



London Borough of Hackney  
Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission  
Municipal Year 2022/23  
Monday 23 January 2023

Minutes of the proceedings of  
the Living in Hackney Scrutiny  
Commission held at  
Hackney Town Hall, Mare  
Street, London E8 1EA

---

<b>Chair:</b>	<b>Councillor Soraya Adejare</b>
<b>Councillors in Attendance:</b>	<b>Cllr Clare Joseph (Vice-Chair), Cllr Joseph Ogundemuren, Cllr Sarah Young and Cllr Zoe Garbett</b>
<b>Councillors in Virtual Attendance:</b>	<b>Cllr Ian Rathbone, Cllr Penny Wrout</b>
<b>Apologies:</b>	<b>Cllr M Can Ozsen, Cllr Ian Rathbone, Cllr Penny Wrout, Cllr Sam Pallis and Cllr Ali Sadek</b>
<b>Officers In Attendance:</b>	<b>Andrew Trathen (Public Health Consultant) and Simon Young (Health Systems Coordinator)</b>
<b>Officers in Virtual Attendance:</b>	<b>Chris Lovitt (Deputy Director of Public Health)</b>
<b>Other People in Attendance:</b>	<b>Councillor Susan Fajana Thomas (Cabinet Member for Community Safety and Regulatory Services, Borough Commander James Conway (Central East Borough Command Unit, Metropolitan Police), Chief Inspector Sean Lyons (Central East Borough Command Unit, Metropolitan Police), Detective Superintendent Dan Rutland (Central East Borough Command Unit, Metropolitan Police) and Peter Merrifield (Chief Executive, Support When It Matters)</b>
<b>Other People in Virtual Attendance:</b>	<b>Eoin Bolger (Head of Regional Operations, Turning Point), Piers Adamson (Senior Operations Manager - City &amp; Hackney, Turning Point), Cllr Ben Hayhurst (Chair, Health in Hackney Scrutiny Commission), Cllr Sophie Conway (Chair, Children and Young People Scrutiny Commission) and Cllrs Kam Adams and Sharon Patrick (Health in Hackney Scrutiny Commission)</b>
<b>Officer Contact:</b>	<b>Craig Player</b>  020 8356 4316  <a href="mailto:craig.player@hackney.gov.uk">craig.player@hackney.gov.uk</a>

## **1 Apologies for Absence**

1.1 The Chair updated those in attendance on the meeting etiquette and that the meeting was being recorded and livestreamed.

1.2 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Ozsen and Sadek.

1.3 Councillors Rathbone and Wrout were in virtual attendance.

## **2 Urgent Items / Order of Business**

2.1 There were no urgent items, and the order of business was as set out in the agenda.

## **3 Declaration of Interest**

3.1 There were no declarations of interest.

## **4 Policing of Drug Use**

4.1 The Chair opened the discussion by explaining that the item had been requested as the Commission was keen to hear about the local approach to policing drug use as part of its continued work on trust and confidence and inclusive policing.

4.2 The Commission saw the discussion as timely given that Hackney had been involved in the ADDER Accelerator programme of work which had impacted on the policing of drug use and the pathways that exist between the criminal justice system and community substance use treatment.

4.3 It was also seen as timely given the Government's white paper on tougher consequences for the possession of drugs, which if successful and became law carried the risk of further marginalising vulnerable residents and the over policing of vulnerable communities.

4.4 N.B. Additional presentation slides on nitrous oxide and the night time economy were tabled at the meeting and included within the minutes pack.

### 4.5 Representing London Borough of Hackney

- Cllr Susan Fajana Thomas, Cabinet Member for Community Safety and Regulatory Services
- Chris Lovitt, Deputy Director of Public Health, City of London & London Borough of Hackney
- Andrew Trathen, Public Health Consultant
- Simon Young, Health Systems Coordinator

### 4.6 Representing Metropolitan Police Central East Borough Command Unit (CE BCU)

- Borough Commander James Conway
- Detective Superintendent Dan Rutland
- Detective Chief Inspector Jason Lyons

### 4.7 Representing Turning Point

- Eoin Bolger, Head of Regional Operations

- Piers Adamson, Senior Operations Manager (City & Hackney)

#### 4.8 Representing Support When It Matters (SWIM)

- Peter Merrifield, Chief Executive

4.9 The Chair invited the Detective Chief Inspector, CE BCU to give a short verbal presentation to supplement the written evidence included within the agenda papers. The main points are highlighted below.

4.10 Project ADDER was a government funded programme which provided additional resources for the police to tackle the supply of drugs, whilst also supporting treatment and recovery plans to cut drug-related crime along with the cycle of misuse and offending.

4.11 The programme was expanded to CE BCU in April 2021. It led to a new approach to tackling drug misuse which combines increased productivity with enhanced treatment and recovery services, bringing together partners including the police, local authorities and health services.

4.12 An ADDER Delivery Group had been established to drive activity across the partnership and ensure shared learning, capacity, intelligence and creativity, and a Police Accelerator Delivery Group also met monthly to drive activity and share ideas and learning with the respective teams across CE BCU covering Hackney and Tower Hamlets.

4.13 An overarching CE BCU Strategy Group chaired by the CE BCU Commander met quarterly to ensure synergy across both local authority areas, and a CE BCU Performance Group met monthly to ensure delivery against the monitoring and evaluation framework set by the Home Office and Office for Health Improvement and Disparities Project ADDER Programme Teams.

4.14 Drugs supply was a driver of violence and a growing enabler of enforcement. The programme therefore focused on the middle market space (Organised Crime Networks and gangs) to increase its reach and impact, and on improving processes/capability/coordination to improve outputs from existing operational teams.

4.15 It also focused on developing pathways into treatment, for example by strengthening Drug Testing on Arrest and widening the use of Out of Court Dispersals into treatment, early intervention and education.

4.16 CE BCU and the local authorities had worked together to develop a greater understanding of the relationship between drugs and violence across Hackney and Tower Hamlets, which it hoped would support appropriate action across the partnership.

4.17 Pan London learning was undertaken and shared across the Metropolitan Police Drugs Board, London Drugs Forum and Drugs Focus Desks to drive understanding of best practice and improve outcomes. The ADDER programme had also been expanded into Lambeth, Southwark/Camden and Islington.

4.18 The ADDER programme had been extended in CE BCU until 2025 at least, with significant investment secured across CE BCU and the local authorities. The

programme would continue to see a strengthening of partnership work which would now fall under the Combating Drugs Partnership.

4.19 The Chair invited the Public Health Consultant and Health Systems Coordinator, Hackney Council to give a short verbal presentation to supplement the written evidence included within the agenda papers. The main points are highlighted below.

4.20 Drug use was harmful to population health, and impactful to communities as a driver of crime. After a decade of divestment from drug treatment and recovery services, drug related deaths had increased both nationwide and in Hackney.

4.21 In 2021 central government released its ten year drug strategy, which focused on three strategic priorities - breaking drug supply chains, delivering world-class treatment and recovery services and achieving a shift in the demand for recreational drugs.

4.22 Social problems often create the conditions in which drug use is more likely, and drug-related deaths and harm were therefore seen as preventable. The public health approach involved creating healthier environments - from dealing with a crisis to preventing problematic use in the first place.

4.23 There were concerns amongst public health professionals around the government's white paper on tougher consequences for the possession of drugs and the impact that such an approach may have on vulnerable communities and existing health inequalities.

4.24 16,455 individuals in Hackney aged between 16 and 59 years old were estimated to have used some kind of drug in the year ending June 2022, and 5535 of these were aged between 16 and 24 years old.

4.25 4650 individuals aged between 16 and 59 years old were frequent drug users (individuals who use drugs more than once per month), 1399 of which were aged between 16 and 24 years old.

4.26 The Council commissioned a suite of services to help meet the needs of residents using drugs as effectively as possible. The main service commissioned was the Hackney Recovery Service, a multidisciplinary team operated by Turning Point.

4.27 Within this service, residents received psychosocial support in order to help them move away from harmful drug usage, as well as pharmacological intervention where necessary or helpful.

4.28 The Hackney Recovery Centre currently worked with around 25% of the number of individuals who used drugs frequently in the borough, so there was clearly some unmet need. Outreach work had therefore been increased, with Turning Point reaching around 100 additional vulnerable residents per month.

4.29 As part of the ADDER programme the Council had worked closely with the police to develop ways of working to more effectively reduce the risks of drug use, such as by utilising Out of Court Dispersals, Merlin reports of vulnerability and Drug Testing on Arrest/Required Assessments.

4.30 As a result, there had been an increase in individuals presenting to drug treatment and recovery services, an increase in individuals engaging with services throughout their treatment and recovery and a decrease in individuals leaving services in a negative fashion - all of which indicated individuals were getting the support they needed.

4.31 The Council also commissioned St Giles Trust to deliver peer led employment support for individuals who use drugs, and Support When It Matters (SWIM) to deliver bespoke interventions to individuals who identify as Black, offering a specific programme of support aimed at older Black men who use drugs.

4.32 The Chair then invited the Chief Executive, SWIM to give a short verbal presentation to supplement the written evidence included within the agenda papers. The main points are highlighted below.

4.33 SWIM had been commissioned to provide a culturally informed programme for older Black men who use drugs. These were men who were reluctant to engage with services and perceived support as ineffective and culturally uninformed.

4.34 It offered a ten-week programme of culturally informed 1:1 and group interventions for clients to stabilise housing, relationships, finances and health. This gave individuals the confidence to engage with other services, decreased the likelihood of reoffending and anti-social behaviour and moved individuals away from drug and alcohol misuse.

#### Questions, Answers and Discussion

4.35 *A Commission Member expressed concern about the government's white paper on tougher consequences for the possession of drugs, which was felt to be in contrast to the approach being taken locally.*

4.36 It was asked whether the two could coexist, and what the likely impact would be should it become law.

4.37 The Detective Chief Inspector, CE BCU responded by explaining that the white paper was focused more on recreational drug use and the night time economy and, should it become law, would not detract from the work being done under Project ADDER.

4.38 The Borough Commander, CE BCU added that the police decided how law was implemented locally, allowing it to respond to local operational and community needs. He confirmed that the CE BCU was committed to the approach being undertaken through Project ADDER.

4.39 The Cabinet Member for Community Safety and Regulatory Services added that one of the strategic priorities of the Community Safety Partnership had been to tackle street based drug markets and substance misuse.

4.40 Its focus had been to reduce the demand and availability of drugs and associated harm, crime and anti-social behaviour, as well as to support drug users into effective treatment and outreach services.

4.41 *The Chair of the Health in Hackney Scrutiny Commission asked what commissioned substance misuse services such as Turning Point were focusing their limited resources on and how increased funding may benefit them.*

4.42 The Head of Regional Operations, Turning Point explained that substance misuse services had experienced severe austerity over the last decade, and that there was considerable evidence to suggest that this austerity caused significant challenges elsewhere, such as in criminal justice, public health and adult social care.

4.43 Much of the focus of its resources was on workforce recruitment and retention. It was hoped that increasing workforce capacity and pay would not only benefit employees and thus increase output, but would also make the service user experience better.

4.44 Recruiting and retaining nursing and clinical staff was a particular challenge, as seen across the sector. Job sharing across various organisations was one way in which Turning Point was looking to make roles more attractive to prospective employees.

4.45 It was also looking at securing additional buildings across Hackney and the City so that it was able to expand the services it offered to identifiable, customer facing locations and engage with different cohorts across the areas it covered.

4.46 *The Chair of the Health in Hackney Scrutiny Commission asked for further information on the link between drug misuse and mental health issues, and how drug misuse and mental health services worked together in Hackney.*

4.47 The Senior Operations Manager (City & Hackney), Turning Point explained that many individuals that come into contact with substance misuse services also had corresponding mental health issues.

4.48 Turning Point operated the City and Hackney Recovery Service in partnership with the mental health charity Mind. There were 11 posts within the service who were employed by Mind and brought with them specialist mental health knowledge, and the partnership meant that a number of mental health interventions and groups were run for service users.

4.49 The City and Hackney Recovery Service also worked closely with local NHS Foundation Trusts who had specialist mental health teams. They often provided a link between the service and local mental health support, and provided support in cases of more complex mental health needs.

4.50 One area the service had considered should additional funding be secured in the future was creating a dual diagnosis team. This would allow employees to work more closely with mental health partners on more complex cases, improving outcomes for service users.

4.51 The Health Systems Coordinator, Hackney Council added that the Combating Drugs Partnership sought to develop partnership working with relevant agencies to ensure outcomes were linked to focused, local aims around different presentations of drug use.

4.52 It was hoped that the Integrated Care Board and Integrated Care Partnership, which had responsibility and oversight for various NHS services, would both be engaged with the work of the Combating Drugs Partnership.

4.53 *The Chair of the Health in Hackney Scrutiny Commission asked whether a demographic breakdown of the number of frequent drug users in the borough was available.*

4.54 The Health Systems Coordinator, Hackney Council explained that the Council was unable to break the demographics of frequent drug users in the borough down any further than by ethnicity, gender or age at this stage.

4.55 Officers were largely reliant on national surveys and census data in this respect. It was hoped that through the Combating Drugs Partnership the shortfall in data could be filled by engaging the local community and working more closely with local partners to understand the local context better.

4.56 *The Chair of the Children and Young People Scrutiny Commission asked for more information on the approach being taken to the policing of children and young people suspected of being in possession of drugs.*

4.57 The Detective Chief Inspector, CE BCU responded by explaining that any child suspected of drugs possession would be treated as a child first and foremost, prioritising their best interests.

4.58 Should a child be found in possession of drugs, they would most likely go through some sort of triage or community resolution through the Youth Offending team. The Youth Offending team were trained to recognise substance misuse needs and make relevant referrals into children's social care services where appropriate.

4.59 The Detective Superintendent, CE BCU added that in cases of possession with intent to supply, a child would be treated as a victim of criminal exploitation first and foremost. This meant that officers would seek to bring those exploiting a child to justice, rather than criminalising the child.

4.60 This approach was largely reliant on the cooperation of the child and the evidence available to officers. If there was insufficient intelligence to suggest that the child was being exploited they may have to be pursued through the criminal justice system.

4.61 However, every child that was arrested for drugs possession or supply in Hackney were provided with wraparound partnership support which sought to provide a trauma informed response and avoid the need for criminalisation.

4.62 The Merlin system was in place to allow the recording and sharing of concerns with relevant partners to safeguard vulnerable individuals. This involved an officer recording their findings in a Merlin report, which would then alert the local authority who would then decide how best to safeguard the individual.

4.63 *A Commission Member asked whether there was a community outreach service for substance misuse in Hackney and, if so, what the service looked like.*

4.64 The Health Systems Coordinator, Hackney Council explained that the substance misuse community outreach function was delivered by a range of commissioned services.

4.65 Outreach work targeted various demographics, for example older Black men who use drugs through SWIM and children and young people through Young Hackney.

4.66 *A Commission Member asked how joined up the partnership response to individuals presenting with substance misuse vulnerabilities was in Hackney, and whether there was any room for improvement.*

4.67 The Health Systems Coordinator, Hackney Council explained that Project ADDER had funded a specific case coordinator role which was based in Hackney and oversaw multi-agency, coordinated responses to referrals.

The Council also hoped to allocate part of the Substance Misuse Treatment and Recovery Grant to developing multi-agency, coordinated intervention models, though the determination of funding was still to be communicated.

4.68 The Chief Executive, SWIM added that partnership working between key agencies such as the police, local authorities and substance misuse treatment services was strong. There was a genuine trust between partners and a desire to improve outcomes for vulnerable residents.

4.69 Increased resources was one area by which the partnership could improve outcomes. Substance misuse treatment services such as SWIM often worked beyond their means whilst also developing close relationships with service users which often meant they become reliant on the service.

4.70 Recruitment was also an area of concern for commissioned services, especially when trying to recruit people with significant lived experience and/or knowledge of multi-agency partnership working.

4.71 The Senior Operations Manager (City & Hackney), Turning Point added that the depth and range of partners involved in this area of work was generally strong, though more work could perhaps be done to engage the probation service locally.

4.72 The Cabinet Member for Community Safety and Regulatory Services added that the Council delivered a range of other services alongside its partners for those that were frequent drug users and/or come into contact with the criminal justice system for drug related issues.

4.73 For example, it delivered two employment services (Individual Placement and Support Employment Service with Hackney Works and a peer led employment programme with St Giles Trust), and Young Hackney also supported children and young people across the borough with a range of issues including drugs and alcohol and youth justice.

4.74 *A Commission Member asked what evidence a police officer would need to be presented with before making a Merlin referral, and what the process was once a Merlin referral was made.*



4.75 The Borough Commander, CE BCU clarified that once a Merlin referral was made, it was shared with the multi-agency safeguarding hub (MASH), which included a wide range of agencies including the local authority and those in health and social care. Some cases may also be referred to the Community Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conference (CMARAC) to manage risks for the most vulnerable adults coming to notice.

*4.76 A Commission Member asked how CE BCU was reviewing the use of stop and search locally to ensure the power was not used disproportionately, and how it was working with local communities to restore trust and confidence in local policing.*

4.77 The Borough Commander, CE BCU began by acknowledging that the use of stop and search had been an issue for the Metropolitan Police and the communities it served for a number of years.

4.78 It was now widely recognised that long-term use of stop and search as a standalone power did not necessarily reduce crime. However, it was considered an effective tool for mitigating short-term challenges such as an escalation in violent crime in a local area.

4.79 The local approach therefore needed to be centred around maximising the effectiveness of stop and search when used in response to short-term challenges, whilst ensuring it did not create long-term damage and distrust in local communities.

4.80 There had been a significant reduction in the use of stop and search in the borough over the previous two years whilst maintaining the volume of positive outcomes. This suggested that a lower volume of searches in Hackney may be just as effective when its use was targeted and appropriate.

4.81 The reduction in the use of stop and search may be due to a range of factors. One may be the delivery of training with local partners to local officers and shared learning across the local BCU from elsewhere in the force, especially in regard to proportionality.

4.81 Another may be that increased intelligence and understanding of the local drugs market developed through Project ADDER may give local officers the confidence to make more targeted and effective use of stop and search powers.

4.82 CE BCU would continue to draw on the voice of local communities in overseeing its approach to stop and search and proportionality and to increase public trust and confidence in local policing.

4.83 For example, Police Encounter Panels were being set up in Hackney to identify where CE BCU could do better in its interactions with residents and help to build stronger relationships with communities.

4.84 The Detective Superintendent, CE BCU added that stop and search remained an effective tool for local policing when used in a targeted and appropriate way. It had a role to play in policing drugs and violent crime, for example.

*4.85 A Commission Member asked whether CE BCU had an understanding of the reasons for disproportionality in the use of stop and search in the borough, especially in relation to young Black boys and men.*

4.86 The Borough Commander, CE BCU responded by explaining that it was difficult to understand disproportionality in the use of stop and search at this time, and it would be unhelpful to speculate in these circumstances.

4.87 It was reiterated that there had been a reduction in the use of stop and search in the borough whilst maintaining the volume of positive outcomes, but it was recognised that a significant number of people were still being searched without there being a positive outcome.

4.88 Work was ongoing to try to understand why disproportionality in the use of stop and search existed in Hackney. Tower Hamlets, for example, did not see the same levels of disproportionality, and so comparative research was needed to try to understand why these situations differed.

*4.89 A Commission Member queried the statement in the written evidence received which claimed that there had been no drop in stop and search since Child Q, whilst also claiming that there had been no More Through Intimate Parts (MTIP) Searches.*

4.90 The Detective Superintendent, CE BCU clarified that stop and search was a different type of search to an MTIP search. Therefore, the written evidence provided explained that whilst there was no decrease in the use of stop and search following Child Q, there had not been an MTIP search undertaken on a child since.

4.91 In terms of public oversight of the use of these powers in the borough, CE BCU held Scrutiny Panels in several different local areas. For example, Youth Scrutiny Panels with local youth organisations were held regularly to discuss a range of issues including the use of stop and search, MTIPs and Section 60s.

4.92 CE BCU had also been working with the local authority and partners to develop a QR code which would give young people access to under 18 aftercare following a search. At the conclusion of the search they would be offered the ability to scan the QR code which would give access to the Young Hackney website with information on stop and search, drugs, county lines, gangs and family support.

*4.93 A Commission Member highlighted how difficult it could be for children and young people to give information over to the police when they were vulnerable and possible victims of exploitation.*

4.94 It was asked what the police did to mitigate potential difficulties in these situations, for example relocating victims and their families.

4.95 The Borough Commander, CE BCU explained that in extreme cases of exploitation, relocation may be considered to ensure a family is removed from harm. However, this option was often reserved only for these extreme cases due to the lack of housing provision options in the borough and London more widely.

4.96 However, there was strong partnership working between the police and local authority (including housing services) and good practice in joined up working could be found, for example, in cases of domestic abuse.

4.97 The Detective Superintendent, CE BCU accepted that it was often difficult to retrieve information from children and young people who may be vulnerable in a

policing context. For example, if a child or young person was searched and found not to be in possession of drugs, there was little that the police could do to get further information out of them unless they were in immediate or significant danger.

4.98 A child or young person may not want to speak even in police custody, and in these cases the multi-agency partnership would be utilised to ensure their safety. For example, their school and social worker would be informed of the encounter through the MESH.

4.99 The Borough Commander, CE BCU added that the work to build trust and confidence in local policing was especially important in this context, and it had been engaging with young people in a variety of ways since Child Q both in and outside of education settings.

4.100 *A Commission Member sought clarification over the statement in the written evidence that 68% of all Section 60s across the Metropolitan Police Service occurred in Hackney.*

4.101 The Detective Superintendent, CE BCU explained that this was likely a misprint and would provide written clarification for Members after the meeting.

4.102 Section 60s could only be granted in a defined area at a specific time when a Superintendent believed there to be a possibility of serious violence, or when weapons may be involved.

4.103 They were seen as an effective police power and when used had the potential to reduce the likelihood of incidents involving serious violent crime taking place. When a Section 60 is in place the police would keep the community informed of its purpose and outcomes.

4.103 The Cabinet Member for Community Safety and Regulatory Services added that the Section 60 Review Panel was established in 2021 to review the use of the power in Hackney. Its composition was small but included a community representative as well as local authority representatives.

4.104 *A Commission Member asked for further information on the Scrutiny Panels and the Police Encounter Panels and sought reassurance that these structures would be well resourced and supported locally.*

4.105 The Borough Commander, CE BCU explained that the scrutiny and accountability structures in Hackney and Tower Hamlets were well resourced and CE BCU were committed to their development.

4.106 Further written information on the roles, responsibilities and composition of these structures would be provided to Members after the meeting.

4.107 *A Commission Member asked about the extent to which commissioning bespoke interventions for individuals of particular demographics and vulnerabilities was an effective way to help meet the needs of residents using drugs.*

4.108 The Chief Executive, SWIM explained that in his experience individuals that come into contact with substance treatment and recovery services responded better to

a service which not only offered appropriate knowledge and skills, but also shared their lived experience and tailored their support to individual needs.

4.109 The Health Systems Coordinator, Hackney Council added that commissioning drug treatment and misuse services that provided bespoke interventions allowed individuals to present as their whole selves, which in turn ensured that the response individuals received took into consideration a range of diverse needs and implications.

4.110 The Council was committed to ensuring that their treatment and recovery services were responsive to the diversity of the borough. For example, a Lived Experience Forum was being established to understand the experience of individuals who come into contact with drug treatment and recovery services and ensure that they were reflective of their diverse needs.

4.111 *A Commission Member highlighted that a common complaint amongst minority communities was that middle class residents were often seen taking drugs but were not put under the same searching tactics or criminalised at the same rate as their minority counterparts.*

4.112 It was asked what the police were doing to ensure this was not the case, and whether work to this end was visible and being communicated to the public.

4.113 The Chief Inspector, CE BCU explained there was a lot of work going on amongst community safety partners to tackle the night time economy drug markets and substance misuse. Much of this related to reducing drug related anti-social behaviour and associated harm in night time economy areas and venues and reducing the availability and demand of drugs.

4.114 This included raising awareness and educating people who frequent the night time economy of the harm and risk of illicit drugs and working with licensed premises to improve screening and seizure upon entrance to venues.

4.115 The Borough Commander added that it was also closely linked to the work to tackle street based drug markets and stop the supply of drugs in the first place, which involved disrupting Organised Crime Networks and gangs.

4.116 The impact of previous national communications campaigns to deter middle class drug use and raise awareness of the harms of illicit drug use and legal highs were still not understood but CE BCU would be open to considering a targeted local campaign if the research suggested it would be useful.

4.117 The Cabinet Member for Community Safety and Regulatory Services added that the Council worked closely with community safety partners to raise awareness and educate people on the harms of drugs, and was working with licensed premises to raise awareness with staff.

4.118 *A Commission Member sought clarification on the statement within the written evidence that 7 out of 30 MTIP searches over the course 2022 were undertaken without an appropriate adult present.*

4.119 The Detective Superintendent, CE BCU explained that this was likely because the child gave officers an older, incorrect date of birth when stopped meaning an

appropriate adult was therefore not deemed necessary, and would provide written clarification for Members after the meeting.

4.120 *A Commission Member asked for more information on how the police shared data with local partners, whether it was proactive in doing so and whether data was made accessible to the public.*

4.121 The Detective Superintendent, CE BCU explained the local BCU had historically allowed local partners access to many of its information systems, for example through the Integrated Gangs Unit. However, the local BCU had more recently been instructed by Met HQ not to do so due to concerns around data and security breaches.

4.122 The Borough Commander, CE BCU recognised that information sharing remained a force-wide issue. Met HQ was looking at ways in which it could be more transparent in the way it shared information, though this needed to be balanced against the data protection legislation currently in place.

### Chair's Summary

4.123 In summing up, the Chair explained that the Commission would reflect on the evidence heard and follow up with any additional information requests after the meeting.

4.124 If appropriate, the Commission may also make suggestions or recommendations for improvement for consideration.

4.125 The representatives from Central East BCU, Public Health and the Cabinet Member for Community Safety and Regulatory Services confirmed that they would be happy to continue to engage with the scrutiny process outside of the meeting.

## **5 Minutes of the Meeting**

5.1 The draft minutes of the previous meeting held on 12th December 2022 were agreed as an accurate record.

## **6 Living in Hackney Work Programme 2022/23**

6.1 The Chair referred to the Commission's work programme and highlighted the discussion items planned for the remainder of the municipal year.

6.2 Members were reminded that a joint meeting with the Children and Young People Scrutiny Commission had been provisionally scheduled for 28th March 2023 to review progress against the outcomes of the Child Q Safeguarding Practice Review.

## **7 Any Other Business**

7.1 There was no other business.

Duration of the meeting: 7.00 - 9.15 pm

Monday 23 January 2023