

London Borough of Hackney
Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission
Municipal Year 2020/21
Date of meeting Monday, 9 November, 2020

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

Chair	Cllr Sharon Patrick
Councillors in Attendance:	Cllr Sade Etti, Cllr Anthony McMahon, Cllr M Can Ozsen, Cllr Ian Rathbone, Cllr Penny Wrout
Apologies:	Cllr Anna Lynch
Officers in Attendance	Cllr Susan Fajana – Thomas (Cabinet Member for Community Safety), Cllr Carole Williams, Cabinet Member for Skills, Employment and Human Resources, Jason Davis, Strategic Lead (Policy) and lead Officer for Hackney’s Community Safety Partnership, Maurice Mason, Community Safety Partnership Manager, Gerry McCarthy, Head of Community Safety, Enforcement and Business Regulation from London Borough of Hackney
Other People in Attendance	Commander Catherine Roper (Head of Profession, Crime Prevention, Inclusion & Engagement - London lead for Crime Prevention, Inclusion and Engagement), Commander Jane Connors (London lead for Violence and Stop/Search), Natasha Plummer (Head of Engagement), Sal Naseem (Regional Director London), Detective Superintendent Mike Hamer (Central East BCU Lead for Violence & Criminal Investigation and Deputy Borough Commander), Tim Head (Account Group Project Officer at HCVS), Great Okosun (HCVS Account Group Representative), Yolanda Lear (HCVS Account Group Representative), Superintendent Andy Port (Central East BCU Lead for Neighbourhood Policing & Community Engagement), Louise Brewood, LBH Safer Neighbourhood Board, Nicola Baboneau, (LBH Safer Neighbourhood Board)
Members of the Public	None
Officer Contact:	Tracey Anderson ☎ 0208 356 3312 ✉ tracey.anderson@hackney.gov.uk

Councillor Sharon Patrick in the Chair

1 Apologies for Absence

- 1.1 Apologies for absence from Commission member Cllr Anna Lynch.
- 1.2 Apologies for absence from the Borough Commander of Borough Command Unit Central East (Hackney & Tower Hamlets), Detective Chief Superintendent Marcus Barnett.
- 1.3 Apologies for lateness from Commission member Cllr Anthony McMahon.

2 Urgent Items/ Order of Business

- 2.1 There was no urgent items and the items of the meeting was as per the agenda.

3 Declaration of Interest

- 3.1 No declarations of interest.

4 Stop and Search and Inclusive Policing

- 4.1 In attendance at the meeting for this items from the Mayor's Office for Policing And Crime (MOPAC), Natasha Plummer, Head of Engagement. From the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) at MET HQ, Commander Catherine Roper, Head of Profession, Crime Prevention, Inclusion & Engagement - London lead for Crime Prevention, Inclusion and Engagement and Commander Jane Connors, London lead for Violence and Stop/Search. From Central East (CE) Borough Command Unit (BCU), Detective Superintendent Mike Hamer, CE BCU Lead for Violence & Criminal Investigation and Superintendent Andy Port, CE BCU Lead for Neighbourhood Policing & Community Engagement. From the Independent Officer for Police Conduct (IOPC), Sal Naseem, Regional Director London.
- 4.2 The Chair introduced this item and commenced by giving some back ground information about the item. The Chair explained the Commission's work in this area started in 2019 following information about the MPS's plans for body worn cameras and the work of the local Account Group.
- 4.3 The Commission followed this up in June 2020 but were left with outstanding questions and wanted a further meeting with the MPS, IOPC and MOPAC.
- 4.4 The Chair pointed out the Commission has a key role in Hackney to look at these issues on behalf of the community. From 2017, since the death of Rushan Charles, trust and confidence among the communities in Hackney has been decreasing significantly. The MPS statistics show an increase in stop and search in Hackney along with a rise in handcuffing across the MPS.
- 4.5 The Commission represents the views of the community but are mindful the Council needs to work with the police to ensure the community is protected. The Chair pointed out currently not all members of Hackney's community felt protected by the Police. The Commission wanted to see improved relations

between Hackney Council, the community, police and MOPAC to find a way forward.

- 4.6 The Chair highlighted following the death of George Floyd the black community's faith in the police is not as it should be due to police behaviour. But this is a global problem between ethnic minorities and the police. Making reference to the Lammy review report the Chair pointed out there are reports that show the BAME community is overrepresented in the justice system.
- 4.7 The Commission invited the Borough Command Unit (BCU) for Central East (Hackney and Tower Hamlets), Metropolitan Police Service Headquarters (MET HQ) and Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) to talk about their work to build trust and confidence and to outline how this public concern was being addressed by the MPS and MOPAC. Included in this discussion was the Independent Office for Police Conduct (IOPC) to further explore how the IOPC works with the MPS in terms of their complaints system and to hear about the review finding from their use of stop and search review.
- 4.8 The Commission submitted questions in advance to the MPS Borough Commander, MET HQ and MOPAC officer. These questions covered the following areas:
1. Stop and Search
 2. Trust and confidence
 3. Accountability
 4. Handcuffing
 5. Fair and inclusive policing.
 6. Sources of intelligence
 7. Community engagement work related to building trust and confidence.
- 4.9 The Commission submitted questions in advance to the IOPC covering the following areas:
1. Powers of IOPC in relation to the recommendations they make to the MPS
 2. Role of the IOPC in relation to MPS complaints
 3. Their success in influencing policy and implementation of the recommendations they make.
 4. Information about the IOPCs review on the use of stop and search.
- 4.10 Written response to the questions were provided in the agenda under item 4a and item 4b and supplementary papers.

Mayor's Office for Policing And Crime (MOPAC)

- 4.11 The Head of Engagement from MOPAC commenced her presentation covering the key points from MOPAC's written submission and provided further information in response to the questions submitted.
- 4.11.1 MOPAC is led by the Mayor of London, Sadiq Khan. The Deputy Mayor for Police and Crime, Sophie Linden leads MOPAC on a daily basis. MOPAC's role is to provide oversight of the MPS and ensure delivery of the Mayor's Police and Crime Plan. The Mayor's Police and Crime Plan sets out his strategic ambitions in relation to crime in London. This also sets out his work with partners to drive an effective criminal justice and crime reduction service across London.

- 4.11.2 The Mayor of London sets the strategic direction and budget for the MPS and has powers to bring partners together to problem solve to address key issues affecting Londoners. The Mayor of London does not have operational control of the MPS and cannot direct the MET Commissioner of the MPS. This is a key difference for UK's policing system to other global police forces.
- 4.11.3 The remit of the Head of Engagement from MOPAC covers community engagement and scrutiny. Areas such as wider stakeholder engagement (such as a targeted round table), use of Covid 19 powers, hate crime (this increased during lockdown) and working with local safer neighbourhood boards (SNBs), local stop and search monitoring groups and independent custody visiting in London boroughs.
- 4.11.4 MOPAC highlighted trust and confidence is the central principle to the work of policing by consent. The foundation of which UK policing built and fundamental to the work of the MPS.
- 4.11.5 MOPAC recognise when people have trust in police they are more likely to be satisfied when they encounter a police officer, will comply with police authority and will assist the police with investigations.
- 4.11.6 MOPAC pointed out the view of the police and how powers are used (i.e. stop and search) or perceived to be used by communities, is critical to maintaining that trust and confidence and delivering effective policing in the London.
- 4.11.7 Police confidence is a key measure that has been tracked for a few years through their public attitudes survey. The main measure is a questions about if the police in their area are doing a good job.
- 4.11.8 The most recent survey shows 58% for London and 56% for Hackney - Hackney has consistently tracked below the London average. MOPAC acknowledged the Chair's commented about the fall in confidence over the last 3-4 years. This measure has been compounded by wider society impacts such as austerity, this period of uncertainty and change like Brexit. However it has stabilised at 58% and they hope it will now start to rise in the future.
- 4.11.9 MOPACs role involves overseeing the work of the MPS in its entirety including their work on community engagement, trust and confidence, stop and search and crime reduction. MOPAC also support the community to scrutinise the police at a local level.
- 4.11.10 MOPAC discharge their function by overseeing the work of the MPS and by holding the MET Commissioner and her senior team to account for delivery. This is through various mechanism like 121 meetings with the Mayor and Deputy Mayor and their formal Oversight Board.
- 4.11.11 The meetings are used to integrate the data and challenge the MET Commissioner and about the team's performance; whilst also challenging on issues that matter most to communities.

- 4.11.12 Another way they hold the MPS to account is through transparency. The transparency is through the publication of a variety of information and data sets. These cover general crime data - public voice data, information about complaints and police workforce statistics. The officer highlighted the Hackney Account Group had made use of this publically available data to challenge and scrutinise their local police officers.
- 4.11.13 MOPAC fund Safer Neighbourhood Boards. The SNB's hold the local MPS to account and fund community safety matters. MOPAC also fund local crime reduction projects. LBH receives £29k for projects and to support the work of the SNB.
- 4.11.14 MOPAC also work with communities to look at key aspects of policing like custody. This entails working with independent custody visitors to review police custody through to stop and search community monitoring.
- 4.11.15 MOPAC explained stop and search is an important police power but they also recognise it is quite an intrusive power (allowing within set parameters police officers to put their hands in pockets) if it has not been carried out correctly or with dignity.
- 4.11.16 It is important for trust and confidence that policing is seen with legitimacy, is intelligence led, conducted fairly and proportionately. It is key for communities to have this view.
- 4.11.17 MOPAC acknowledged the data show disproportionality and that this is a cause for concern by community. Based on population data they know that black individuals are 3.5 times more likely to be stopped and search compared to a white individual.
- 4.11.18 As part of MOPACs work they support a network of community stop and search monitoring groups to scrutinise that data at a local level. MOPAC recognise it is important to ensure the community performs that functions and that their conversations feed into the work MOPAC is doing at the corporate centre.
- 4.11.19 MOPAC pointed out 2020 have been a challenging year. The world has witnessed the murder of George Floyd and protests around the world have put police services around the world under intense scrutiny. The Mayor of London is committed to an action plan to address 4 key areas MOPAC hope will address trust and confidence in policing.
- 1) **Better use of police powers** – this looks at consistency e.g. for area like the hand cuffing policy and reviewing the disproportionality across a range of tactics and tools like stop and search, tasers etc.
 - 2) **How we work together with black communities to keep them safer** - this is about developing a new framework for engagement between the police and communities. Enabling more accessible opportunities for a wider range of people to be in the conversations. To help with problem solving and to fully understand how people are experiencing policing on the ground. This work takes into consideration their work with safer schools officers, thinking about how they are supported to build relationships with young people and to keep them safe.

- 3) **Building a police service that better represents and serves black Londoners** - people want a service to reflect them and London. More importantly they want the service that can be seen to operate within the various communities in London. This work will focus on the retention and recruitment of black and ethnic minority officers at every level of the service. It will also highlight how communities and young people can get involved in recruitment training, to make it more open and transparent and bring in lived experience. Help to empower and train officers to operate within London.
- 4) **Holding the police to account** - it is clear from conversations with the community they do not recognise MOPAC is doing a lot of accountability and oversight work. MOPAC is thinking about how to make that more transparent and make communities more aware it is happening. Critically they want to build new and broader opportunities for communities to be involved in that scrutiny. MOPAC is look at how to broaden out the remit of borough level scrutiny and are proposing to build city wide scrutiny mechanisms to enable the public to be more involved. This will not just focus on stop and search but look at other police powers such as the use of tasers.

4.11.20 MOPAC acknowledged there is a lot of work to do but highlighted they are building on a good foundation. They are hearing that communities want more to be done and rapidly.

4.11.21 For MOPAC the challenges are:

- a) how they better inform communities about their work holding the MET to account.
- b) enable people to understand their rights and responsibilities in this space.
- c) support and work with the IOPC to help people to understand how the complaints system works and make it more accessible.

4.11.22 As part of this work MOPAC want to create specific opportunities to be held to account for the oversight they do of the MPS in delivering the plan. They want to be held to account by the public for the experience of how policing feels to them.

4.11.23 MOPAC recognise that trust and confidence is important but so is understanding the perceptions, feelings and experiences of the communities. MOPAC would like to see in 4-5 years' time the monitoring indicators reflecting progress and change and the community feeling and experience to improve too. They want a better relationship with communities across London.

4.12 **Metropolitan Police Service (MPS)**

4.12.1 The Head of Profession, Crime Prevention, Inclusion & Engagement - London lead for Crime Prevention, Inclusion and Engagement from Metropolitan Police Headquarters (MET HQ) / MPS commenced her presentation covering the key points from the written submissions by BCU Central East and in response to the questions submitted.

- 4.12.2 The officer's areas of responsibility include crime prevention and inclusion across the MPS. The department has 3 strands the crime prevention strategy, diversity and inclusion strategy and the engagement strategy. These strategies set the tone for the organisation and holds the organisation to account for the activities carried out.
- 4.12.3 The Head of Profession, Crime Prevention, Inclusion & Engagement - London lead for Crime Prevention, Inclusion and Engagement advised her attendance was following strong messages from the community about not seeing and feeling all the activities the MPS is doing to engage with the community and that their internal structures are aware is happening.
- 4.12.4 Referring to the MOPAC officer's comments the MPS echoed that 2020 has been an unprecedented year and that this has been the same for policing.
- 4.12.5 The MPS highlighted at the beginning of the year trust and confidence in the MET was beginning to be positive. People were feeling more informed about local policing and addressing the concerns of local communities and what they cared about.
- 4.12.6 Following March, April and May there has been a slump in the public attitudes survey particularly trust and confidence within the black communities. Especially after the murder of George Floyd. Commenting there has been an out pouring of frustrations from communities, particularly the black communities in London.
- 4.12.7 The Head of Profession, Crime Prevention, Inclusion & Engagement - London lead for Crime Prevention, Inclusion and Engagement explained they have been working with the community and have a long list of the people the department has engaged with daily. However the MPS did accept they did not do enough talking to people for example they did not speak to the Chinese and south Asian communities and at the start of Covid they started to suffer from hate crime.
- 4.12.8 The MPS have carried out more engagement in a number of their normal policing processes e.g. public order. Although they acknowledged the community seems to not see the impact of this work. The MPS recognised their engagement work has not been fully successful in is their BCUs (frontline policing).
- 4.12.9 There has been some inconsistencies in how they were engaging across the organisation. The MPS was not fully aware of who they were engaging with and who they needed to engage with more. The Head of Profession, Crime Prevention, Inclusion & Engagement - London lead for Crime Prevention, Inclusion and Engagement is taking the lead with a group of officers to resolve.
- 4.12.10 In the agenda papers submitted for the meeting the MPS outlined their minimum offer within frontline policing for all BCUs. This should remove the inconsistency within the service from local policing.
- 4.12.11 The MPS will be increasing their scrutiny processes. The MPS is trying to keep communities better informed and respond to the feedback.

- 4.12.12 The MPS highlighted we are about to enter into lockdown 2. Based on the public's feelings about this they will need to navigate this sensitively.
- 4.12.13 The officer highlighted the MET Commissioner has committed to being the most trusted police service globally. The MET Commissioner has 2 priorities: 1) violence – to reduce violence across the capital; 2) Improve trust and confidence between the MPS and their communities. The MPS acknowledge they have a lot of work to do.
- 4.12.14 The London lead for Violence and Stop/Search added the following points in response to the questions submitted.
- 4.12.15 The officer gave an overview of her role which is the lead for violence in the MPS which also covers stop and search. A key aspect of her role is to look at inconsistency and the accountability of police officers within the MPS. Her role includes making sure they are scrutinised, understand the impact, ensure they are visible and able to respond to their communities. This also includes addressing consistency across the BCUs and pan London units' e.g. violent crime task force and the TSG.
- 4.12.16 The officer's role is to oversee stop and search across the MPS to ensure it is done correctly, effectively and that the MPS listens to communities to improve going forward.
- 4.12.17 From Central East BCU, Deputy Borough Commander and CE BCU Lead for Violence & Criminal Investigation commenced his presentation in response to the questions submitted.
- 4.12.18 The Deputy Borough Commanders for CE BCU highlighted the BCU was asked to respond to two questions 1) briefing and tasking for stop and search b) their engagement work.
- 4.12.19 CE BCU is doing their own internal review with the Head of Profession, Crime Prevention, Inclusion & Engagement - London lead for Crime Prevention, Inclusion and Engagement to look at local stop and search. This will be a deep dive into their stop and search activity. The local MPS recognised that to police with consent they needed to work with the community. The local BCU were of the view they do this and that their work with the community is largely effective.
- 4.12.20 The Deputy Borough Commander for CE BCU pointed out he was joined by the CE BCU Lead for Neighbourhood Policing & Community Engagement. This officer supported community safety teams, SNBs and is the lead engagement officer for the borough.

As part of the opening statement the Chair asked the Deputy Borough Commander for CE BCU to provide more information about how they used intelligence for stop and search. Pointing out Members wanted to understand what the term intelligence led meant for policing and in particular how it informs stop and search activity.

4.12.21 The Deputy Borough Commander for CE BCU confirmed the information is the foundation for their tasking. The information is assessed and analysed and then they use it to task police officers to cover particular issues. Following the tasking they analyse the information and then repeat the cycle. One of the priority areas for the MPS is violent crime – knife, gun and robbery. This covers street based offences. The Deputy Borough Commander for CE BCU explained the intelligence information comes from crimes recorded – in Hackney they record 80 crimes a day. This is information from victims, witnesses and other resources e.g. CCTV, Hackney Council or private resources. The MPS also receive information from the public through face to face contact, calls into the service about ASB, weapon carrying or in recent Covid times group gatherings.

As part of the opening statement Members of the Commission asked the Deputy Borough Commander to clarify how they decide an individual or group of people should be stopped and searched. Members wanted an explanation of how the police make a judgement of who to stop and search and who to handcuff. In the Commission's view this information is missing from the reports or regular updates provided. The Deputy Borough Commander was asked to clarify how a police officer on street patrol would decide they needed to conduct a stop and search. Members referred back to the statistics showing disproportionality.

4.12.22 The Deputy Borough Commander explained the reason and grounds for a stop and search were personal to the police officer from what they observed. This is influenced by their own observations, information from a member of the public or as a result of wider tasking. The officer informed the MPS has finite resources so they want to put their police officers in the locations and at the times where the crime is occurring.

4.12.23 The Deputy Borough Commander pointed out Police officers are not instructed to go out and do a stop and search. They have information about the issues, victim information of the crime profile and tasking information. A stop and search could be in response to an emergency call with very specific information and description of the people involved. It could also be as a result of a patrolling police officer's observes of something that is not right. This professional judgement may lead them to have a personal encounter with a member of the public. The Deputy Borough Commander confirmed he would not give an explanation for individual encounters in Hackney because they are as a result of a variety of reasons.

4.12.24 The focus of the deep dive for stop and search is to understand (though body worn videos and supervision) the recorded grounds for a stop and search alongside reviewing the complaints data to assess if it was sufficiently articulated and justified.

4.12.25 As part of the opening statement the Chair referred to best use of resources and indicated a 20% positive outcome rate for stop and search would not indicate a best use of resources. Members also commented it was unclear if these statistics relate to warnings or people being taken through the justice system.

4.13 **Independent Office for Police Conduct (IOPC)**

- 4.13.1 The Regional Director London from the IOPC commenced his presentation covering the key points from the written submissions and in response to the questions submitted.
- 4.13.2 The officer started by saying three words “stop and search”. The officer explained these words provoke a range of thoughts and emotions from people and they can come from a person’s lived experience, from carrying out a stop and search or working closely in this area.
- 4.13.3 The IOPC know that stop and search is a necessary policing tool and part of the policing tool kit. They also know that for members of the black community it’s a policing tactic in which there is disproportionality and this has eroded their trust and confidence in the MPS police.
- 4.13.4 The IOPC recognise both positions and the importance of trust and confidence. The role of the IOPC is to help maintain trust and confidence in policing by ensuring police officers are accountable for their actions, learn lessons and that there is an effective police complaints system. However the IOPC acknowledged there are concerns about engaging with the police complaints system.
- 4.13.5 The IOPC informed their research showed 33 thousand complaints were logged against the police but only 4% were from members of the black community and 1% by young people. In addition less than 1% of total complaints related to stop and search.
- 4.13.6 The IOPC explained this confirms two things 1) the complaints data in this area should not be used as a measure of policing to assess whether communities are dissatisfied with stop and search. 2) Black communities and young people (both with the lowest rates) are least likely to engage with the systems in place that are designed to take forward their concerns.
- 4.13.7 The IOPC has been making efforts to address this through their work on their engagement strategy. They have worked with their youth panel, done joint presentations with MOPAC and the MPS and carried out broader media work to raise the profile of the complaints system.
- 4.13.8 From speaking to the communities in London the IOPC repeatedly heard comments like “why should I make a complaint. It’s just the police investigating themselves.” Although it is correct that the vast majority of complaints go to the police to investigate. The IOPC pointed out if you are unhappy with the review a person has the right of appeal with either MOPAC or the IOPC.
- 4.13.9 In response to the point why complain, the Regional Director made reference to the recent work of the IOPC on stop and search. The Director highlighted the IOPC looked at all completed investigation data featuring stop and search. There were 5, all featuring black men. They reviewed the cases holistically to understand the bigger picture, key themes and trends.
- 4.13.10 Following this review the IOPC made 11 statutory learning recommendations based on the evidence found. The learning recommendations were made at

an organisational level to avoid inconsistencies around stop and search repeating.

- 4.13.11 The IOPC consulted with community stakeholders, young people and organisations working with young people in this space when they were drafting the recommendations from the review.
- 4.13.12 The 6 key themes found in the review were:
- 1) A lack of understanding by police officers about the impact of disproportionality on communities.
 - 2) Poor communication throughout the stop and search.
 - 3) Consistent use of force.
 - 4) Failure to use body worn video at the start of encounter.
 - 5) Continuing to seek evidence when the initial grounds for stop and search were unfounded.
 - 6) The smell of cannabis being used as the sole grounds for a stop and search.
- 4.13.13 The evidence the IOPC found matched the views being expressed by communities across London.
- 4.13.14 The IOPC review highlighted the need for the MPS to better support their police officers to do their job effectively, with the right training and supervision.
- 4.13.15 The IOPC explained stop and search is a policing tool but like any tool it needs to be used with care and in the right circumstances.
- 4.13.16 By making the learning recommendations they hope both the MPS and black communities in London address the gap that exists in their relationship around trust and confidence.
- 4.13.17 The IOPC pointed out to address a problem the first step is an acknowledgement of the issue that needs to be tackled. It is important to recognise the MPS have accepted all the recommendations.
- 4.13.18 The next challenge will be improving and action.
- 4.13.19 The IOPC pointed out none of their work to address this important issue would be possible if those individuals had not made a complaint. Adding, like any service, the MPS can only improve when they are informed something has gone wrong.
- 4.13.20 The IOPC closed with highlighting this is the importance and value of the complaints system.

4.14 **Questions Answers and Discussions**

- (i) **Members commented this has been a journey and there have been several engagement session on this topic with the Police. The Members acknowledged the work of the Accounts Group and the recommendations in the report. Members referred to the CE BCU's written response to question 1 in the agenda. Highlighting under**

‘intelligence and sources of information’ it refers to a person behaviour and makes reference to bandanas as grounds for stop and search. Members read out the definition of a bandana and asked why this item of clothing (that could be used by any person) is listed as a reasonable ground for a stop and search.

The Deputy Borough Commander from Central East BCU explained the occasions on which any type of clothing is used for grounds for stop and search is very seldom. The MPS review grounds for stop and search and it is never based on an aspect of clothing. However there have been groups that identify themselves by clothing colours in large gatherings e.g. at Nottingham Carnival. However for Hackney the colour of clothing is not a significant feature on the streets of Hackney. This would not be a significant reason for a stop and search in Hackney.

- (ii) **The Cabinet Member for Community Safety from London Borough of Hackney (LBH) made the following comments and questions:**

Hackney welcomed the report of the IOPC on stop and search and was pleased the MPS accepted all the learning recommendations. The Cabinet Member pointed out conversations about stop and search, particularly related to young black men, have been ongoing for decades.

The MET HQ mentioned they are doing a lot of community engagement work but the people are not seeing or feeling the engagement work with the community. The Cabinet Member suggested it was time for the MPS to change the way they engage with the community. Pointing out the issues related to stop and search were more about the relationship and engagement with the community.

The Cabinet Member suggested to address the issue of trust and confidence. They should implement robust engagement with the community. Safer Neighbourhood Board (SNB) and stop and search monitoring group

The Cabinet Member asked the following questions:

- 1) what support and strengthening can MOPAC offer the SNB and stop and search monitoring group to fulfil their role in scrutinising the activities of the police.**
- 2) How many repeats stop and searches are there in Hackney?**
- 3) In relation to the work by MOPAC, how will the IOPC recommendations be incorporated in their work about the MPS and black justice?**

- (iii) **Members referred to previous reports about police operation and the treatment of people from the BAME communities. Members asked how things will be different this time and the change people will see in relation to how the MPS engages with the community?**

- (iv) **Member commented the MPS had stated community groups are involved but they were unclear about who they were and who they represent.**

- (v) **Member also commented there has been work to look at body worn cameras. The Commission heard that in Hackney the body worn cameras were not being used correctly and hidden by clothing. Members suggested there was wider community involvement to look at the footage of body worn videos (BWV) like the Northampton project - where the community is shown redacted BWVs.**
- (vi) **Members referred to public confidence and suggested this needed statistical data to show how many police officers were disciplined for not wearing their body worn camera correctly. Member also suggested there should be information about how many were disciplined for the miss use of force with handcuffing. Member commented without this type of monitoring information the promises of change were good intentions. Members suggested the community needed evidence to demonstrate there is a difference on the frontline. Members suggested these figures should be made publically available to help improve trust and confidence. Members asked when these figures would be published?**
- (vii) **Members asked if the MPS was working with the Black Police Association (BPA) to help overcome some of the barriers.**
- (viii) **Members commended the poem featured in the report of the Account Group by Yolanda Lear.**
- (ix) **Members referred to the previous question about the criteria for stop and search and handcuffing and pointed out the MPS's response did not outline the criteria. Members also referred to the response dismissing bandanas as grounds for a stop and search and queried how a bandana was decided and then subsequently undecided as grounds? Members asked the MPS to give clarity about the criteria.**
- (x) **Members highlighted the key questions they are seeking responses to were:**
 - a) **why bandana were included and then dismissed?**
 - b) **the criteria for a person to be stop and searched?**
 - c) **why handcuffs are used?**
- (xi) **Members suggested there must be some form of training and criteria otherwise it was based on the individual police officer's judgement. Member did not think this was appropriate. Members asked the MPs to be specific about the criteria.**

In response to the above question the MPS replied.

In relation to how this will be different this is a question and challenge the MPS has asked itself too. The MPS pointed out they have started reviewing and doing things differently.

The MPS highlighted the Mayor's action plan (which will hold the MPS to account for a range of activities) is not just about doing activities but improving the way they communicate and explain all their work to the public.

The MPS aim to improve how they bring members of the community into processes and how they engage with communities to collate their views, experiences with empathy.

The MPS acknowledge they need to listen more and take responsibility for improvements across the organisation. The MPS pointed out they have included community members in the design and delivery of procedures for police officer training across the organisation. This is to put the focus on the lived experience, fairness and understanding and to have empathy at the heart of MPS activity. They have brought in community members and IAG members to help train their new recruits on stop and search to better understand the recipient's views of that activities.

The MPS works with local communities and bring community representatives to their special operations room for things like public orders so they can see decision making and briefings.

The MPS accept if they cannot explain how people can engage with the MPS, IOPC or MOPAC to make a complaint or engage in the scrutiny of their activities they are letting the community down.

The MPS is also rolling out increased scrutiny procedures for use of force. This is being trailed in Hackney but will be rolled out across the organisation. The aim of this work is to encourage more people to scrutinise MPS activity.

Over the summer the MPS implemented a central scrutiny board to look at the use of Covid-19 regulations. This helped to explain how the regulations would be used, where and why.

AT MET HQ the Head of Profession, Crime Prevention, Inclusion & Engagement - London lead for Crime Prevention, Inclusion and Engagement has responsibility of working with the BCUs to make sure their communities understands where they can obtain information and understand how they can make challenges.

The MPS has involved the community in their diversity and inclusion strategy to bring the community into the heart of their work. This includes communicating about the strategy.

MPS highlighted this needs a cultural shift and was not just about activities or a transactional relationship but about empathy and understanding the emotions attached.

Fundamentally the MPS accepted despite all the work they have done it has had limited impact. But it was their responsibility to change. The BCU commitments outlined in the agenda was the start of this process. The roll out of additional scrutiny is an example of this.

- (xii) **Members referred to the Account Group in Hackney and young people on the streets of Hackney, who feel traumatised and abused from stop and search and hand cuffing and asked what difference they will see? Members asked if there will be less handcuffing, less stop and search, politer officers etc. to help people believe.**

In response the MPS explained the difference will be through local police officers. Whilst the Head of Profession, Crime Prevention, Inclusion & Engagement - London lead for Crime Prevention, Inclusion and Engagement from Met HQ accepted, acknowledged and was saddened about the trauma and upset of the young people in London - particularly young black men – and the effects of stop and search. The MPS is pleased there is still some engagements from this cohort and that they are still holding conversations with the MPS.

In response to what will look and feel different. There will be local training delivered for visiting units to give information about the lived experience and the cultural history of Hackney will be provided. They should see a cultural shift in the way local police officers engage with the people of Hackney, talk to them and explain things as well as empathy. This will not take away difficulties and having to work through them.

They are going to be held to account and the IOPC recommendations have been agreed as a commitment from the MPS.

(xiii) **Members asked about the timescale for this work by the MPS.**

In response the MPS advised the roll out of additional scrutiny on the use of force will be in Hackney and referred to the BCU for a fuller response.

The Central East BCU Deputy Borough Commander added the local MPS will endeavour to review the use of force for each stop and search. This includes the use of handcuffing. There will be a team of 5 people who will review every stop and search encounter.

The police officer explained there are 2 aspects to this work. How they use the learning from this work and how they implement any changes in a timely and proportionate way to moderate police behaviour if needed. Working on the soft skills to communicate, deescalate and sympathise with people better. In the interest of transparency they will use a community reference group and monitoring framework to help support the work. This work has commenced and will need to be communicated back to the community.

The MPS pointed out in September 2020 they had 93% of BWV footage for all stop and searches. This was reported as good progress.

Currently the work has started and they are finalising the terms of reference for the external engagement. They will enable some public review of the BWV unedited. They are looking at the governance issues for this work. They hope to open this up to the community monitoring group in a few weeks.

(xiv) **Members asked how the community monitoring group is selected and if it is representative of Hackney's diverse community?**

In response the MPS confirmed the intention is to have a monitoring group that is representative of the community. The local MPS is speaking to the Account Group about their role in this group. They are building the group as

they go but the intention is for all sections of the community to be involved particularly the youth.

In response to the previous questions above the MPS explained there are other areas of on ongoing work within professional standards. An independent advisory group to scrutinise the professional standards processes across the MET service.

The MPS have community members involved to help design their training for stop and search and procedural justice.

They have young people come and talk to new MPS recruits to give their lived experience from being stopped and searched and growing up in London.

In response to the number of police cadets in London. In Hackney they have approximately 130 Volunteer Police Cadet (VPC) and nearly 5000 across London. In relation to diversity it is approximately 40% black and ethnic minority for the VPC. In addition the MPS pointed out they have approximately 4000 additional volunteers that help the police service on a daily basis.

The MPS pointed out there is a lot of work in progress but they recognise they need to better communicate their work and highlight the scrutiny process more. Then they need to listen to the feedback so it can inform their next steps.

- (xv) **Members commended the 5000 police cadets across London. However Members were still disappointed that there were only 130 in Hackney and asked why? Members commented this was not sufficient or a reason to be complacent.**
- (xvi) **Members were of the view for the public to see change this needed to be demonstrated through statistics that showed change. In their view this included the number of police officers held to account.**
- (xvii) **Members referred to the MPS response to the IOPC recommendations in their recent report. Members made further reference to the use of force and the way a police officers' use of force will be monitored - by asking officers to justify their use of force. But Members suggested the list reads as a check list that gives officers an excuse as to why they use force not justification. Members were of the view this does not help to push back to make a police officer justify their actions. Members think this would be an effective way to reduce the use of force.**

In response to the questions about professional standards, disciplinary of police officers and body worn cameras the London lead for Violence and Stop/Search from MET HQ explained in relation the data and publication of the figures the MPS has a stop and search dashboard and a MOPAC dashboard but acknowledged it was not user friendly. The MPs advised they are working with scrutiny group to establish the data needed for each local area so they provide this data. This will be in addition to the MPS level

data on the dashboard. They acknowledge there are variations in data across the MPS.

There is also the visibility of the information and accessibility of the data and they are working on this too. This is what they are working on with the local scrutiny group.

- (xviii) **Members interjected and pressed for the MPS to clarify if they take disciplinary action against police officers for stop and search and not wearing body worn camera correctly? Members commented this should be communicated back to the community with evidence showing how and what action they are taking. Members were still concerned about stop and searched being intelligence led and having no criteria but relied on a police officer's judgement.**

In response the MPS explained the scrutiny groups look at un-redacted videos and including the grounds for the stop and search records. The officer explained the community representatives on the community groups can look at the grounds and the police officers' actions. They can then provide their feedback on the police officers behaviour, the reason for grounds and provide comment on areas of improvement.

In response to Members concern about justifying, the MPS highlighted the stop and search slip and BWV is made available for scrutiny. This the process by which police officers have to justify their action and why. This is how they are held to account.

In relation to the statistics the MPS is happy to provide data to the community groups. This would be the local BCU scrutiny group. The MET HQ officer encouraged them to submit data requests.

The MPS officer reiterated the BWV footage is at 93% and pointed out the scrutiny groups independently select their own footage to watch from a random selection.

- (xix) **The Account Group representative made the following comments. Thanked the Councillors for their reference to the report they produced. Highlighted the report sets out their findings and recommendations. The Account Group advised they have been in meetings but to date there has been little progress.**

In reference to the IOPC comments they Account Group commented the IOPC's views were justifying stop and search with no regards to the statistics. In their view the IOPC does not understand the problem and that people are not going to them because they think reporting concerns will not be productive. The Account Group highlighted there is no faith in the IOPC and the police regardless of the promises made. The Account Group representative pointed out young people, in particular young black men, have very little faith in the police to help or treat them fairly. The Account Group informed they have been in meetings with the police and have been overlooked and they feel disrespected. This is the view of young people when they have tried to speak to the police or ask for their help.

- (xx) **The Account Group representative asked how the MPS will fix the problem when the responsibility is being pushed from senior management decision makers onto the local police units. The Account Group expressed the view that senior managers within the MPS were not taking responsibility for the actions of police officers.**

In response to questions raised earlier in the discussion MOPAC provided the following responses in reference to what will be different and the community engagement question by the Cabinet Member from LBH.

MOPAC explained people are more open and receptive to having this dialogue now than they were a year ago. There is an openness to being challenged and to challenge each other to have the conversations. There is a lot of scrutiny so their actions are all under the spotlight. This gives a real opportunity to make some differences requiring more than just words.

MOPAC made reference to their new engagement framework. MOPAC will look at how they diversify some of their activities. There are a number of structures they support but it's clear there is not enough diversity within the formal mechanisms - diversity of thoughts, experience etc. Their formal structures are not providing the full picture of how people are experiencing policing. This can lead to other side conversation but MOPAC would like these conversations to be captured in their formal mechanisms. To make this happen the current structures need more support than currently provided by MOPAC. MOPAC pointed out these are points SNBs and others have made.

MOPAC informed they provide funding to SNBs for their operation and to support community projects. But there is no support given for community development or engagement more widely whilst also holding the police to account. MOPAC does not provide support for this and this is a gap identified. This is an area they will want to address in the new framework.

In reference to information and data e.g. the complaints data, this is available in the public domain. But there are so many different data sets that are buried on a website that it can make it hard to access. And if found they are not always user friendly.

Following publication of the Mayor's action plan MOPAC will develop a collection of data that will bring key data into a format that will be accessible to people. MOPAC will aim to make this available twice a year. This will be a collection of all the key metrics that will help them to understand if they are improving in trust and confidence, disproportionality and if complaints are being handled effectively and on time. The key aim is to bring this information together to enable people to assess it at a quick glance.

In relation to the discussion about how policing operates MOPAC pointed out how a police officer understands and carries out their role/job compared to how the public understand their job/role and how they carry out their job; there is a gap between the two viewpoints.

They need to work together to bring these 2 positions together. Although there may not be agreement there could be better understanding of the different viewpoints and the parameters in which policing operates. To the public policing can seem archaic and it has a lot of regulation that members of the public are not aware of.

It is equally important for SNBs and groups like the Account Group to challenge and point out if there is a different ways things can be done. This can feed into the work of MOPAC.

The Mayor also has influence and can lobby Government for changes in legislation if required. In addition MOPAC can think differently about how they do scrutiny too.

MOPAC pointed out changing policing, the way it operates and how we experience it will not happen overnight. This is a real challenge for them to accept that it will take time to: a) implement and b) have the impact they want. It is important for the communities to understand that if they make changes it will not be immediately seen. However they need to continue to have these conversations to see if they are starting to have the right impact.

What is important to MOPAC is for people say the MPS is more transparent and that they have a better understanding of their operations. They want people to feel they have an opportunity to inform the MPS of their experiences. This would be a success.

If MOPAC publish the action plan and over time they are hearing from the community it is not delivering the changes they want. They will have to review what they are doing. MOPAC recognise it is not good to have a plan and tick off delivery if the public feeling and experience is not different.

The MPS and MOPAC recognise they need to keep being challenged and reminded of what the community want.

(xxi) **Members referred to the IOPC's opening statement making reference that the report was only possible due to individuals logging a complaint in the system. Members referred to comments from the Account Group in this discussion and their lack of confidence in the IOPC. Members referred to the IOPC's youth panel and asked how young people can get involved in this?**

In response to the questions from the discussion the IOPC provided the following responses.

This discussion exemplified the barrier that the IOPC have to overcome to build trust and confidence in the system.

The police complaints system is the system in place and it is designed to take forward public concerns and complaints about the police.

The complaints system was reformed earlier this year to make it easier so that at the end of the process there was a right of appeal to an independent body to make sure the complaint was handled correctly.

In reference to the IOPC's review work the Director reiterated this was only possible because those individuals engaged with the current system and this is the message he continuously communicates to people. The IOPC are encouraging people to get their voice heard if they are unhappy by using the system that is in place. Although it's acknowledged it is not a perfect system.

That being said using the complaints the IOPC conducted an independent investigation and made the learning recommendations.

In reference to earlier discussions about it being the bigger issues that matter. The IOPC agree with this and pointed out this was the rationale behind taking this issues that were happening and presenting them to the MPS at an organisational level. The IOPC used their statutory powers to make learning recommendations and highlighted the MPS had accepted all 11 recommendations. The MPS response is published on the IOPC website.

The IOPC advised in terms of building confidence in institutions it's about the action taken. The IOPC's pointed out the learning recommendations were made using the powers they have. The MPS will be charged with implementation and MOPAC will be charged with scrutiny and accountability of the learning recommendations.

The starting place for any concern is to engage in the system that is there.

- (xxii) **In discussions Members talked about making a recommendation to the Council to work with the Account Group to help residents to make complaints.**
- (xxiii) **Members referred back to their comments and concerns in relation to institutional racism and the disproportionality of young black men who are subject to stop and search. Member wanted a response to explain the reason for disproportionality and the low positive outcome rates in relation to arrests. Members remained concerned about the grounds for stop and search being executed correctly and the use of handcuffing resulting in trauma to those who have been handcuffed. Members were not satisfied with the explanation thus far for the criteria and grounds to conduct a stop and search and that it was being communicated effectively. Member commented the protocols from the College of Policing were not filtering through to police officers on the frontline.**
- (xxiv) **In addition to the points raised about disproportionality in the discussion Members cited that in the previous lockdown the number of arrests, charges and prosecution for drug possession went up dramatically during this period. Members pointed out this is likely to have had a disproportionate impact on young people. Members asked for the MPS's view on this activity and commented because the streets were quieter it might have been easier to pick up people for drug offences during this time.**

- (xxv) **In addition the Account Group representative raised questions about the statistical analysis related to the positive outcome rates. The Account Group asked what percentage of stop and searches do the police find prohibited items e.g. weapons etc.?**
- (xxvi) **The Account Group pointed out the overall positive outcome rate in Hackney is approximately 20-25%. For the general population the stop and search rates generally are 22%. The Account Group highlighted that the positive outcome rate for young black men aged 15-19 years was 14%. The difference in the 2 rates is quite stark for young people. In local dialogue with the BCU young people have been pushing to get a commitment to improve this rate to equal the general population rate. The Account Group suggested this could be a joint piece of work with the MPS, IOPC and MOPAC. So they could push up this outcome rate to at least equal their white peers.**
- (xxvii) **The Account Group asked for a commitment from the MPS, IOPC and MOPAC to remove the disproportionality in the positive outcome rate. But if this commitment could not be made the Account Group asked why?**

In response to the questions raised about the MPS work with the BPA, not being honest and in response to the comments made by the MOPAC officer about needing more than just words from the MPS. The Head of Profession, Crime Prevention, Inclusion & Engagement - London lead for Crime Prevention, Inclusion and Engagement from Met HQ informed the MPS welcomed hearing more from the youth group so they can consider what they could do differently. The MPS accepts that people who do not have trust and confidence in the MPS would struggle to have trust in the words they are saying. But would like to invite them to have a dialogue with the MPS.

The MPS were unable to refer to the current breakdown for Hackney's stop and search rates. However the general positive outcome rate is 22/23%.

The MPS confirmed they did not have target volume rates for stop and search or target rates for positive outcome rate. The MPS acknowledged they have had previous discussion with the Account Group.

The Deputy Borough Commander from the Central East BCU explained the role of the community monitoring group was to look at the data for local stop and search. The local BCU advised this is a regular report to the community monitoring group which is discussed. This report includes a breakdown of ethnicity and age.

The local BCU were of the view they do have a reinvigorated community monitoring group.

The MPS provided the current statistical data in response to the Account Group question. They quoted as at October 2020 the general outcome rate for white people for stop and search was 23% and for black it was 27.7%. In reference to the younger age group of 15-19 the rate for white it was 20% and for black it was 18.3%. Pointing out the gap was slightly lower than the

statistics quoted by the Account Group. For the 20-24 age group it was 22.5% for white and 32.4% for black.

The MPS cautioned against quoting figures that were not current. The MPS highlighted the most recent statistics show an improved position to the figures quoted earlier.

- (xxviii) **Members acknowledged the statistics were different but commented fundamentally the trend was black people were 10 times more likely to be stopped and searched nationally and 8 times more likely in London. Member commented young people were still feeling racially profiled as a criminal by the police and discriminated against. Member commented it will take more than words to overcome the racism young people feel.**
- (xxix) **Member referred to the training and noted a lot of reference to new recruits. Members asked about the training for established police officers.**
- (xxx) **Members also referred to the increase in Section 60s and asked about the stop and search carried out during the period of a Section 60.**

In response the Deputy Borough Commander advised training was important particularly training for new police officers who do not have prior knowledge of Hackney. This is the impact awareness training. Equally training needs to be refreshed for all police officers because experienced police officers become the role models for new police officers.

One of the objectives of the local stop and search review is to use the learning to work on the soft and communicative skills.

In reference to the question about Section 60s. At the peak they had 9 stop and searches in May 2020, 5 in June 2020, 4 in July 2020, 3 in August 2020 and 5 in September 2020. This correlates with the escalation in violence and the unlicensed music events during this period.

The BCU officer explained this is a preventative tool. A Section 60 is used either post incident or as a preventative if they anticipate disorder. The MPS pointed out the number of Section 60s have not escalated and are reflective of the violence profile during lockdown.

In response to the questions about institutional racism, increase in handcuffing and the request for an update on the work with the Black Police Association (BPA). The MPS informed they are commencing a review on handcuffing. This involves community representatives and the IOPC. This will look at the use of handcuffing and arrests primarily linked to stop and search, to understand why it has increased, who they are being used on and the disproportionality for handcuffing. The MPS advised there will be instances when handcuffing is appropriately used but they acknowledge there has been an increase and disproportionate use in particularly on young black men. The review has commenced and will be made public. The review is expected to conclude at the end of this year.

- (xxxix) **Members asked about the MPS safeguarding responsibility and duty of care in relation to the use of handcuffing.**

In response the MPS confirmed their responsibility was to ensure the use of force is lawful and proportionate. Their responsibility is to only use force when it is absolutely necessary.

- (xxxix) **Members asked what further support the IOPC and community safety partnership can provide to young people and the wider community that will encourage them to use the complaints system if they feel unfairly targeted. Members commented it is clear the complaints system is key to raising awareness.**

In response the MPS pointed out and agreed the lack of use of the complaints system is not a measure of success. Agreeing there is a lack of trust in the system. The MPS pointed out there are 4 ways a person can make a complaint about a police officer:

- 1) directly to the IOPC
- 2) to crime stoppers – this is an anonymous process
- 3) to a manager in the local police unit
- 4) directly to the Safer Neighbourhood Team.

The MPS officer committed to working with local SNTs to make the process of complaints more accessible and to make young people feel more empowered. The MPS suggested the Account Group to hold her to account to encourage trust and hold the MPS to account to share the information with them.

In response to the concerns raised about institutional racism the MPS reiterated the MET Commissioners position that she does not consider the MPS to be institutionally racist. However there are issues they need to work through and unconscious and conscious bias. The MPS officer pointed out there are approximately 45 thousand staff who work in and around the organisation. This means the organisation will have the best and worst of society working in the organisation. The MPS officer pointed out there are significant challenges in regards to trust and confidence. The ongoing work with the SNT, scrutiny and senior MPS is showing their commitment to change trust and confidence.

- (xxxix) **Members asked if stop and search videos can be stored for people to access and referenced if they want to make a complaint. Asking if the stop and search video could be given a reference number to be accessed.**
- (xxxix) **The Account Group representative commented the MPS officers stated police officers are not racist. The young person pointed out if you consider the areas where black and Asian communities reside evidence suggests they are suffering at the hands of the police. They are not in areas that have smaller numbers of ethnic minority groups.**
- (xxxix) **The Account Group representative commented if there is no recognition of a problem then it will be hard to make a change. The young person pointed out they have raised the issue of institutional**

racism but it has been ignored, despite there being statistical information from their research and the MPS's own bodies. The Account Group representative highlighted the responsibility is being passed to the local police officers. But in the young person's view senior management needed to take ownership and responsibility for their employee's actions.

- (xxxvi) **The Account Group representative added regardless of how the police feel the facts tell a different story. The MPS is institutionally racist if it is viewed from a stop and search prospective, persecution prospective and how the police respond to calls. The MPS use racial profiling and more when they doing a stop and search. Regardless of how the MPS feel there are multiple credible resources and bodies in the UK and internationally that support their statement that institutional racism is a major problem within the UK police system.**

In response the IOPC advised they have developed some resources working with their youth panel. This is a guide for young people on how to access the complaints system.

After the meeting the IOPC will share these resources with the scrutiny committee to share with their networks to build awareness of the system in place.

- (xxxvii) **The Cabinet Member for Skills, Employment and Human Resources at LBH made the following comments.**

She struggled with the concept that there was no institutional racism in the MPS. The Cabinet Member pointed out it is recorded, reported and researched that institutions within society all have racism built in. Both consciously and unconsciously.

Therefore it is not as simple to say there is conscious and unconscious bias in the individual that works within an organisation. That gives the organisation too much of an easy get out clause and the ability to blame individual staff without looking at the systems within the organisation.

It is important to remember the key principle written into the Lawrence inquiry about racism and people defining their own experiences. It can be damaging to defining that racism for those individuals.

If there are people telling you they are experiencing racism we need to listen and hear their experiences of racism.

The Cabinet Member commented we are aware the MET Commission has denied there is institutional racism in the MPS. But urged all officers to take the time to reflect on the organisations they are part of. Highlighting it is very easy to be defensive because we take accusations personally as they wanted to think the best of the organisation they work for. But everyone needed to put themselves aside to progress. Pointing out if they set themselves aside to listen to

what their residents, society and constituents are saying they will have an indication of the problems, issues and challenges ahead.

The MPS has come a long way but it still has a long way to go too.

The Cabinet Member hoped today's meeting and conversation would open an opportunity to continue to work together. The Council appreciates the MPS signing up to their local charter to be an anti-racist organisation and that the local MPS are signing up to the Council's inclusive leadership programme.

The Cabinet Member informed there has been a lot of work and good dialogue at all levels. The Cabinet Member hoped there would be continued dialogue between the Council, MPS and the Account Group. It was her hope that everyone left the meeting feeling robustly challenged.

5 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

- 5.1 The minutes of the previous meeting held on 30th September 2020 were approved.

RESOLVED: Minutes were approved
--

- 5.2 The Chair updated on the matters arising from the previous meeting.

- 5.3 The action on page 16 bullet point xi. The Interim Director of Housing to report back on the timescales for delivery for the project implementing cost effective internet access to all blocks in their estates, community halls and the voucher scheme.

This update will follow and will be available at the next meeting on 14th December.

- 5.4 The action on page 18 bullet point xiv. The Interim Director of Housing to report back about the floods in the blocks in Fellows Court tower blocks north and south and timescale for current works.

In response the Interim Director of Housing advised this repair is being actioned by housing maintenance services and is actively being progressed. The work is complex due to the number of flats which require access to repair the pipe and other work being undertaken in the block.

The Director has advised these issues have been resolved and the council was on site week commencing the 14th October 2020 to repair the defective pipe. The work was expected to complete by the end of the week.

6 Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission- 2020/2021 Work Programme

- 6.1 The Chair asked Members to agree the draft work programme in the agenda for the municipal year.

Members agreed the work programme.

- 6.2 In further discussions about the work programme Members suggested looking at LTNs. The Chair informed the Commission this was not within their remit and would be discussed by the Skills, Economy and Growth Scrutiny Commission on 23rd November 2020.
- 6.3 Members discussed spending more time at the next meeting looking at the work programme.
- 6.4 The Commission Members discussed monitoring the concerns about stop and search and the impact on the community in approximately 6 months.
- 6.5 The Commission Members discussed involving young people in the January meeting focused on parks and open spaces.

7 Any Other Business

- 7.1 None.

Duration of the meeting: 7.00 - 9.50 pm