

Merton Council

Overview and Scrutiny Commission

14 July 2015

Supplementary agenda

- | | | |
|---|--|---------|
| 3 | Minutes of the meeting held on 25 March | 1 - 8 |
| 4 | Policing in Merton - presentation by Borough Commander | 9 - 12 |
| 5 | Stop and Search Monitoring Data - presentation by the Chair of Merton's Stop and Search Monitoring Group | 13 - 14 |

This page is intentionally left blank

All minutes are draft until agreed at the next meeting of the committee/panel. To find out the date of the next meeting please check the calendar of events at your local library or online at www.merton.gov.uk/committee.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMISSION 25 MARCH 2015

(19.15 - 21.05)

PRESENT: Councillor Peter Southgate (in the Chair),
Councillor Peter McCabe, Councillor John Dehaney,
Councillor Brenda Fraser, Councillor Jeff Hanna,
Councillor Russell Makin, Councillor Oonagh Moulton and
Councillor Dennis Pearce, Councillor James Holmes, Councillor
John Bowcott

ALSO PRESENT: Chris Lee (Director of Environment and Regeneration), Paul
Walshe (Parking Services Manager), John Hill (Head of Public
Protection), Janet Pinkney (Safer Merton Manager), Rebecca
Redman (Scrutiny Officer), David Palmer (Chief Super
Intendent – Met Police)

1 DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST - SEE NOTE OVERLEAF
(Agenda Item 1)

None.

2 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Agenda Item 2)

Apologies were received from Denis Popovs, Colin Powell and Simon Bennett.

3 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 10 MARCH 2015 (Agenda Item 3)

Panel agreed the Minutes as a true record of the meeting.

A Member raised concerns about the lack of a report from the Borough
Commander responding to the questions raised and forwarded by the
Commission, via the Scrutiny Officer, in February 2015. Information on the
revised deployment rationale was requested. The Member added that the lack
of a report did not aid effective scrutiny.

David Palmer explained that a verbal response was to be provided to those
questions at this meeting and apologized that a written report had not been
made available in advance. This was due to staff sickness.

A Member asked that this response be provided in report format following the
meeting and sought reassurance that this would be actioned. David Palmer
agreed to do so.

4 POLICING IN MERTON (Agenda Item 4)

David Palmer outlined that there are 331 officers, of which, 60 officers are in neighbourhood policing teams. All other officers are deployed in response to need. In addition there are 20 PCSO's allocated to Merton. The 60 officers are allocated across all 3 sectors and work on a 5 week shift pattern to ensure teams operate well. This approach is felt to be more practical.

The percentage of crime in each of the three sectors was outlined as follows: Mitcham (41%); Morden (28%) and Wimbledon (31%). The number of Police officers deployed is Mitcham (24); Morden (17) and Wimbledon (18).

Police officers currently not allocated to a home beat role have also been placed in Mitcham, and Pollards Hill. Mitcham coverage has been supplemented with 4 additional PCSO's to ensure a constant presence to reassure residents.

David Palmer explained that the Police are looking to develop a different approach, subject to consultation, operating in 2 sectors instead of 3. This would ensure officers were proportionately balanced. Senior Managers remain in support of deploying officers to where there is greater need. The process to move towards this model is not clear as yet. It would require the agreement of MOPAC and conversations are underway with stakeholders on this.

David Palmer highlighted that difficulties arise because a high number of new officers are coming through that need 10 weeks basic training and then paired up with an experienced officer. They are then posted to neighbourhood policing teams and on 2 years probation. Those that pass probation are then posted to a response team. The particular difficulties with moving officers and the impact on the team in that location, is that there are low numbers of experienced officers to utilise in each sector.

A Member asked about the constituencies that the two sector model would split. A Member asked about the format of the consultation. David Palmer confirmed that there would be split wards in Morden and that there is no clear consultation format as yet which has been agreed. There is agreement in principle from senior police officers and a report to take this forward is being formulated at present.

A Member noted the importance of maintaining a regular police officer contact in certain wards to reassure residents. David Palmer explained that this wasn't always possible due to budget cuts and the radical change programme that is underway which is changing the way the police operate all the time. The ability to post resources according to need has also diminished.

A Member expressed concerns that the data provided was too simplistic and that these figures did not represent the seriousness of crime committed. The Member asked for data and information on the nature of the review that has taken place and how the data has been interpreted to form a judgement as to how officers are allocated.

A Member asked about arrangements for tackling drug dealing. David Palmer confirmed that there is no specific drug team on street patrol. At a low level, neighbourhood officers would tackle this and at the higher risk levels a task force or the crime squad would deal with this.

A Member asked how many officers are required to go to court if they are at the scene of a crime. David Palmer stated that an officer is only sent to court when required by the CPS as a witness. Officers are only sent for the day they are giving evidence, not for whole case.

A Member noted the increase in violence in the data and, in particular, domestic violence. David Palmer explained that this is following the inspectorates review on the recording and classification of crime by the MET and concerns that were raised about accuracy, which have been responded to and reflected in the data.

RESOLVED: The Commission requested a written report to the next meeting to cover the review that has taken place, outcome of consultation with MOPAC and outlining responses to the questions provided to the Borough Commander previously.

5 TRANSFORMING REHABILITATION (Agenda Item 5)

John Hill introduced the item and explained that the report focusses on integrated offender management and summarises recent changes in legislation. Rehabilitation is concerned with reducing repeat offending. The Probation Service provides advice and support in this area. The Safer Merton Team work in partnership with the Probation Service and Police to manage offender rehabilitation with the objective of reducing opportunity for repeat offending.

John Hill explained that the introduction of significant changes to the probation system recently introduced by central government meant that opportunities have been created so that the rehabilitation of offenders can now be provided by a diverse range of providers for low and medium risk offenders. On an annual basis 45,000 offenders are released into the community nationally. The current system allows for offenders to be released without any rehabilitation plan in place to reduce the likelihood of repeat offending. The changes introduced by government will create a "Through the Gate" service to coordinate the resettlement of offenders sentenced to less than 12 months custody. In London this will apply to around 8,000 offenders per year. The resettlement plan will include accommodation, employment, financial and

health advice. This programme is intended to break the cycle of reoffending. The changes are currently being rolled out. Although early in the process, it is expected that the new initiative will have resource implications for all agencies involved in the rehabilitation process including the Council. John Hill added that he was happy to bring back an update report in due course on how the council have responded and how well they are performing in this area.

The Chair asked how many offenders would be under the councils care. Janet Pinkney explained that the numbers were not fixed as yet and that the demand on services could not be fully anticipated until this was the case. The council has no additional resource to rehabilitate and can only work with the probation service and police on this.

The Chair asked what length of time the council would be responsible for rehabilitation. Janet Pinkney explained that the council and police are involved in the assessments and meetings prior to release and for 12 months after leave, when an evaluation will be taken as to extending this supervision.

John Hill explained that the rehabilitation contract for London had been awarded to MTC Novo who have a long track record in rehabilitation and offender management. They tailor rehabilitation based on the characteristics of the offender.

A Member asked if employment was offered to those being rehabilitated. John Hill stated that this could be the case and that there are a number of opportunities that the council working together with partner agencies could explore to offer employment, for example, through apprenticeships.

A Member asked if youth offender management was separate. Janet Pinkney confirmed that this was the case.

Chris Lee explained that in relation to probation, the council are a partner and do not commission these services. Probation may be devolved to a London wide level in due course. The council does not have a statutory responsibility. Its role is to work alongside the probation service and police. Chris Lee suggested that the Commission may wish to bring MTC Novo along to a future meeting to look at their programme. The Chair agreed.

RESOLVED:

- Ask MTC Novo and Probation Service to a future meeting of the Commission.
- Janet Pinkney agreed to bring back information on the likely number of offenders the council would be working with to a future meeting.

Chris Lee introduced the report and explained that there had been investment in infrastructure and that the council had been looking at connectivity and potential financial savings. Across the 4 key areas in the action plan, significant progress has been made. This work has been supported by a consultant and £600,000 capital funding has been allocated to CCTV investment. This would involve investing in recording and monitoring equipment. This is out to tender at present.

Chris Lee added that these changes would establish a better and more reliable maintenance regime and connectivity, securing better value for money. The Manager post for the CCTV would also be filled shortly. Furthermore there has been effective partnership working between the parking team and police and better performance management data to inform where the service needs to focus. The Action Plan within the agenda resulted from a successful audit of the CCTV service which is showing progress.

A Member asked if CCTV was only in the locations shown in the report. Chris Lee explained that some sites not listed do have CCTV but that they are sites that are monitored by other organisations and not networked to the Council system. Chris Lee added that the contract between CHMP and the council for CCTV had not been cancelled by CHMP. CHMP have so far decided to stay within the contract and have their sites monitored via the Council control room and that if they choose to withdraw then CHMP would be solely responsible for monitoring CCTV locally on site and would lose connectivity with the council and its relationship with the police.

A Member asked if all CCTV was on the council's network. Chris Lee explained that the cameras are linked via the councils CCTV centre. The council are seeking to link other camera systems, generate income and increase community safety.

A Member asked what covert CCTV was in place and how its use was prioritized. Chris Lee responded that only 3 pieces of redeployable CCTV equipment were owned by the council and used by the environmental enforcement team. Chris Lee added that he would be happy to look into this further.

The Chair asked if this would entail acquiring more units. Chris Lee explained that 3 units had just been procured and that the CCTV Steering Group, attended by the Police, would look at whether more covert CCTV was needed.

A Member asked about low staffing numbers for the CCTV Centre.

John Hill explained that the council are managing sickness and absenteeism and that the new managerial post in the team will manage shift patterns, staff coverage and technical issues.

John Hill added that looking to downsize the number of CCTV mobile units will take place. Paul Walshe explained that the deregulation of CCTV vehicles has affected what can be enforced.

John Hill asked the Commission to record his and the Director of E&R's thanks to Claire Cuffie who has managed the CCTV team through its transition period during the last 18 months. Claire had done this in addition to her substantive role as ASB supervisor. During the period of time when Claire has been managing the CCTV service the team won 4 Metropolitan Police awards for helping to solve crime through the use of public realm CCTV.

RESOLVED: Commission notes the report.

7 OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY ANNUAL REPORT 2014/15 (Agenda Item 7)

The Chair introduced the report. The Chair of the Sustainable Communities Scrutiny Panel asked that the pre decision scrutiny undertaken on Merton Adult Education be noted.

The Chair of the Children and Young People Scrutiny Panel asked that the absence of the requested information from the Borough Commander having not been received be acknowledged in the report. The Commission agreed that the Annual Report was not the appropriate place to raise these concerns.

RESOLVED: The Commission agreed the report.

8 PLANNING THE COMMISSION'S 2015/16 WORK PROGRAMME (Agenda Item 8)

The Chair introduced the report and sought topics from the Commission. The Chair asked how much time Members felt should be allocated to budget scrutiny given that the November 2014 round of budget scrutiny did not provide a significant amount of information as expected. The Commission agreed that this should be considered at the time.

The Vice Chair informed the Commission that the General Purposes Committee stated that the Commission should look at information put before it when setting its work programme.

The Chair highlighted his attendance at the London Scrutiny Network and highlighted the session on Child Sexual Exploitation and, in particular, the cost of temporary social workers and the need for continuity of care of clients. The Chair of the Children and Young People Scrutiny Panel agreed to add this to the list of topics for consideration for the Panel at the May 2015 workshops.

RESOLVED: The Commission noted the report.

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee: Overview and Scrutiny Commission

Date: 14 July 2015

Subject: Policing in Merton

Lead officer: Stuart Macleod, Merton Borough Commander

Lead member: Councillor Peter Southgate, Chair, Overview and Scrutiny Commission

Contact officer: Julia Regan, Head of Democracy Services,
julia.regan@merton.gov.uk, 0208 545 3864

Recommendations:

- A. That the Overview and Scrutiny Commission discuss and comment on the report and crime data provided by the Borough Commander (see Appendix A) and ask other questions as appropriate.
-

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1. The Borough Commander has been invited to attend the Overview and Scrutiny Commission meeting to give a brief presentation setting out his plans and challenges for the year ahead.
- 1.2. He has also been requested to provide a written report to answer questions previously raised by the Commission and to provide crime data in the same format as that provided to the Commission's meeting on 25 March 2015. This is set out in Appendix A.
- 1.3. The definition and recording of hate crime was discussed at the Commission's topic workshop on 20 May. Information from a report to the Joint Consultative Committee With Ethnic Minority Organisations has therefore been included below so that the Borough Commander can comment at the Commission's meeting.

2 DETAILS

- 2.1. Chief Superintendent David Palmer attended the Commission's meeting on 25 March 2015. At this meeting the Commission requested a written report to its meeting on 14 July to include:
- Information about the review that has taken place of the allocation of officers to the three sectors in Merton
 - Outcome of the consultation with MOPAC about the proposed move from 3 to 2 sectors in the borough
 - Crime data in same format as for 25 March meeting
 - Formal response to the questions sent previously in relation to the motion of Full Council on 19 November 2014:
 - I. whether a review of the deployment of officers has been carried out and, if so, what was its nature
 - II. what are the current levels of crime in the three sectors

III. what is the current deployment of officers in each of the three sectors and the rationale for this

IV. The Commission understands that of the 300 officers on the borough, 200 are dedicated to specific areas and 100 are retained for flexible deployment. How are these 100 being deployed at present?

- 2.2. These requests were sent to the Borough Commander by email on 9 April and a reminder was sent on 3 June.
- 2.3. Following a request made at the scrutiny topic workshop on 20 May, and conveyed to the Borough Commander by email on 3 June, he has also been asked to give his view on how well the neighbourhood watch scheme is working in Merton.
- 2.4. Appendix A contains a report from the Borough Commander plus Metropolitan Police performance indicators for Merton for the past three months on a rolling 12 month basis for Merton plus snapshot information for Merton's statistical neighbours.
- 2.5. In response to a topic suggestion made by Merton Centre for Independent Living, members at the Commission's topic workshop on 20 May requested that information on hate crime provided to the Joint Consultative Committee be sent to the Commission's meeting so that the Borough Commander could be asked to comment on the categorisation. Merton CIL's concern was that disability hate crime is not recorded as a distinct category and they asked when this would be addressed.
- 2.6. The hate crime data received by the Joint Consultative Committee With Ethnic Minority Organisations meeting in December 2014 for the preceding year was:

Hate Crime Performance, (up until 20/11/14)

Hate Flag	MPS		Merton	
	Offences	SDs	Offences	SDs
Racist and Religious	7525	28.7%	131	32.8%
Racist	7289	29.3%	114	18.4%
Faith	796	16.7%	23	47.8%
Anti-Semitic	242	14.0%	1	0.00%
Islamophobic	453	19.4%	20	55.0%

Race and religious crime is defined as any incident which is perceived to be racist by the victim or any other person, or any offence where the offender demonstrates hostility based on the victim's membership of a racial or religious group. Some crimes will be double counted, for example, some crimes are flagged as both racist and religious and therefore the sum of racist crimes and faith crimes exceeds the number of overall offences.

3 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

Commission members may choose to ask questions about other aspects of policing in Merton.

4 CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN OR PROPOSED

4.1. Not applicable.

5 TIMETABLE

5.1. Not applicable.

6 FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND PROPERTY IMPLICATIONS

6.1. There are no property or resource implications at this time.

7 LEGAL AND STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS

7.1. None for the purposes of this report.

8 HUMAN RIGHTS, EQUALITIES AND COMMUNITY COHESION IMPLICATIONS

8.1. None for the purposes of this report.

9 CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

9.1. None for the purposes of this report.

10 RISK MANAGEMENT AND HEALTH AND SAFETY IMPLICATIONS

None for the purpose of this report.

11 APPENDICES – THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENTS ARE TO BE PUBLISHED WITH THIS REPORT AND FORM PART OF THE REPORT

Appendix A – report from the Borough Commander plus MOPAC performance indicators

12 BACKGROUND PAPERS

12.1. None

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee: Overview and Scrutiny Commission

Date: 14 July 2015

Subject: Stop and Search Monitoring Data

Lead officer: Christine Matthews, Chair, Merton Stop and Search Monitoring Group

Lead member: Councillor Peter Southgate, Chair, Overview and Scrutiny Commission

Contact officer: Julia Regan, Head of Democracy Services,
julia.regan@merton.gov.uk, 0208 545 3864

Recommendations:

- A. That the Overview and Scrutiny Commission discuss and comment on the report provided by the Chair of Merton's Stop and Search Monitoring Group (see Appendix A) and ask other questions as appropriate.
-

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1. The Chair of Merton's Stop and Search Monitoring Group has been invited to attend the Overview and Scrutiny Commission meeting to present the latest stop and search monitoring data and answer questions. Her report is provided in Appendix A.

2 DETAILS

- 2.1. This issue was suggested by a councillor and by Merton Centre for Independent Living for inclusion in the Commission's 2015/16 work programme.
- 2.2. The councillor has suggested that the Commission:
- scrutinise the operation of stop and search of young people in the borough (under 25s);
 - examine monitoring data broken down by age, gender and ethnicity to check any over-representation and then to find out what action is being taken to address this;
 - find out what the roles of the police, council and schools are in relation to stop and search, including information about people's rights.
- 2.3. Merton Centre for Independent Living has suggested that any scrutiny of this issue should also consider monitoring disability as this is not currently recorded and there is a specific issue, particularly for people with autism where the situation can escalate if the police are not aware of the condition.

3 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

Commission members may choose to ask questions about any aspect of stop and search.

4 CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN OR PROPOSED

- 4.1. Not applicable.

5 TIMETABLE

5.1. Not applicable.

6 FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND PROPERTY IMPLICATIONS

6.1. There are no property or resource implications at this time.

7 LEGAL AND STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS

7.1. None for the purposes of this report.

8 HUMAN RIGHTS, EQUALITIES AND COMMUNITY COHESION IMPLICATIONS

8.1. None for the purposes of this report.

9 CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

9.1. None for the purposes of this report.

10 RISK MANAGEMENT AND HEALTH AND SAFETY IMPLICATIONS

None for the purpose of this report.

11 APPENDICES – THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENTS ARE TO BE PUBLISHED WITH THIS REPORT AND FORM PART OF THE REPORT

Appendix A – report from the Chair of Merton’s Stop and Search Monitoring Group

12 BACKGROUND PAPERS

12.1. None