

Police and Crime Committee response to the draft Police and Crime Plan for 2013-2017



Contents

1. Background	5
2. Introduction and Overview	6
3. Performance Targets	8
4. Cutting crime – the impact of changes to neighbourhood policing	13
5. Cutting costs – staffing changes	18
6. Cutting costs – changes to the police estate	21
7. Public confidence	25
8. Criminal justice and community safety	31
9. Conclusion	34
Appendix 1 – Summary of recommendations	35
Appendix 2 – Conservative group views	38
Appendix 3 – How we conducted the investigation	40
Appendix 4 - Endnotes	43
Appendix 5 – Orders and translations	53
Appendix 6 – Principles of scrutiny	54

Members of the Police and Crime Committee

Joanne McCartney (Chair)	Labour
Jenny Jones (Deputy Chair)	Green
Caroline Pidgeon (Deputy Chair)	Liberal Democrat
Tony Arbour	Conservative
Jennette Arnold	Labour
John Biggs	Labour
Victoria Borwick	Conservative
James Cleverly	Conservative
Len Duvall	Labour
Roger Evans	Conservative
Murad Qureshi	Labour
Fiona Twycross	Labour

Copyright

Greater London Authority

Published by
Greater London Authority
City Hall
The Queen's Walk
More London
London SE1 2AA
www.london.gov.uk
enquiries 020 7983 4100
minicom 020 7983 4458

1. Background

Policing in London is unique and complex. There are unparalleled challenges because of London's role as the nation's business and administrative capital, the numbers of people it attracts for work, leisure and tourism and its complex physical, social and political geography. The Mayor is responsible for ensuring that policing in London meets the needs of all its communities, that communities and the police are able to work together, and that the public has confidence in the police.¹ At the same time, the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) has national responsibilities which the Mayor must balance with local needs.

The Mayor has a statutory duty to publish a Police and Crime Plan. The Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) has a key role in helping the Mayor to prepare his Plan which should set out the his policing and crime priorities, including what policing the MPS is expected to provide and what resources will be provided to the Commissioner of Policing.²

In this investigation, the Committee sought to check that the Plan will effectively reduce crime, address the issues that matter to Londoners and improve the MPS's service. We have sought the input of experts to assess the ambitions in the Plan and what impact they might have on the service received by Londoners. We also explored what impact budget-saving proposals – incorporating changes to structures, staffing and estates – may have on communities. More information about the terms of reference for this work and the evidence we gathered is included in Appendix 3.

2. Introduction and Overview

The Mayor faces a challenge in seeking to deliver savings in the MPS budget at the same time as driving improvements in its performance. Nevertheless, both are important: nationally the Home Office's funding for the police is set to decline by around 20 per cent by 2014-15³ while a variety of indicators suggest that MPS performance needs to be improved. Public confidence in the MPS puts it 23rd out of 42 forces in the country; ⁴ trends for the proportion of crimes that are solved are declining across a number of crimes;⁵ and while crime levels have fallen significantly in recent years there remains a struggle to reduce fear of crime.⁶

The Plan sets out the Mayor's overall mission to deliver:

- A metropolis considered the greatest and safest big city in the world.
- An MPS that becomes the UK's most effective, most efficient, most respected, even most loved police force.
- A capital city where all public services work together and with communities to prevent crime, seek justice for victims and reduce re-offending.

To deliver these aspirations, the Mayor has articulated key performance targets in his 20.20.20 Challenge. The MPS is tasked with: reducing crime by 20 per cent across seven neighbourhood crimes by 2016; ⁷ reducing costs by 20 per cent by 2016; and increasing public confidence by 20 per cent by 2016. The Mayor has also introduced a new set of 20.20.20 Challenge targets for criminal justice partners to: reduce court delays by 20 per cent by 2016; increase compliance with community sentences by 20 per cent by 2016; and reduce reoffending by young people leaving custody by 20 per cent by 2016.

The Committee welcomes the Mayor's aspiration to improve the service received by Londoners – through a cut in crime, an increase in public confidence and ensuring that taxpayers' money is used efficiently – but believes there are ways that the draft Plan could be strengthened to ensure it delivers the improvements required. Our investigation found that the Plan needs to go further to support the MPS to achieve its targets and that some of the proposed changes may in fact make the targets more difficult to meet. Further, the very basis of the targets was called in to question, which may have damaging consequences for the credibility of MOPAC and for the performance of the MPS.

We believe that the Mayor's proposed changes represent a significant shift in the way neighbourhood policing is carried out and the way that the public will access the police. The draft Plan is not clear enough about how some of these changes were arrived at or how fundamental they will be. We therefore make recommendations in this report so that MOPAC and the MPS are more

transparent in their decision-making, provide greater evidence to demonstrate that these changes are right for London, and are clearer about the steps they will take to improve public confidence in the police.

The Committee also welcomes the aspiration to reduce reoffending and improve the experience of crime victims and witnesses. But we contend that as it stands the Plan misses an opportunity to realise the benefits of the Mayor's wider responsibilities for crime reduction and criminal justice. The creation of MOPAC could be a catalyst for greater coordination in the criminal justice system and we had hoped that the Plan would bring much-needed clarity on the Mayor's priorities for community safety. We conclude that the draft Plan does not yet realise this potential and that these two areas require considerable improvement in the final document.

The Conservative Members of the Committee have come to a different conclusion on some elements of this report and this is reflected throughout this submission.

3. Performance targets

The Mayor needs to develop and communicate more sophisticated headline performance targets if they are to be credible and deliver real improvements in policing. These targets should be based on robust evidence.

The draft Police and Crime Plan includes two sets of “20.20.20 Challenges”. The first will be used to hold the MPS to account, and requires it to reduce crime, increase public confidence and reduce costs – all by 20 per cent by 2016.⁸ The Plan also introduces for the first time Mayoral targets for the criminal justice agencies. These seek a reduction in court delays, an increase in compliance with community sentences and a reduction in reoffending – again, all by 20 per cent.⁹

The 20.20.20.20.20 challenge

The Committee heard that targets are an important tool for determining priorities and measuring performance.¹⁰ Their role in helping to define a strategic direction is also particularly important as resources come under increasing pressure. The 20.20.20 Challenge will form an important part of the Mayor’s approach to holding the Commissioner to account and will allow the public to assess how well the Mayor has delivered on his promises.

Time and again in this investigation the Committee heard scepticism about the evidence base used to determine the targets.¹¹ The Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime previously told us he would commission an external review to inform the vision for the MPS.¹² The Committee is not aware of such a review having taken place and there is no reference to its findings in the draft Plan. It appears that the consistent application of 20 per cent targets is a gimmick and is not based on a systematic analysis of the challenges facing the MPS and the potential improvements they could make.¹³

There are other potential problems with the targets. Some of the targets may actually be in conflict and therefore extremely difficult to achieve. Improved public confidence may lead to rising crime figures, as people become increasingly willing to report crime.¹⁴ This would make it challenging to achieve a cut in crime at the same time as increased public confidence.

We also heard that a number of the targets may be unrealistic.¹⁵ At their worst unrealistic targets may encourage officers to “fiddle the figures in order to make the target look as though it is being met.”¹⁶ The Commissioner explained that the MPS has processes to check that crime is being recorded in the right way¹⁷ but the Mayor did not satisfy us that MOPAC’s approach to quality assurance is yet well enough developed.¹⁸

“The question of the 20 per cent target, it seems to me is just designed to grab headlines.”¹

Marian FitzGerald, visiting Professor of Criminology, University of Kent

We recognise that there has been a long-running debate within policing about the limitations and benefits of targets. The challenge of target-setting and measurement has limited internal and external efforts to evaluate the police's performance over the years and we acknowledge that this is not easy to resolve. The recent IPCC investigation into the MPS's approach to recording rape and sexual violence clearly demonstrates the risks associated with targets and highlights the need for rigorous analysis of crime statistics.¹⁹

During its investigation, the Committee heard that there are ways to cross-check and validate the data being presented to test whether it accurately reflects instances of crime in the capital.²⁰ This will be even more important for public confidence as we enter a period in which politics – through directly elected police and crime commissioners – has a more direct influence on policing. The public must be able to have confidence in the figures that are being reported. Methodical, challenging approaches to assessing crime data must, therefore, be pursued by MOPAC.

Priority crime types

The Plan identifies seven priority crime types that will be targeted but it is not clear why those particular crimes have been picked. MOPAC's reasoning – that they "have sizeable impact on Londoners, are high volume, are clearly understood by the public and are victim-based offences" – does not adequately explain the thinking or evidence behind this decision. Many other crimes would also fulfil these criteria and the impact of the chosen crimes (relative to others) is debated.²¹ The selection also fails to fully take account of public priorities or professional judgement of the most important crimes to tackle in London.²²

Throughout the investigation the Committee heard concerns about whether the right crime types had been chosen and whether other areas will receive less attention.²³ For example, the Plan sets no targets regarding the MPS's approach to rape and serious sexual violence.²⁴ It was suggested that no headline targets were included because the MPS recognises it is underreported and wants to avoid any risks of discouraging reporting.²⁵ We understand that an increase in reporting in some crimes, such as sexual assaults and hate crime may indicate an increase in confidence that the police will deal with these crimes effectively. The Plan presents an opportunity to explain these issues to the public and therefore we continue to press for greater consideration of this issue in the Plan. We are pleased that the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime has taken this on board and recently suggested "some kind of balanced scorecard" could be developed:²⁶ the latest thinking on measuring performance for sexual violence should be included in the final Plan.

"There are a number of reasons why you might elect to have a target here. Are you doing it by virtue of volume, because they cause the most harm, because they act as gateway offences? I did not see what I took to be a compelling explanation of why these seven."

Martin Innes, Deputy Director for research, Cardiff University School of Social Sciences

The Mayor told us he would look again at how sexual offences could be better addressed in the document²⁷ but there are other areas that also require further attention. Gun and knife crime is the top priority that the public want the police to tackle in London.²⁸ The key issue we raised in our response to London's anti-gangs strategy was the need to balance enforcement activity with prevention and diversion programmes.²⁹ The Plan takes us no further in understanding MOPAC's and the MPS's approach to this issue. We also heard concerns in this investigation that the MPS's approach to gangs does not consider the role of girls and women. We would therefore welcome more detail on the Mayor's approach to gangs in the final Plan and in particular these two issues.

A number of written submissions to the Committee³⁰ suggested that the Plan should prioritise dangerous driving, which is among the top priorities that Londoners want the police to tackle.³¹ Barnardo's suggests the Plan needs to pay greater attention to child sexual exploitation³² and similarly some organisations are concerned that the Plan makes no reference to the police's role in safeguarding children and young people.³³ Refuge says more details is needed on what the Mayor seeks to achieve regarding domestic abuse.³⁴

The Committee accepts the need for some prioritisation and acknowledges this is a controversial task. We also accept that, by definition, a high level strategy will not include details about dealing with every crime type. MOPAC has other relevant strategies, such as anti-gangs and violence against women, and we look forward to continuing to work constructively with them on these more detailed strategies.

Nevertheless, we have repeatedly heard that "what gets measured, gets done."³⁵ By not addressing other priority areas in the targets, MOPAC is in danger of implying they are not important. In evidence to us MOPAC has been clear that performance in other areas will be measured³⁶ but the Plan does require greater clarity on how other important crimes will be tackled. This is particularly important given that the Commissioner said the priorities in the Plan will drive allocation of resources³⁷ and that allocations in MOPAC's Crime Prevention Fund are being determined using these seven crime types as a measure of need.³⁸ The list of seven priority crimes, against which MPS performance will be measured, cannot be allowed to unduly absorb resources required to tackle other significant crimes and public concerns.

Also, we have heard concerns that the Plan does not make the most of a preventive approach to reducing crime.³⁹ One such example is the fact that the Plan makes no reference to safeguarding. Intervening earlier when vulnerable adults or children are at risk should be a primary concern of the police and yet the Commissioner has previously said that "I don't think we are here to be social workers".⁴⁰ Another relates to the approach to tackling

gangs, as discussed above, where the MPS needs to ensure that its enforcement activity is coordinated with the preventive and diversionary approaches of partners. We urge the Mayor to ensure that the MPS sees its role in prevention as a strategic priority and ensure this is reflected in the Plan.

Finally, priorities for crime reduction are unlikely to be of equal significance across London's boroughs.⁴¹ At present, ward panels determine local priorities. This process is important as the police need a mechanism to understand local priorities: research has shown that people who believe the police are tackling local priorities are likely to report high confidence in the police.⁴² The Plan states that the Mayor's new Safer Neighbourhood Boards will be required to ensure that every ward has a panel in place but does not give any further reassurance on how the police will continue to be held to account at this very local level.

Recommendations:

- 1. In the final Plan, MOPAC must set out the evidence base used to develop the targets to demonstrate that they are appropriate – i.e. stretching but achievable. MOPAC should also demonstrate how it believes the targets can be met by including interim targets it expects the MPS to reach throughout the Plan period. MOPAC should provide the Police and Crime Committee with an annual report (by the end of March each year) on progress against this trajectory on each of the key performance targets, and an assessment of the impact of the Plan.**
- 2. To ensure that the figures being reported by the MPS accurately reflect Londoners' experiences of crime and disorder, within the next six months MOPAC should work with independent experts to develop quality assurance mechanisms that can interrogate the information being provided by the MPS. It should report back to the Committee on this work by the end of September 2013.**
- 3. The final Plan must explain how MOPAC believes it addresses the issues that matter to Londoners and the priorities that are reported in the MPS's public surveys. It must include reassurance that significant public concerns that have not been included in the headline targets – including sexual violence and gangs – remain a priority. The final Plan should demonstrate that they will be adequately resourced and include the latest thinking on how performance will be assessed. The final Plan should also address the MPS's role in prevention of crime.**

4. The Committee welcomes the role that local forums currently play in determining local priorities and holding the MPS to account for performance. The final Plan should include a commitment to how these local engagement mechanisms will be supported in future and details of how they will be used to understand local concerns.

4. Cutting crime – the impact of changes to neighbourhood policing

The final Plan needs to demonstrate that the new neighbourhood policing model will not damage community engagement, accountability and public perceptions of policing.

The Police and Crime Plan will change how neighbourhood policing is structured. Ward-level safer neighbourhood teams will in future have fewer dedicated officers, with borough-level support provided by a pool of PCs, Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs) and Specials that can be deployed according to need. In the new structure, each ward will have a named sergeant, one dedicated PC and one dedicated PCSO, where currently each ward has a dedicated sergeant, two dedicated PCs and three dedicated PCSOs. The changes proposed represent a fundamental shift away from the dedicated ward team model – introduced first in London and copied around the country – to neighbourhood policing that is built around boroughs.

“At the moment, we have ended up with neighbourhoods with no one there some days... I do not think it is a good model. It is good on paper, but not in delivery.”

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe, Commissioner of the Police of the Metropolis

Changes to neighbourhood policing

The majority of the Committee believe that the safer neighbourhood model has served us well in the past decade and have not been persuaded that the model will improve local policing. They are keen that the concerns we heard regarding the impact of changes to safer neighbourhood teams are addressed.

There are questions about the basis for the changes and a lack of information about potential consequences. Pilots of similar models⁴³ have taken place in London and while some high-level analysis of these pilots has been given to the Assembly, no formal evaluation of these pilots has been published.⁴⁴ In the information provided it is not clear how the challenges identified were addressed in the new model so we cannot assess how effectively the pilots have contributed to the development of the new model or its likely implications on the ground. One of the arguments in defence of the new model – that it will minimise abstractions – needs to be considered in the context that abstractions have only been approved to such a large extent relatively recently.⁴⁵

However, we also heard that there are potential benefits to the new model, and the Conservative Members of the Committee support these viewpoints. One expert suggested that that the new model is a “rational response” to the challenges facing neighbourhood policing:⁴⁶ For example, the MPS suggests the new model will ensure that PCs and PCSOs will not be

abstracted from their ward, a frustration that is often reported to the MPS under the current arrangement.⁴⁷ The Conservative Members of the Committee note the Commissioner's views that SNTs are not at full strength: "[you claim that SNTs have] about 6 [staff] – as though they are there for 24 hours. That's untrue. They leave; they have abstractions. Now by being able to share officers across neighbourhoods those will be filled and there are going to be more of them too. I think we have to be careful we are not comparing apple with pears."

These Members also suggest that the new explanation of "dedicated" officers – that they will never be abstracted – is more accurate than the previous use of the term, when any member of a safer neighbourhood team could be abstracted. This more upfront approach was supported by some experts who agreed that "honesty is the best policy" when managing public expectations of the police.⁴⁸

The Conservative Members of the Committee also support the Commissioner's view that the new model – with a larger pool of officers in local teams – is more robust. The Committee has also heard that floating reserves can be more effectively deployed to trouble spots⁴⁹ and research by HMIC has shown that targeting hotspots can be an effective way to use resources.⁵⁰

From reassurance to response

The MPS has set out its intention to change the emphasis of neighbourhood policing from reassurance towards enforcement and response. It says that its approach will move "from one that is solely based on something we call reassurance to put crime fighting more on the front foot."⁵¹ This shift is seen as significant; for example, Jon Collins of the Police Foundation told the Committee that the model proposed is "response policing by the back door".⁵² The balance between reassurance and response-based policing has shifted before – it is part of a perennial debate on the most effective policing model – and neighbourhood policing in London will again begin to look substantially different as the changes are implemented.

Many people "are not even aware of the specifics of the police organisation within London" and therefore structural changes are unlikely to concern them.⁵³ However, we heard valid concerns about the reduction in the size of dedicated ward safer neighbourhood teams and its impact on community safety. Evidence from the Home Office has shown that neighbourhood policing has been successful in reducing crime and perceptions of anti-social behaviour.⁵⁴ Central to this was the presence of locally recognisable officers and problem solving in partnership with the local community.⁵⁵ The majority of the Committee are concerned that these proposals will reduce the number of dedicated officers and the capacity of ward teams to work with local partners to develop long-term solutions.⁵⁶ Experts also told us that the

"This is a substantial weakening of the Neighbourhood Policing model, which has been demonstrated to be an effective approach to reducing local ASB and low level crimes and problems and increasing public confidence."

Peter Neyroud, Institute of Criminology, University of Cambridge, and former Chief Constable of Thames Valley

police spend a significant proportion of time dealing with issues that are not in the strictest sense 'criminal', but which nonetheless are extremely important to local residents.⁵⁷ We fear that a reduction in the size of dedicated ward teams may reduce their ability to deal with this lower level disorder, which can act as a 'magnet' for other crime and disorder.⁵⁸ The Commissioner has agreed to reflect on this issue and the Committee looks forward to seeing how it will be addressed in the final Plan and the rollout of any new model.⁵⁹

The Conservative Members of the Committee are nonetheless confident that much of the evidence provided demonstrates that the new local policing model will serve Londoners well. For example, the Committee heard that the new model "seems a perfectly rational approach to the problem to me... I think the structure here, as long as it maintains that local emphasis, and it may even improve it if we have that kind of stability and the ability of people in local areas to build proper links with the other agencies they need to work with".⁶⁰ The Conservative Members of the Committee therefore suggest the new model has the potential to improve problem solving and partnership working.

Another element of these changes is a reduction in the number of Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs). These have already declined in recent years and the MPS has indicated their numbers will decline by a further 30 per cent.⁶¹ The MPS says that PCSOs are "good for visibility and reassurance but only have limited enforcement powers and cannot broadly investigate crime".⁶² A focus on PCs reflects the concerns of some members of the public that PCSOs lack power.⁶³

The Committee heard that there are potential risks to this approach. Experts explained that PCSOs have a distinct role focussed on engaging the local community. This was a deliberate feature of their introduction in recognition of the fact that police officers are often keen to 'fight crime' in preference to engaging with the community.⁶⁴ Having the time to engage with the community is not simply a 'nice to have' but essential to enabling the police to do their job. Although the reduction in PCSOs may be an attractive strategy to meet budget reductions and the commitment to keeping officer numbers high, this shift may actually make it more difficult for the MPS to meet its crime reduction targets.

Finally, there are concerns about the process of determining borough allocations.⁶⁵ Clarity must be provided on how relative needs were assessed so that the process behind these decisions is transparent. We are pleased to hear that the Commissioner intends to review this within six months to ensure that the new model is meeting local needs.⁶⁶ Clearly this will also require on-going monitoring as local circumstances change.

From specialists to generalists

To facilitate increases in neighbourhood teams, officers will be redeployed from boroughs' specialist Criminal Investigations Department (CID) squads to neighbourhoods and response: they will remain in boroughs but "be tasked in a different way".⁶⁷ The Commissioner feels the new approach will increase local, uniformed officers whose numbers have previously declined despite an increase in overall officer numbers.⁶⁸

In this inquiry, we sought to examine the impact of changes to specialist investigation teams. We heard views about the specialist teams that might need to be retained and some concern that these changes could lead to a loss of specialist investigative skills.⁶⁹ The Commissioner agreed that some specialist teams – for example tackling gangs or sexual violence – should remain⁷⁰ and assured the Committee that the removal of other specialist teams would not affect crime prevention and detection.⁷¹

However, the level of detail provided in the consultation makes it difficult to assess the potential impact of moving officers from specialist teams. While the Commissioner has provided some details to the Committee, the public lacks full information about which teams these officers are coming from. This also makes it difficult to validate whether this shift is a paper exercise 're-branding' officers or a genuine increase in local resources. The Committee will seek to monitor how resources are changing within specialist teams to ensure that commitments to particular crime types and important areas – such as work with young people – are maintained.

Recommendations

- 5. In advance of implementing changes to neighbourhood policing, the MPS should publish details of how borough allocations were determined. This should include assessments of relevant pilots and explain how the lessons were used to develop London-wide plans for neighbourhood policing changes.**
- 6. To manage some of the risks we highlight, the final Plan needs to:**
 - a) explain how the MPS believes the new model will strengthen neighbourhood policing;**
 - b) provide clarity on where additional resources will come from; and**
 - c) respond to concerns about the importance of locally known officers. The Commissioner should consider increasing the number of named and/or dedicated officers allocated to local areas.**

Using the British Crime Survey, the Committee will monitor visibility statistics and public awareness of safer

neighbourhood teams to review the impact of these changes.

7. MOPAC and the MPS should look again at the proposal to cut PCSO numbers. The final Plan should demonstrate that this is the best option for dealing with the MPS's budgetary constraints and that there are no other less damaging areas for savings. Figures about borough allocations of PCSOs should be included in the final Plan along with details of police officer numbers.
8. Within six months of the implementation of the new neighbourhood policing model, MOPAC should report to the Committee on its impact. This report should assess the impact on:
 - Effectiveness in tackling crime
 - Tackling anti-social behaviour
 - Community engagement
 - Public confidence

5. Cutting costs – staffing changes

MOPAC and the MPS must put in place adequate safeguards to ensure that reducing numbers of civilian staff and changing supervision arrangements do not damage performance or public perceptions of policing.

The Commissioner intends to re-profile the MPS workforce to live within ever tighter budget constraints and meet the Mayor's officer numbers target. His strategy is "a programme that gets officers out from desk jobs and supervisory roles onto the streets".⁷² Numbers of civilian staff are also being reduced by nearly 20 per cent over the next three years.

Reducing civilian staff

Reducing civilian staff is one of a very limited number of ways of making the necessary savings without cutting officer numbers, but there is a risk that this leads to officers backfilling support roles. Civilian staff are budgeted to fall from 14,500 in 2012-13, to below 12,000 in 2015-16.⁷³ The Plan suggests that the MPS can reduce the numbers of support staff "without replacing police staff with police officers" and the Commissioner told the Committee that in his professional judgment that this is "a reasonable way forward".⁷⁴ He also assured the Assembly that he will approach the Mayor if he feels that police officers are being required to backfill civilian positions.⁷⁵

There are other risks to this approach, which the Commissioner recognises.⁷⁶ The changes could impact on productivity, for example if officers have to do more "self-service bureaucracy", reducing the time available for patrol.⁷⁷ Effective neighbourhood policing produces an administrative requirement that could make safer neighbourhood teams "victims of their own success" if they lack effective administrative support.⁷⁸ Some changes that do not amount to losing officers from the front line may in the longer-term affect operational capacity and front-line performance.⁷⁹

Analysis shows that operational strength – frontline police officers, PCSOs and staff – in the MPS has already fallen by nine per cent between 2010 and 2012.⁸⁰ MOPAC must ensure that the MPS provides regular data about officer and staff deployment using the Operational Policing Measure analysis to enable such analysis. The MPS has already committed in principle to provide this information to the Assembly (via the Budget and Performance Committee)⁸¹ which will help us to monitor workforce changes and their impact on operational capacity – and ultimately the efficiency – of the MPS. However, it has not been able to meet that Committee's requests

"Unless you have all of those pieces in place, which are not glamorous, which are not sexy (who cares about civilian staff?), unless you have them there processing the intelligence and making sure it gets to the right place at the right time, you are up a gum tree."

Marian FitzGerald, visiting Professor of Criminology, University of Kent

to provide this information with the MPS budget proposals and indications are this will not be available until the new financial year. This raises the concern that decisions are being taken without full understanding of their impact on operational capacity.

Changing the supervision of officers

To reduce costs further, the Commissioner intends to cut supervisory ranks at the MPS. Around 1,100 officers above the rank of Sergeant will be removed, a fall of around 16 per cent.⁸² This will change supervisory ratios from the current 4.4 constables for every sergeant to 6, above the national average of 4.8 and its most similar forces average of 5.5.⁸³ While this implies a significant change, the Committee heard that supervisory ratios “are relatively meaningless” as it is the deployment of officers within individual teams (“the effect will depend entirely on how they are used”) that is more important than headline averages.⁸⁴

However, evidence to the Committee suggests reducing the number of supervisors could be risky. Areas of particular concern are CID and specialist teams, which may affect the MPS’s ability to maintain performance in solving serious crimes, including serious sexual assault.⁸⁵ The new approach also seems in conflict with decisions previously taken by the MPS. For example, the head of the Sapphire Unit (which investigates rape and serious sexual assault) has previously said that he increased supervision following high profile cases of officer misconduct.⁸⁶

The new neighbourhood policing model proposes that in some places sergeants will work across wards, which may make it harder for them to embed themselves in their teams and understand the detail of what they are working on.⁸⁷ There was also concern that the vital role of supervisors in informal training and mentoring of their teams – that is, passing on knowledge – may be more difficult to deliver. Since the MPS will also begin to see an influx of new officers, supervision is likely to become both more important and challenging,⁸⁸ a point recognised by the Commissioner.⁸⁹

Overall, however, the Commissioner was able to provide some welcome reassurance regarding the proposed new approach to supervision. There will be a greater role for inspectors in neighbourhood policing and this will be important in ensuring adequate managerial oversight.⁹⁰ We heard that this new role could deliver important oversight, and accountability for issues such as safeguarding.⁹¹ We acknowledge the Commissioner’s view that training – rather than supervision – will tackle performance problems. We therefore welcome the Commissioner’s commitment to training,⁹² which the Committee heard would be vital to enable leaders to respond to the pressures of the new approach.⁹³ The Committee would like to see MOPAC taking an active role in ensuring that future supervision arrangements are appropriate, given its explicit role in helping to build public confidence in

the MPS.⁹⁴ We will continue to monitor – through the Operational Policing Measure – where changes are being made to supervision as this detail is not currently available.

Recommendations

- 9. MOPAC should ensure that the MPS honour its commitment to provide regular Operation Policing Measure analysis to the Assembly. This analysis would demonstrate the effect of changes to the police workforce – i.e. areas where civilian staff and supervisors are being lost.**
The Committee will monitor these figures and hold the Mayor to account if it appears that his officer number commitment is affecting operational capacity, efficiency or safety.
- 10. MOPAC needs to be able to assure itself and demonstrate to the public that supervision is adequate, not least to avoid high-profile damaging cases of officer misconduct. The final Plan should include a statement on the Mayor's oversight of MPS supervision and reassurance that the proposed models are adequate.**

6. Cutting costs – changes to the police estate

MOPAC and the MPS must explain much more clearly how they are deciding which front counters and police stations to close, and provide evidence of how the needs of all members of the community will be met by new access provision.

In the draft Plan, the Mayor commits to improving public access to the police. His approach to London's policing estate is described as "prioritising high police numbers and selling expensive and underused buildings."⁹⁵ Limited further information is provided in the draft MOPAC/MPS Estate Strategy, which proposes closing 65 front counters and changing the opening hours of 66 front counters that are currently 24-hour. Its proposals are significant in helping the MPS to meet its budget reduction targets; running costs of the estate are expected to fall to £140 million each year by 2015/16 (a reduction of 30 per cent on 2012 costs).

'Creative solutions' for public access

"If they want face-to-face contact, there are large sections of the public that you may want to get to who would not want to be seen going into a police station, where it may be easier to access the police if they want to face-to-face contact in other ways."

Marian FitzGerald, visiting Professor of Criminology, University of Kent

MPS figures show that there has been a 20 per cent reduction in front counter reporting and a 32 per cent increase in internet and email reporting since 2008.⁹⁶ Taking advantage of this shift, the Mayor aims to improve public access through "creative solutions" such as contact points and crime prevention desks, telephone and online contact and offering appointments to victims of crime. The Mayor has pledged "to ensure that where it is necessary to close one building, a better form of public access can be created."⁹⁷

The proposals in the Plan and associated Estates Strategy will result in significant changes to access provision and we have heard concerns about front counter closures. Experts agreed that some community members may see their local police stations as an important refuge and place of safety.⁹⁸ There is evidence that certain groups, including BAME victims and victims of rape, are more likely to report crimes at a front counter.⁹⁹ While we welcome the MPS's commitment to personal visits for victims of crime, we heard that many crime victims will not want police officers to visit them at their home.¹⁰⁰ We therefore reiterate the findings of our previous victim care investigation, which called on the MPS and MOPAC to maintain a sufficient network of appropriate public access sites to enable any Londoner to report a sensitive crime face-to-face.¹⁰¹

In this investigation we heard that ease of contacting the police is more important than local access to a police station for most Londoners.¹⁰²

Conservative Members of the Police and Crime Committee felt that police stations were strongly criticised by some witnesses: “[in the current police station model] you cannot get through to anyone, and it is often very unpleasant having to go into a police station and wait to see someone, with the best will in the world...” Conservative members were reassured that several academics felt the new model proposed by MOPAC would actually lead to an improved service for vulnerable victims. “Talking about improving confidence by increasing reporting - when people feel threatened [they] would not want to be seen walking into a police station and feel an awful lot safer if they just happened en passant in the library to tip off an officer.”

Alternative public access provision

A frustration for many has been that the consultation lacks enough detail to assess whether the proposed public access provision will be sufficient or not. This was a recurring message during this investigation and has also been expressed to MOPAC at its consultation events.¹⁰³ The draft Estate Strategy and draft Plan do discuss potential alternative means of public access to the police, but MOPAC and the MPS have been unable to provide clarity, even to partners who may host these facilities, about what services would be provided and the relative purpose they would serve.¹⁰⁴ There is also scant detail on how remaining front counters will operate, for example their opening hours or the role of volunteers in staffing them. This confusion is in contrast to commitments made previously by the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime.

The proposals for closures and changes to opening hours of police front counters and police stations focus on the savings to be achieved¹⁰⁵ but detail about the financial implications is lacking. The Commissioner has said that reduced front counter staffing requirements could lead to anything between £11 million and £20 million in savings.¹⁰⁶ The Mayor has conceded that full information on savings is not available¹⁰⁷ and there have been no detailed calculations of the costs of setting up, running and staffing alternative public access facilities and no budget for this element of the estates strategy has been provided.

In the absence of published criteria for police station and front counter closures, it is felt that some decisions are being made that will damage policing efficiency and visibility.¹⁰⁸ It seems that the proposals are being made on the basis of outdated data and that they do not account for changes likely to occur in future years.¹⁰⁹ This lack of detailed information about a) alternatives; b) the criteria being used to assess closures; and c) the financial implications of the changes makes it extremely difficult for communities to have informed discussions with the police about public access.

“I would expect our Police and Crime Plan - and certainly I will not put my name to it unless - we are absolutely clear about how we propose to make our public access commitments and reshape the estate to ensure we have better public access.”

*Stephen Greenhalgh,
Deputy Mayor for
Policing and Crime*

Ensuring accessibility

The Committee would also expect MOPAC to be able to demonstrate how it has considered the needs of London's diverse communities in the development of alternatives. MOPAC and the MPS have a legal duty to consider the needs of, and impact on, all individuals.¹¹⁰ The draft Plan has only passing reference to Londoners' diverse needs.¹¹¹ While there are indications that the MPS is seeking to improve the service provided in the new facilities – for example through instant access translation¹¹² – this detail is lacking in the Plan and Estates Strategy and therefore this consultation has been unable to reassure Londoners.

“Our concerns are very much that people can go to a place that they feel safe in to have a face-to-face contact with the police. How can that be made accessible and how can the aids, adaptations and structures be put in place to make sure that is possible to do so reasonably? I think the best way for that is to thoroughly and carefully equality impact assess each proposal”

Kirsten Hearn, Chair of Inclusion London

Although the Assembly has been told that an assessment has been made, this was not published for scrutiny alongside the Plan and therefore it is difficult to assess if considerations specific to particular communities have affected the proposals.¹¹³ Decisions are being taken based on an out-of-date footfall survey that does not include details about who is using front counters and for what reasons. Such detailed information would be helpful in understanding the equalities implications of front-counter use (for example, if they are predominantly used by a particular age group). We note that the MPS has commissioned a new survey¹¹⁴ and hope that this might include this more detailed assessment to allow more informed decisions.

The Committee has heard various examples of implications that must be thought through when determining alternative services.¹¹⁵ These might include ensuring alternative facilities are physically accessible and have equipment to aid communication; ensuring that opening hours are appropriate for the local community; and taking into account the financial impact of expecting people to travel further to a police station. There are concerns that MOPAC's consultation was not rigorous enough to enable communities to raise relevant concerns and there are already embarrassing examples that demonstrate these issues have not been considered so far. Recent investment in facilities that are more accessible than other outdated parts of the estate now appear to be under threat.¹¹⁶ These improvements must not be lost through ill-thought through closures.

There also appears to be accessibility implications of these changes for particular communities. Analysis shows there are an increasing number of areas where the accessibility of front counters will decrease.¹¹⁷ More than 800,000 additional people will be required to travel for more than 45 minutes by public transport to a police front counter under the new proposals than is currently the case. More than one million additional people will find this is the case if they want to access a 24-hour front counter. These 'black holes' in provision appear to have come about because analysis has been carried out on a borough-by-borough basis, rather than taking a pan-London approach acknowledging that natural communities do not always adhere to borough boundaries.

Other changes to the estate

MOPAC and the MPS will be making other changes to the police estate that also warrant scrutiny to ensure financial and operational efficiency. Again, there is insufficient information in the public domain and a lack of clarity to allow this. MOPAC has not published proposals for the full list of buildings across the police estate (including all properties, not just those with front counters). One example is Safer Neighbourhood Bases. In some cases, there are concerns that their closure would mean that teams serving a community will not actually be locally based¹¹⁸ and it is unclear whether they could be used as contact points for the public. The Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime has committed to including all necessary detail in the final Police and Crime Plan (due to be published on 25 March)¹¹⁹ but local communities will need time to discuss and address their concerns, taking in to account the totality of changes.

Recommendations

- 11. In its final Estates Strategy, MOPAC should publish the criteria used to assess which front counters have been earmarked for closure. This will help to build confidence in the process.**
- 12. In advance of closing any front counters, MOPAC should conduct and publish a formal assessment of the impact of each closure and the adequacy of agreed alternatives. This will help to reassure communities that all implications have been identified and mitigated as appropriate.**
- 13. MOPAC should ensure there is a period of reflection between the publication of the detailed proposals and changes beginning to be made on the ground. This would allow further local discussions - taking into account all of the changes e.g. to SNT bases - to ensure that any concerns are mitigated before changes are implemented.**

7. Public confidence

The Plan must explain much more clearly how MOPAC and the MPS will work together to improve public confidence in the police. Improving police legitimacy in the eyes of the public will be crucial.

One of MOPAC's headline challenges to the MPS is to improve its public confidence score by 20 per cent. The target requires an increase from the current 62 per cent of Londoners who believe the MPS is doing a good or excellent job to 75 per cent by 2016.¹²⁰ The top police forces nationally all fail to break 70 per cent in public confidence so the Mayor's target would see the MPS significantly out-performing any other force in the country in a relatively short space of time (while there have been improvements in the last 10 years it remains 23rd out of 42 forces).¹²¹

The draft Plan sets out the key ways it hopes public confidence can be improved. MOPAC will monitor stop and search, police complaints and performance, aspire to a more diverse force and publish data on professional standards. But evidence given to the Committee shows that public confidence is difficult to measure, with witnesses disagreeing on issues around this topic. There is also some debate on the extent to which external factors – rather than perhaps personal experience – influence confidence. It is therefore difficult to accurately predict whether the changes proposed in the Plan will lead to an improvement in public confidence.

"I think something quite profound happens when you tie people to localities and to specific places... If you go in one day and you antagonise and you wind people up and you create problems you are going to be there the next day to pick up the consequences of that."

Martin Innes, Deputy Director for research, Cardiff University School of Social Sciences

There was evidence provided to the Committee implying that the various changes to the local policing model, estate and safer neighbourhood teams could improve confidence. However, the Committee also heard that the approach to improving public confidence – as set out in the Plan – may not be enough to build confidence in the police to the extent required to meet the Mayor's target and that changes to safer neighbourhood teams risks damaging it.

Building relationships in communities

If big improvements in confidence are to be made, the MPS will clearly need to focus on groups which currently have the lowest confidence in the police. Representatives from some of these groups (BAME and migrant communities, disabled people and areas with lower than average confidence) told the Committee that some of the changes proposed may be a backwards step.¹²² They echoed the concerns raised earlier in this report regarding the reduction in the size of dedicated ward safer neighbourhood teams, suggesting these changes may impact on the ability of the police to engage with – and be part of – local communities.¹²³ The Commissioner has said an increase in the number of borough-based neighbourhood officers should compensate for these changes as they would dedicate more of their time to neighbourhood patrol and engagement.¹²⁴

The new model increases the proportion of officers that will be allocated to ‘floating’ reserves that are not explicitly linked to particular wards. The Committee heard concerns that these unallocated officers may lack accountability to their local community which is important for police legitimacy.¹²⁵ BAME and migrant organisations also told the Committee they were concerned about this change. They felt this may echo the negative perceptions that some communities have of territorial support group officers, who lack ‘investment’ in the community and therefore do not have the positive relationship that neighbourhood teams have developed.¹²⁶

In this context, the loss of PCSOs is also significant. Our evidence shows that good PCSOs have had a significant impact on community confidence and fear of crime.¹²⁷ Other research has found that people value their visibility, reassurance and approachability.¹²⁸ PCSOs have been particularly valuable in engaging harder to reach groups. We heard that they have been effective at engaging with young people¹²⁹ and building relationships with disabled residents as they have the time to spend one-to-one.¹³⁰

The loss of both dedicated ward officers and PCSOs is an issue we addressed earlier in this report in relation to the MPS’s capacity to tackle crime. We recommended that the final Plan demonstrates a strengthened approach to neighbourhood policing (recommendation 6) and that the policy to cut PCSOs is reviewed (recommendation 7). We heard during our investigation that these changes to local policing may also impact on community relations with police officers, and therefore public confidence. Our recommendations are therefore valid for two of the Mayor’s main performance challenges.

Conservative Members of the Committee were, however, encouraged by evidence that suggested that reassurance and related confidence would be maintained in the new model. Professor Hough told the Committee: “I do not see why you could not treat people fairly, decently and respectfully and listen to them if you are investigating a crime.”

Police legitimacy

The Committee heard that increasing police legitimacy should be the central goal of any policing strategy.¹³¹ While experts felt it was positive that the MPS is seeking to improve public confidence, they suggested a more important issue is police legitimacy, which encourages people to comply with the law and cooperate with the criminal justice system and is a more effective judgment of police performance. Experts that spoke to the Committee were of the view that improving the quality of contact between the police and the public was the most important factor in determining police legitimacy.¹³² The draft Plan acknowledges that the “conduct of police officers is a critical component in building and maintaining public

trust and confidence” but does not specifically put any expectations on the MPS to improve individual encounters with police officers.

The Committee heard from different groups that police contact is inconsistent. There are encouraging examples of good practice¹³³ and we recognise corporate commitments to improve performance but we also heard about examples of particularly poor contact¹³⁴ that can be extremely damaging to perceptions of the police. For example, bad experiences with the police can deter young people from reporting crime and our evidence indicates concerns about police attitudes to young people that do report crimes.¹³⁵ Poor quality encounters with young people exert a lasting impact on adult judgments of the police.¹³⁶ We have also heard that commitments and good practice tend to fall by the wayside in times of pressure and that there appears to be backwards steps in some communities following the 2011 riots.¹³⁷

There is a clear need to make police contact more consistent and effective across London and translate high-level commitments into action on the ground. An overarching message we heard was the need to ensure better training for officers so they understand the different needs of different communities and individual members of the public. This should be reflected in the final Plan.

Stop and search

Dissatisfaction with police contact really affects confidence badly, depresses it deeply. Satisfaction only improves it slightly. Each time there is a bad contact that has a very serious effect on overall confidence. If you want to get back to where you were, you have to have an awful lot of good contact to get there.¹

Mike Hough, Professor of Criminal Policy, Birkbeck College, University of London

One matter that warrants special attention when considering quality of contact is stop and search. The Plan recognises that “the police use of stop and search powers can be a key source of tension between the police and especially black and minority ethnic Londoners, and this undermines confidence”.¹³⁸ This was certainly borne out in our investigation: in our discussions with young people stop and search was their overwhelming concern¹³⁹ and Cllr Janet Daby told us this remains a key issue for BAME residents in her area.¹⁴⁰

When challenged on this issue the Commissioner provided a robust defence of MPS strategy for stop and search, saying that progress is being made to tackle the use of section 60 searches.¹⁴¹ However, we have heard that in many families poor perceptions of stop and search have built up over generations, starting with grandfathers being searched in the 1970s. This is a significant legacy to overcome and is unlikely to be tackled simply by recent reductions in searches.¹⁴² At our roundtable with BAME and migrant organisations, we were also told that when searches being conducted under one power are reduced, the police often increase the use of searches using other powers.¹⁴³

The draft Plan states that stop and search will be monitored through MOPAC Challenge and Safer Neighbourhood Boards but, given the

significant impact that stop and search can have on public perceptions of the police, it warrants greater attention. The Committee welcomes the Commissioner's attempts to tackle the use of section 60 searches and the MPS's decision to roll out new training for operational officers on stop and search.¹⁴⁴ However, we have heard that these steps may not go far enough to tackle entrenched concerns about the use of these powers.¹⁴⁵ Further, any positive steps will only make a difference if the public is told about the changes and the final Plan offers an opportunity to do this. MOPAC's monitoring will also need to be more sophisticated, taking account the use of different search powers, and current thinking on this should be described in the Plan.

A more diverse force

ACPO's lead on workforce development recently suggested that the force must become more diverse to ensure police legitimacy and maintain operational effectiveness.¹⁴⁶ This is reflected in the Plan, which commits to improving the diversity in the force. It aims to make use of the new national direct entry scheme to allow more participation from those outside policing. We heard from BAME, migrant and refugee organisations that a diverse force is important in achieving culture change in the MPS.¹⁴⁷ It was suggested that diversity in the force would help to challenge stereotypes and negative perceptions, which a recent survey has shown is still an issue in the MPS.¹⁴⁸

While we strongly welcome the aspiration to achieve a more diverse force, we are concerned that targeting graduates through direct entry will not be effective at delivering this change. This programme has already been in place for some years and has not delivered significant changes in the diversity of the force, and similar schemes – for example in the civil service – have failed to deliver the changes desired.¹⁴⁹ These concerns were echoed by BAME and refugee organisations.¹⁵⁰ We were therefore pleased to hear the Commissioner announce that the MPS is looking to re-open officer recruitment with a particular drive to encourage applications from London residents.¹⁵¹ This should be a better way to ensure that the force represents the communities it serves and respond to Londoner's desire to be policed by a force that represents local communities.¹⁵² The MPS may want to target recruitment activity at under-represented communities to encourage as much interest as possible.

The reduction in PCSOs is again significant to this issue, although the full effect is difficult to predict. PCSOs are generally more diverse than the rest of the police force and therefore a reduction in their numbers may reduce the overall diversity and representation of the MPS.¹⁵³ On the other hand, a number of PCSOs have moved on to become fully warranted officers which could help to improve diversity of the main force. Given the uncertainty over the impact of these changes, MOPAC's commitment to monitor the

Too often the police have had a kind of “take me to your leader” approach to local communities. “We will go and talk to that person and everything will be OK.” It does need to be much more diffuse and they need to develop the ability to talk to a much wider range of people within local areas and across London than any kind of formal structure of this kind is going to allow.

Ben Bradford, Career Development Fellow in Criminology, University of Oxford

recruitment, retention and progression of BAME police officers and staff is therefore important. Beyond monitoring, we will look to MOPAC to examine further practical steps in this area.

Safer neighbourhood boards

The Plan reiterates the Mayor’s manifesto commitment to provide £1 million funding to establish a new Safer Neighbourhood Board in every borough, with responsibility for establishing local policing priorities. The Boards should not be seen as a panacea to community engagement. Formal structures have a place, notably in determining and holding the police to account for local priorities, as discussed in recommendation 4. However, our concerns about the impact of changes to neighbourhood policing on community engagement will not be remedied by formal structures alone. Further, formal structures often struggle to be truly representative of the local community.¹⁵⁴ To develop credibility with the local community, it will be important that the Boards are seen to be independent¹⁵⁵ and the final Plan must provide more information on how this will be ensured.

The Plan implies Safer Neighbourhood Boards will have a role in gathering community intelligence, stating they will “improve connections with local communities to ensure community tensions are identified and acted on.”¹⁵⁶ Experts told us that the MPS’s approach to gathering community intelligence needs to be more sophisticated, for example individual figures cannot be relied upon to understand the complexities of community tensions.¹⁵⁷ Further, we heard significant concerns from organisations working with BAME and refugee communities that engagement should not be used as a way to gather intelligence.¹⁵⁸ The two approaches should be distinct or it can be damaging to community confidence and relationships. Safer Neighbourhood Boards will not reduce the need for the MPS to develop more sophisticated ways of gathering intelligence.

Recommendations

14. The final Plan should address officer training and explain how MOPAC and the MPS will ensure that the training package adequately equips officers to deal with different needs of communities and individuals.
15. The final Plan should include far greater detail on the MPS's efforts to address community concerns around stop and search. This is a potentially positive opportunity for the MPS to demonstrate how it is responding to community concerns and yet none of this detail is included in the draft Plan.
The Committee will seek to bring greater transparency to the use of stop and search by investigating this topic later this year.
16. The final Plan should give details of the Commissioner's plans for recruitment of London residents, expectations of the impact of this scheme on diversity and a sense of what more will need to be done.
17. The final Plan should set out how MOPAC intends to recruit a diverse membership to Safer Neighbourhood Boards that is representative of the local community and its diversity. It must provide greater clarity on the specific remit of the Boards and rethink their role as an intelligence gathering mechanisms for the MPS.
The Committee will seek to investigate progress in its investigation into community engagement and safer neighbourhood boards later this year, with a view to responding to MOPAC's consultation on safer neighbourhood boards.

8. Criminal justice and community safety

The final Plan must provide much more detail on how MOPAC will work with its partners to achieve the Mayor's objectives for criminal justice and improve community safety.

Justice and resettlement is one of the Plan's 'core elements'. The Plan introduces a new set of targets for partners in criminal justice to:

- reduce court delays by 20 per cent by 2016;
- increase compliance with community sentences by 20 per cent by 2016; and
- reduce reoffending by young people leaving custody by 20 per cent by 2016.

The 20.20.20 challenge for criminal justice

We welcome the Mayor's overall aspiration "to deliver swift and sure justice, efficiencies and most importantly better victim satisfaction."¹⁵⁹ During discussions with criminal justice experts, partners agreed that the Plan was seeking to tackle most of the significant issues facing criminal justice.¹⁶⁰

However, the evidence given to the Committee suggests that the Plan as it stands will fail to deliver the Mayor's high-level aspirations in the criminal justice system.

Firstly there are problems with the targets and we heard that key criminal justice partners were not consulted during the development of the Plan.¹⁶¹ They were unclear as to why across-the-board targets of 20 per cent have been chosen.¹⁶² Detail was lacking: the Chief Crown Prosecutor questioned how 'court delays' would be defined and measured¹⁶³ while other partners wanted a more precise definition of the 'young people' that would be targeted by the Plan.¹⁶⁴ In other places, the targets seem too specific: witnesses questioned the focus only on young offenders leaving custody¹⁶⁵ and suggested the aim to improve compliance should be extended beyond just those on community sentences.¹⁶⁶

There is also concern about multiple layers of targets.¹⁶⁷ Partners told us that they are already working towards a range of targets set by their principal funder¹⁶⁸ and while some may be complementary to the Mayor's targets, he cannot expect his to take precedence. Given the mismatch between the aspirations in the Plan and that the Mayor does not control these other organisations, it is surprising that partners have not been properly engaged to seek their views in the first place.

"The plan will need to be developed in order to make a dent on reoffending and look at some of those issues that I have mentioned which are not perhaps covered in detail in this plan."

*Vicki Helyar-Cardwell,
Director, Criminal Justice
Alliance*

The creation of MOPAC, with its wider criminal justice remit, presented an opportunity to bring greater coordination in this area and invigorate partnership working. Given that MOPAC has now existed for a year we would expect to see evidence of an agreed approach to meeting shared objectives in the final Police and Crime Plan.

Reducing offending

There is a risk that Plan's aspirations to reduce offending will not be met if it continues to overlook the challenges facing the criminal justice system in dealing with the most complex offenders. We heard that many a significant proportion of offenders have mental health problems which must be addressed if their offending behaviour is to be tackled.¹⁶⁹ Similarly, a large number of offenders have substance abuse problems. Many of the most prolific repeat offenders, in particular, fall in to one or both of these categories. Yet the Plan makes no real consideration of the challenges in dealing with these offenders and fails to acknowledge the vital importance of joint working with health partners in addressing these challenges. As an example, we heard that the abstinence programmes that are proposed in the Plan will only be successful if they are accompanied by adequate support programmes to enable compliance.¹⁷⁰

Health partners are just one of a wider range of partners that MOPAC must engage if it is to deliver the Mayor's aspirations. Many crucial partners involved in tackling offending sit outside the criminal justice system (e.g. housing and social services).¹⁷¹ Many submissions to the Committee noted that the Plan should include greater consideration of these wider partners¹⁷² or the role of voluntary sector organisations.¹⁷³

Community safety

The Police and Crime Plan is required to include details on community safety priorities, including details of grants being provided.¹⁷⁴ The Committee has previously heard significant concerns from local partners about MOPAC's approach to community safety funding, in particular regarding delays in providing them with details about the commissioning process.¹⁷⁵ The lack of detail available for partners has not been addressed and the draft Plan fails to provide the greater clarity that partners had hoped for.¹⁷⁶ There is also a mismatch between the seven priority crime listed in the Plan and those that partners are being told are the priorities for community safety which may cause confusion.¹⁷⁷

“The plan is basically a policing plan rather than a crime plan, in that almost all the detail is focused on the police rather than on other players. A £1m fund for crime prevention in every borough is a drop in the ocean and appears, on the face of it, to be insufficient investment to support the ambitions of the Plan.”

Peter Neyroud, Institute of Criminology, University of Cambridge, and former Chief Constable of Thames Valley

Recommendations

- 18. The final Plan should include a more comprehensive picture of the relative roles and responsibilities of partners in achieving the aims – i.e. an outline of who will do what and when to bring about improvements – developed through proper consultation with partners. Additional consideration needs to be given to the role of the voluntary sector and partners outside the criminal system, in particular. There are also serious questions regarding the justice and resettlement targets. MOPAC should therefore review the justice and resettlement section of the draft Plan.**
- 19. The final Plan should provide much-needed clarity and details of the funding available to deliver the Mayor's priorities for community safety. MOPAC should address the concerns of local partners about the lack of information about MOPAC's strategic approach and how it will assess bids for funding.**

9. Conclusion

The Committee welcomes the Mayor's overall aspirations to improve the service received by Londoners – through a cut in crime, an increase in public confidence and ensuring that taxpayers' money is used efficiently. However, we remain to be convinced that this Police and Crime Plan will realise these aims unless considerable enhancements are made.

We will monitor performance against the Plan and seek to assess what's working and what's not on an on-going basis. Our role is to provide an independent evaluation of the quality of policing and crime reduction in London and to hold the Mayor to account. We will therefore assess performance against the Plan in its entirety and the wider impact of the MPS's approach on the quality of service received by Londoners; the efficiency of policing in London; and crime reduction. This will ensure performance can be improved throughout the Mayor's term, rather waiting to 2016 to see if MOPAC's headline targets have been met.

Appendix 1 – Summary of recommendations

1. In the final Plan, MOPAC must set out the evidence base used to develop the targets to demonstrate that they are appropriate – i.e. stretching but achievable. MOPAC should also demonstrate how it believes the targets can be met by including interim targets it expects the MPS to reach throughout the Plan period. MOPAC should provide the Police and Crime Committee with an annual report (by the end of March each year) on progress against this trajectory on each of the key performance targets, and an assessment of the impact of the Plan.
2. To ensure that the figures being reported by the MPS accurately reflect Londoners' experiences of crime and disorder, within the next six months MOPAC should work with independent experts to develop quality assurance mechanisms that can interrogate the information being provided by the MPS. It should report back to the Committee on this work by the end of September 2013.
3. The final Plan must explain how MOPAC believes it addresses the issues that matter to Londoners and the priorities that are reported in the MPS's public surveys. It must include reassurance that significant public concerns that have not been included in the headline targets – including sexual violence and gangs – remain a priority. The final Plan should demonstrate that they will be adequately resourced and include the latest thinking on how performance will be assessed. The final Plan should also address the MPS's role in prevention of crime.
4. The Committee welcomes the role that local forums currently play in determining local priorities and holding the MPS to account for performance. The final Plan should include a commitment to how these local engagement mechanisms will be supported in future and details of how they will be used to understand local concerns.
5. In advance of implementing changes to neighbourhood policing, the MPS should publish details of how borough allocations were determined. This should include assessments of relevant pilots and explain how the lessons were used to develop London-wide plans for neighbourhood policing changes.
6. To manage some of the risks we highlight, the final Plan needs to:
 - a) explain how the MPS believes the new model will strengthen neighbourhood policing;
 - b) provide clarity on where additional resources will come from; and
 - c) respond to concerns about the importance of locally known officers. The Commissioner should consider increasing the

number of named and/or dedicated officers allocated to local areas.

Using the British Crime Survey, the Committee will monitor visibility statistics and public awareness of safer neighbourhood teams to review the impact of these changes.

7. MOPAC and the MPS should look again at the proposal to cut PCSO numbers. The final Plan should demonstrate that this is the best option for dealing with the MPS's budgetary constraints and that there are no other less damaging areas for savings. Figures about borough allocations of PCSOs should be included in the final Plan along with details of police officer numbers.
8. Within six months of the implementation of the new neighbourhood policing model, MOPAC should report to the Committee on its impact. This report should assess the impact on:
 - Effectiveness in tackling crime
 - Tackling anti-social behaviour
 - Community engagement
 - Public confidence
9. MOPAC should ensure that the MPS honour its commitment to provide regular Operation Policing Measure analysis to the Assembly. This analysis would demonstrate the effect of changes to the police workforce – i.e. areas where civilian staff and supervisors are being lost.

The Committee will monitor these figures and hold the Mayor to account if it appears that his officer number commitment is affecting operational capacity, efficiency or safety.
10. MOPAC needs to be able to assure itself and demonstrate to the public that supervision is adequate, not least to avoid high-profile damaging cases of officer misconduct. The final Plan should include a statement on the Mayor's oversight of MPS supervision and reassurance that the proposed models are adequate.
11. In its final Estates Strategy, MOPAC should publish the criteria used to assess which front counters have been earmarked for closure. This will help to build confidence in the process.
12. In advance of closing any front counters, MOPAC should conduct and publish a formal assessment of the impact of each closure and the adequacy of agreed alternatives. This will help to reassure communities that all implications have been identified and mitigated as appropriate.

13. MOPAC should ensure there is a period of reflection between the publication of the detailed proposals and changes beginning to be made on the ground. This would allow further local discussions – taking into account all of the changes e.g. to SNT bases – to ensure that any concerns are mitigated before changes are implemented.
14. The final Plan should address officer training and explain how MOPAC and the MPS will ensure that the training package adequately equips officers to deal with different needs of communities and individuals.
15. The final Plan should include far greater detail on the MPS’s efforts to address community concerns around stop and search. This is a potentially positive opportunity for the MPS to demonstrate how it is responding to community concerns and yet none of this detail is included in the draft Plan.
The Committee will seek to bring greater transparency to the use of stop and search by investigating this topic later this year.
16. The final Plan should give details of the Commissioner’s plans for recruitment of London residents, expectations of the impact of this scheme on diversity and a sense of what more will need to be done.
17. The final Plan should set out how MOPAC intends to recruit a diverse membership to Safer Neighbourhood Boards that is representative of the local community and its diversity. It must provide greater clarity on the specific remit of the Boards and rethink their role as an intelligence gathering mechanisms for the MPS.
The Committee will seek to investigate progress in its investigation into community engagement and safer neighbourhood boards later this year, with a view to responding to MOPAC’s consultation on safer neighbourhood boards.
18. The final Plan should include a more comprehensive picture of the relative roles and responsibilities of partners in achieving the aims – i.e. an outline of who will do what and when to bring about improvements – developed through proper consultation with partners. Additional consideration needs to be given to the role of the voluntary sector and partners outside the criminal system, in particular. There are also serious questions regarding the justice and resettlement targets. MOPAC should therefore review the justice and resettlement section of the draft Plan.
19. The final Plan should provide much-needed clarity and details of the funding available to deliver the Mayor’s priorities for community safety. MOPAC should address the concerns of local partners about the lack of information about MOPAC’s strategic approach and how it will assess bids for funding.

Appendix 2 – Conservative group views

The Conservative Members of the Committee agree with certain areas of the Committee's consultation response. However, there were particular areas where these Members record their dissent to the majority view. These are included in the main body of the report and collated below for ease of reference.

The Conservative Members of the Committee largely support the approach, direction and aspirations of the draft Police and Crime Plan but similarly have questions about certain areas in the Plan. In particular, the Members have concerns over the significant focus on targets, as they have historically had serious reservations around this area of policing. However, they view changes to the neighbourhood policing – such as the increased flexibility, transparency and 2,000 additional officers in the teams – as a step towards improving local policing. The Conservative Group also feels that some criticisms – such as those relating to the criminal justice system – are invalid as the Plan was never intended to have this level of detail.

Changes to neighbourhood policing

However, we also heard that there are potential benefits to the new model, and the Conservative Members of the Committee support these viewpoints. One expert suggested that the new model is a “rational response”¹⁷⁸ to the challenges facing neighbourhood policing:

For example, the MPS suggests the new model will ensure that PCs and PCSOs will not be abstracted from their ward, a frustration that is often reported to the MPS under the current arrangement.¹⁷⁹ The Conservative Members of the Committee note the Commissioner's views that SNTs are not at full strength: “[you claim that SNTs have] about 6 [staff] – as though they are there for 24 hours. That's untrue. They leave; they have abstractions. Now by being able to share officers across neighbourhoods those will be filled and there are going to be more of them too. I think we have to be careful we are not comparing apples with pears.”

These Members also suggest that the new explanation of “dedicated” officers – that they will never be abstracted – is more accurate than the previous use of the term, when any member of a safer neighbourhood team could be abstracted. This more upfront approach was supported by some experts who agreed that “honesty is the best policy” when managing public expectations of the police.¹⁸⁰

The Conservative Members of the Committee also support the Commissioner's view that the new model – with a larger pool of officers in local teams – is more robust. The Committee has also heard that floating reserves can be more effectively deployed to trouble spots¹⁸¹ and research by HMIC has shown that targeting hotspots can be an effective way to use resources.¹⁸²

The Conservative Members of the Committee are nonetheless confident that much of the evidence provided demonstrates that the new local policing model will serve Londoners well. For example, the Committee heard that the new model “seems a perfectly rational approach to the problem to me... I think the structure here, as long as it maintains that local emphasis, and it may even improve it if we have that kind of stability and the ability of people in local areas to build proper links with the other agencies they need to work with”.¹⁸³ The Conservative Members of the Committee therefore suggest the new model has the potential to improve problem solving and partnership working.

Changes to the police estate

In this investigation we heard that ease of contacting the police is more important than local access to a police station for most Londoners.¹⁸⁴ Conservative Members of the Police and Crime Committee note that police stations were strongly criticised by some witnesses: “[in the current police station model] you cannot get through to anyone, and it is often very unpleasant having to go into a police station and wait to see someone, with the best will in the world...” Conservative members were reassured that several academics felt the new model proposed by MOPAC would actually lead to an improved service for vulnerable victims. “Talking about improving confidence by increasing reporting – when people feel threatened [they] would not want to be seen walking into a police station and feel an awful lot safer if they just happened en passant in the library to tip off an officer.”

Public confidence

Conservative Members of the Committee were encouraged by evidence that suggested that reassurance and related confidence would be maintained in the new model. Professor Hough told the Committee: “I do not see why you could not treat people fairly, decently and respectfully and listen to them if you are investigating a crime.”

Appendix 3 – How we conducted the investigation

Terms of reference

In advance of the publication of the [draft of the Mayor's Police and Crime Plan](#), the Committee agreed the terms of reference for this investigation, which were:

- **To assess whether the Police and Crime Plan will enable a 20 per cent cut in neighbourhood crimes.** The Committee will also explore how realistic these targets are and whether they will address the issues that matter to Londoners.
- **To assess whether the Police and Crime Plan will enable the MPS to achieve a 20 per cent increase in public confidence.** The Committee's investigation will consider whether the Police and Crime Plan, including the Estates Strategy and local policing model, delivers what Londoners want.
- **To investigate the impact of the 20 per cent budget reduction.** The Committee will explore how the budget proposals in the Police and Crime Plan will impact on the service received by Londoners.

The full terms of reference of the investigation can be found at www.london.gov.uk/who-runs-london/assembly

Formal committee meetings

The Committee held a series of formal public meetings with external experts to explore the impact of the draft Police and Crime Plan.

A session on [17 January](#) examining public confidence in the police was attended by:

- [Ben Bradford](#), Career Development Fellow in Criminology, University of Oxford
- Marian FitzGerald, visiting Professor of Criminology, University of Kent
- [Mike Hough](#), Professor of Criminal Policy and Co-Director of the Institute for Criminal Policy Research, Birkbeck College, University of London

On [17 January](#) the Committee also met with organisations from across the criminal justice system to discuss the Mayor's priorities for reform. The panel consisted of:

- Vicki Helyar-Cardwell, Director, [Criminal Justice Alliance](#)
- Catherine Hennessey, Director of Development & Partnerships, [Revolving Doors](#)
- Heather Munro, Chief Executive, [London Probation Trust](#)
- [Alison Saunders](#), Chief Crown Prosecutor, London

The Committee examined the Mayor's strategy for crime reduction and the impact of changes to policing with experts on [31 January](#). The Committee was joined by:

- Jon Collins, Deputy Director, [Police Foundation](#)
- [Martin Innes](#), Director, Universities Police Science Institute and Deputy Director for research, Cardiff University School of Social Sciences

Understanding community confidence

The Committee explored what needs to be done to improve community confidence, particularly among groups that traditionally report lower levels of confidence.

The first discussion, in a formal committee meeting on [31 January](#), was attended by:

- [Cllr Janet Daby](#), Cabinet Member for Community Safety, London Borough of Lewisham
- Jo Davies, Campaign & Policy Officer and Scott Watkin, Inclusion Advisor [MENCAP](#)
- Kirsten Hearn, Chair, [Inclusion London](#)

The Committee also held an informal roundtable discussion on 27 February with organisations representing migrant, refugee and BAME communities to test the Committee's findings and emerging recommendations. This was attended by:

- Zrinka Bralo, [The Forum](#) (Migrant and Refugee Communities Forum)
- Rita Chadha, [Refugee and Migrant Forum of East London](#) (RAMFEL)
- Estelle Du Boulay, Director, [Newham Monitoring Project](#)
- Rahana Mohammed, [Race on the Agenda](#)

The Committee was supported by the [GLA's Peer Outreach Team](#) to ensure this investigation took into account the views of young people. Officers met with young people at a Peer Outreach Team meeting and sought their views on policing in London. Jenny Jones AM, Deputy Chair of the Committee, attended a Practitioners' Network of organisations working with young people.

Call for written views

The Committee welcomed views in writing, which elicited 20 responses:

- London Borough of Southwark
- Gareth Scarlett
- Shaun McNamee
- Jim Gleeson
- Stephen Taylor
- Angus Hewlett
- London Borough of Newham
- Andrea Casalotti
- Vanessa, Tooley Street
- St Giles Trust
- Leap Confronting Conflict
- Barnardo's
- London Borough of Camden
- Only Connect Group
- London Councils
- Refuge
- Howard League for Penal Reform
- London Borough of Hackney
- London Borough of Lewisham
- Victim Support

The Committee also benefited from written briefings from the following experts:

- Dr Timothy Brain, OBE, QPM, FRSA, former Chief Constable of Gloucestershire Constabulary
- Marian FitzGerald, visiting Professor of Criminology, University of Kent
- Peter Neyroud, CBE, QPM, former Chief Constable of Thames Valley Police and former CEO of National Policing Improvement Agency

Appendix 4 – Endnotes

¹ Home Office website: [Police and Crime Commissioners' Role](#), accessed 18 February 2013

² *Police and Crime Plans: Guidance and Practice Advice*, Association of Police Authority Chief Executives, August 2012

³ *Group budget proposals and precepts 2013/14*, GLA, January 2013 (page 43)

⁴ Surveys in the MPS: Londoners' Views Count, The Metropolitan Police Service, October 2012

⁵ Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime, Stephen Greenhalgh, at MOPAC Challenge on 19 July 2012.

⁶ 'From reducing fear to improving community confidence - a change of emphasis for practitioners', Kirby and McPherson, In: *Safer Communities*, Vol. 8, No. 3, 2009, p. 21-27

⁷ The seven crime types are burglary, vandalism, theft from a motor vehicle, theft of a motor vehicle, violence with injury, robbery and theft from person.

⁸ The full detail of the 20.20.20 Challenge for the MPS is to: reduce crime by 20 per cent across seven neighbourhood crimes (see endnote 7) by 2016; reduce costs by 20 per cent by 2016; and increase public confidence by 20 per cent by 2016.

⁹ The full detail of the criminal justice 20.20.20 Challenge is to: reduce court delays by 20 per cent by 2016; increase compliance with community sentences by 20 per cent by 2016; and reduce reoffending by young people leaving custody by 20 per cent by 2016.

¹⁰ See discussion at the Police and Crime Committee on 31 January 2013

¹¹ This was an overriding message from the Committee meetings on 17 January 2013 and 31 January 2013. A number of written submissions also questioned the basis of the targets: London Borough of Camden; London Borough of Hackney; London Borough of Newham; London Borough of Southwark; Only Connect; St Giles Trust.

¹² At the Police and Crime Committee on 5 July 2012, the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime, Stephen Greenhalgh, told the Committee: "I think it could be profoundly positive for London if we get it right with an independent review that looks very broadly from the outside to support that process... and develop a vision that is right for the next century." He said that such a review would be published in advance of any vision for the MPS, indicating this would be before the end of the 2012.

¹³ Marian FitzGerald said at the Committee on 17 January 2013 that meaningful targets need to be set in a systematic way: "...you look very hard and scientifically at what is the problem you are trying to address. You look at the resources available, you set a realistic and meaningful target, and then you work towards that. It can be done, but this is not the way to do it."

¹⁴ See comments by Marian FitzGerald at the Police and Crime Committee on 17 January 2013 and Martin Innes at the Police and Crime Committee on 31 January 2013

¹⁵ For example, at the Police and Crime Committee on 17 January 2013 Mike Hough said the public confidence targets was "optimistic" and Ben Bradford said "it is probably unachievable."

¹⁶ Marian FitzGerald at the Police and Crime Committee on 17 January 2013. An example of "fiddling the figures" might be choosing to categorise a crime differently. Martin Innes told the Committee on 31 January 2013 that around 20 per cent of incidents that are categorised as antisocial behaviour actually have a crime component, and could therefore be categorised as a crime.

¹⁷ The Commissioner told the Committee on 14 February 2013: "We actually employ someone who is a member of the Metropolitan Police Service who drives some of our people crackers about whether or not they should be recording crime in a certain way. When they do not record it as a burglary, should they actually record it as a burglary?"

¹⁸ The Mayor told the Committee on 14 February 2013: “I do not think there is any reason to be sceptical of a lot of these figures. I think they are issued in good faith.”

¹⁹ The IPCC published a report in to the recording and investigation of sexual offences by the Sapphire team in Southwark. It has since been suggested that up to five other boroughs were involved in the same practices. The IPCC’s report said:

- “This pressure to meet targets as a measure of success, rather than focussing on the outcome for the victim, resulted in the police losing sight of what policing is about – protecting the public, and deterring and detecting crime. As many similar cases have shown, the solution to victims withdrawing from the process is to ensure that they are supported through it, not that they are prevented from engaging with it.” (page 4)
- “Performance indicators will always be a factor in policing, given the need to report on, and measure, what gets done – but this case highlights the risks of policing being driven by the wrong performance measures and targets: a classic case of hitting the target but missing the point.” (page 7)

See *Southwark Sapphire Unit’s local practices for the reporting and investigation of sexual offences, July 2008 – September 2009*, IPCC, February 2013

²⁰ At the Committee on 31 January 2013 the panel suggested that, as well as cross-checking recorded crime against the Crime Survey for England and Wales, other sources can be used to validate the data being presented. For example, hospital accident and emergency data can be compared to police recorded crime figures for violence, while insurance records could be compared to recorded figures for crime such as theft of a motor vehicle.

²¹ In a written briefing for this Committee, Peter Neyroud argues: “Crimes in these categories range from the very violent and harmful – armed robberies with firearms – to a small scratch with a key against the side of car. This is not... consistent with the phrase ‘high impact’... It would much more effective to focus on harm rather than volume and start to introduce a sliding scale of crime harm impact combined with an overall target.”

²² The public’s priorities for the police in London were gun and knife crime; drugs; anti-social behaviour; gangs/ gang related’ crime reduction; and resident burglary. Locally, the responses were accessibility/ visibility; anti-social behaviour; drugs; residential burglary; traffic/ road related issues; and gangs/ gang related. Taken from Surveys in the MPS: Londoners’ views count, MPS, October 2012

²³ Submissions from Barnardo’s; London Borough of Camden; London Borough of Hackney; London Borough of Newham; London Borough of Southwark; Only Connect; and St Giles Trust have also questioned how these crime types were chosen.

²⁴ The draft Plan suggests that sexual violence is among its other key offences where performance will be “actively monitored” and recognises that under-reporting is a particular issue for victims of sexual violence. It says the Mayor’s Violence Against Women and Girls Strategy will challenge the MPS to solve more rapes and other serious sexual offences.

²⁵ Comments by the Commissioner at the Police and Crime Committee on 14 February 2013

²⁶ Deputy Mayor, Stephen Greenhalgh, at the Police and Crime Committee on 28 February 2013

²⁷ At the Committee on 14 February 2013 the Mayor said: “I am grateful to you for putting pressure on this point – we will go away and see what we can offer in that respect.”

²⁸ Surveys in the MPS: Londoners’ views count, MPS, October 2012

²⁹ See London Assembly Police and Crime Committee’s [response to the LCRB anti-gangs strategy](#)

³⁰ The following respondents referred to the need for the Plan to say more about dangerous driving: Andrew Casalotti, Jim Gleeson, Angus F. Hewlett, Shaun McNamee, Garrett Scarlett, Stephen Taylor.

³¹ According to research by the Metropolitan Police Authority, “anti-social driving and road safety were rated as a top priority within the MPS Public Attitude Survey, TFL’s Community Safety Plan, and the City of London’s Community Strategy... It was also considered the second most important priority by the respondents of the MPA/MPS consultation and has

featured in this over the past three years.” See MPA/MPS consultation on London policing priorities for 2009/10, Metropolitan Police Authority, May 2008

³² Barnardo’s consultation response to the Police and Crime Plan 2013–2017, 15 February 2013

³³ Comments made at the Committee’s BAME, migrant and refugee round table on 27 February 2013. For more information about this meeting, see Appendix 3.

³⁴ Refuge’s consultation response to the Police and Crime Plan 2013–2017, 21 February 2013

³⁵ Jon Collins at the Police and Crime Committee on 31 January 2013

³⁶ Andrew Morley (Interim Chief Executive, Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime) told the Committee at its [25 October](#) meeting that “This is not the totality of the monitoring arrangements that we have in place. MOPAC officers will be routinely monitoring performance data coming out from the MPS and if there is anything there that is of concern, that will be raised either through the MOPAC Challenge or with the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime’s bilateral meeting with the Commissioner.”

³⁷ The Commissioner said at Police and Crime Committee on 14 February 2013: “We have tried to allocate the resources appropriate to the priorities”.

³⁸ See page 6 of MOPAC’s [Crime Prevention Fund application guidance](#)

³⁹ See discussion at the Police and Crime Committee on 17 January 2013 on the importance of dealing with lower level disorder and the following submissions which suggested the Plan should say more about prevention: Only Connect, Refuge, St Giles Trust.

⁴⁰ [Bernard Hogan-Howe: Dixon of Dock Green is my role model... police officers are not social workers](#), *Evening Standard*, 15 September 2011

⁴¹ See discussion at the Police and Crime Committee on 31 January 2013.

⁴² *Public confidence in the police*, Mayhill & Beak, National Policing Improvement Agency, 2008

⁴³ Two operational pilots – Operation Erin in Brent and Operation Hannah in Lambeth – tested a new model for response and neighbourhood policing services. According to an [MPA report](#), detailed evaluation was expected in July 2011.

⁴⁴ A short summary of the pilots was provided in a [letter to the Budget and Performance Committee](#) (4 February 2013).

⁴⁵ The MPA approved greater flexibility within safer neighbourhood teams in June 2011. This allowed the MPS to “temporarily flex resources across ward boundaries in response to specific local problem solving demand” and was implemented from 2012.

⁴⁶ See comments by Bed Bradford at the Police and Crime Committee on 17 January 2013, who said: “I thought the structure proposed in here was not bad; I mean that seems a perfectly rational approach to the problem to me.”

⁴⁷ Comments by Deputy Commissioner, Craig Mackay, at the Budget and Performance Committee on 9 January 2013

⁴⁸ Mike Hough at the Police and Crime Committee on 17 January 2013.

⁴⁹ Comments taken from briefing provided to the Committee by Timothy Brain

⁵⁰ [People and places – how resources can be targeted](#), HMIC website, accessed 21 January 2013

⁵¹ Assistant Commissioner, Simon Byrne, at MOPAC Challenge on 30 October 2012

⁵² Jon Collins at the Police and Crime Committee on 31 January 2013

⁵³ See comments by Bed Bradford at the Police and Crime Committee on 17 January 2013, who said “I thought the structure proposed in here was not bad; I mean that seems a perfectly rational approach to the problem to me” and “most people probably are not even aware of the specifics of the police organisation within London... to large sections of the public they do not care.”

⁵⁴ A Home Office review of neighbourhood policing found that it achieved reductions in crime and perceptions of anti-social behaviour, and an increase in public confidence and feelings of safety. One important element of the approach was the “presence of visible, accessible and locally known authority figures in neighbourhoods, in particular police officers and police community support officers”: *An evaluation of the impact of the National Reassurance Policing Programme*, Tuffin, Morris & Poole, Home Office Research, Development and Statistics, 2006

⁵⁵ Research by HMIC found that when police work systematically with local people and other organisations to identify and solve problems, it delivers significant reductions in crime. [What stops people offending](#), HMIC website, accessed 21 January 2013

⁵⁶ Comments taken from briefing provided to the Committee by Timothy Brain

⁵⁷ See comments by Ben Bradford at the Police and Crime Committee on 31 January 2013

⁵⁸ ‘Bad Behaviour’, Martin Innes in: *Police Review* pp. 16-17, 1 October 2010

⁵⁹ At the Committee on 14 February 2013 the Commissioner said: “I think there is one point that you have made before and has made me reflect, which is that the rest of the team need to be equally known. I think that is a fair point and it is something that we can take away and work on in terms of communication.”

⁶⁰ Ben Bradford at the Police and Crime Committee on 17 January 2013.

⁶¹ The London Datastore figures show that PCSOs numbers have fallen from a high of 4,705 in July 2009 to 2,693 in January 2013.

Figures provided by Deputy Commissioner, Craig Mackey, to the Assembly’s Budget and Performance Committee on 9 January 2013 show that the MPS will reduce the number of PCSOs to 2,380 in 2015-16, a fall of around 1,100 (30 per cent) on the current numbers quoted at the meeting (3,444).

⁶² Comments by Assistant Commissioner, Simon Byrne, at MOPAC Challenge on 30 October 2012.

⁶³ *Engaging communities in fighting crime: a review by Louise Casey*, Cabinet Office, June 2008

⁶⁴ At the Police and Crime Committee on 31 January 2013 Martin Innes said: “We know that within the police occupational culture, if there is a chance to go and do crime rather than engage, they will go and do the crime.”

⁶⁵ The following submissions questioned how borough allocations were determined: Barnardo’s, London Borough of Camden, London Borough of Hackney, London Borough of Newham, London Borough of Southwark, London Councils, and Only Connect.

⁶⁶ At the Committee on 14 February 2013 the Commissioner said: “If we get everything in place by June, within six months, say by Christmas I would expect another review of that just to see whether it is working or whether we need to tweak it.”

⁶⁷ The Commissioner at Assembly Plenary on 16 January 2013.

⁶⁸ See comments by the Commissioner at the Police and Crime Committee on 14 February 2013.

⁶⁹ In her written briefing for the Committee, Marian FitzGerald said that this shift in capacity may make it difficult to tackle areas where the draft Plan expects improvements, such as sexual offences and gangs. Experts told the Committee on 31 January 2013 that sexual violence and gangs would require ongoing specialist resources, and also suggested the same for cyber crime, child protection and homicide.

In his written briefing for the Committee, former chief constable Timothy Brain warned “the danger is that there will be a concentration on crimes which are visible and recordable, rather than those... which are debilitating for a community but not easily visible or recordable, e.g. racial and sexual abuse, trafficking and racketeering.”

The concern over the loss of specialist skills was raised by Jon Collins at the Police and Crime Committee on 31 January 2013.

⁷⁰ At the Committee on 14 February 2013 the Commissioner said that Trident and Sapphire – which deal with gang crime and serious sexual violence – would be among the types of

squads that would be retained. He told the Committee: "Some things we have to do as specialists."

⁷¹ At the Committee on 14 February 2013 the Commissioner replied: "Yes, I am confident" when asked if he was satisfied that changes to specialist teams would not affect crime detection rates.

⁷² The Commissioner at Assembly Plenary on 16 January 2013

⁷³ *MOPAC Budget Submission 2013-14 to 2015-16*, MOPAC, 2012

⁷⁴ The Commissioner at the Police and Crime Committee on 14 February 2013

⁷⁵ The Commissioner made this point at both the Police and Crime Committee on 14 February 2013 and the Assembly Plenary on 16 January 2013

⁷⁶ At the Committee on 14 February 2013 the Commissioner said of backfilling: "There is a risk it could happen."

⁷⁷ Comments taken from a briefing provided to the Committee by Peter Neyroud.

⁷⁸ Comments taken from a briefing provided to the Committee by Marian FitzGerald.

⁷⁹ One such example was provided in a briefing by Timothy Brain for the Committee. "An example might be vehicle maintenance personnel. These could be reduced; there is no possibility of police officers filling those posts; there is no direct impact on the frontline, but eventually increased service intervals for vehicles ultimately runs the risk of increased frontline inefficiency."

⁸⁰ *'It's not the number of police officers the Met has, it's the size of the frontline that counts'*, Jenny Jones, on Mayorwatch, 4 February 2013. At the Committee on 14 February 2013 the Commissioner explained that this reduction was largely accounted for by a reduction in PCSOs (about half of the change). There was also a temporary reduction due to a recruitment freeze, and the rest of the reduction was due to other police staff that are considered 'frontline'.

⁸¹ This analysis, undertaken by the MPS, shows the number of officers and staff operating in different positions (operational, operational support or organisational support) within a given police force. At the Budget and Performance Committee on 23 October 2012, the Deputy Commissioner committed to making this information available.

⁸² Figures provided by the Mayor at the 14 January 2013 Budget and Performance Committee. The reduction is from 7,160 in March 2013 to 6,022 by 2016.

⁸³ Value for money profiles, HMIC, 2012

⁸⁴ In a briefing provided to the Police and Crime Committee, Timothy Brain said "The averages are relatively meaningless, as the maximum and minimum allocation will vary considerably in practice. Some sergeants will supervise far more than six constables, others will supervise fewer and maybe, in some specializations, none at all. This does represent a loss of supervisory capacity and capability, but the effect will depend entirely how they are used."

⁸⁵ In a briefing provided to the Police and Crime Committee, Peter Neyroud said "a reduced supervision ratio could result in problems in sustaining performance on serious crimes and, particularly, serious sexual assaults."

⁸⁶ Comments by Mick Duthie at the Police and Crime Committee on 15 November 2012.

⁸⁷ See comments by Jon Collins at the Police and Crime Committee on 31 January 2013.

⁸⁸ See discussion at the Police and Crime Committee on 31 January 2013.

⁸⁹ The Commissioner said at the Committee on 14 February 2013 that more supervision is needed where people are least experienced and for have just started in the MPS.

⁹⁰ The Commissioner told the Committee on 14 January 2013 that "we have not previously had an inspector who is dedicated in that neighbourhood to looking after those neighbourhood teams, and it seems to me that is an enhancement."

⁹¹ Comments made at the Committee's BAME, migrant and refugee round table on 27 February 2013. For more information about this meeting, see Appendix 3.

⁹² The Commissioner said at the Committee on 14 February 2013: “One of the things that we are embarking on over the next few months is that every sergeant and inspector that we have will receive training they did not receive for 20 years about how they manage, about how they monitor, about how they intervene where they are not happy that things are happening.”

⁹³ This point was raised at the Police and Crime Committee on 31 January 2013 and in a briefing to the Police and Crime Committee by Peter Neyroud.

⁹⁴ See Home Office website: [Police and Crime Commissioners’ Role](#), accessed 18 February 2013

⁹⁵ *Police and Crime Plan 2013-2017, consultation draft*, MOPAC, January 2013 (page 6)

⁹⁶ Draft MOPAC/ MPS Estates Strategy 2013-2016, January 2013 (page 14)

⁹⁷ *Police and Crime Plan 2013-2017, consultation draft*, MOPAC, January 2013.

⁹⁸ See discussion at the Police and Crime Committee on 17 January 2013.

⁹⁹ See Metropolitan Police Authority reports: [Update on current provision of front counter services](#), (2010) and [Reporting Domestic and Sexual violence to MPS Front Counters](#), (2011)

¹⁰⁰ This issue was raised at the Police and Crime Committee on 31 January 2013 and at the Committee’s roundtable with BAME, refugee and migrant organisations on 27 February 2013.

Victim Support’s submission to the consultation also noted that some vulnerable victims (e.g. domestic violence and anti-social behaviour) may be put at risk of repeat victimisation if they are visited at home by police officers.

¹⁰¹ *Duty of care: Improving support for victims of crime*, London Assembly Police and Crime Committee, January 2013

¹⁰² See discussion at the Police and Crime Committee on 17 January 2013.

¹⁰³ The following written submissions to the Committee suggest that more information is needed about alternative provision: London Borough of Camden, London Borough of Newham, London Borough of Southwark, and London Councils.

¹⁰⁴ At the Police and Crime Committee on 31 January 2013 Cllr Janet Daby said the police in her borough were unable to explain what alternatives they wanted and what they would be used for.

¹⁰⁵ The Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime said at 9 January Budget and Performance Committee that the consultation would listen to the demands of Londoners, but ultimately there must be an estates plan that contributes to “balancing the books”.

¹⁰⁶ Commissioner at Assembly Plenary 16 January 2013.

¹⁰⁷ In a letter to the Budget and Performance Committee Chairman the Mayor said that “detailed financial calculations of revenue savings from individual sites have not yet been conducted”.

¹⁰⁸ The London Borough of Lewisham raised this concern in its submissions to the Committee: “There is a concern that officers may be located at such a distance from the areas they serve that the notion of greater police numbers in neighbourhood teams may not actually be visible to local residents.”

¹⁰⁹ The London Borough of Newham’s submission to the Committee said: “Both the Royal Docks and Stratford are earmarked as significant growth areas and this must be factored into any decisions... It is vital that this landmark new community has appropriate policing resources and in this context, the closure of a police station in such a key area is deeply concerning.”

¹¹⁰ The public sector Equality Duty of the Equality Act requires public bodies to consider all individuals when carrying out their work. It requires public bodies to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity, and foster good relations between different people when carrying out their activities. The Duty requires public bodies to be transparent about how they are responding to the Equality Duty.

¹¹¹ The Police and Crime Plan 2013-2017, consultation draft it says: "The most deprived communities in London need face-face access, particularly where there are language barriers."

¹¹² See, for example, comment in Met wants public to report crimes at counters in mosques and coffee shops, *The Telegraph*, 10 December 2012: "These 24-hour front counters will be improved to provide a better service for the public and will eventually include, for example, initial contact kiosks to provide instant access translation for the public."

¹¹³ Munira Mirza, the Deputy Mayor for Education and Culture who has a lead on equalities for the Mayor told the Assembly's Oversight Committee on 26 February 2013: "My understanding is that MOPAC have done an EIA on the broader strategy and the whole public access project. They have also worked with boroughs on individual assessments on some of the proposals." However, the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime told the Committee on 28 February 2013 that the assessment is London-wide.

¹¹⁴ See discussion at the Police and Crime Committee 28 February 2013.

¹¹⁵ At the Committee on 31 January 2013 we heard examples of implications to be considered in developing alternative provision. This might include, but is not limited to, the following issues:

- Many communities prefer face-to-face contact so online and telephone contact may not be sufficient. Some Londoners are less likely to have internet access, and will be more likely to access services in person. Some disabled people may find online services less accessible.
- Some people may have particular access requirements such as communication support services and wheelchair access. Language support services including video interpretation for deaf people and Language Line are available at some front counters. There is a fear that these services could be lost when front counters are replaced with alternatives.
- For poorer residents, the financial implications of travelling further cannot be underestimated. The geography of each area also needs to be considered to ensure the remaining stations are accessible from across the borough.

¹¹⁶ For example, Crosspoint House in Sutton was recently refurbished following the closure of another police station.

¹¹⁷ See www.frontcounters.org.uk/: analysis commissioned by Jenny Jones, AM.

¹¹⁸ See discussion at the Police and Crime Committee on 28 February 2013.

¹¹⁹ See discussion at the Police and Crime Committee on 28 February 2013.

¹²⁰ The MOPAC Challenge target and benchmark will be measured by the Crime Survey for England and Wales.

¹²¹ Crime Survey for England and Wales, Office for National Statistics.

¹²² See discussion at the Police and Crime Committee on 31 January 2013.

¹²³ For example, organisations working with BAME, migrant and refugee communities said they are concerned that the changes will leave the police less able to work in partnership. They have been told by their local police that borough teams will not have the capacity for partnership work in future. Comments made at the Committee's BAME, migrant and refugee round table on 27 February 2013. For more information about this meeting, see Appendix 3.

¹²⁴ At the Committee on 14 February 2013 the Commissioner said: "I would argue that by putting more officers out, more patrols, having bigger teams doing things more locally with people, that will make a big contribution"

¹²⁵ See comments by Martin Innes at the Police and Crime Committee on 31 January 2013.

¹²⁶ Comments made at the Committee's BAME, migrant and refugee round table on 27 February 2013. For more information about this meeting, see Appendix 3.

¹²⁷ See comments by Martin Innes at the Police and Crime Committee on 31 January 2013.

¹²⁸ *Engaging communities in fighting crime: a review by Louise Casey*, Cabinet Office, June 2008.

¹²⁹ See comments by Martin Innes at the Police and Crime Committee on 31 January 2013.

¹³⁰ See comments by Kirsten Hearn at the Police and Crime Committee on 31 January 2013.

¹³¹ Mike Hough at the Police and Crime Committee on 17 January: "I think the key thing in any policing plan is to keep an eye on levels of police legitimacy; what makes the police legitimate in the eyes of the public. It is probably...the way that people and police interact." Further opinion in this paragraph taken from discussions at 17 January Police and Crime Committee.

¹³² See comments by Mike Hough at the Police and Crime Committee on 17 January 2013.

¹³³ At the Committee on 31 January 2013 the following examples were discussed: Birmingham police's work with a learning disability self-advocacy group; London borough work on hate crime, such as Waltham Forest Stay Safe and Greenwich Association of Disabled People; and Second Wave, a project bringing together young people and police officers in Lewisham.

¹³⁴ See discussion at the Police and Crime Committee on 31 January 2013 and consultation response from Howard League.

¹³⁵ These comments came from the GLA peer outreach team and practitioners network. More details on the meetings undertaken with the GLA peer outreach team are provided in Appendix 3.

¹³⁶ Building police-youth relationships: the importance of procedural justice, Lyn Hinds: in *Youth Justice*, Vol. 7(3) p195-209, 2007

¹³⁷ Comments made at the Committee's BAME, migrant and refugee round table on 27 February 2013. For more information about this meeting, see Appendix 3.

¹³⁸ *Police and Crime Plan 2013-2017, consultation draft*, MOPAC, January 2013 (page 17)

¹³⁹ Comments from the meeting with the GLA peer outreach team. More details on the meetings undertaken with the GLA peer outreach team are provided in Appendix 3.

¹⁴⁰ See discussion at the Police and Crime Committee on 31 January 2013.

¹⁴¹ Commissioner's comments at the Police and Crime Committee on 14 February 2013.

In a briefing for the Police and Crime Committee, Marian FitzGerald explains that the MPS has exceptionally high use of searches under section 60. It was originally intended only to be used for limited periods in exceptional circumstance and does not require reasonable grounds for suspicion. Its yield is very low: only 2 per cent resulted in an arrest for any reason section 60 searches in London. Those searched under section 60 are disproportionately of minority ethnic origin. Whereas Black and Asian people accounted for 29 and 14 per cent respectively of section 1 searches by the MPS in 2009-10, the figures for section 60 searches were 41 and 20 per cent.

¹⁴² Comments made at the GLA practitioners meeting. More details on the meetings undertaken with the GLA peer outreach team are provided in Appendix 3.

¹⁴³ Comments made at the Committee's BAME, migrant and refugee round table on 27 February 2013. For more information about this meeting, see Appendix 3.

¹⁴⁴ See comments at MOPAC Challenge on 22 January 2013 by the Deputy Commissioner.

¹⁴⁵ Feedback from the Committee's efforts to engage young people and BAME and migrant organisations have suggested these tactics will not be enough to tackle this issue. For example, at the BAME and migrant organisation roundtable, we were told that training is "missing the point" and there are more complicated issues that need to be tackled.

¹⁴⁶ [Calls for new laws to force police to tackle diversity crisis at top](#), *The Guardian*, 27 January

¹⁴⁷ Comments made at the Committee's roundtable with BAME and migrant organisations (see Appendix 3 for more information).

¹⁴⁸ In a recent MPS survey, half of those questioned agreed that "certain communities do little to deserve the respect of the police" and almost three in 10 said that some victims were "more deserving of a good service than others". See ['Ask police for help? I wouldn't bother, Met officers tell poll'](#), *The Observer*, 3 November 2012

¹⁴⁹ See comments by Jennette Arnold at the Police and Crime Committee on 28 February 2013.

¹⁵⁰ Comments made at the Committee's BAME and refugee round table on 27 February 2013. For more information about this meeting, see Appendix 3.

¹⁵¹ Commissioner at the Police and Crime Committee on 14 February 2013.

¹⁵² BAME and migrant organisations we spoke to agreed that targeting Londoners may help to improve diversity and help the force to understand local communities. Comments made at the Committee's BAME, migrant and refugee round table on 27 February 2013. For more information about this meeting, see Appendix 3.

¹⁵³ See discussion at the Police and Crime Committee on 31 January 2013.

¹⁵⁴ See comments by Marian FitzGerald at the Police and Crime Committee on 17 January 2013.

¹⁵⁵ Comments made at the Committee's BAME and refugee round table on 27 February 2013. For more information about this meeting, see Appendix 3.

¹⁵⁶ *Police and Crime Plan 2013-2017, consultation draft*, MOPAC, January 2013 (page 13).

¹⁵⁷ See comments by Marian FitzGerald at Police and Crime Committee on 17 January 2013.

¹⁵⁸ Comments made at the Committee's BAME, migrant and refugee round table on 27 February 2013. For more information about this meeting, see Appendix 3.

¹⁵⁹ Police and Crime Plan, as appended to the MOPAC monthly report, November 2012.

¹⁶⁰ See discussion at the Police and Crime Committee on 17 January 2013.

¹⁶¹ In discussion at the Police and Crime Committee on 17 January 2013 the Committee heard that the Crown Prosecution Service and London Probation were not consulted. These organisations are members of the London Crime Reduction Board, which is expected to deliver these priorities.

¹⁶² See discussion at the Police and Crime Committee on 17 January 2013.

¹⁶³ At the Committee on 17 January 2013 Alison Saunders said that more detail was needed: "Of course, it does depend what you mean by court delays. If you are looking at it from offence through to finalisation, that is quite a large period and for different categories of cases there will be issues there around when does it get to the court, if it is the first hearing, and finalisation. That is a very different period of time."

¹⁶⁴ See discussion at the Police and Crime Committee on 17 January 2013

¹⁶⁵ In her briefing for the Police and Crime Committee, Marian FitzGerald explains that "in the overall scheme of things reducing reoffending rates by this group will make little difference to reoffending overall. For it is very rare for young offenders to go to prison... even here no more than 5 per cent of young people 'subject to disposal' receive custodial sentences." The London Borough of Lewisham also suggested this target should be extended to adults and not just young people.

¹⁶⁶ At the Committee on 17 January 2013 Heather Munro said: "I think certainly focus on increased compliance. However, we would say not just on community sentences but also offenders on licence as well, which is a large part of our work."

¹⁶⁷ In its submission to the Police and Crime Committee's investigation, the London Borough of Newham said: "In general, the draft plan remains silent on how the target driven approach sits with other government agencies... [We] would ask that we receive confirmation that local areas will not be held to different sets of targets by different government agencies."

¹⁶⁸ For example, the CPS is ultimately responsible to the Director of Public Prosecutors and the Attorney General and has agreed performance targets.

¹⁶⁹ See discussion at the Police and Crime Committee on 17 January 2013.

¹⁷⁰ Catherine Hennessy told the Committee on 17 January 2013 that offenders are unlikely to comply with abstinence "unless they are provided with support alongside the order to enable them to comply with it. A straightforward, "If you don't do this you will end up

going to prison”, without any additional support, is likely to end up in the individual going to prison.”

¹⁷¹ At the Committee on 17 January 2013 Vicki Helyar-Cardwell said “there is a little bit of thinking to be done about how that will work, particularly agencies that may not even be branded criminal justice agencies – housing, social services – that we know have such an impact on reducing reoffending and must be pulled in to contribute to those aims.”

¹⁷² Catherine Hennessy told the Committee on 17 January 2013 that: “There is a notable absence of a commitment to work with health delivery partners. There is no mention of health, and that will be particularly important in achieving all the targets around reoffending.”

¹⁷³ The following submissions argue for greater consideration of the role of the voluntary sector and other partners: Barnardo’s, London Borough of Lewisham, London Borough of Southwark, Only Connect, and St Giles Trust.

¹⁷⁴ *Police and Crime Plans – Guidance and Practice Advice*, Association of Police Authority Chief Executives, August 2012

¹⁷⁵ On 20 December 2012, the Committee held a meeting on the future of Community Safety Funding in London. The Committee wrote to the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime with its concerns about MOPAC’s approach to commissioning regarding MOPAC’s programme management and the support given to boroughs.

¹⁷⁶ In its submission to this investigation, the London Borough of Newham told the Committee that “The draft Plan will present difficulties for CSPs to make proposals/bids to reduce crime and disorder for their boroughs as it is very vague... it is difficult for boroughs to provide informed bids or prioritise their own resources without knowing the direction MOPAC plan to take...”

The London Borough of Lewisham said “the rush in which bids have been completed might not necessarily get the desired outcomes for the spend.”

¹⁷⁷ See priorities on page 7 of MOPAC’s [Crime Prevention Fund application guidance](#)

¹⁷⁸ See comments by Ben Bradford at the Police and Crime Committee on 17 January 2013, who said: I thought the structure proposed in here was not bad; I mean that seems a perfectly rational approach to the problem to me.”

¹⁷⁹ Comments by Deputy Commissioner, Craig Mackay, at the Budget and Performance Committee on 9 January 2013

¹⁸⁰ Mike Hough at the Police and Crime Committee on 17 January 2013.

¹⁸¹ Comments taken from briefing provided to the Committee by Timothy Brain

¹⁸² [People and places – how resources can be targeted](#), HMIC website, accessed 21 January 2013

¹⁸³ Ben Bradford at the Police and Crime Committee on 17 January 2013.

¹⁸⁴ See discussion at the Police and Crime Committee on 17 January 2013.

Appendix 5 – Orders and Translations

How to order

For further information on this report or to order a copy, please contact Susannah Drury on 020 7983 4484 or email: Susannah.drury@london.gov.uk

See it for free on our website

You can also view a copy of the report on the GLA website:
<http://www.london.gov.uk/assembly>

Large print, braille or translations

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 ਆਪਣੀ ਭਾਸ਼ਾ ਵਿਚ ਲੈਣਾ ਚਾਹੋ, ਤਾਂ ਕਿਰਪਾ ਕਰਕੇ ਇਸ ਨੰਬਰ 'ਤੇ ਫੋਨ ਕਰੋ ਜਾਂ ਊਪਰ ਦਿੱਤੇ ਡਾਕ ਜਾਂ ਈਮੇਲ ਪਤੇ 'ਤੇ ਸਾਨੂੰ ਸੰਪਰਕ ਕਰੋ।

Hindi

यदि आपको इस दस्तावेज़ 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 দস্তাবেজের একটি সারাংশ নিজের ভাষায় পেতে চান, তাহলে দয়া করে ফোন করবেন অথবা উল্লিখিত ডাক ঠিকানায় বা ই-মেইল ঠিকানায় 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

الحصول على ملخص لهذا المستند بلغة،
فارجاء الاتصال برقم الهاتف أو الاتصال على
العنوان البريدي أو عنوان البريد
الإلكتروني أعلاه.

Gujarati

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

Appendix 6 – Principles of Scrutiny

An aim for action

An Assembly scrutiny is not an end in itself. It aims for action to achieve improvement.

Independence

An Assembly scrutiny is conducted with objectivity; nothing should be done that could impair the independence of the process.

Holding the Mayor to account

The Assembly rigorously examines all aspects of the Mayor's strategies.

Inclusiveness

An Assembly scrutiny consults widely, having regard to issues of timeliness and cost.

Constructiveness

The Assembly conducts its scrutinies and investigations in a positive manner, recognising the need to work with stakeholders and the Mayor to achieve improvement.

Value for money

When conducting a scrutiny the Assembly is conscious of the need to spend public money effectively.

Greater London Authority

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

www.london.gov.uk

Enquiries 020 7983 4100
Minicom 020 7983 4458