LAMBETH SAFER NEIGHBOURHOOD BOARD CONSULTATION – SUMMARY OF RESPONSES BY KEY STAKEHOLDERS, May 2014

Stakeholder Key Comments	Respond?	(1) SNB role (2) Area / Cluster Panels	(3) SNB functions	(4) Membership: Who? How many?	(5) Membership: Associate Members Scheme?	(6) Meetings/Governance	(7) Rights of Audience? Options (a) or (b)	(8) Administration: Tender for 3rd party?
Business Crime Reduction Partnership "It is important that the interests of business are well represented so that we create a thriving business community within Lambeth that helps to create and sustain jobs throughout the borough."	✔	Welcome the Consultation Paper. Welcome the vision and aims of the SNB.	No specific response.	MOPAC have highlighted at 15% of all recorded crime is business related. Therefore propose that Chair and Vice-Chair should represent BCRP on the SNB. Agree a slimline board of up to 20 members, "which should be representative of Business and Local members and de-clutter the representative landscape." Business needs to be "correctly" represented … to build and sustain local jobs and employment."	No specific response.	Agree to four meetings a year. Agree to election of independent Chair.	There needs to be further work with regard to public access at the meetings and our position would be to support a one hour session whereby members of the public can attend in an open and transparent way.	No specific response.
Lambeth Fire Brigade	**No**							
Health & Wellbeing Board [*to be discussed at HWB Chairs in June*]	**No**			Informal indication that HWB is likely to take a seat.				
Independent Advisory Group	✔	"…we are satisfied with the proposal submitted to MOPAC containing the draft terms of reference, the structure and proposed membership of the SNB and we support the current public consultation process…"	No specific response.	"IAG is content to be aligned with the new borough SNB, to be represented on the Board and to provide regular reporting on the work of the IAG and the themes it addresses."	No specific response.	No specific response.	No specific response.	No specific response.
Independent Custody Visitors "[our] response is in agreement with the Lambeth CPCG response previously circulated…" "Lambeth ICV considers the consultation process to be deficient. The various alternatives for the form and function of the SNB are not presented in equal terms…"	✔	As per CPCG's response (see below).	As per CPCG's response (see below).	As per CPCG's response (see below).	As per CPCG's response (see below).	As per CPCG's response (see below).	As per CPCG's response (see below).	As per CPCG's response (see below).

Stakeholder Key Comments	Respond?	(1) SNB role (2) Area / Cluster Panels	(3) SNB functions	(4) Membership: Who? How many?	(5) Membership: Associate Members Scheme?	(6) Meetings/Governance	(7) Rights of Audience? Options (a) or (b)	(8) Administration: Tender for 3rd party?
Lambeth Community Police Consultative Group "The unfettered access for ordinary residents to walk in from the street and present their concerns to senior police officers…has been pivotal in building local confidence in policing. The grudging granting of limited 'audience' is no substitute. Nor can the Safer Neighbourhood Panels fulfil this role. They are restricted to addressing very local issues and are far from accessible…" "CPCG is disappointed that the Co-Chairs of the SNB Working Group were not able to show greater persistence in seeking some compromise proposal…"	✔	*SNB role*: Reject ToR (1), (2) and (3) and propose re-writes. In particular, propose that the overarching role of the SNB is to, "promote and secure policing by consent in Lambeth." *Area Panels*: "It is rash…to include any role for as yet non-existent 'Area Panels' and they should not be incorporated into any borough wide engagement arrangements unless and until they are up and running and have proven their worth." "…in no circumstance should they operate through closed or secret meetings, they should accept the same obligation for publication of papers as the SNB…and the organising and managing of the Panels should be the responsibility of the community members, not the Cluster Inspectors."	*Policing Priorities*: "…local SNP priorities tend to exclude the most violent crimes in the borough … restricting the borough's priorities only to those crime types identified by the SNPs would fail to encompass some of the most serious crime issues facing the borough." *Oversight and/or support of community groups*: reject disparity of treatment between *'fairness'* groupings – IAG, SSMG, ICV – and *'effectiveness'* groupings – SNPs, NW, BCRP – whereby there is 'oversight' for the former and 'support' for the latter. All groups should be 'supported' and groups required to report should be in membership. *Additional functions*: "the SNB needs to be responding outwards to the community … the SNB must build and maintain an up to date web presence…together with a mailing list onto which anyone can enrol themselves…"	ICV and SSMG should have seats. Fire Service and Neighbourhood Watch should lose seats if there is a concern about total numbers exceeding 20 once 6 'associate' members have been added (see right).	"…accountability is to be blunted by the fact that the over-whelming majority of 'approved' community organisations proposed to be represented on the SNB are sponsored, gate-kept of managed by either the police or local authority. "…the SNB needs to reach beyond the usual suspects amongst the well connected…" Propose an associate membership scheme, "open to anyone who lives, works or studies and also to any community organisation…" 6 seats allocated to the associate membership: 3 individuals, 3 organisations. "We do not consider that the two seats allocated to CPCG are an adequate provision for this constituency."	Generally supportive. "Agendas, minutes and papers should be circulated to the mainling list [*see 'additional functions, left*] a week ahead of the meetings and not just to 'stakeholders'."	"The either/or choice presented in the consultation paper…is a false one…" Propose adoption of public access model implemented by NHS Clinical Commissioning Group; ie. "An hour is allocated prior to each meeting for a public forum. There is no requirement forprior notice of questions or comments. At the start of the forum the Chair asks thosepresent to indicate and to state whether their comment/question relates to the Agenda or ismore general. Agenda related contributions are dealt with first. Responses may becommitments to follow up actions. "At the start of the meeting proper, the Chair summarises what has transpired in the premeetingforum and that is minuted. During the meeting, after discussion of each item byBoard members the Chair (time permitting) can ask if there are any contributions from thefloor before moving to a decision on the item." "If it cannot be contained within the time constraints of the meeting schedule, then the SNB should schedule separate publically accessible forums , where members of the public can address senior officers in the police and the local authority on borough wide issues."	No specific response.

Stakeholder Key Comments	Respond?	(1) SNB role (2) Area / Cluster Panels	(3) SNB functions	(4) Membership: Who? How many?	(5) Membership: Associate Members Scheme?	(6) Meetings/Governance	(7) Rights of Audience? Options (a) or (b)	(8) Administration: Tender for 3rd party?
Lambeth Victim Support	✔	*SNB role*: Agree the ToR contain the correct role. Suggest an additional principle added to 2.7 re. residents and communities who are victims of crime being able to raise their concerns. Suggest SNB members should sit on other multi-agency and partnership meetings to build relationships. And also need to reach out within their own constituencies of expertise. SNB needs a specific strategy to engage with young people. *Area Panels*: Think 3 area panels is about right, though may need to be reviewed if becomes clear that the number of wards acts as a barrier to the bottom-up approach. Victims need to be represented on the Area Panels and suggest the VS Service Delivery Manager should attend them.	"Function 5: Monitoring complains from victims of crime – In delivering this function we propose that … Victim Support provides additional data for victim complaints that may not be 'officially' made…we propose that these are reviewed at the SNB to ensure that they are not getting overlooked and we are getting a true picture of the issues facing victims in Lambeth … In addition to monitoring complaints from victims of crime in Lambeth that we also look at initiatives to reduce them." Agree that additional 'networking' functions in 3.2 should be added to the core functions.	Agree slimline membership of up to 20. Councillor representation is better undertaken at the Area Panel level. "…we propose that Lambeth's Hate Crime Co-ordinator could be an effective link between some of the issues facing these key communities of interest and the SNB." "We propose that more local organisations that represent key communities of interest can represent at cluster and ward levels."	"We propose that CPCG has two seats on the board and elects its members at the groups AGM. The CPCG is a well established group within the borough, has a membership from the local community already and has an understanding of the crime and policing issues that face Lambeth."	Agree with ToR for meetings and governance. "…we would highlight the importance of victim data being confidential and although the function of the board is not to deal with specific, individual complaints this must be managed closely."	Support option A (pre-meet Public Forum). "We feel that option B may not allow for an effective meeting."	Agree with the proposal to tender for 3rd party admin of the SNB.
Lambeth Youth Council "The relationship between the young people of Lambeth and the Police is a very complicated one. We often see many problems arising between the two groups. This has raised many concerns within the community. The Lambeth Youth Council believe that the creation of this Safer Neighbourhood Board will be the first step into solving some of these problems."	✔	*SNB role*: "The Youth Council sees this board as an opportunity for young people to voice their opinions about issues between the police and themselves…" "Many boards and committees have been created in the past to review the work of the police, but there has not been any real change. I am aware that this board will be new and fresh but is it certain that any of the problems that will be raised can get solved. Hopefully this can be an opportunity for the council to listen to young people like myself and solve some if the issues we have to face with the police." *Area Panels*: No specific response.	"We discussed how the board could engage and affect young people, this raised the question; should there be a separate board for young people? … Most felt there should not be a separate board for young people due to funding and costs, but also because they felt the whole community should share their problems on the same level." Concern about what powers the Board has to actually achieve things: "We do not want to be working hard to find problems but left without these problems solved."	Think that the proposed membership is OK, but their key concern is that a single youth 'voice' may not be enough: "we believe there should be a larger youth representation." However, appreciate the 'bottom-up' structure for engagement and believe that representation of young people "should start from the ward groups up."	No specific response.	No specific response.	No specific response.	Need for appropriate support for the youth member: "Through this board we believe we can improve the way that standing issues are being dealt with. For this to happen we will need the full support of Lambeth Council and surrounding agencies helping the board."

Stakeholder Key Comments	Respond?	(1) SNB role (2) Area / Cluster Panels	(3) SNB functions	(4) Membership: Who? How many?	(5) Membership: Associate Members Scheme?	(6) Meetings/Governance	(7) Rights of Audience? Options (a) or (b)	(8) Administration: Tender for 3rd party?
Neighbourhood Watch Association	✔	*SNB role*: Agree ToR for engagement structure and role. Ward panels are "the key element" for the new engagement model. An agreed meetings cycle will be necessary to avoid diary conflicts between ward and cluster meetings. *Area Panels*: Area Panels should consist of SNP Chairs and ward cllrs. Area Panels open to the public (though possibly in restricted terms as under 5.3(a) for the Board). Area Panels to act as a clearing house for issues raised at ward level. Probably better for them to be chaired by an elected ward chair rather than Cluster Inspector.	Think the 10 core functions are correct. The additional networking functions should not be added immediately as the basic model needs to be given opportunity to be used and tested.	Agree with slimline membership and the representation proposed. Disagree with additional councillor representation, though perhaps their non-voting attendance could be encouraged.	Disagree with an associate membership scheme.	Agree with ToR for meetings and governance.	"We believe option A is the better format. This allows public participation, but also gives the board an opportunity to complete their remit within what will always be a limited time frame."	No specific response.
Lambeth Probation	**No** [*Possible later response*]			[Note: changes to the probation service in Lambeth since April 2013 have divided the service between a Community Rehabilitation Company (medium and low risk offenders) and the National Probation Service (high risk offenders). In other boroughs the CRC is attending the SNB due to role in Community Payback.]				

Stakeholder / Key Comments	Respond?	(1) SNB role / (2) Area / Cluster Panels	(3) SNB functions	(4) Membership: Who? How many?	(5) Membership: Associate Members Scheme?	(6) Meetings/Governance	(7) Rights of Audience? Options (a) or (b)	(8) Administration: Tender for 3rd party?
Safer Neighbourhood Panel Chairs	**No** [these comments based on response to v7 of the Consult. Paper 4/3/14]	*SNB role*: Agree by inference. Engagement model should not be written into the ToR. *Area Panels*: Only just coming into operation, so little practical experience of them yet.	Agree core functions. Reject proposal 3.2(b) for an engagement network.	Agree with slimline membership. Reject seats for Probation and Fire, these orgs to be attendees. Reject councillor membership beyond the Cabinet Member. Reject "concept of membership by issue." Reject IAG seat as "conflicts of interest" would result. 1 seat on the Board rather than 2 for CPCG and account made in ToR for CPCG's new status after Apr 1st.	Reject as this would "defeat the objective of the pyramid structure prescribed by MOPAC." Will not participate in a Board with members elected by an 'associate' scheme.	Agree by inference.	Reject option (b) and will not participate in a Board which permits public participation according to option (b). The procedure for option (a) needs to be "rigorously disciplined" and ToR should contain a clause re. adjournment in the case of public disorder.	Agree. Note that the ward Panels are in need of assistance and this should be recognised in the ToR.
Stop and Search Monitoring Group	**No**							
Tenants Council Executive	**No**							
Young Lambeth Coop	✔	*SNB role*: Strongly support an SNB role around youth issues and engagement. Agree the elected Youth Council is the appropriate vehicle to secure youth representation on the Board. Support the 'bottom-up' engagement model: the ward panels are where youth representation and engagement for policing should start – they see revitalised ward panels as the key to future youth engagement. *Area Panels*: Should be youth representation at these meetings.	No specific response.	Share concern of Youth Council about youth rep. being a lone and tokenistic voice. Can youth representation be strengthened?	No specific response.	No specific response.	No specific response.	Additional support for the youth rep(s) on the Board so they can contribute effectively will be essential.

LAMBETH SAFER NEIGHBOURHOOD BOARD CONSULTATION – SUMMARY OF ONLINE RESPONSES BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC, May 2014

	Are there other issues the SNB should be considering?	Are there other ways you would like to be involved in decisions about crime and policing?	Are these the right members of the Safer Neighbourhood Board? Are there other people or groups who should be represented?	Is three years the right length of time for independent member to serve on the Board?	Do you think these are suitable working arrangements for the board, or is there something else you would like to see?
RESPONDENT 1	V7=I hope that the SNB would takes the opportunity to engage with the existing Safer Neighbourhood panels to benefit from their many years of experience engaging with local residents. In setting the priorities for the police they should also consider setting priorities and performance evaluation of the council agencies tasked with community safety and in dealing with anti-social behaviour. Local residents and businesses have consistently called for higher viability Policing on the streets, and pro-active action by the council against perpetrators of ASB, particularly of council tenants. There needs to be much more done to tackle drug related crime, targeting drug addicts who are typically repeat offenders, and much more use of the under utilized existing powers of ASBO and eviction or tenancy enforcement action. The public know the council need, and could do far more to help with crime prevention.	V10=I would like to see a group formed who could consult with council departments and hold them to account. The Police are accountable to the public but it appears the council is not.	V15=Borough businesses should have an input.	V16=2 (About right)	V19=If the meetings are held in a public forum you run the risk of them descending into chaos as is often the case with the CPCG public meetings.
RESPONDENT 2	V7=Overseeing the operation and reliability of on street CCTV cameras (which are sometimes defective without explanation or even generally being known)	V10=happy at any time to take part in on line polling	V15=perhaps representatives of local schools, residents and religious groups though I'm not certain on this. The list above seems pretty broad though.	V16=2 (About right)	V19=it is important that the chair has the confidence of the entire board so perhaps better to be either elected by entire board or some other way of ensuring broad support
RESPONDENT 3	V7=1) Ensuring that all those on the electoral register and all local businesses know how and to whom to report crime (e.g. include details in every issue of Lambeth Talk) 2) Ensure that all those on the electrical register and all local businesses know how to protect themselves and their property (e.g regular articles in Lambeth Talk including links to information websites 3) Ensure that reported crime and incident patterns are regularly reported to residents, summaryreports in Lambeth Talk with details of websites for more details 4) Ensure that all residents has opportunities to meet/contact those responsible for policing their street: e.g. well publicised quarterly ward meetings, websites, e-mail addresses and phone numbers 5) Ensure that prospective offenders (including prospective repeat offenders) are taken off the streets into sports, social, educational and legitimate revenue earning activities.	V10=We have not had a meeting with our neighbour police team since the last but one community policing initiative, several years ago, before the London riots shook confidence in the ability of the police to protect the community. That confidence will not be restored unless and until my neighbours have the opportunity of regular and well publicised meetings with police officers and others who have the authority to take relevant decisions, collect resident's views and/or receive crime reports. I regularly served on community policing groups before moving to Lambeth but would be frightened to stick my head above the parapet in an area where three people have been shot dead with a half mile radius, one outside our house and (have watched late night drug dealing between the occupants of parked cars from my bedroom window.	V15=Who are the police consultative group and the Independent Advisory Group? What do they do that is different to the SNB. Should the Youth Council representative be replaced by representatives from the main youth groups (scouts, cadets, faith groups) or do these elect the Youth Council? In any case there should be at least four representatives from the 16 - 24 age group: 50:50 male/female including at least two from organised youth groups, at least one from an offender rehabilitation programme and at least one born in the borough. The six chairs from the SNPs should be joined by a least six elected representatives from different age groups and social backgrounds. It should be [possible for these to be re-elected to provide more democratic accountability over time.	V16=2 (About right)	V19=A quarterly report to be carried in Lambeth Talk or in the South London Press and other community newspapers and/or websites when council run newspapers are abolished as anti-competitive.
RESPONDENT 4	V7=Lambeth Hate Crime Action Plan - Prevention, Victim Support, Operational Response and additional activities to enhance community cohession and encourage local	V10=I would like to see greater use of social networking to help the public connect and engage with what is going on.	V15=Lambeth Hate Crime Coordinator should attend the meetings in an advisory capacity at least.	V16=2 (About right)	V19=Seems fine

	Are there other issues the SNB should be considering?	Are there other ways you would like to be involved in decisions about crime and policing?	Are these the right members of the Safer Neighbourhood Board? Are there other people or groups who should be represented?	Is three years the right length of time for independent member to serve on the Board?	Do you think these are suitable working arrangements for the board, or is there something else you would like to see?
	people to work more closely together to address any community tensions.				
RESPONDENT 5	V7=No	V10=no	V15=Yes	V16=2 (About right)	V19=Yes
RESPONDENT 6	V7=Mental health, police youth engagement, engagement with faith and race groups.	V10=Safer neighbourhood forums need to be renamed as such, rather than 'panels'. Meetings need to be quarterly, advertised widely in advance, be publically accessible and open and transparent in how they work. These can be effective local mechanisms for engagement, problem recognition and solution seeking and the essential frontline interface between local communities and the statutory services of police and community safety		V16=2 (About right)	V19=Yes
RESPONDENT 7	I am concerned that little effort is being made to engage with the majority of the borough's residents in the policing of the borough.	I feel very strongly that there should be a forum which is accessible to any resident, provided that he can show that he has the support of, say, 6 other residents, where he can publicly raise his concerns and have them answered by the Borough Commander or his deputy.

At the moment, the moment CPCG, at its monthly meetings, provides such a forum; Ward Safer Neighbourhood Panels do not. Very frequently the date and venue of their meetings is not publicised on the MPS web page, and Panel Chairs do not provide a contact email address or telephone number. The result of this is that and in most wards it is only possible to obtain this information through their Safer Neighbourhood Team. This system is not working: in one case a resident has been trying to obtain this information for 18 months, and, despite numerous requests to the Team, has not been able to obtain this information. This needs to be remedied. | It is generally agreed that the best policing is by consent. This would suggest that the residents of the borough should be involved in the policing process to as great an extent as is possible. The structure set out in the Consultation Document appears to be seriously defective in this regard. A large proportion of the suggested membership of the Safer Neighbourhood Board consists of functionaries, not residents; and Safer Neighbourhood Panel representation is third tier – not selected by the generality of Ward SNP members, but chosen by the Chairs of the different Area Panels.

Perhaps the Independent Advisory Panel needs to be expanded to be more representative and to include representation from established community organisations that have a large membership. It is most important that the Council and Police should be aware of deeply felt concerns of residents, if they are not to be surprised by rioting or other civil disorder. The CPCG, although often unmanagable, was generally good at indicating this. | | Another problem with Safer Neighbourhood Panels is that they were established to set the policing priorities for the ward's Safer Neighbourhood Team, and are really only effective in dealing with minor crime in the neighbourhood where that Team operates. They do not attempt, nor are they equipped, to deal with borough wide issues, or, the occasional case of abuse of police powers. I believe that the Safer Neighbourhood Board needs to have that capacity, and to be pro-active in seeking accountability.

…, I have serious concerns about transparency. I believe that, except in exceptional circumstances, where confidentiality is obviously necessary, all Safer Neighbourhood Board meetings should be held in public, and the papers relating to all meetings should be freely available to the public on the web.

Otherwise, I feel that the paper is a move in the right direction, and, no doubt, adjustments will be made in the course of time, as circumstances demand. |