>post hoc</i>. Suggested amendment:</p>

	<p>' The Board will be consulted on the preparation of the Annual Strategic Assessment of crime and disorder and shall ensure that that there is effective community input into setting annual priorities.'</p> <p>[see also Annual Crime Summit below]</p>
Function 3	<p>The wording here appears to be drifting back to the notion of the Ward Panels being per force an exclusive entry point into the engagement process, effectively acting as filters. This was eschewed by the 10 June meeting. Suggested amendment:</p> <p>Reword "basic entry or 'gateway' " to 'entry point for ward level engagement'</p>
Function 9	<p>As agreed at 10 June meeting, SNB relationship with community groups is one of support. Amend to 'Support the delivery of the Stop and Search Monitoring Function'.</p>
Membership 6	<p>In respect of '2 Members to be nominated by Lambeth Community Police Consultative Group':</p> <p>Our argument around the need for the widest possible access to the SNB has been set out in our earlier papers – they centre on representation, accessibility, independence and accountability.</p> <p>We have argued for 6 individuals, who may be representative of community organisations, drawn by some democratic from those who live, work, or study in the borough but do not necessarily have some predefined relationship with policing and community safety (as with eg Victim Support, ICVs etc).</p> <p>It should be noted that the suggestion of places specific to CPCG has not originated from CPCG nor been part of any of our documents. Rather we have argued that there should be a registered, associate membership for the SNB from which these 6 members should be elected.</p> <p>The Extended Working Group has not felt able to countenance a registered, associate, however, but has not proposed an alternative mechanism. In the absence of any open, accessible and democratic mechanism within the SNB, CPCG can provide this membership on the basis that there is a commitment in the ToR to the Board agreeing such a mechanism within a reasonable time scale.</p> <p>Additional Clause:</p> <p>The SNB shall satisfy itself, and give account in its Annual Reporting, that all Independent Members are nominated by open, accessible and democratic processes.</p>

<p>Meetings – Public Access</p>	<p>The constraints set around the format for the SNB meetings appear far more proscriptive than were agreed at the 10 June meeting. Whilst the terms should aim to ensure that the SNB gets through its business within the time allotted and that individuals get their questions and comments answered, overly restrictive prescriptions are likely to be counter-productive.</p> <p>We suggest that</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Public Forum Prior to each meeting of the Board, a Public Forum, generally lasting for an hour, will be held at which members of the public may ask questions of any member of the Board and in relation to any of the functions of the Board. 2. The public shall be advised that they are more likely to get a comprehensive answer to their question if they make it in advance of the meeting, but shall not be excluded from putting their question if they have not. 3. The Chair will give a brief summary of key points from the Forum at the start of the meeting proper, and that shall be minuted – in particular, any undertakings given. 4. Public participation in discussions of the Board Following discussion of each item of the Board’s agenda, and prior to moving to a decision (if necessary) on that item, the Chair may request if there are any contributions in relation to that item from members of the public in attendance. <p>Add.</p> <p>In all matters relating to both the Forum and the Meeting proper, the Chair’s shall exercise discretion to strike a reasonable balance between being open and accessible to the public whilst ensuring that the Board concludes its business. The Chair’s decisions shall be final.</p> <p>Add</p> <p>Additional Events</p> <p>The Board shall hold, or commission, additional quarterly forums which shall have open access and be set around particular themes of concern within the community. These will be timed to fall between formal meetings of the Board and shall be attended by the Borough Commander, the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods, the Assistant Director for Community Safety and the Chair of the SNB. These forums shall ensure a wider and richer participation in the engagement process.</p> <p>The Board will coordinate, and its members contribute to, the holding of an annual crime summit which shall encourage</p>

	<p>wide participation from across the borough. The summit should be timed to synchronise with the SLP's preparation of its Strategic Assessment and priority setting and likewise MOPAC's production of its Police and Crime Plans.</p> <p><i>Drafting Note: para 23. Use of 'in camera' implies non-reporting of proceedings. Amend to 'continue the meeting with only Board members present'.</i></p>
<p>Communication/Administration</p>	<p>The mailing list should be open to self-enrollment.</p> <p>There should be a clear commitment to maintain a website.</p> <p>The arrangement with an independent third party should be arrived at by a simple tender.</p> <p>We suggest it is ill-advised for the SNB to entrust a Treasury function to the same body as it is commissioning to undertake administrative duties.</p>