

LONDON ASSEMBLY

Response to the Mayor's Draft Police and Crime Plan



Police and Crime Committee
February 2017

Holding the Mayor to
account and
investigating issues that
matter to Londoners

LONDONASSEMBLY

Police and Crime Committee Members



The Police and Crime Committee examines the work of the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) and investigates issues relating to policing and crime reduction in London.

Contact

Becky Short, Scrutiny Manager

Email: becky.short@london.gov.uk

Contact: 020 7983 4760

Follow us:

@LondonAssembly #AssemblyPolice

facebook.com/london.assembly

Contents

Recommendations	4
1. Introduction	9
2. Priorities for the capital	10
3. A better quality service for victims	19
4. Frontline policing	22
5. Holding the Met and MOPAC to account.....	25
6. Delivering in uncertain times	27
7. A clear sense of direction for the capital?.....	30
Our approach.....	31
References	32
Other formats and languages	36

Recommendations

Keeping children and young people safe

Recommendation 1

The final Police and Crime Plan, and the subsequent knife crime strategy, should include a commitment to improving engagement with young people about knife crime and violence to support prevention. This should include:

- uncoupling the perception that serious youth violence and knife crime are linked to gang activity, and redirecting public attention to reflect the prevalence of non-gang-related youth violence
- providing reassurance and appropriate messaging about the realities of knife crime
- helping to drive an increase in awareness of the importance of young victims reporting serious violence, and the ways in which they can do so
- exploring the potential to extend youth worker provision in Accident and Emergency into other areas, such as sexual health clinics, to support those who experience abuse

<p>Violence against women and girls (VAWG)</p>	<p>Recommendation 2</p> <p>The Mayor should use his commissioning powers to provide and deliver sustainable services to meet the needs of all victims and survivors of VAWG in London, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • increasing the number of Independent Sexual Violence Advisers (ISVAs) and Independent Domestic Violence Advocates (IDVAs) • providing long-term funding to give specialist services certainty in the support they can provide to victims
<p>Standing together against extremism, hatred and intolerance</p>	<p>Recommendation 3</p> <p>The final Police and Crime Plan should include specific commitments to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • work with local authorities and the Home Office to explore new ways of commissioning activity to prevent extremism • engage communities more effectively to safeguard against extremism
<p>Harmful practices: FGM</p>	<p>Recommendation 4</p> <p>The final Police and Crime Plan should fully reflect the Mayor’s promise that FGM is a practice that he will not tolerate. It should provide further specific detail on how the Mayor and MOPAC will work with organisations and communities in London to eradicate FGM.</p>

<p>Fraud and online crime</p>	<p>Recommendation 5</p> <p>The final Police and Crime Plan should be much clearer on its plans around cyber security and online crime, and include further detail on how the Mayor intends to support efforts to tackle online fraud.</p>
<p>Tackling drug use</p>	<p>Recommendation 6</p> <p>The final Police and Crime Plan should set out more clearly how the Mayor intends to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • approach prevention, intervention, and enforcement in respect of tackling drugs in the capital • work with partners in neighbouring counties to tackle drug trafficking that occurs across county lines
<p>Health and policing</p>	<p>Recommendation 7</p> <p>The final Police and Crime Plan should set out the Mayor’s intention to draft a clear plan and specific actions for supporting people with mental health needs that come into contact with the police and criminal justice service.</p> <p>Recommendation 8</p> <p>The final Police and Crime Plan should outline the Mayor’s commitment to push for improvements in the commissioning of healthcare in custody, to be delivered effectively and soon, to ensure that all detainees have access to the healthcare that they need.</p>

<p>A better criminal justice service</p>	<p>Recommendation 9</p> <p>The final Police and Crime Plan should set out the steps the Mayor and MOPAC will aim to take to take to push for greater devolution of powers and more responsibility over the criminal justice service to City Hall.</p>
<p>Frontline policing</p>	<p>Recommendation 10</p> <p>As a matter of urgency, MOPAC should revisit its local priority setting processes, to ensure that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the parameters for what priorities look like are clear and transparent • Safer Neighbourhood Boards, ward panels and other interested groups have an input into the priorities for their boroughs <p>Recommendation 11</p> <p>The Mayor should ensure that an adequate period of time is given to the borough merger pathfinder pilots, to ensure that they can be fully assessed. This assessment should examine the impact of differing priorities across a single Basic Command Unit on officers and on performance.</p>
<p>Holding the Met and MOPAC to account</p>	<p>Recommendation 12</p> <p>The final Police and Crime Plan should set out how each priority, including local priorities, will be measured and provide a clear indication of what success would look like. The Mayor should also set out how, using these measures, he will make an assessment about the performance of the Metropolitan Police as a whole.</p>

**Delivering in
uncertain times**

Recommendation 13

The Mayor should make it a priority for the new Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police to tackle the issue of workforce morale as part of the force's work on inclusion, fairness and equality. This should include:

- a particular focus on officers working in high pressure specialist areas, such as firearms
- ensuring adequate training for officers throughout their careers, to instil a positive culture and ensure they are well equipped to deal with the issues Londoners face
- examining how increased diversity in the Met can support good morale, and any new ways in which it can be achieved

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Mayor's Draft Police and Crime Plan comes at a time of great challenge and uncertainty for policing in the capital. Crime is changing, with increasingly complex and serious offences placing new demands on officers and requiring them to develop new skills. The growing number of specialist investigations that the Met has to undertake—in areas such as child protection and historical sex abuse—is expected to continue, and are the very types of investigations the Met has been heavily criticised for. At the same time, population growth and pressures on public services mean the expectation and demand on the everyday work of the police is increasing. And surrounding all of this is a tough funding situation that does not look set to improve in the near future.
- 1.2 Nevertheless, the draft plan proposes an ambitious set of priorities for London. The headlines are ones that few would disagree with: issues such as safeguarding, vulnerability and effective neighbourhood policing have been longstanding concerns of this committee and a commitment to improving them will always be welcomed by the vast majority of Londoners.
- 1.3 This report sets out the committee's response to the draft plan. We examined how the priorities and commitments reflect the challenges of modern policing, and the unique nature of crime in London. We also assessed the arrangements for effective oversight of the plan, to ensure that the London Assembly and Londoners can clearly hold the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) and the Metropolitan Police to account.
- 1.4 We accept that a high level strategy will not have all the answers. But there are some issues in the draft plan that we believe need further thought or explanation. It is critical that the final plan, and the strategies that follow it, will build and inspire confidence in these challenging and uncertain times: both of the police in the leadership shown by the Met and MOPAC, and of the public in the police's ability to respond to their needs effectively.
- 1.5 We hope that MOPAC and the Mayor will genuinely reflect on the comments and suggestions made by those that have taken the time to contribute to its consultation, and we look forward to seeing the final plan to make London a safer city for all.

2. Priorities for the capital

- 2.1 The challenges of modern policing in the capital are well reflected in the draft plan. It identifies, for example, that population growth and pressures on public services mean the demand on the police is increasing; and that crime now increasingly involves repeat victims and repeat offenders.
- 2.2 The draft plan also recognises that crime is changing, both in terms of volume and type, and that changing technology is contributing to this. Officers need new and specialist skills in order to do their job effectively. It is worth noting on this point, however, that while the number of ‘acquisitive’ crimes—such as robbery and car theft—has fallen, we are now beginning to see small increases.¹ With high harm offences such as sexual exploitation and serious violence coming to the fore, plus the potential for increases in what we sometimes think of as ‘traditional’ crimes, the pressure on the Met and the criminal justice service can only be expected to increase.
- 2.3 There is, however, an additional challenge for the capital not clearly identified: that of the Met’s workforce, in particular the morale of its officers. This was highlighted to us as one of the biggest risks for policing today, and is something we will address in this response.

Keeping children and young people safe

Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE)

- 2.4 Reports of child sexual abuse and exploitation offences continue to increase. Our predecessor committee’s report, *Confronting Child Sexual Exploitation in London*, highlighted that London has made significant developments in its response to Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE), but concluded that “more needs to be done to prevent and tackle child sexual exploitation.”²
- 2.5 We know, for example, that missing and looked after children are proportionately more at risk of CSE. Evidence suggests that a large proportion of victims of alleged CSE have previously been reported as missing, and generally, repeat incidents of going missing are “strongly linked to sexual exploitation.”³ In addition some children are also exposed to CSE when they become looked after.⁴ The Met has been criticised for its ability to handle missing children cases, along with other child protection measures. We are looking for strong direction from the Mayor to the Met and local authorities to get a grip on this issue.
- 2.6 The commitment in the draft plan to encourage more victims of CSE to come forward and report is welcome. But the Mayor must ensure the right

resources are in the right places to support survivors and those at risk of CSE. Currently there is an expectation that the local response to CSE is led by the Local Safeguarding Children Board (LSCB).⁵ The draft plan states that MOPAC will continue to make a financial contribution to each of the Children and Adult Safeguarding Boards in the boroughs. But there has been some concern over the effectiveness of LSCBs and questions about whether their statutory powers enable them to adequately hold partners to account. In addition, the Children and Social Work Bill—currently making its way through Parliament—proposes to remove the duty to have LSCBs and introduces measures to give the local authority, health services, and the police “greater autonomy to define the approach to be taken locally and the appropriate geographical reach of that approach.”⁶ MOPAC will need to examine how this will affect its commitment to protecting and keeping children safe, and it must ensure any new partnership arrangements deliver the level of protection children in London need.

Youth violence

- 2.7 News of young people being violently injured or killed—often by their peers—feels like an increasingly regular feature in local media. In our recent investigation into serious youth violence we found that the number of victims of serious youth violence has been rising over the past four years; and that half of all reports involve a knife.⁷
- 2.8 It is appropriate, therefore, that the Mayor has chosen to focus his attention on the high-harm areas of knife crime, serious youth violence and gang-related crime. We are pleased the draft plan recognises that only a small percentage of youth violence involving young people is related to gangs.⁸ As highlighted in our report, we believe that the Mayor and MOPAC could do more to challenge the perception that youth violence is a ‘gang issue’, and rebalance public policy and public attention to reflect the prevalence of non-gang-related youth violence.
- 2.9 We welcome the Mayor’s commitment to better targeted and intelligence-led Stop and Search as an effective tactic to tackle knife crime. Our committee has heard that intelligence led Stop and Search is critical in the recovery of weapons from our streets.⁹ We also welcome the Draft Plan’s recognition of the disproportionate effect of Stop and Search on BAME communities and therefore welcome the Mayor’s continued support for the Stop and Search Community Monitoring Network.
- 2.10 The Mayor’s commitments and the tactical responses to serious youth violence will need to adapt as the threat, risk and harm evolves. The draft plan, for example, promises tough action to ensure that laws restricting the sale of knives are enforced. The availability of knives is an ongoing concern, but in reality a big risk factor comes from regular knives, “ones that are readily there in the home, not the trophy knives that we see quite often on social media and elsewhere.”¹⁰ The Mayor will need to consider how he gives his attention to this particular aspect of the knife crime problem.

- 2.11 But prevention really is fundamental here. We know, for example, that a driver of knife possession among young people is a belief that they need to be prepared to defend themselves. This could be fuelled by a perception of the number and severity of weapons on the streets. It may also be fuelled by incidents that occur in communities. We know that “if you carry a knife you are far more likely to get stabbed, probably with that knife”: victims risk becoming perpetrators and vice versa.¹¹
- 2.12 The draft plan links the prevention of youth violence with initiatives such as the Information Sharing to Tackle Violence (ISTV) programme.¹² We are pleased to see an increase in the number of Emergency Departments sharing data. We are also pleased to hear that the Mayor will continue to fund and expand the provision of youth workers in trauma centres, and extend this to other A&E departments. These types of programmes that focus on the ‘teachable moment’ should continue to be supported while they can demonstrate such positive impact.
- 2.13 However, when a young person is admitted to A&E with serious injury, we can consider safeguarding and preventive arrangements to have failed. The Mayor will need to consider how he can use his unique position to send a strong message about the dangers and impact of youth violence, engage with young people, and best support the solutions that prevent violence from taking place. This includes providing reassurance and effective and appropriate messaging about the realities of knife crime; and helping to drive an increase in awareness of the importance of young victims reporting crime and the ways in which they can do so. By doing so the negative perception of safety that can lead young people to violence can be changed.

Recommendation 1

The final Police and Crime Plan, and the subsequent knife crime strategy, should include a commitment to improving engagement with young people about knife crime and violence to support prevention. This should include:

- uncoupling the perception that serious youth violence and knife crime are linked to gang activity, and redirecting public attention to reflect the prevalence of non-gang-related youth violence
- providing reassurance and appropriate messaging about the realities of knife crime
- helping to drive an increase in awareness of the importance of young victims reporting serious violence, and the ways in which they can do so
- exploring the potential to extend youth worker provision in Accident and Emergency into other areas, such as sexual health clinics, to support those who experience abuse

Violence against women and girls

- 2.14 Reports of violence against women and girls (VAWG) in London are rising. While reports of domestic abuse, rape and sexual offences are increasing, these crimes are severely under-reported, making it hard to establish the full extent of the problem. The commitments made in the draft plan to tackle VAWG “as a matter of urgency” and to encourage more victims to come forward and report are welcome.
- 2.15 Increased reporting has not translated into increased action against alleged perpetrators. This is a concern, and rightly reflected in the draft plan. Our recent work on VAWG found that criminal justice outcomes remain low, and that there is a risk that this may, in due course, reduce reporting and reverse the positive trends over the last few years.¹³ The Mayor can play a significant role in guiding and supporting women and girls through the criminal justice system and will need to hold the Met and London’s criminal justice services to account on this issue and bring more perpetrators of VAWG to justice.
- 2.16 The Mayor’s commitment to investing in prevention and support services for survivors of VAWG is essential. While we welcome his pledge to maintain current investment in rape crisis and sexual assault support, it is important to ensure that investment matches demand, and long-term funding is available. VAWG services have told us how important it is that specialist services are well funded and protected. As recommended in our report on VAWG, the Mayor must protect and build on London’s network of specialist support services; put the right resources in in the right places; and ensure that the refreshed VAWG Strategy not only builds on the success of London’s last Strategy, but is adequately resourced and able to deliver on its priorities.

Recommendation 2

The Mayor should use his commissioning powers to provide and deliver sustainable services to meet the needs of all victims and survivors of VAWG in London, including:

- increasing the number of Independent Sexual Violence Advisers (ISVAs) and Independent Domestic Violence Advocates (IDVAs)
- providing long-term funding to give specialist services certainty in the support they can provide to victims

- 2.17 The Mayor must take action to address the shortage of safe and secure accommodation for victims and survivors of VAWG in London. The draft plan acknowledges the lack of refuges for survivors of domestic abuse and makes a commitment to improve the availability of housing for women and girls fleeing violence. We welcome the Mayor’s promise to work with the GLA and local authorities to improve the availability of safe accommodation and explore options for pan-London commissioning to meet the housing needs of victims and survivors of VAWG in London. We expect to see further detail

from the Mayor on improving the availability of safe accommodation and how this will complement the London Plan and Housing Strategy.

Standing together against extremism, hatred and intolerance

- 2.18 We are pleased that the Mayor has directly reflected this committee’s findings on tackling extremism in the draft plan.¹⁴ It recognises that extremism can do more harm than just physical attacks: it undermines integration and isolates individuals. The draft plan also recognises that the current approach to tackling extremism in the capital, overseen by the Government, creates variations in the level of support provided to London’s boroughs.¹⁵
- 2.19 Terrorism and extremism do not respect borough boundaries: and neither should the support available to prevent it. The draft plan states that the Mayor and MOPAC are in a unique position to understand what is happening across the city, to identify risk, deploy resources more strategically and join up services. MOPAC has already identified these opportunities, but efforts to make them happen have been slow.
- 2.20 Over a year on from its creation, the London CONTEST Board—set up to oversee the implementation of the Government’s counter-terrorism strategy in London—does not appear to have made much progress in its stated aims of sharing information, improving transparency and delivering interventions more effectively.¹⁶ The Mayor will need to reinvigorate work in this area, and to do so the reference in the draft plan to exploring ways of commissioning activity to counter radicalisation should be made a firm commitment.
- 2.21 The public must not be the forgotten partner in the fight against extremism. Community engagement is shown to work, but is also the hardest element to achieve. Our predecessor committee recommended that the CONTEST Board and MOPAC commit to “regular, open and honest communication and engagement with the public about what is happening in London” and collaborate with the public more about ways to prevent extremism.¹⁷ We welcome the Mayor’s proposal to engage communities more effectively in efforts to safeguard against extremism, but again think that this should feature as a firm commitment in the plan to ensure that it receives the attention it needs.

Recommendation 3

The final Police and Crime Plan should include specific commitments to:

- work with local authorities and the Home Office to explore new ways of commissioning activity to prevent extremism
- engage communities more effectively to safeguard against extremism

What priorities are missing?

- 2.22 There is a difficult balance to be achieved when putting together any strategy or set of priorities: covering the issues that are most important to Londoners, but not committing to so much that it becomes unachievable. We heard that there is a danger that the Mayor has set too many priorities, but were assured by the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime (DMPC) that, as it currently stands, the plan is “absolutely within the parameters of what the Met can deliver.”¹⁸
- 2.23 Contrarily, we also heard about areas where the plan was felt to be lacking and have set these out below. The Mayor will need to consider which are most pressing and how these can be reflected in the final plan, without affecting the overall ability to deliver.

Harmful practices: FGM

- 2.24 The campaign against the practice of Female Genital Mutilation (FGM) has gained significant momentum in the last few years. Positive steps have been taken to tackle FGM, but we know new cases are being discovered in London. It is estimated that there are 137,000 women and girls affected by FGM in England and Wales, and 50 per cent of recorded FGM cases are in London.
- 2.25 The London Assembly recently brought together frontline professionals from across the capital to share best practice and talk frankly about the challenges and barriers to tackling FGM. Participants stressed the importance of practitioners having the confidence and resources to confront FGM, and how the sharing of intelligence, and the quality of information recorded, needs to improve. They also said more needs to be done to educate and raise awareness to better protect those who might be at risk of FGM.¹⁹
- 2.26 There is clearly more that can be done to prevent cutting taking place in London. Our recent report on violence against women and girls stressed the need for the new plan to strengthen the Mayor’s commitment to tackling harmful practices, including FGM. We recommended that it should include a focus on increasing understanding of harmful practices across public service agencies, and commit to the provision of dedicated and specialist support for survivors and those at risk.²⁰
- 2.27 We are concerned that the draft plan is not clear enough about how it will address FGM and other harmful practices in London. As it stands, it fails to fully reflect the Mayor’s promise that FGM is a practice that he will not tolerate. The final plan should include a much stronger commitment to support and protect women and girls affected by, or at risk of FGM, in London, and provide more detail as to how the Mayor and MOPAC will work with organisations and communities in London to eradicate FGM.
- 2.28 In particular, the Mayor must speak out against FGM, take a visible lead and drive a more effective multi-agency response to FGM, with a shared vision across organisations. A collaborative approach between the Mayor and local

agencies should be instilled, and pan-London investment for FGM training, awareness and prevention activity should be a funding priority for the Mayor.

Recommendation 4

The final Police and Crime Plan should fully reflect the Mayor's promise that FGM is a practice that he will not tolerate. It should provide further specific detail on how the Mayor and MOPAC will work with organisations and communities in London to eradicate FGM.

Fraud and online crime

- 2.29 Online crime is a “rapidly growing, high-volume type of offence that is affecting people right across society.”²¹ Representatives from London's Safer Neighbourhood Boards (SNBs) told us that it is an area that is becoming increasingly important to residents and Rory Geoghegan, Founding Director of the Centre for Public Safety, told us that:

“I spent three years as a neighbourhood officer in Lambeth and certainly I would regularly be coming into contact with online-enabled crime: credit-card fraud, doorstep fraud, landlord fraud. That sort of stuff is hugely growing. [...] The Met has made good progress with things like Falcon and getting that up and running, but for me anyway, it is one of the evolving threats that really does need to get a good focus for the next four years.”²²

- 2.30 Measures to tackle online crime, particularly online fraud, are considered to be lacking in the draft plan. There are brief references within the different priorities in the plan, and a reference to the development of a cyber-security strategy, but it was felt that specifically the approach to tackling online fraud needs to be set out more clearly for Londoners to have confidence that it is being tackled. It was suggested, for example, that more emphasis could be placed on how the Mayor will help to improve information sharing about fraud, to fully realise the scale in London.²³ We welcome the offer made to us by the DMPC to see what can be done in the final plan to make its plans on online crime and fraud clearer. We also note that a Chief Digital Officer is yet to be appointed: this should be rectified as soon as possible.²⁴

Recommendation 5

The final Police and Crime Plan should be much clearer on its plans around cyber security and online crime, and include further detail on how the Mayor intends to support efforts to tackle online fraud.

Tackling drug use

- 2.31 The draft plan commits to taking strong enforcement action against those who deal drugs and target young people. There is a question as to whether this is enough to give Londoners the confidence that the Mayor has got to

grips with this issue. Evan Jones, Head of Community Services at St Giles Trust, said for example:

“All it says in the report is that we want to make sure they [drug traffickers and dealers] are arrested. [...] For the youngsters who carry the drugs out to Ipswich, Southampton or wherever, it is a safeguarding issue and it should be a multi-agency response. That is not what we are getting at the moment.”²⁵

- 2.32 The issue of drugs is still of serious concern to Londoners and impacts on their perception of safety.²⁶ It is also an important driver of other types of crime: in our investigation into serious youth violence, for example, we heard that one of the reasons for the increase in knife possession and use was that young people are increasingly involved in serious organised drug trafficking.²⁷
- 2.33 It is for these reasons that we would like to see greater emphasis in the final plan on how the Mayor intends to approach the prevention, intervention and enforcement of drug use in the capital. We note that in the Mayor’s Talk London survey ahead of publication of the draft plan, Londoners were not asked for their views on this issue. It may be that the Mayor needs to undertake further work to understand the perceptions of Londoners and what they expect from any strategy or commitments in this area.

Recommendation 6

The final Police and Crime Plan should set out more clearly how the Mayor intends to:

- approach prevention, intervention, and enforcement in respect of tackling drugs in the capital
- work with partners in neighbouring counties to tackle drug trafficking that occurs across county lines

Health and policing

- 2.34 A sizeable minority of police action involves dealing with people with a mental health illness. Despite this, they often do not get the care they need from the police.²⁸ The Met is improving, but more needs to be done. There are references to supporting both victims and offenders with mental health needs in the draft plan, but it was described as “perhaps a little too quiet” on non-crime demand areas such as this.²⁹ The Mayor will need to set out a clear plan and specific actions for supporting people with mental health needs that come into contact with the police and criminal justice service.
- 2.35 We note that there is little reference in the draft plan—other than the commissioning of drugs testing—on healthcare in custody. Healthcare provision in London’s custody suites has been a concern of this committee for some time. We are concerned to hear that drug and alcohol workers are being removed from custody suites, and that a reason for this is reduced funding for embedded support from MOPAC.³⁰ We also remain concerned about the level

of healthcare provision more broadly. There is still a shortage of nurses in custody suites. The Met has chosen to focus provision on the busiest suites: leaving some with only access to a doctor, who is expected to provide cover for a number of custody suites over a large geographical area.

- 2.36 The DMPC has said that it, along with the Met, is putting together plans to improve the commissioning of healthcare in custody “as fast as we can”, but progress feels slow.³¹ The Mayor must push for these improvements to be delivered effectively and soon, to ensure that all detainees have access to the healthcare that they need.

Recommendation 7

The final Police and Crime Plan should set out the Mayor’s intention to draft a clear plan and specific actions for supporting people with mental health needs that come into contact with the police and criminal justice service.

Recommendation 8

The final Police and Crime Plan should outline the Mayor’s commitment to push for improvements in the commissioning of healthcare in custody, to be delivered effectively and soon, to ensure that all detainees have access to the healthcare that they need.

3. A better quality service for victims

- 3.1 Victims of crime need to have the confidence that they will be listened to, supported, and that they will receive swift justice. They should not go through the criminal justice process only to be let down. This has long lasting effects on the victim, their friends and family, and the wider community, and breaks down trust and confidence.
- 3.2 Currently, the criminal justice service in London struggles to deliver a quality service for victims: cases take a long time to move through the courts; and there are a number of unsuccessful trials due to witnesses or victims not attending, refusing to give evidence or retracting evidence.³² Rory Geoghegan told us that:

“...having been a victim, a police officer and a witness in various cases, the experience as a victim and a witness is very shaky and can be very inconsistent.”³³

A Victims Commissioner for London

- 3.3 The proposed introduction of a Victims Commissioner for London is a welcome one. But there is a need for this role to be as robust as possible. Ben Summerskill, Director of the Criminal Justice Alliance, told us that “just having a Commissioner who in some sense gives a voice to victims is probably not quite enough” and that the individual also has to have “the toughness and the resource to be able to challenge those parts of the criminal justice system in London in order to ensure that necessary structural change takes place or that efficiency is delivered”.³⁴ Rory Geoghegan told us that:

“The key to success of making that role worthwhile would be for that person or that team to move beyond just policy. A bit like an undercover shopper or something, they could go out and see the experience that Londoners are going through and then deliver concrete actions. If it just going to be a report here or a report there on issues affecting victims, it does not hold the feet to the fire enough and it would not be particularly beneficial.”³⁵

- 3.4 We received a number of suggestions about areas that the Victims Commissioner could focus on. These include:
- Victims that have previously been offenders: we heard that the experience of these victims is poor because “they are treated very differently. They do

not even report the crimes but, when the crimes do come to the attention of the authorities, they do get treated so differently. They are not treated as victims, even though on that occasion they most certainly are.”³⁶

- Adherence to the Victims Code: We heard that there are instances where the code is not being upheld, for example in offering victims the opportunity to make a Victim Personal Statement, which “can be a very powerful voice for victims and means they are having their voice heard and their feelings heard.”³⁷
- Access to Restorative Justice: to ensure that all victims know that it is a benefit and entitlement that they have “rather than the somewhat vapid offering that is given in the Victims’ Code, which is that they have an entitlement to be told about restorative justice”.³⁸

3.5 The post of Victims Commissioner is now being advertised. We look forward to meeting with the successful candidate to hear about their priorities, how they will tackle the challenges in London, measure success and deliver real change for victims.

A better criminal justice service

3.6 The proposal for devolution set out in the draft plan has been welcomed. Gavin Hales told us that “there does seem to be potential for a clearer leadership and bringing that system together, streamlining processes and so on” and Professor Marian Fitzgerald from the University of Kent said “it would be interesting if London could, bottom up, create an alternative model.”³⁹ Areas such as the magistrates’ courts, youth offending, and the witness service were all suggested as potential areas for further devolution.⁴⁰

3.7 There was caution, however, in respect of how realistic and how well thought out the proposals around devolution are. Rory Geoghegan told us that:

“I do not feel there is enough in this draft at the minute to give me confidence that there is anything more than just nice words in relation to criminal justice. I would like to see much more and I would like the CPS as a key part and a key entity that needs to be engaged and held to account.”⁴¹

3.8 The London Assembly has previously called for further work to be carried out to make the case to Government on devolution. In its report, ‘A new agreement for London’, it said that “the criminal justice system in London should be accountable just as is the Metropolitan Police Service” and that devolution could make it easier to provide a ‘whole-person’ approach to commissioning services to support for all those who have been through the criminal justice system.⁴²

3.9 The Assembly has previously said that MOPAC needs to demonstrate how outcomes would be improved through greater devolution and how it will safeguard the independence of the criminal justice system and in particular

sentencing.⁴³ Based on the feedback we received, the case still needs to be made.

Recommendation 9

The final Police and Crime Plan should set out the steps the Mayor and MOPAC will aim to take to take to push for greater devolution of powers and more responsibility over the criminal justice service to City Hall.

4. Frontline policing

‘Real neighbourhood policing’

- 4.1 The public continues to place a high value on having visible police officers in neighbourhoods and this is a driver of confidence.⁴⁴ For those working locally with officers, such as the SNBs, the move towards a minimum of two dedicated officers in each ward is a positive one.⁴⁵ However we heard that ‘visibility’ of these officers is about much more than being seen “on the beat”. Rory Geoghegan stressed that communication is the “number one skill” that should be sought in an officer and interaction with people is just as, if not more, important than simply being seen.⁴⁶ In improving the awareness of neighbourhood teams, the Mayor may also wish to consider or measure how often Londoners interact with their local officers.
- 4.2 There are two issues that the Mayor will need to monitor to ensure that the increase in dedicated ward support is a success:
- protection from abstraction: placing more officers from the neighbourhood pool into dedicated roles will, of course, leave fewer officers to draw on for abstraction when big events happen. We believe that there is a small risk, therefore, that dedicated ward officers could be abstracted for events other than New Year’s Eve and Notting Hill Carnival.
 - turnover of dedicated ward officers: SNB representatives felt that dedicated ward officers should stay in the same location for a period of time, so they can build up knowledge and relationships with the community. In some ways, having a minimum of two officers will negate some of the problems in this area, because it “enables transitions to happen in a relatively seamless fashion. If you only have one dedicated ward officer and they move on to a new gig, the replacement officer has a cold start.”⁴⁷

Local priority setting

- 4.3 Setting priorities locally has benefits. It means that the police and other partners can truly focus on the issues that matter to those around them, and it prevents London from being treated “as though it is just a homogenous lump—which it certainly is not—with homogenous communities and homogenous crimes.”⁴⁸ However, the current plans for local priority setting, and the way it is being carried out, raise significant concerns.
- 4.4 The first concern is what these priorities will look like. Gavin Hales told us:

“MOPAC needs to be clear. What does a good priority look like? What are the parameters that are going to be set? In particular, it needs to mitigate the risk that priorities are set because they are the things that are easiest to do or they are reflective of what is most practical rather than perhaps what is most important.”⁴⁹

- 4.5 The second is around who is involved in the priority setting. Community engagement and buy-in would appear to sit naturally with local priority setting, but we heard that local groups, such as SNBs and ward panels, are not having any input into local priorities: these are being determined by the borough Commander, MOPAC, and the leadership of the local authority.⁵⁰
- 4.6 This appears to go against the commitment in the plan to “enhance our engagement” with these types of groups.⁵¹ We were told by the DMPC that she would expect the Borough Commanders and the local authority leads “to have been to the Safer Neighbourhood Boards and to have taken that into consideration when they are setting the priorities.”⁵² SNBs were not aware these meetings were taking place and have not had conversations with Commanders in their boroughs.⁵³
- 4.7 It cannot be right that the priorities are being set without the buy-in of the residents they affect. This needs to be rectified, to ensure that there is community ownership of priorities. It also needs to be made clearer how ward priorities will feed into local priorities and how communication with residents will take place so that people understand and accept why priorities have been chosen.
- 4.8 Finally, we are concerned about how local priorities will play out in practice with other changes taking place in the Met: namely the move toward Basic Command Units (BCUs) across two or more boroughs.⁵⁴ Questions were raised with us about how officers will approach the different priorities of the different boroughs within their BCU.⁵⁵ This is something that the two pilots currently underway will need to reflect on and assess, to determine how officers manage and respond to these different and competing priorities.

Recommendation 10

As a matter of urgency, MOPAC should revisit its local priority setting processes, to ensure that:

- the parameters for what priorities look like are clear and transparent
- Safer Neighbourhood Boards, ward panels and other interested groups have an input into the priorities for their boroughs

Recommendation 11

The Mayor should ensure that an adequate period of time is given to the borough merger pathfinder pilots, to ensure that they can be fully assessed. This assessment should examine the impact of differing priorities across a single Basic Command Unit on officers and on performance.

5. Holding the Met and MOPAC to account

- 5.1 Part of the purpose of a Police and Crime Plan is to “provide the basis for the DMPC to hold the Commissioner to account and for [the London Assembly] to scrutinise the DMPC in terms of how things are progressing over the next few years.”⁵⁶
- 5.2 The Met was held to account under the previous Police and Crime Plan through the ‘20:20:20’ challenge, including the ‘MOPAC 7’: the 7 high volume crimes that all boroughs were expected to reduce. Londoners were able to see, through mechanisms like our regular monitoring reports and MOPAC dashboards, the direction of travel that the Met was taking. While we note the reasons for wanting to move away from hard targets, any subsequent performance framework must be clear on what is being measured, and what success looks like, so as not to negatively affect confidence.
- 5.3 The draft plan says that a “suite of measures” have been identified “that in combination will monitor the priority areas outlined in the plan”. MOPAC says that it will make data on crime and anti-social behaviour in every borough publicly available, and will hold the Commissioner to account for the Met’s engagement and performance using data from its “quarterly surveys to monitor Londoners’ levels of confidence and satisfaction in the job the police are doing.”⁵⁷
- 5.4 The fact that so much data will be available for scrutiny is encouraging. But we need to be reassured that it will be updated regularly and consistently, and that with the combination of London-wide priorities, local priorities, commitments and objectives, not only can the Mayor and MOPAC hold the Met to account, but that Londoners can easily understand how the Met is performing as a whole.
- 5.5 We heard that a greater narrative on achievements and outcomes “which goes out to the right channels” could be more beneficial “than statistics which people do not understand and are very sceptical about.”⁵⁸ The issue was best summarised by Gavin Hales:

“The thing that the Plan needs to do is to say how the sum of the parts can be assessed. When it comes to the Deputy Mayor [for Policing and Crime] holding the Commissioner to account, what do the numbers add up to? How do you know whether the Met in London as a whole is doing good work? The Plan as it is drafted at the moment needs to say

more about how performance will be assessed and what good performance is going to look like.”⁵⁹

Recommendation 12

The final Police and Crime Plan should set out how each priority, including local priorities, will be measured and provide a clear indication of what success would look like. The Mayor should also set out how, using these measures, he will make an assessment about the performance of the Metropolitan Police as a whole.

6. Delivering in uncertain times

- 6.1 The priorities set out in the draft plan are rightly ambitious, but with the uncertainty faced by the Met the likelihood of achieving them is at risk.

Funding

- 6.2 The Met's budget is under pressure. The London Assembly's Budget and Performance Committee recently reported that the Met:
- must find an additional £400 million of efficiency savings by 2020-21
 - faces a £17.4 million reduction in Home Office funding
 - receives an inadequate National and International Capital City Grant
 - faces further cuts following the outcome of the funding formula review

The Met also faces other pressures, such as the costs associated with its IT systems upgrades.

- 6.3 Taking the NICC payment as an example, London is estimated to be £172 million short of what is needed: the Home Office has calculated that the Met needs £281 million a year.⁶⁰ There has been no clear reason given as to why the Home Office has decided to underfund this aspect of London's needs. Before proposals to change the funding formula were abandoned in 2015, the Met stood to lose anywhere between £180 million and £700 million. It is unclear how devastating the new plans for the funding formula will be for the Met, but former Commissioner Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe has said that the Met will have to carry out its work "slower and worse" if there are significant reductions.⁶¹
- 6.4 Both the Mayor and DMPC have said they will be lobbying for fair funding from the Government in order to deliver on the promises in the plan. The Mayor has said that "the expectation is that, hopefully, the Government will take on board our representations in relation to the new funding formula" and he hopes to make progress in respect of NICC. He has also said, however, that he has a "lack of optimism" in relation to a fair settlement "because of the response the Home Secretary and the Home Office gave to us in the recent grant settlement."⁶² We remain to be convinced that anything will be different from the years of lobbying that has already taken place.
- 6.5 It is clear, however, that without increased funding from central government, front-line policing will be affected. The Mayor has said that "if the

Government subjects London’s police service to any further cuts, it will become near impossible to maintain the number of police on our streets.”⁶³ The outgoing Commissioner has cited money as the number one challenge for his successor and thinks consequently that there may be fewer front line officers in future.⁶⁴

Supporting a positive culture in the Met

- 6.6 It was suggested that morale is one of the biggest risks for the Met today. We heard that the mind set of an officer is one of being “under attack” because of an environment in which:

“if you do something, whatever it might be, however innocuous it may seem at the time - you may not even notice that you have made an honest mistake - you subsequently come under such scrutiny for such an extended period often that it really does undermine the goodwill one might have for the city that one swore an oath to serve”.⁶⁵

- 6.7 The draft plan specifically refers to “supporting a positive culture within the Met” and sets an objective to “improve the job satisfaction of Met officers and staff”.⁶⁶ The impact of good morale cannot be reinforced enough: the consequence of not achieving this was neatly summarised for us:

“If the next Commissioner and the Mayor and the Deputy Mayor [for Policing and Crime] do not address the workforce issue, then in five years’ time my real concern is that we may still have 32,000 officers - let us say we do - but we will not have the 32,000 we would like and we will not have London being policed in the way we would love for it to be.”⁶⁷

- 6.8 Many of the solutions appear simple but we recognise they are difficult to deliver. They include things like training, which was described as “the currency by which officers feel valued by the organisation”, and increased diversity, which will help to improve the perception of the Met.⁶⁸
- 6.9 The draft plan says that the Mayor and DMPC will continue to engage and show their support and admiration for officers—and we will continue to do the same—but further work to fully understand the drivers of poor morale, and the solutions, is needed. This should be an immediate priority for the new Commissioner of the Met.

Recommendation 13

The Mayor should make it a priority for the new Commissioner of the Met to tackle the issue of workforce morale as part of the force's work on inclusion, fairness and equality. This should include:

- a particular focus on officers working in high pressure specialist areas, such as firearms
- ensuring adequate training for officers throughout their careers, to instil a positive culture and ensure they are well equipped to deal with the issues Londoners face
- examining how increased diversity in the Met can support good morale, and any new ways in which it can be achieved

7. A clear sense of direction for the capital?

- 7.1 Overall, the priorities set out in the draft plan broadly reflect the challenges for London, striking a balance between volume crimes, such as burglary and theft, and ‘high harm’ crimes such as serious violence.⁶⁹ What needs to be certain, however, is that it provides a clear sense of direction to inspire confidence in both officers and the public.
- 7.2 For the police, it was questioned whether the final plan would help officers to “know what is most important when confronted with a wide range of pressures every day”. Gavin Hales told us that:
- “throughout the report as a whole—and this is not something that is unique to London but we see it in police and crime plans across the country—where we have priorities, objectives, commitments and so on, it can be very difficult to discern exactly what is most important. That really matters.”
- 7.3 The final plan also has to have resonance with the public as a whole. There is an argument that the draft plan, as it stands, is “not particularly accessible to a lay reader”. It was suggested to us that it could provide “a clearer summary of priorities” and we agree with this.⁷⁰ A simple summary that best describes the intent of the plan, which the DMPC said was “providing a good-quality service for all Londoners and making sure that we protect the most vulnerable”, could go some way to increasing understanding of the direction London is being taken in, and inspire confidence.

Our approach

The Police and Crime Committee agreed the following terms and conditions for this investigation:

- To examine the feasibility and potential impact of the Mayor's Draft Police and Crime Plan. In particular, to
 - examine how well it prepares the Met for current and future challenges
 - assess the arrangements for effective oversight of the Plan and its priorities

At its public evidence sessions, the Committee took oral evidence from the following guests:

- Professor Marian Fitzgerald, University of Kent
- Rory Geoghegan, Director, Centre for Public Safety
- Gavin Hales, Deputy Director, The Police Foundation
- Evan Jones, Head of Community Services, St Giles Trust
- Bernadette Keane, Victims Services Director, London Victim Support
- Sophie Linden, Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime, MOPAC
- Craig Mackey QPM, Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police
- Ben Summerskill, Director, Criminal Justice Alliance
- DAC Mark Simmons, Metropolitan Police
- Representatives from London's Safer Neighbourhood Boards

References

¹ For example, in the year to January 2017, compared with the previous year, totally robbery was up 6.1 per cent; theft of motor vehicle was up 22.3 per cent; and theft from person was up 5.3 per cent. See MOPAC, Report to the Police and Crime Committee, [23 February 2017](#)

² London Assembly, [Confronting Child Sexual Exploitation in London](#), March 2015

³ Research in Practice, [Children and young people missing from care and vulnerable to sexual exploitation](#), 2013

⁴ Alexis Jay OBE, [Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Exploitation in Rotherham 1997-2013](#), August 2014

⁵ LSCBs have a statutory duty to bring agencies together to safeguard and promote the welfare of children. They have a range of functions and play a key role in developing local safeguarding children policy and procedures and scrutinising local arrangements, including CSE

⁶ House of Lords, [Children and Social Work Bill explanatory notes](#), November 2016

⁷ London Assembly Police and Crime Committee, [Serious Youth Violence](#), September 2016

⁸ We found in our investigation into serious youth violence that data shows gangs were involved in just fewer than five per cent of knife crimes—or around 290 incidents—in 2015-16. See London Assembly Police and Crime Committee, [Serious Youth Violence](#), September 2016

⁹ Meeting of the Police and Crime Committee, [14 July 2016](#)

¹⁰ Commander Duncan Ball, meeting of the Police and Crime Committee, [14 July 2016](#)

¹¹ London Assembly Police and Crime Committee, [Serious Youth Violence](#), September 2016

¹² ISTV comprises a small anonymised dataset collected by Emergency Departments and shared with the GLA SafeStats Team and local Community Safety Partnerships (CSP). The data covers all Emergency Department attendances resulting from violent incidents, including: time and date of the incident; time and date of arrival in A&E; specific location of the incident; primary means of assault (i.e. weapon or body part used). See MOPAC, [Information Sharing to Tackle Gang Violence](#)

- ¹³ London Assembly Police and Crime Committee, [Violence against women and girls](#), November 2016
- ¹⁴ London Assembly Police and Crime Committee, [Preventing Extremism in London](#), December 2015; and [letter from the PCC Chairman to the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime](#), November 2016
- ¹⁵ London Assembly Police and Crime Committee, [Preventing Extremism in London](#), December 2015
- ¹⁶ Comments made by Martin Esom and other guests at the meeting of the Police and Crime Committee, [19 May 2015](#)
- ¹⁷ London Assembly Police and Crime Committee, [Preventing Extremism in London](#), December 2015
- ¹⁸ Meeting of the Police and Crime Committee, [26 January 2017](#)
- ¹⁹ London Assembly conference, Tackling FGM Conference: an event for London's frontline practitioners, 24 January 2017
- ²⁰ London Assembly Police and Crime Committee, [Violence against women and girls](#), November 2016
- ²¹ Gavin Hales, meeting of the Police and Crime Committee, [12 January 2017](#)
- ²² Rory Geoghegan, meeting of the Police and Crime Committee, [12 January 2017](#)
- ²³ Gavin Hales, meeting of the Police and Crime Committee, [12 January 2017](#)
- ²⁴ Mayor's Question Time, Appointment of Chief Digital Officer, [Question 2016/4516](#), 14 December 2016
- ²⁵ Evan Jones, meeting of the Police and Crime Committee, [26 January 2017](#)
- ²⁶ Meeting of the Police and Crime Committee with representatives from London's Safer Neighbourhood Boards, 31 January 2017
- ²⁷ London Assembly Police and Crime Committee, [Serious Youth Violence](#), September 2016
- ²⁸ Lord Adebawale, Meeting of the Police and Crime Committee, [18 December 2014](#)
- ²⁹ Gavin Hales, meeting of the Police and Crime Committee, [12 January 2017](#)
- ³⁰ Police and Crime Committee site visit to Brixton Custody Suite, 1 February 2017
- ³¹ Meeting of the Police and Crime Committee, [19 July 2016](#)
- ³² It can take around 160 days for cases to go through a Magistrates court and more than 300 days for a Crown Court. See Mayor of London, [A Safer City for All Londoners](#), December 2016; CPS data for London shows this to be the case in 23 per cent of unsuccessful trials.

- ³³ Rory Geoghegan, meeting of the Police and Crime Committee, [12 January 2017](#)
- ³⁴ Ben Summerskill, meeting of the Police and Crime Committee, [26 January 2017](#)
- ³⁵ Meeting of the Police and Crime Committee, [12 January 2017](#)
- ³⁶ Evan Jones, meeting of the Police and Crime Committee, [26 January 2017](#)
- ³⁷ Bernadette Keane, meeting of the Police and Crime Committee, [26 January 2017](#)
- ³⁸ Ben Summerskill, meeting of the Police and Crime Committee, [26 January 2017](#)
- ³⁹ Gavin Hales, meeting of the Police and Crime Committee, [12 January 2017](#); Marian Fitzgerald, meeting of the Police and Crime Committee, [12 January 2017](#)
- ⁴⁰ Meeting of the Police and Crime Committee, [26 January 2017](#)
- ⁴¹ Rory Geoghegan, meeting of the Police and Crime Committee, [12 January 2017](#)
- ⁴² London Assembly Devolution working group, [A new agreement for London](#), September 2015
- ⁴³ London Assembly Devolution working group, [A new agreement for London](#), September 2015
- ⁴⁴ In MOPAC's recent Talk London survey nearly 90 per cent of respondents felt that providing a visible patrolling presence was very or fairly important.
- ⁴⁵ Meeting of the Police and Crime Committee with representatives from London's Safer Neighbourhood Boards, 31 January 2017
- ⁴⁶ Rory Geoghegan, meeting of the Police and Crime Committee, [12 January 2017](#)
- ⁴⁷ Rory Geoghegan, meeting of the Police and Crime Committee, [12 January 2017](#)
- ⁴⁸ Marian Fitzgerald, meeting of the Police and Crime Committee, [12 January 2017](#)
- ⁴⁹ Gavin Hales, meeting of the Police and Crime Committee, [12 January 2017](#)
- ⁵⁰ Sophie Linden DMPC, Meeting of the Police and Crime Committee, [26 January 2017](#)
- ⁵¹ Mayor of London, [A Safer City for All Londoners](#), December 2016
- ⁵² Sophie Linden DMPC, Meeting of the Police and Crime Committee, [26 January 2017](#)

- ⁵³ Meeting of the Police and Crime Committee with representatives from London's Safer Neighbourhood Boards, 31 January 2017
- ⁵⁴ In November 2016, the Met announced that from January 2017 it would 'begin testing a proposed restructure of local policing' which involves moving from a borough-based policing model to one with fewer, but larger, basic command units (BCUs). In order to test this new model, the Met is undertaking pathfinder borough merger pilots, of two and three boroughs, in two areas: Camden and Islington (inner London) and Barking and Dagenham, Redbridge, and Havering (outer London). Each BCU will be led by an interim BCU commander and chief superintendent. They will be supported by four superintendents who will have cross borough leadership responsibility for one of the core local policing functions. The boroughs within the BCU will share people, vehicles, buildings and technology. The Met will use the results of these two pilots in order to inform further roll out of this new model.
- ⁵⁵ Meeting of the Police and Crime Committee with representatives from London's Safer Neighbourhood Boards, 31 January 2017
- ⁵⁶ [Written notes](#) by Gavin Hales, Deputy Director, Police Foundation
- ⁵⁷ Mayor of London, [A Safer City for All Londoners](#), December 2016
- ⁵⁸ Gavin Hales, meeting of the Police and Crime Committee, [12 January 2017](#)
- ⁵⁹ Gavin Hales, meeting of the Police and Crime Committee, [12 January 2017](#)
- ⁶⁰ Budget and Performance Committee, [10 January 2017](#)
- ⁶¹ Evening Standard, [Met will be forced to ration services, says Chief](#), 16 February 2017
- ⁶² Budget and Performance Committee, [10 January 2017](#)
- ⁶³ Mayor of London, [Londoners' safety will be put at risk if police funding is cut further](#), 16 January 2017
- ⁶⁴ The Guardian, [Met police chief says cuts will lead to fewer officers in London](#), 3 February 2017
- ⁶⁵ Rory Geoghegan, meeting of the Police and Crime Committee, [12 January 2017](#)
- ⁶⁶ Mayor of London, [A Safer City for All Londoners](#), December 2016
- ⁶⁷ Rory Geoghegan, meeting of the Police and Crime Committee, [12 January 2017](#)
- ⁶⁸ Rory Geoghegan, meeting of the Police and Crime Committee, [12 January 2017](#)
- ⁶⁹ Marian Fitzgerald, meeting of the Police and Crime Committee, [12 January 2017](#)
- ⁷⁰ [Written notes](#) by Gavin Hales, Deputy Director, Police Foundation

Other formats and languages

If you, or someone you know, needs a copy of this report in large print or braille, or a copy of the summary and main findings in another language, then please call us on: 020 7983 4100 or email: assembly.translations@london.gov.uk.

Chinese

如您需要这份文件的简介的翻译本，
请电话联系我们或按上面所提供的邮寄地址或
Email 与我们联系。

Vietnamese

Nếu ông (bà) muốn nội dung văn bản này được dịch sang tiếng Việt, xin vui lòng liên hệ với chúng tôi bằng điện thoại, thư hoặc thư điện tử theo địa chỉ ở trên.

Greek

Εάν επιθυμείτε περίληψη αυτού του κειμένου στην γλώσσα σας, παρακαλώ καλέστε τον αριθμό ή επικοινωνήστε μαζί μας στην ανωτέρω ταχυδρομική ή την ηλεκτρονική διεύθυνση.

Turkish

Bu belgenin kendi dilinize çevrilmiş bir özetini okumak isterseniz, lütfen yukarıdaki telefon numarasını arayın, veya posta ya da e-posta adresi aracılığıyla bizimle temasa geçin.

Punjabi

ਜੇ ਤੁਸੀਂ ਇਸ ਦਸਤਾਵੇਜ਼ ਦਾ ਸੰਖੇਪ ਅਪਣੀ ਭਾਸ਼ਾ ਵਿਚ ਲੈਣਾ ਚਾਹੋ, ਤਾਂ ਕਿਰਪਾ ਕਰਕੇ ਇਸ ਨੰਬਰ 'ਤੇ ਫੋਨ ਕਰੋ ਜਾਂ ਉਪਰ ਦਿੱਤੇ ਡਾਕ ਜਾਂ ਈਮੇਲ ਪਤੇ 'ਤੇ ਸਾਨੂੰ ਸੰਪਰਕ ਕਰੋ।

Hindi

यदि आपको इस दस्तावेज का सारांश अपनी भाषा में चाहिए तो उपर दिये हुए नंबर पर फोन करें या उपर दिये गये डाक पते या ई मेल पते पर हम से संपर्क करें।

Bengali

আপনি যদি এই দলিলের একটা সারাংশ নিজের ভাষায় পেতে চান, তাহলে দয়া করে ফো করবেন অথবা উল্লেখিত ডাক ঠিকনায় বা ই-মেইল ঠিকনায় আমাদের সাথে যোগাযোগ করবেন।

Urdu

اگر آپ کو اس دستاویز کا خلاصہ اپنی زبان میں درکار ہو تو، براہ کرم نمبر پر فون کریں یا مذکورہ بالا ڈاک کے پتے یا ای میل پتے پر ہم سے رابطہ کریں۔

Arabic

الوصول على ملخص لهذا المبرتن بل غتك،
فرجاء الاتصال بمرقم الهاتف أو الاتصال على
العنوان البريدي العادي أو عنوان البريدي
الالكتروني أعلاه.

Gujarati

જો તમારે આ દસ્તાવેજનો સાર તમારી ભાષામાં જોઈતો હોય તો ઉપર આપેલ નંબર પર ફોન કરો અથવા ઉપર આપેલ ટપાલ અથવા ઈ-મેઇલ સરનામા પર અમારો સંપર્ક કરો.



Greater London Authority

City Hall
The Queen's Walk
More London
London SE1 2AA

Enquiries 020 7983 4100
Minicom 020 7983 4458

www.london.gov.uk

Front cover photo: Metropolitan Police Service media library