Appendix C: Youth Violence

Youth Violence – trends, patterns and responses

1.1 The Committee requested information about youth violence following a number of high profile incidents across London during 2015 and rising public concern about the involvement of young people with gangs, knife crime and other violence.

1.2 In terms of overall violence involving people of all ages (to provide some context) – the key police measure of Violence with injury (VWI) suggests that, for London as a whole, there has been an increase of just under 31% between April 2015 and January 2016. In the same period, Lambeth has seen an increase of 3.9%. Note that only 5 boroughs in the Metropolitan Police area have shown a reduction in VWI offences in this period. In the MPS league table for changes to VWI, Lambeth are currently 15th with Lewisham at 4% increase and Croydon 4.4% increase.

1.3 ‘Serious Youth Violence’ is a Home Office classification of crime that counts the number of victims of most serious violence, knife crime and gun crime, where the victim is aged 19 or under. ‘Most serious violence’ incudes the highest categories of violence against the person, primarily serious wounding and grievous bodily harm. The use of weapons, particularly knives, is often connected to personal robbery, so this crime type is also strongly linked to serious youth violence. SYV gives a good indicator of the most high impact violent crimes involving young people, though these are, and remain, small in volume.

1.4 Youth Violence between April 2015 and January 2016 in the MPS area has shown a 4.9% increase. Last year there were 4,872 offences whilst this year 5,111 offences (as of 24/01/16). Lambeth is currently seeing an 8.9% increase. Although some of the Met-wide increase can be accounted for in terms of changes in crime classifications and more robust policy of reporting of crimes, there is no question there has been an increase during 2015/16, with a significant increase in Lambeth borough.

1.5 However, our understanding of what is happening to youth violence today needs to be set into the context of appreciating the long term trend for youth violence in Lambeth:
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1.5.1 The chart shows Lambeth’s experience of Serious Youth Violence since 2010 – the monthly fluctuations in numbers of victims shows a clear downward trend over the six year period, from an average of 30-40 incidents a month to less than 20. This financial year to date (April 2015 to January 2016) there have been 229 offences counted as SYV. For the same 10 month periods since 2010, the figures have been:- 330 (2010-11); 387 (2011-12); 236 (2012-13); 241 (2013-14); 200 (2014-15). Therefore, there has been a spike upwards in serious youth violence in the last year in Lambeth, though the figures are well down on where they were four or five years ago.

1.5.2 As knife crime tends to disproportionately affect young people as victims and offenders, it’s also worth looking at overall knife crime over the last six years. Here, the average number of offences each month has more than halved over the period and continues to decline in 2015/1.

1.5.3 Gang Activity Indicators:

- The MPS looks at firearm discharges and knife crime victims for under-25 year olds (non Domestic Abuse) as an indicator for gang activity. So far this year:
  - Gun crime discharges (on rolling 12 month data) show a reduction of 7.7% (or 24 offences compared to 26 in the previous rolling 12 months).
  - Knife crime victims U25 (on rolling 12 month data) show a reduction of 7.5% (or 86 offences compared to 93 offences in the previous rolling 12 months).

Profile of Youth Violence

1.5.4 Analysis of crime data and patterns (as used, for example, in the Violence Needs Assessment published by Lambeth Community Safety in 2015) suggests that most victims of serious youth violence are male, African Caribbean, and aged between 17 and 19 years old which coincides with the peak age for victims of knife crime. Perpetrators tend to have a similar profile. Serious youth violence occurs on estates near town centres. Weapons are also a prominent feature in serious youth violence (50% of offences). In knife offences - the victim tends to be male, Afro Caribbean and between the ages of 25 and 30 years old. However, 31% of total knife crime offences had a victim who was aged 19 or under.

1.5.5 Analysis of health data from St Thomas’ and Kings College Hospitals and London Ambulance call-outs (used for the Violence Needs Assessment) provides additional insight into levels of serious youth violence in the borough. For ambulance call-outs for violent incidents, 63% were for males and 13% were for victims in the 10 to 19 age group – the highest rate of call-outs (ie. per 1000 pop.) for any age group. This pattern is repeated for hospital admissions for violence: 83% were males and the highest rate per 1000 pop. was for the 10-19 age group.

1.5.6 Although incidents of serious youth violence are found all over Lambeth, key ‘hotspots’ tend to be found around Stockwell, Brixton, Loughborough Junction and Streatham High road. There is no direct link between schools & violence – SYV tends to happen outside of schools some distance away. However, we do see a clear link between transport hubs and SYV. Hotspots are often found in or near major transport hubs for the borough.
Responses to Youth Violence

1.5.7 Police, Council and other partners continue to actively intervene to deter, disrupt and reduce violent crime involving young people.

- Operation Teal as described within the Gangs Section.
- Operation Sceptre as described within the Gangs Section.
- Youth Offending Work as highlighted in the Youth Offending Service report.

Knife crime – legislative changes

1.5.8 There have also been legislative changes around young people and knives. Section 28 of and Schedule 5 to the Criminal Justice and Courts Act 2015 create a minimum custodial sentence for those aged 16 and over convicted of a second or subsequent offence of possession of a knife or offensive weapon, contrary to section 1 of the Prevention of Crime Act 1953 or sections 139 and 139A of the Criminal Justice Act 1988. The minimum custodial sentence for 16 and 17 year olds is at least a four month detention and training order (DTO).

Youth Violence: conclusions

1.5.9 Last year we achieved significant reductions in serious youth violence, gun and knife crime. Although we have managed to maintain a reduction in knife injury and gun crime it’s of concern that Serious Youth Violence has shown an increase. The number of knives being recovered shows that young people are still prepared to carry weapons despite a change in the legislation. A number of other London Boroughs have seen a decrease in the use of stop and search but Lambeth has not reduced its use. The tactic when used lawfully is fully supported by the SLT at Lambeth. Significant resources are deployed into Lambeth from central units as well as significant resources deployed specifically to target gangs from within the Borough.

1.5.10 Intelligence would show that there are still a number of active disputes between a number of different gangs within Lambeth. There are no quick fixes and the partners agree that the fight against gangs in this Borough will require significant resources from within the MPS, MOPAC and other agencies (such as the YOS) for years to come.
Appendix D: Lambeth Shield – Reflections of the first six months

Report Summary
The purpose of this report is to reflect on Lambeth’s experience of the first six months of Shield. It draws on local lessons learned with the intention to inform implementation in other boroughs, the next six months in Lambeth, and the final evaluation. The report makes a number of recommendations for improvement. We believe it is essential to ensure parity between the three strands of work within the programme i.e. Help, Moral Voice and Consequences.

Report Recommendations

1. The statutory community safety partnership should have oversight of the pilot, and be part of the overall governance structure. The Shield governance boards should have significant lead in time to plan implementation.
2. Consideration should be given to the strength of the partnership and relationships between key stakeholders.
3. Consideration should be given to the role of the Safer Neighbourhood Board and its oversight of policing and community engagement.
4. Consideration should be given to the resourcing of these additional boards.
5. A strategic approach to messaging, community engagement and consultation is required.
6. The community development element of Shield should commence at least 12 months prior to implementation. This should include an element of flexibility with the model to reflect local context. A dedicated community development worker should be appointed to each borough to develop the community voice.
7. Develop a violence reduction network to address the wider violence agenda in Lambeth.
8. Consideration should be given to preparedness to manage a large number of people with complex needs with credible support and interventions. Consideration should be given to voluntary and community sector capacity to manage referrals.
9. Consideration should be given to mapping community assets and resources prior to commencing the ‘help’ offer.
10. The Safer Lambeth Partnership and MOPAC should consider funding for community and voluntary sector providers to enhance the ‘help’ provision.
11. The community element of the model should be considered a priority when determining timing.
12. Improve direct dialogue between the National Network and borough practitioners to ensure active learning and correct interpretation of the operating model. It is noted that conference calls have now been introduced and are improving understanding.
13. The issue of cohort selection to be escalated to MOPAC to clarify process, and resource requirement necessary to enable the Shield cohort list to be dynamic.
14. Consideration to be given to reviewing the Operating Model within the UK context.
1. **Background**

1.1 Lambeth local partners joined the Shield programme as it builds on the work we have been engaged in since 2012 to reduce the number of victims and perpetrators of group, or gang, related serious violence. Serious violence has disproportionate impacts on young people, BME communities and those communities living in some of our most disadvantaged neighbourhoods. Lambeth’s Community Safety and Public Health partners conducted a Needs Assessment of Violence\(^1\) in the borough which highlighted these disproportionate impacts and sets out the local borough context. For example, although African, Caribbean, Black and Mixed Race individuals make up about 34% of Lambeth’s population, this group accounts for 39% of victims of all violence against the person; 69% of victims of most serious youth violence; 50% of victims of youth knife crime; 43% of victims of gun offences and 73% of victims of gang related violence against the person.

1.2 The prevalence of group and gang related violence in parts of our borough, and the disproportionate impacts associated with it, has an adverse impact on the lives of the communities affected, particularly the young men and boys growing up in those neighbourhoods. This strengthens our local determination to take effective and impactful action that disrupts group violent offending. It offers a credible way out for those involved, and promotes safer communities and community cohesion. We believe that mobilising the “moral voice” of the community is one of the most effective ways we have to reach out and influence those individuals who need help and support. We signed up for Shield because it is based on the Group Violence Intervention (GVI) model which has a proven record of success in reducing violence.

---

\(^1\) Available at https://www.lambeth.gov.uk/violence-in-lambeth-research-and-needs-assessment-2015
1.3 The purpose of this report reflects on Lambeth’s experience of the first six months of Shield. It draws on local lessons learned with the intention to inform implementation in other boroughs, the next six months in Lambeth, and the final evaluation. The report makes a number of recommendations for improvement. We believe it is essential to ensure parity between the three strands of work within the programme i.e. Help, Moral Voice and Consequences.

2. Governance
2.1 The Intelligence Group was first convened on 23rd January 2015 and is chaired by the Lambeth police DCI. The Group has been effective in developing the Shield cohort, and making representations to the Delivery Group, including enforcement options. It met fortnightly for the first 5 months, but has now moved to monthly.

2.2 The Delivery Group was first convened on 6 February 2015. Chaired by the operations manager from the council’s Gang Violence Reduction Unit (GVRU), the Group has provided the tactical direction and oversight of the pilot programme. Initially the Group met fortnightly, but moved to monthly from June. However, it had to reconvene in early July at short notice in response to a trigger offence. Additionally, most members of the Group were required to meet weekly as part of a Task and Finish Group to plan the call-in.

2.3 The Programme Board is chaired by the Strategic Director, Neighbourhoods and Growth. The Board meets bi-monthly and provides strategic direction and oversight to the pilot in Lambeth. It is the view of the Board that strategic governance should have been in place long before the launch in January.

2.4 The multi-agency governance structures are an effective way to manage the pilot locally. There has been improved communication, information sharing and decision making between partners. However, there have been difficulties managing relationships between the various stakeholders, particularly in relation to the demarcation of roles and responsibilities and the collective understanding of the operating model. The relationship between the various Groups has been positive and areas of responsibility have been adhered to.

2.5 Recommendations
1. The statutory community safety partnership should have oversight of the pilot, and be part of the overall governance structure. The Shield governance boards should have significant lead in time to plan implementation.

2. Consideration should be given to the strength of the partnership and relationships between key stakeholders.

3. Consideration should be given to the role of the Safer Neighbourhood Board and its oversight of policing and community engagement.

4. Consideration should be given to the resourcing of these additional boards.

3. Consequences
3.1 Since the launch of Shield in January 2015, the MPS has conducted three enforcement phases, culminating in a large scale demonstration enforcement operation on 1 April. The MPS committed significant resources to this. The fraud investigator and analyst from the council’s GVRU were involved from the outset. The operational relationship and level of confidential information sharing demonstrated huge confidence between the two organisations.
3.2 A trigger offence committed on 3rd July triggered collective enforcement against one group. Again, the MPS committed a large resource for this activity.

3.3 Shield has led to a significant uplift in enforcement activity, particularly by the MPS.

4. **Community Voice**

4.1 As a community led model, this element is most critical. Lambeth originally identified the need for a full time community development worker to support development of the moral voice, however, it was not until 20th May that the Community Development Foundation (CDF) was made available to Lambeth as a resource. With the call-in scheduled within 2 weeks of that date, involvement of a community development organisation provided limited opportunity to engage with affected communities.

4.2 When conducting call-ins prior to Shield, Lambeth has relied on the involvement of local people and service providers who live or work in the neighbourhoods directly affected by the gang violence. However, the Shield Programme Board directed Lambeth to hold a public meeting prior to the call-in. The only recognised community engagement forum that has oversight of police and community safety is the Safer Neighbourhood Board. The Board subsequently hosted a meeting on 28th May to explain Shield and the proposed call-in. Attended by community activists and pressure groups, the meeting descended into verbal attacks on the police, council and City Hall. People were angered by the lack of consultation. Reference was repeatedly made to the Mayor’s press release of 22nd January, specifically the terms ‘collective punishment’ and ‘collective enforcement’. Shield was seen as totally enforcement focussed, and aimed disproportionately against young men from BAME communities. The meeting concluded with people stating that they would do all they could to stop Shield in Lambeth.

4.3 The CDF were tasked with approaching service providers within three of our gang affected areas, to identify community representatives in those areas and invite them to a further meeting, away from the negative voices. However, that meeting on 9th July was attended by some community agitators who dominated the discussions. Despite this, the CDF were able to identify a number of issues that can inform future engagement. The meeting concluded with demands for the council’s chief executive officer and Leader to be summoned to a public meeting to denounce Shield. Notes from that meeting are attached at Appendix 1.

4.4 Since these two meetings, the community representatives who sit on the Delivery and Programme Boards and have supported Shield have stated that they feel unable to speak publicly in future. They have been subject to intimidation and innuendo. Indeed at the first public meeting there were shouts of ‘grasses’ aimed at them. This places them at significant risk of violence.

4.5 For any community led initiative to succeed there needs to be effective community engagement. There is a lack of community engagement and involvement structures in place in relation to violence in Lambeth.

4.6 **Recommendations**

5. A strategic approach to messaging, community engagement and consultation is required.

6. The community development element of Shield should commence at least 12 months prior to implementation. This should include an element of flexibility with the model to reflect local
context. A dedicated community development worker should be appointed to each borough to develop the community voice.

7. Develop a violence reduction network to address the wider violence agenda in Lambeth.

5 Help
5.1 The ‘help’ element of Shield relies on existing referral pathways, and the support of service providers particularly in the voluntary and community sector. As a consequence of the call-in, 44 young men have indicated their need for help. The challenge is to meet the identified needs of each individual. It is clear that the range and complexity of need is more than anticipated.

5.2 ‘I think the idea about collective enforcement is unfair, but the help if you want it is good. I now have a key worker who has helped me to get help with education and legal services. Access to boxing, music and mentoring if I want it is a good look. I am now in college, and doing things in the evening has kept me out of trouble’.

Shield gang member September 2015

5.3 Recommendation
8. Consideration should be given to preparedness to manage a large number of people with complex needs with credible support and interventions. Consideration should be given to voluntary and community sector capacity to manage referrals.

6 Resources
6.1 It is clear that enforcement is heavily resourced. This is disproportionate to the investment in the other parts of the model where the level of resourcing is comparatively inadequate. This may contribute to the negative narrative that Shield is solely about enforcement.

6.2 Recommendations
9. Consideration should be given to mapping community assets and resources prior to commencing the ‘help’ offer.

10. The Safer Lambeth Partnership and MOPAC should consider funding for community and voluntary sector providers to enhance the ‘help’ provision.

7 Timing
7.1 Enforcement has dictated implementation and delivery in Lambeth. The timescale from the demonstration enforcement to public meeting and call-in were too tight. Inadequate resources were available to mobilise those in the community who can influence our young men, as the resources available had to plan and prepare the other elements of Shield, including setting up and administering the programme and governance arrangements. The community resource from CDF was only available after 22nd May. The borough-wide community meeting was rushed in order to meet the requirement to convene it before the call-in.

7.2 Recommendations
11. The community element of the model should be considered a priority when determining timing.

8 Prison call-in
8.1 The Operating Model outlined the pilot to be held in HMP/YOI Isis, targeting Lambeth gang nominals due for release in 2015. However, the MPS moved the call-in to HMP Thameside aimed at the cohort of gang members who are on remand after the demonstration enforcement
of 1 April. Delays occurred with the arrangements for speakers. However, as a consequence
of challenge by the National Network, the prison call-in did not take place. Their rationale
included the following:

- The gang members should be due for release in 6-12 months;
- The call-in should have a direct impact on gang violence within the prison; and,
- There should be a link between delivering the call-in at Thameside with violence in
  Lambeth.

8.2 Whilst police believed they could make the link with violence in Lambeth, it was decided not to
invest any further time pursuing this initiative at this time.

9. **Learning from the National Network for Community Safety, New York.**

9.1 There has been limited direct dialogue between Lambeth and the National Network. Conversations have only started recently. It is clear from those conversations that there is
some misunderstanding of the GVI Model and its interpretation within the Operating Model. For example, our approach to the call-in was focused towards gaining voluntary attendance. Professor Kennedy has categorically stated that attendance should only be directive, and as
a statutory requirement. The experience in a US city who adopted the voluntary approach was
similar to ours. If we had known this and had advice and oversight from the National Network, we would have approached the call-in differently, and not wasted limited time and resources. Similarly, the prison call-in was an unnecessary diversion. The National Network questioned
the purpose of this call-in and its impact on reducing violence in Lambeth. They also queried
why we were investing resources planning it. When they outlined how call-ins are run in US
jails, and the rationale for them, it was clear that there was no point attempting it here. Again,
early dialogue with the National Network would have prevented this wasted time and effort.

9.2 The Operating Model identifies the process for cohort selection. The understanding in Lambeth
is that, once identified, the cohort remains static throughout the duration of Shield.

However, it has been highlighted by the National Network that the cohort is dynamic, as the
Gang Matrix, with the flexibility for individuals and gangs to be added and removed based on
current intelligence.

9.3 The partners within Lambeth have been compliant with the Operating Model. Based on our
experience of implementing the Model, and our developing understanding of the GVI Model,
we believe that consideration should be given to reviewing the Operating Model within a UK context.

9.4 **Recommendations**

12. Improve direct dialogue between the National Network and borough practitioners to ensure
active learning and correct interpretation of the operating model. It is noted that conference
calls have been introduced and are improving understanding.

13. The issue of cohort selection to be escalated to MOPAC to clarify process, and resource
requirement necessary to enable the Shield cohort list to be dynamic.

14. Consideration to be given to reviewing the Operating Model within the UK context.
Appendix 1: Notes from the Lambeth Community Voice Meeting, 9th July 2015

Appendix 2: Letter to the Mayor of London from the Leader of Lambeth Council
Appendix E: Night Time Economy & Licensing Update

1.5.11 In total there are 1380 licensed premises in Lambeth the fourth largest number of licenced premises in London. The largest contingent (1200) of these relate to the supply of alcohol. here are 4 licensed sex entertainment venues all of which are located in the Vauxhall area.

1.5.12 The table provides a breakdown of the number of licensed premises within the main night time economy/ town centre areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town Centre Area</th>
<th>No. of Licensed Premises (Supply Alcohol)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brixton</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clapham</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bank</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vauxhall</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.5.13 The table below provides an overview of night time economy related crime and anti-social behaviour over the last three year period, the data attempts to capture recorded crime within the peak period of night time economy related activity (20:00 – 06:00).

1.5.14 Looking at all crime that took place between 2000-0600; crime reported within our NTE areas made up 68% of crime in 2013; 75% in 2014 and 76% in 2015. Over the three year period, these figures represent a 8% proportional increase in crime. These figures demonstrate that the crime generated in our NTE areas is disproportionally high compared to crime reported across the borough and this proportion in increasing.

1.5.15 Licensing

1.5.16 The Lambeth Licensing Service is based in Brixton and is now co-located with the Lambeth Metropolitan Police Licensing Unit, the co-location has significantly increased the amount of partnership activity and has also played a key role in supporting the successful implementation

---

2 The numbers produced may vary from those published by the Metropolitan Police as only reported crimes with a specified location have been included, the analysis also provides information based on calendar years as opposed to financial years (April – March).
of the intelligence led Licensing Tasking Group; which routinely assesses the available data in order to develop a co-ordinated response to night time economy related issues / trends.

1.5.17 There remains a relatively high volume of new licence applications and existing licence variations received by the Councils Licensing Service, the Lambeth Statement of Licensing Policy (introduced in 2014) established new criteria with regard to the assessment of new licence applications – the increased level of scrutiny is reflected to some degree in the sustained increase in the number of licence applications forwarded to the Lambeth Licensing Sub Committee for review, assessment and final decision. The Licensing Service is also responsible for the processing and initial assessment of Temporary Event Notices (TEN) which can legally be issued to allow one-off licensable events without the need for a premises licence, club premises certificate or the presence of a personal licence holder, provided certain criteria are met. In 2015 1018 TENs were issued, this compares with 957 and 1087 for 2013 and 2014 respectively.

Clapham – Cumulative Impact Zone

1.5.18 The intention behind Cumulative Impact Zones (CIZ) is to prevent or restrict the number of new licenced premises opening in a specified area. At present Lambeth operates CIZ in Clapham which was reviewed during 2015. All licence applications within the Clapham CIZ area ‘without exception’ are referred to the Council’s Licensing Sub Committee for further examination. The Licensing Sub Committee is charged with the responsibility of assessing the application and ultimately deciding whether the licence application should be granted.

1.5.19 It is important to note that the Cumulative Impact Zones do not provide the Council with an opportunity to adopt policy which creates a blanket restriction on the issuance of new licences, instead the Licensing Act 2003 provides the Council with an ability to establish a presumption against the application. The available subjective data suggests that there has been a decrease in the number of licence applications within the Clapham area since the introduction of the CIZ.

Key achievements

1.5.20 As previously stated the partnership Licensing Tasking Group was established during 2015 as a way of delivering an integrated approach towards the management of licenced premises that are found to be breaching one or more of the licensing conditions and are not promoting the licensing objectives or policy guidelines. The integrated approach allows intelligence data to be used to quickly identify issues / premises which require intervention. Licensee holders are routinely invited to attend formal meetings to discuss breaches and agree specific actions (this could include additional licence conditions).

1.5.21 It should be noted that the integrated approach does provide scope for issues to be escalated if the agreed actions have not delivered a sustained improvement. Licenses can be referred by the relevant Council / Met Police officer or other regulatory services, to Lambeth’s Licensing Sub Committee (in the form of a Licence Review). The License Review assesses whether further changes should be made to the licence conditions or in some cases considers whether a licence should be revoked. The Licensing Tasking group meets regularly every 3-4 weeks and there are on average 20 licensed premises under examination during each session. It is anticipated that this process will continue to be developed as access to data like accident and emergency assault data becomes more routinely available.
1.5.22 In 2015 The Licensing Working Party was created to increase dialogue with local residents via quarterly meetings with Safer Neighbourhood Ward Panel Chairs, the Police and Council legal representatives. The working group meetings focus primarily on designed and implementing initiatives which aim to provide local communities with more information on the licensing process, this approach in turn seeks to empower local residents to inform the decision making process with regard to licence applications and licence reviews forwarded to the Council’s Licensing Sub Committee.

1.5.23 Significant improvements have been made to the online public access system which now provides local Lambeth citizens with the opportunity to access information on individual licensed premises across the borough (closing hours, licence conditions etc). In addition the public access system allows members of the public / elected members to register with the service in order to set up alerts for specific premises, streets, wards and areas of interest, if an application is made which meets the search criteria the enquirer will receive an alert email. There is also detailed guidance designed to support the ongoing commitment towards empowering local residents to influence the licensing process and the management of the Lambeth night time economy.

1.6 Business Crime Reduction Partnership

1.6.1 During 2015/16 membership of the Safer Lambeth Business Crime Reduction Partnership (BCRP) increased from 102 to 148 businesses, with 202 security radios connecting businesses, street-wardens and local police teams. Within this time frame, businesses have submitted 563 Incident Reports on a secure information-sharing platform, which highlights crime and anti-social behaviour taking place in the Borough.

1.6.2 The BCRP has processed 3 Exclusion Notice Schemes and sent 6 warning letters to persistent offenders in the community – the Lambeth scheme remains as a high profile example of an innovative borough-wide program to tackle crime and anti-social behaviour by working in partnership with businesses.

Key achievements:

1.6.3 62% of BCRP members said their confidence in local police had increased with membership, and 70% of members saw benefits in the radio and secure intranet. These results came from the Safer Lambeth 2015 survey.

1.6.4 The BCP has contributed to 31% reductions in total notifiable offences in Clapham according to a 2015 Problem Orientated Policing application submitted by Inspector Richard Holiday. Safer Lambeth BCRP worked closely with Clapham BID and Lambeth Police to establish Friday Night briefings. Night-time economy premises gather at The Hub every Friday evening to discuss crime trends and offenders coming to notice in the Borough.

1.6.5 The collaborative approach established during the Friday briefings includes the routine use of warden service patrols (funded by the Clapham BID), body-worn camera devices, Special Constable deployment, Street Pastors and the use of group dispersal policies. The briefings have now been extended to Brixton and Vauxhall.

1.6.6 In addition, the BCRP has:
- 32 Criminal Intelligence reports submitted to the Metropolitan Police intelligence system to support reduced crime and anti-social behaviour.
- 3 Community Impact Statements given to Lambeth Council and Lambeth Police to strengthen Criminal Behaviour Order evidence base against repeat street beggars in Clapham, Brixton & South Bank.
- As part of National Counter Terrorism Week, organised the second ‘Stay Safe in Vauxhall’ event alongside Vauxhall BID & Orange Nation. The event attracted 70 delegates from local businesses, and covered topics including dynamic lockdown procedures, business crime prevention and staff safety. 95% of delegates rated the event ‘Good’ or ‘Excellent.’
- Establishment of Streatham Pub Watch alongside In Streatham BID and Lambeth Police & Lambeth Council.
- Collaboratively worked with multiple BID’s to develop tailored crime prevention initiatives including Safer Neighbourhood Board funding applications, Best Bar None night-time economy standards & Purple Flag. Additionally working with the NHS to design an alcohol diversion scheme in Clapham to teach heavily intoxicated patrons the link between alcohol, violence and offending.
- Purchased Section 35 Dispersal Order pads for Lambeth Police, giving local officers the power to disperse troublesome individuals under Section(s) 34 - 42 of the Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014. To date over 500 individuals have been dispersed using this legislation.