
London Borough of Hackney
Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission
Municipal Year 2016/17
Monday, 10th December, 2018

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

Chair: Councillor Sharon Patrick



Councillors in Attendance: Cllr Sade Etti (Vice-Chair), Cllr Michelle Gregory, Cllr Anthony McMahon and Cllr M Can Ozsen

Apologies:

Officers In Attendance: Brendan Finegan (Service Manager - Youth Justice Service), Maurice Mason (Community Safety Manager) and Jan Stout (Integrated Gangs Unit Manager)

Other People in Attendance: Emma Harradine (Probation Officer, Integrated Gangs Unit), Samir Khattab (Case Worker, SOS Project, St Giles Trust, Integrated Gangs Unit), Nichole McIntosh (Director for Operations, Safer London), Damion Roberts (Case Worker, SOS Project, St Giles Trust, Integrated Gangs Unit), Councillor Vincent Stops, Sue Williams (Central East Commander, Metropolitan Police Service), Oladele Woye (Community Engagement Officer, DWP, Integrated Gangs Unit) and Councillor Caroline Selman (Cabinet Member for Community Safety, Policy and the Voluntary Sector)

Members of the Public:

Officer Contact: Tom Thorn
 0208 356 8186
 thomas.thorn@hackney.gov.uk

Councillor Sharon Patrick in the Chair

1 Apologies for Absence

1.1 Cllr Etti had sent apologies for lateness.

2 Urgent Items / Order of Business

2.1 There were no urgent items and the order of business was as laid out.

2.2 However, the Chair advised Members that under the any other business item at the end of the agenda consideration would be given to the Executive's response to the Commission's investigation into segregated cycle lanes.

3 Declarations of Interest

3.1 There were no declarations of interest.

4 Evidence gathering for review - work and approach of Hackney's Integrated Gangs Unit

4.1 Guests in attendance for this item were:

- Maurice Mason, Community Safety Partnership Manager
- Jan Stout, Integrated Gangs Unit Manager
- Emma Harradine, Probation Officer, Integrated Gangs Unit
- Brendan Finegan, Service Manager - Youth Justice Service
- Oladele Woye, Community Engagement Officer, DWP, Integrated Gangs Unit
- Samir Khattab, Case Worker, SOS Project, St Giles Trust, Integrated Gangs Unit
- Damion Roberts, Case Worker, SOS Project, St Giles Trust, Integrated Gangs Unit
- Steve Gowan, Researcher, Integrated Gangs Unit
- Nichole McIntosh, Director for Operations, Safer London

4.2 The Chair noted that during the scoping stages of its review looking at serious violence, the Commission had heard about the successes of the Hackney Integrated Gangs Unit in reducing gang violence in the borough.

4.3 This item was intended to build on that introduction to the Gangs Unit received in September. A number of partners and commissioned services operating within the unit were in attendance to talk and answer questions on their work.

4.4 She welcomed guests and thanked them for coming. She particularly wished to thank Samir and Damion from St Giles Trust. Samir and Damion had offered to talk at the meeting on their own journeys from being involved in gang related activity to now working to prevent others going down these paths.

4.5 There were two papers in support of this item. The first on pages 5 to 10 was intended to give an insight into the work of the IGU overall.

4.6 The second paper on pages 11 to 18 looked specifically at the work of the Youth Justice Service, which had officers based in the IGU. This had been requested to help the Commission explore what happened to young people

involved with gang activity, after they reach 18, in terms of transitions from youth justice to adult probation services.

- 4.7 In terms of the format of the item the Chair said she would firstly ask Samir and Damion to speak on their experiences and their work, prior to Members being invited to ask questions.
- 4.8 Following that discussion, Officers would be asked to introduce the papers for this item which were available in the agenda packs. There would then be a second question and answer session.
- 4.9 Invited to make any opening points, Samir Khattab made the following substantive points:
- He had been invited to talk to the Commission about his life and his journey from his earlier days to where he was today. He was not a self-publicist and as such was generally sceptical around requests to talk about his own story. This said, he had agreed to the request in the hope that it would give benefit and purpose to the Commission's work.
 - He had grown up in West London where - in the wider environment - violence and drugs were visible. He had fallen into a culture involving these factors during his teenage years.
 - There had been a culture where young people could feel pressure to establish a name for themselves, or to be able to name drop others. This could be felt to be a means to protect themselves and their families and friends.
 - From the age of 14 he had become involved in incidents of ABH and common assault. Then at aged 18 he had been involved in an argument between a group of peers which had led to a death. He had served a custodial sentence; three years in a young offenders unit before a move to an adult prison at age of 21. He had been released 17 months ago.
 - He would previously disagreed with anyone claiming that he had been involved in gang activity, or that he was part of a gang. He had not worn a gang logo, a bandana or any other type of uniform. He had not felt that he represented a particular postcode. However, it was the case that he grew up and socialised with a core group of peers on his estate. He would have met other people's definition of someone who was involved in gangs.
 - From his work now with young people who had become or were at risk of becoming involved in harmful behaviour, he could see that they were suffering from similar issues that he and or his peers were suffering from in his younger years. These included mental ill health, low self-esteem, a lack of identity, peer pressure and other factors.
 - He himself had come to realise that despite having quite high levels of confidence, he had suffered from low self-esteem and had had no self-identity.
 - If he was asked how or what had turned his life around, he would say three things:
 - The first of these was the establishing of a more positive peer group. The move to an adult prison had actually been positive for him. At the Young Offenders unit high numbers of the inmates had had something to prove. It was easy for

incidents to escalate from small issues like someone accidentally touching the toes of another person.

- Adult prisons had these issues too, but there were also people behaving positively. He had identified inmates who were more tolerant and had an ethos that it was better to be respected through love rather than through fear. He had made the conscious decision to become one of these people.
 - Victim awareness was the second. A priest had worked with him on this aspect. It had been pointed out to him that Criminal Justice Legal documents often stated on the front page that cases were set as the defendant against the state (Regina). There was little mention of the victim. He had been shown evidence of the impact of crimes on victims, which had been powerful and rehabilitative.
 - Islam was the third. It had enabled him to build a positive self-identity and had given grounding to his efforts to explore what he would do upon his release. Reading had given him an insight into the importance that Islamic faith paid to showing kindness. Islam taught the need to hold neighbours in the highest regard. It taught that whatever little you had, that this should be shared with others in need.
- In preparation for and after his release he worked with a Job Centre Advisor. They had recommended that he seek support from St Giles Trust.
 - This support had helped him secure a job working in rail maintenance, through Carillion.
 - Further to Carillion's collapse, he lost this job. Setbacks like these could make the road rocky. However, he had moved on to enrolling on a course. He had then been interviewed for a job by St Giles Trust. This had resulted in him meeting and now working for Jan Stout in the Integrated Gangs Unit. Jan Stout was a talented and excellent officer. He had now completed his course.
 - He really valued working in the Integrated Gangs Unit. Staff in the unit were supportive and did not look down on one another. Jan Stout and others enabled staff to grow and develop rather than be locked down in their roles. Everyone appreciated everyone's contributions. It delivered excellent work. He was pleased to contribute to this by working with young people who were currently gang affiliated. Hackney was a challenging borough which was not soft. The IGU's work was crucial.

4.10 Damion Roberts made the following substantive points:

- He grew up in Hackney and had lived a positive lifestyle up to the age of 13. He had played basketball at a borough wide level.
- However, he then started to transition into criminality. At age 16 he was arrested in Islington for possession with the intent to supply. He spent time in a Youth Offenders Institute between the ages of 17 and 19. This did not turn around his behaviour and he then served a longer term sentence. This started in a Youth Justice setting before moving into an adult prison.
- What had changed his outlook was a realisation that his attitudes towards loyalty had been misconceived. He came to realise that his family and his home setting was where there was true loyalty, rather than the social networks he had been operating in.

- In the adult prison setting he had taken up a wide range of interventions and training courses. This included training in questioning skills. These courses led him towards wanting to work in youth services. He followed through on this on his release; taking up a role in Southwark mediating between gangs and or individuals who were in conflict. He had also lived in Southwark during that period.
 - He had then moved to a Head of Year post at Hackney New School before joining St Giles Trust and now being based within the IGU. His work involved speaking to young people on the activities that they were involved with. He agreed with the point made by Samir around the unit working very well.
 - He also agreed that there was a need to get to understand the issues being faced. There were issues around self-esteem as mentioned by Samir. Some young people's parents were absent. This included cases where single parents were facing difficulties be that mental ill health and or significant financial pressures, and were effectively absent from the young person's life as a result.
- 4.11 Members gave Samir and Damion a round of applause. The Chair noted that in their accounts both spoke more positively about the Criminal Justice System – adult prisons in particular – than might have been expected. She noted that both Samir and Damion worked with young people. She asked what they told young people to make them think twice about going down the road towards crime.
- 4.12 Damion said the risk was that young people could gravitate towards these lifestyles as they could be seen as exciting and glamorous. Some young people talked about the money and the goods which they believed were open through these avenues. In his discussions with young people he sought to tone these aspects down and provide a dose of realism. He tried to highlight how these roads could involve much more negative elements; the loss of family and freedom, exposure to violence, and manipulation by others.
- 4.13 Samir agreed with these points. The wide range of partners operating in the IGU played crucial and different roles in addressing his issues. In his role he used his past as an asset. It helped enable him to build trusting relationships in which he was able to influence young people, and to undermine the negative behaviour which they were exhibiting or being at risk of doing. Others played other valuable and specialist roles but were less likely to be able to 'reach some young people'.
- 4.14 He was able to show how working hard and being legitimate had enabled him to achieve things like owning a motorbike and Nike Air Jordan's. There was an issue around what he called the fingertip generation, where young people wanted to get to these positions immediately.
- 4.15 A Member said he had now been a Councillor for 16 years. As the Council Speaker in 2009 he had been involved in the response to a tragic murder of a young person. In discussions with young people and their families he had heard accounts that some young people were removed or alienated from society, with nothing to belong to. He wondered how to get around this. He worried that rampant capitalism and the creation of need for material goods to demonstrate success was driving more young people to become involved in gang activity.

- 4.16 Samir said it was a shame if young people were feeling that they had nothing to belong to. He said that self-esteem was crucial to giving a grounding to young people. As someone who now had high self-esteem he was happy with one pair of Jordan's. Some others wanted five pairs. There was a desire for immediate gains.
- 4.17 This had helped to create a culture where a 9 to 5 job or a job in the supermarket was not seen as sexy. He tried to give messaging that working hard and receiving a regular and reliable wage in return was the route to eventually being able to afford a Mercedes.
- 4.18 In terms of the desire to possess material goods, there was also a need to challenge things that were not realistic. People posted pictures of themselves standing next to the cars of strangers, claiming them to be their own. A Young person he had worked with did at one point have a bundle of money, but within a week he had had nothing. He worked to myth bust around the earning potential which was actually open through taking harmful routes.
- 4.19 Damion agreed on these points. Music videos of artists often contained cars which were on hire. These displays of wealth were usually a façade. The challenge was to highlight the positives of working in legitimate employment and drawing a salary every month. It was about showing the negatives – being sent far away through county lines, living in the cold and alone without being able to wash.
- 4.20 A Member asked Samir and Damion what more they felt schools could do to help keep young people safe and to ensure that wrap around support was provided.
- 4.21 Damion said that in his role of Head of Year at a school he had seen the range of issues which some young people suffered from. He wished to say that teachers did really good jobs and were committed to young people. However, while some young people had mum and dad at home, had everything given to them yet still misbehaved for example by answering back or not wearing the school uniform, others only had mum at home and could not afford the uniform. There needed to be greater support for these pupils.
- 4.22 This was particularly in terms of approaches to school exclusions. The question needed to be asked what some young people who were excluded for a fixed term would do during the days. There were risks that they would move towards smoking weed and other potentially harmful behaviours which could lead to others. There needed to be greater caution around excluding pupils who were vulnerable.
- 4.23 Samir agreed with these points. A County Lines project run by St Giles found that all of the young people it aimed to support had been excluded from mainstream education and were students of Pupil Referral Units.
- 4.24 He had seen how the rejection which exclusion from schools gave young people left them very vulnerable to seeing criminal activity as the only viable option for them.

- 4.25 The Chair said that colleagues on the Children and Young People's Scrutiny Commission were exploring school exclusions in their review. She appreciated that there were issues but also that it was an area over which the Council had limited control.
- 4.26 She said that the Commission was aiming to explore the gaps in support and provision for young adults aged 18 to 25. She noted that while it was often felt that it was predominantly under 18s involved in serious violence that this was not always the case, partly indicated by the majority of the people that the Gangs Unit supported being aged between 18 and 25. She asked if there were any views around this.
- 4.27 Emma Harradine, Probation Officer, Integrated Gangs Unit, responded to this point. The young adults she worked with were in the criminal justice system and had often been in and out of custody.
- 4.28 She said that the lack of accessible opportunities was the biggest hurdle. These could dry up after young people reached adulthood. Criminal records could hinder people. In addition, those opportunities which might otherwise be accessible were often unsuitable. Large numbers of the cohort had previously been in care. Those she supported had often suffered from trauma in their childhoods from issues including parental addictions and domestic violence. There was a prevalence of mental health conditions. The service visited those in custody to work with and support them in preparation for their release. This often led to a presence of a mental illness which had not previously been identified. This was sometimes due to the stigma around mental health leaving those in custody reluctant to seek support from those inside the prison.
- 4.29 The opportunities which could be brokered for the cohort were often in the form of full time employment. Many were not ready to enter immediately into this despite having the will to do so. The lack of accessible, realistic options meant that the cohort was less likely to believe that legitimate and legal lifestyles were possible for them.
- 4.30 One thing that would really help would be more sympathetic employers willing to phase people into work. If employers enabled the cohort to start a job on the basis of one or two shifts a week this would really help.
- 4.31 A Member asked whether Faith Leaders were involved with the work mentioned by the Probation Officer.
- 4.32 The Probation Officer, Integrated Gangs Unit said that chaplains based within custody settings did some very helpful work. She was not aware of support programmes led by them in the community.
- 4.33 The Chair thanked the Probation Officer. She now invited Maurice Mason, Community Safety Partnership Manager to introduce the paper on pages 5 to 10 of the agenda packs.
- 4.34 The Community Safety Partnership Manager introduced the officers in attendance for the item. While this was rare to achieve, he felt it fair to say that this was a dream team. These were only words and he looked forward to

himself and others receiving questions so that Members could make up their own minds. However, he very much felt it to be the case.

- 4.35 The unit had a three pronged approach. It did have an enforcement role in order to keep the community safe. However, this was set within an appreciation that the issue was not one which could be arrested the way out of. As such, there was a main and significant focus on prevention and diversion. Within this, a key challenge was to identify and work with young people who were or were at risk of exploitation. Significant safeguarding was needed in these cases, rather than criminalisation.
- 4.36 The integrated nature of the unit was crucial, bringing partners together in one location. It enabled close dialogue and information sharing. The unit had access to quality data. This was through the IGU Researcher who was in attendance and also the Intelligence Hub within the Community Safety Partnership's wider resource. These two aspects enabled joined up and intelligent-based interventions. This included the identifying of young people who were at risk of exploitation. The Unit worked closely with the Children's and Families Service.
- 4.37 The service also sought to harness the strength of the community in Hackney. It had worked with the community to deliver interventions in Woodberry Down and the Nightingale. The IGU was not resting on its laurels and was working to improve further. The unit was working towards recruiting to a Community Gangs Worker post to help further improve community links.
- 4.38 The number of people worked with by the IGU regularly shifted. However, the cohort generally stood at around 90, around a third of which were in custody.
- 4.39 Looking at the last 12 months, there had been a spike in tragic gang related murders and in tension between gangs generally. Hackney was far from unique in having seen this; it was the case on a London wide and national level. However, it was important to note that indicators for Hackney now showed violent crime to be reducing. Levels of Knife Crime, Gun Crime, Serious Violence and Serious Youth Violence had reduced.
- 4.40 There was no complacency and there were always improvements to be made. However, he did feel confident that the borough was now coming out of what had been a traumatic time.
- 4.41 He was proud of the Unit. It was recognised internationally as having an excellent model. It was not an over estimate to state that it was amongst the best in the world. Delegations from other London boroughs had visited and were seeking to install the same arrangements in their areas. Only this week there had been a visit from London's Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime. The IGU had also hosted visits from Columbia and Canada.
- 4.42 A Member thanked the Community Safety Partnership Manager. She welcomed the work of the IGU. She wished to explore how those in need of support might gain access to its services. She asked how a young person who was at risk of becoming involved in gang activity and needed help to avoid this but was not aware of the IGU offer, could become aware and then access the service.

- 4.43 The Community Safety Partnership Manager said that the Council website contained a range of information on the IGU. Alongside this, the IGU actively went out into the community. For example it had attended a recent event at the Salvation Army. It did not work in isolation, and sought to raise awareness through its links with the Children and Families Service, and others. The Contextual Safeguarding approach being installed within the Council was relevant to its work to address the causes of ASB, gang activity and other harmful behaviour. It had helped inform the approaches taken on one estate which had seen a concentration of these issues.
- 4.44 In response to a Member asking whether information could be added to the noticeboards on estates, the Community Safety Partnership Manager said that he would respectfully suggest that the challenge was to ask community leaders to cascade information to residents. He was keen the service followed a 'community on top, professionals on tap' ethos.
- 4.45 The Member accepted this point, but felt that estate noticeboards and Neighbourhood Offices should still be used to publicise the support available from the IGU.
- 4.46 A Member noted and welcomed that Hackney appeared to be on a downward slope from the spike in serious violence. He asked for some background in terms of what caused the spike and why and how levels had had been reduced.
- 4.47 Steve Gowan, Researcher, Integrated Gangs Unit said analysis had shown one of the causes of the spike to have been the emergence of new gangs which were made up of people of younger ages than those usually involved in gang activity. These groups had been involved in conflicts. They appeared to have not been formed on a territory-based way, but through social media.
- 4.48 The escalation in violence appeared to have been caused more by perceptions around respect and disrespect, than by drugs. Social media had increased the capacity for these issues to escalate. In the past if one party was disrespected for example by being made to strip in the street, only a handful of people would know. Now these incidents were recorded and posted on YouTube. There was then peer pressure within schools and elsewhere for retaliation.
- 4.49 Invited to introduce the second paper for this item and to make any initial comments, Brendan Finnegan, Service Manager - Youth Justice Service, said that he had been in this post since 2014. Youth Offending Teams had been made statutory services in 1998. One of these was based in the Integrated Gangs Unit in order to work with young people involved in gang activity and or serious violence.
- 4.50 Youth Justice was based at the end of the line. The offer of other services through Education and Young Hackney was a crucial reason why the cohort was relatively very small – with 87 currently on their books.
- 4.51 Sanctions delivered varied from the lower level Community Orders, through to the taking of young people into custody. However, he was proud of the focus on diversion, and of the breadth of support which the service delivered to a cohort of young people who had found themselves in trouble.

- 4.52 Bespoke plans were in place for the 87 young people in the cohort. Services delivered within a multi-agency integrated resource included individual and family therapists / psychotherapists and the Virtual School. The service had also installed speech and language therapists based on evidence that high shares of the youth justice cohort had needs in this area. These elements of support worked to divert people from a path towards adult offending.
- 4.53 There was a strong need to help young people through a range of issues caused by factors including poverty, previous exposure to trauma and loss. Some of the cohort were being raised by single parents who were working 2 or 3 jobs to make ends meet for the household. They were sometimes understandably weary and tired and had little capacity left for the emotional presence which children required. The service would work and support parents in these cases.
- 4.54 The multi-agency team included Probation Officers. Some young people would – unfortunately – graduate from Youth Justice to being under the remit of probation services. Probation Officers worked to ensure an effective transition in these cases.
- 4.55 A Member said that she was keen to know what care and support was available to staff based within the IGU. She appreciated that it was likely to be a challenging area to work in. As an action, she asked if a written summary of the support could be made available to the Commission following the meeting. The Community Safety Partnership Manager agreed to this.

Action 1: Community Safety Partnership Manager

To provide information on support available to Integrated Gangs Unit staff

- 4.56 Guests were thanked and excused.

5 Evidence gathering for review - police resources to tackle serious violence

- 5.1 Sue Williams, Central East Commander, Metropolitan Police Service, was in attendance for this item. She made the following substantive points:
- Policing in Hackney had faced some significant recent challenges. This – tragically – had included the response to a number of murders.
 - However, following the spike in violence, evidence did point to things being turned around. Levels of knife crime, knife crime involving young people aged up to 25, and gun crime, were all down. As a partnership, things were moving in the right way.
 - She would give a brief summary of the different central units which had helped to deliver this improvement.
 - The Violent Crime Taskforce was set up earlier this year, made up of local Met Officers. The Taskforce went around London providing support in areas where there was concern. Deployment was based on bids from boroughs / Basic Command Units (BCU), which were made on a day to day basis. The unit on a pan London level had delivered some strong outputs including 473 weapons seizures, 871 stop and searches

Monday, 10th December, 2018

and 838 vehicle searches. Hackney had received significant shares of the support from this unit meaning that many of these cases would have been delivered in the borough.

- To give reassurance around the deployment of this unit in the borough, the Central East Commander, Metropolitan Police Service wished to advise that all units received bespoke briefings on the Hackney context. All Officers in the unit wore body cameras in the interests of safeguarding officers and individuals.
 - Another unit - Operation Venice - focused on making people safe from the threat of moped enabled crime. Some of these crimes had been perpetrated by people linked to gang activity.
 - Road Transport Police came into the borough to perform patrols and to assist other operations.
 - The Territorial Support Group was comprised of two elements. One of these was made up of teams deployed for periods of between 2 weeks and a month. The other – the Commissioners Reserve TSG – could be bid for by the boroughs / BCUs on a daily basis. These units had roles in responding to disorder and reducing priority crime.
 - Centrally controlled armed response vehicles included Hackney in their patrols. These units held firearms and also Tasers and other non lethal weapons. Armed officers were also in place through operation Radian.
 - A role of armed response vehicles and armed officers was to perform hard stops, where vehicles or people were stopped due to intelligence or information suggesting that weapons including guns may be in evidence. By way of providing assurance around the professionalism and standards practiced in these cases, community leaders including members of the Safer Neighbourhood Board were able to join these patrols.
 - The BCU worked closely with Operation Trident to help tackle organised crime in the borough. This joint work had delivered tangible outcomes. The period between December 2017 and March 2018 had seen a spike in violence in the N16 area. A covert operation in response had resulted in 37 arrests, drugs seized, and a number of drug supply lines closed. Cases had now journeyed through the courts and had resulted in a number of convictions and prison sentences.
 - It was important to note that Trident incorporated community engagement and prevention elements, in addition to its reactive and proactive operations. She had joined Trident units in delivering sessions in youth clubs which aimed to help foster better relationships with young people and to promote diversion and prevention.
- 5.2 With the agreement of the Chair, the Central East Commander, Metropolitan Police Service proceeded to present on the next agenda item. There would then be a discussion covering both of these items.
- 6 Evidence gathering for review - opportunities and risks of changes to local policing in relation to tackling serious violence**
- 6.1 Sue Williams, Central East Commander, Metropolitan Police Service, made the following substantive points to introduce this item:

Monday, 10th December, 2018

- Police restructures leading to the establishment of BCU structures had been carried out to make operations more efficient and streamlined.
- The BCU model would see 32 boroughs supported by 12 operational units.
- It needed to be acknowledged that funding reductions had left the old individual borough model unsustainable, particularly in relation to the outer London boroughs.
- The BCU model had five strands:
 - Emergency Response
 - CID investigations
 - Neighbourhoods
 - Safeguarding
 - Leadership and Governance
- Hackney's Integrated Gangs Unit and the Gangs Taskforce were based within the CID element.
- She had delivered a restructure bringing significant (18) changes. The BCU model was giving greater flexibility to tackle serious violence; it allowed resources to be flexed between the two boroughs to deal with issues emerging in either one. The restructure had been based on the principle of learning best practice from both sides. An example was her recognition of the value of the co-located, borough-specific gangs unit which was in place in Hackney through its IGU. This learning had led to the installation of a similar arrangement in Tower Hamlets.
- The Neighbourhoods strand incorporated ward-based activities and focus on licensing and anti-social behaviour (ASB). Within the ASB aspect, there was a strong focus on drugs.
- ASB initiatives included work to implement an ASB Warning System in Hackney, which was in place in Tower Hamlets. This was better enabling action to be taken by the police and or partners when people were known to be involved in activities including drug dealing but where the police had been unable to catch them in act. In these cases information sharing with other partners including registered social landlords, better enabled family based issues to be tackled and for people to be aided out of criminality. There had been an 80% reduction in ASB in Tower Hamlets following implementation of the scheme there. MOPAC had identified the initiative as good practice.
- The Safeguarding strand was aimed at protecting the most vulnerable. This included young people suffering from child sexual exploitation and or exploited into county lines activities.
- On children and young people, the Police Cadets scheme was a very important tool to aid prevention and diversion. The police sought to engage students who schools had identified as being on the edge of criminality. The Cadets enabled young people to be directly involved with a range of operations, including test under age purchasing of alcohol.
- There was lots of commentary around stop and search. In Hackney, numbers had reduced. The borough also had a positive outcomes rate which was in the top third

Monday, 10th December, 2018

across the Met. 30% of Stop and Searches in Hackney had delivered positive outcomes compared to the 20% target. Only 4 Section 60s – orders which allowed officers to stop and search people without reasonable grounds criteria being in place – had been put in place in Hackney since October.

- In response to a question, the Central East Commander, Metropolitan Police Service advised that a positive outcome was where action had been taken against someone who had been stopped and searched.
- 6.2 A Member thanked the Central East Commander, Metropolitan Police Service for what she said had been a comprehensive description of the action being taken. However, she was aware from feedback she received that residents did not feel that they were seeing this on the ground. For example, there had been an absence of community reassurance by the police following shots being fired in her ward.
- 6.3 Another said that that residents in his ward also felt a lack of a local policing presence.
- 6.4 The Central East Commander, Metropolitan Police Service said that the London Mayoral target of having two dedicated PCs and one Police Community Support Officer in place per ward, was largely in place. Efforts were also made to balance the need to deploy these resources elsewhere due to specific incidents, with the appreciation of the importance that these abstractions were limited. The BCU was working hard to limit these siphoning's off.
- 6.5 It was not the case that these Ward Officers would be visible all of the time. They were not a 24 hour a week, 7 day a week presence. They also had specific objectives as set locally and by MOPAC, which they were tasked with focusing on. However, they were there.
- 6.6 A Member noted that the Commission's review would be exploring the Community Safety Partnership's work to improve community trust and confidence in the police. Large shares of residents had difficulties in their relationships with the police. He aired frustration that staff turnover – in his view – could hinder progress on this agenda. His ward had lost an excellent sergeant who had built up trust with people from across the community. He asked if work was being done to improve recruitment and retention.
- 6.7 The Central East Commander, Metropolitan Police Service acknowledged that the retention of good officers was a challenge. She had sought to address this. When Officers first arrived in the borough she asked that they signed a statement of intent that they would remain in the position for a minimum of two years. In addition, these statements were refreshed as a condition of particular training courses being provided such as advanced driving. These statements could not be made legally binding. However, she felt that they did give better prospects for reasonable lengths of service.
- 6.8 She was lobbying decision-makers and Human Resources to enable those gaining promotion to be retained rather than being deployed elsewhere. While it was satisfying to see officers develop, it was a source of frustration that they needed to move to other areas when achieving promotion. She would continue to flag this.

- 6.9 The Chair noted the reductions to police numbers and budgets. She asked whether this had impacted on the police presence within the IGU.
- 6.10 The Central East Commander, Metropolitan Police Service advised that it had not. Numbers of Police Officers in the Hackney IGU had been maintained. Rather than reduce the police presence in the IGU, the model was one that she was replicating in Tower Hamlets.
- 6.11 She added that while some front line policing functions had shrunk, others – including Trident – had grown. She was aware that there were concerns around this approach, but there were valid reasons for it.
- 6.12 The Chair noted this point. She worried that increasing centralised units at the expense of local resources could bring an approach which was reactive and not preventative. Residents wanted bobbies on the beat. There was a view that this was not in place anymore, enabling crimes such as drug dealing to go unchallenged. There was sometimes a perception that the police were nowhere to be seen, except for when there were mass deployments which residents could sometimes feel were excessive. She worried that these issues could impact on trust and confidence.
- 6.13 The Central East Commander, Metropolitan Police Service said that there was significant proactive work happening, both by central and local units, which she could not discuss.
- 6.14 On drug dealing, she said that the police did actively target areas where it was happening, reviewing and acting upon CCTV footage.
- 6.15 On the point around mass deployments, the Central East Commander, Metropolitan Police Service said that these could occur due to a range of issues including a serious incident when there were outstanding suspects, or where intelligence suggested that an issue might escalate.
- 6.16 In terms of prevention and also the community relationship, a lot of work was happening. This included work in schools (for which additional funds had been allocated) and youth clubs, including The Crib. There were show and tell sessions on Stop and Search, and regular engagement through the stop and search monitoring groups. The police also gave opportunities to community leaders to witness stop and searches.
- 6.17 A Member noted the reference to the ASB Warning System. She asked why it was not in place in Hackney.
- 6.18 The Central East Commander, Metropolitan Police Service said that she was keen for the system to be put in place in Hackney, and training was being delivered currently. As a first step, the police would work with Registered Social Landlords. The system once in place would enable the police to issue ASB Warnings and to pass on details of these to the relevant Registered Social Landlord. This could help in situations where young people were known to be involved in criminal activity such a drug dealing but where the police had been unable to catch them in the act. It could enable support interventions to be delivered at a household level, and provide legislative options which were open

to RSLs as a landlord but not the police. Evidence from Tower Hamlets showed that the initiative was very successful at reducing repeat incidents of ASB by those served with a warning. MOPAC had backed the approach.

- 6.19 The Chair noted that Lynne Troughton, a Member of the Safer Neighbourhoods Board and a Ward Panel Chair, was in attendance. She asked if she had any questions or comments around policing and the impact of the operational changes on the experiences of residents.
- 6.20 Lynne Troughton said she had found the item useful. She said that the points made around police being less visible, were commonly heard in the forums she was involved with. She said that an item for both Ward Panels and the Safer Neighbourhood Board on the organisational structure of the BCU, would be useful.
- 6.21 The Central East Commander, Metropolitan Police Service thanked Lynne Troughton. She agreed that there was a gap in terms of information on the BCU being cascaded through to Ward Panels. She had now asked the Safer Neighbourhood Board to convene a meeting including the Ward panel Chairs in order for them to be briefed on this.

7 Minutes of the meetings of 13th and 21st November

- 7.1 The minutes of the meetings of the 13th and the 21st November were agreed as accurate records.

8 Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission- 2018/19 Work Programme

- 8.1 The Work Programme was noted.

9 Any Other Business

- 9.1 The Chair pointed Members to the papers on their desks; the recommendations from the Commission's report on segregated cycle lanes, and the Executive Member's response to this. She advised that the response had been agreed at Cabinet in November.
- 9.2 She advised that Cllr Stops who was a Member of the Commission during its review, was in attendance to speak about the response.
- 9.3 Cllr Stops thanked the Chair. He said that he had a number of concerns with the response to the report. However, he wished to focus on recommendation 1, as stated below below:
- *That the Council consults on and publishes a clearer criteria for deciding when segregated cycling provision should be used.*
 - *We understand the Council's Transport Strategy to place the Council in a position to consider segregated cycling provision on main roads where it would be felt to improve the safety and comfort of cyclists, where some other types of intervention would not fully achieve this or are not practical, and where a range of other considerations (including interactions between bus users and cyclists and junction safety) can be effectively managed.*

- *This is the Commission's understanding based on a number of paragraphs of the Cycling Plan section of the Council's Transport Strategy.*
 - *Paragraph 7.54 states that: "The Council is open and willing to examine proposals for segregated and semisegregated cycle lanes on principal roads but it will be considered on a case by-case basis - taking into account concerns about: high collision rates at intersecting junctions where segregated lanes end; visual impact on the streetscape; interaction between bus users and cyclists at bus stops; and other competing demands for road space on Hackney's busiest routes." Paras 7.4 and 7.5 and the hierarchy of provision sets out that the Council will consider segregated cycle lanes in cases where a number of other intervention types are not appropriate, or do not achieve the full 'clear safe space for cyclists' principle.*
 - *We appreciate that the segregated provision will not always be the most appropriate intervention and support the Council in their approach of considering it on a case by case basis.*
 - *However, we also feel that the Council position could be made clearer in terms of the specific circumstances / criteria in which segregated provision should be delivered. For example this could include measures around road widths, traffic volumes (PCU), etc.*
 - *We ask that the Council develops and consults on a clear criteria to be used to help determine where segregated provision should be used.*
- 9.4 Cllr Stops said he was disappointed that this recommendation had not been accepted. He noted the explanation given for this was that each location had to be considered on a case by case basis, that it was unlikely that the Council could produce a clearer criteria nor to make it fully applicable to each location, and that instead the Council should continue to work with TfL and other boroughs and draw on growing London wide evidence in this area.
- 9.5 He noted that the review had heard real concerns from residents with disabilities about the impact of schemes on their ability to feel safe when moving around the borough. He said that the detrimental impact of some schemes meant it was important in his view that there was clarity within policy on the cases where segregated cycle lanes would be delivered. He tabled pictures of schemes in some other boroughs which he said compromised pedestrian safety and comfort. He said that by making Hackney's Transport Policy in this area more clear, the risk of similar schemes appearing in the borough would be reduced.
- 9.6 A Member agreed with Cllr Stops. She felt that a clear criteria should be in place to help determine when segregated cycle lanes would be considered. She worried about the impact of segregated cycle lanes on the journey times for both pedestrians and bus users. Another Member felt that all necessary steps should be taken to avoid the delivery of schemes in Hackney like the ones in the pictures tabled by Cllr Stops (which were not of schemes in Hackney).
- 9.7 The Chair thanked Members. She advised that both she and Cllr Stops were meeting with the Deputy Mayor and Cabinet Member for Health, Social Care,

Monday, 10th December, 2018

Transport and Parks and the Mayor to discuss the response. She would raise the concerns of Members at this meeting.

Duration of the meeting: 7.00 - 10.00 pm