

# MAYOR OF LONDON

**Steve O'Connell AM**  
Chairman of Police and Crime Committee  
City Hall  
The Queen's Walk  
More London  
London SE1 2AA

**Our ref:** MGLA180118-1003

**Date:** 12 JUN 2018

Dear Steve,

Thank you for sending me a copy of your report *Respecting others: tackling antisocial behaviour in London*. I am sorry for the delay in replying.

My Police and Crime Plan recognises that for some people, such as the elderly, children or disabled people, antisocial behaviour (ASB) can be particularly distressing and that, left unresolved, problems like this can leave all Londoners feeling vulnerable when going about their daily lives.

Whilst overall responsibility for antisocial behaviour lies with central government and local authorities, tackling it needs a multi-agency response. My Office for Policing And Crime (MOPAC) works with the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) to deliver a policing service that is better equipped to perform their role in dealing with crime and antisocial behaviour locally, across the city and online, strengthening neighbourhood policing; giving boroughs a say in local policing and crime priorities.

Under this system, each borough has selected two local priority crimes, based on local knowledge, crime data and police intelligence, along with antisocial behaviour, which was identified in the consultation for this plan as an important issue in every borough.

In this way, MOPAC has ensured that ASB is a mandatory priority for each borough in London, as we see this as an important issue that should not be put aside. You will have seen evidence of this from the new dashboards that MOPAC has published, including the borough volume crime trends, which can be viewed on the City Hall website at: [www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/mayors-office-policing-and-crime-mopac/data-and-statistics/mopac-performance-framework](http://www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/mayors-office-policing-and-crime-mopac/data-and-statistics/mopac-performance-framework).

MOPAC uses this data in oversight discussions with the MPS to understand which enforcement responses are best placed within which environment.

There is also a key issue relating to ASB in regard to potential vulnerability. As we saw with the tragic Pilkington case, ASB can have the most serious consequences if the people who report the issue are not supported in the right way. This is why the London Crime Reduction Board (LCRB) recently led a discussion on the impact of government cuts on safeguarding across London, and why MOPAC continues to fund the London Children's Safeguarding Board and local boards. Policing alone cannot solve these kinds of issues, and for this reason MOPAC encourages police and councils to work together with a problem-solving approach, using all the powers and resources

## MAYOR OF LONDON

at their disposal to prevent antisocial behaviour and make our communities better places to live. London Councils is a key member of the LCRB and was heavily involved in this discussion, as it is always actively representing its members, who have statutory responsibilities and powers to tackle ASB.

I am sure you are aware that the Association of Police and Crime Commissioners is carrying out a review of ASB legislation and powers and MOPAC will ensure London is represented. Locally, we are working with partners to explore reasons for any lack of take up of the Community Trigger and Community Remedy.

Significant changes to ASB legislation, led by the Home Office, took place during the previous City Hall administration. This legislation introduced several new ASB powers available to the police and Local Authorities, including the Community Trigger and the Community Remedy.

When this legislation was introduced, MOPAC sought to negotiate standard approaches to the Community Trigger across all London Boroughs. This was agreed and set at three complaints (to whichever agency) in a six-month period. All boroughs agreed however there is some local variation as to what constitutes a complaint.

In terms of the Community Remedy, again at the time MOPAC discharged its responsibilities by agreeing a Community Remedy 'menu' with the MPS.

Since then, there has been a lack of central government leadership for addressing ASB (in particular since the dissolution of the Respect Taskforce). The lines of responsibility for addressing ASB are blurred and this has resulted in a deferral of responsibility and action between services. Where the Home Office is no longer collating returns in a meaningful way (or funding this work), there has been little accountability.

However, once set, these powers take resourcing and we are all only too aware of the huge cuts that have hit Local Authorities and the impact this will have had on the services they previously provided to victims of ASB. MOPAC and the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime are continually taking up with the Government the issue of fairness of resourcing, including for support to victims in London. Clearly, the allocation for London needs to reflect current complexities and capacity, and this includes nationally reflected increases in violence, terror and issues such as ASB.

I hope that this response addresses the Committee's questions. Thank you once again for writing to me about these issues.

Yours sincerely,



**Sadiq Khan**  
Mayor of London