



## Police Committee

**Date:** FRIDAY, 1 JUNE 2012  
**Time:** 10.45am  
**Venue:** COMMITTEE ROOMS, WEST WING, GUILDHALL  
**Members:** Henry Pollard (Chairman)  
Simon Duckworth (Deputy Chairman)  
Deputy Douglas Barrow  
Mark Boleat  
Bob Duffield  
Alderman Alison Gowman  
Brian Harris  
Deputy Keith Knowles  
Alderman Ian Luder  
Helen Marshall  
Deputy Joyce Nash  
Don Randall  
Deputy Richard Regan

**Enquiries:** Gregory Moore  
tel. no.: 020 7332 3113  
gregory.moore@cityoflondon.gov.uk

**\*PLEASE NOTE THE TIME OF THE MEETING\***

Lunch will be served for Members in the Guildhall Club at the rising of the  
Committee

Chris Duffield  
Town Clerk and Chief Executive

# AGENDA

## Part 1 - Public Agenda

1. **APOLOGIES**
2. **DECLARATIONS BY MEMBERS OF PERSONAL OR PREJUDICIAL INTERESTS IN RESPECT OF ITEMS TO BE CONSIDERED AT THIS MEETING**
3. a) **MINUTES**  
To agree the public minutes and summary of the meeting held on 27 April 2012 (copy attached).  

**For Decision**  
(Pages 1 - 10)
- b) **PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS AND COMPLAINTS SUB-COMMITTEE MINUTES**  
To receive the public minutes and summary of the meeting held on 27 April 2012 (copy attached).  

**For Information**  
(Pages 11 - 14)
4. **STANDARD ITEM ON THE SPECIAL INTEREST AREA SCHEME**
  - a) **Community Engagement Update** (copy attached)  

**For Information**  
(Pages 15 - 22)
  - b) **Equality, Diversity and Human Rights**
  - c) **Any Other Special Interest Area Updates**
5. **ICV ANNUAL REPORT**  
Report of the Town Clerk (copy attached).  

**For Information**  
(Pages 23 - 36)
6. **STANDARDS REGIME UNDER THE LOCALISM ACT 2011**  
Joint report of the Town Clerk and Comptroller & City Solicitor (To Follow).  

**For Decision**
7. **FEES AND CHARGES 2012/13**  
Report of the Commissioner (copy attached).  

**For Decision**  
(Pages 37 - 50)
8. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**
9. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**
10. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

MOTION - That under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part I of the Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

Item No.	Exempt Paragraphs
11a	3
11b	1, 2 and 5
12	7
13	7
14	3
15	7

## Part 2 - Non-Public Agenda

11. a) **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**  
To agree the non-public minutes of the meeting held on 27 April 2012 (copy attached).  
**For Decision**  
(Pages 51 - 54)
- b) **PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS AND COMPLAINTS SUB-COMMITTEE MINUTES**  
To receive the non-public minutes of the meeting held on 27 April 2012 (copy attached).  
**For Information**  
(Pages 55 - 58)
12. **COMMISSIONER'S UPDATES**  
Commissioner to be heard.  
**For Information**
13. **OLYMPIC, PARALYMPIC GAMES AND DIAMOND JUBILEE UPDATE**  
Report of the Commissioner (copy attached).  
**For Information**  
(Pages 59 - 64)
14. **CONSULTANCY SERVICES**  
Report of the Commissioner (copy attached).  
**For Decision**  
(Pages 65 - 68)
15. **PUBLIC ORDER: THREAT AND RISK FOR THE CITY OF LONDON**  
Report of the Commissioner (copy attached).  
**For Information**  
(Pages 69 - 82)
16. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**

17. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE COMMITTEE AGREE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**

**Part 3 - Confidential Agenda**

18. **SENIOR OFFICER APPOINTMENTS**  
Joint Report of the Town Clerk and the Commissioner (separately bound).  
**For Decision**

## POLICE COMMITTEE

FRIDAY, 27 APRIL 2012

Minutes of the meeting of the POLICE COMMITTEE held at Guildhall, EC2, on FRIDAY 27 APRIL 2012, at 11.30am.

### Present

#### Members

Mark Boleat	Helen Marshall
Simon Duckworth	Henry Pollard
Robert Duffield	Deputy Joyce Nash
Brian Harris	Don Randall
Alderman Alison Gowman	Deputy Richard Regan
Alderman Ian Luder	

#### In Attendance

Edward Lord

#### Officers

Simon Murrells	- Assistant Town Clerk
Gregory Moore	- Town Clerk's Department
Ignacio Falcon	- Town Clerk's Department
Steve Telling	- Chamberlain's Department
Nagina Kayani	- Equalities, Diversity and Human Rights Manager
Rashmi Chopra	- Comptroller & City Solicitor's Department

#### City of London Police

Adrian Leppard	- Commissioner
Frank Armstrong	- Assistant Commissioner
Ian Dyson	- Commander
Eric Nisbett	- Director of Corporate Services
Hayley Williams	- Corporate Support, CoLP
Theresa Russell	- Commissioner's Staff Officer

### **1. APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Deputy Doug Barrow and Deputy Keith Knowles.

### **2. DECLARATIONS BY MEMBERS OF ANY PERSONAL AND PREJUDICIAL INTERESTS IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THIS AGENDA**

There were none.

### **3. ORDER OF THE COURT OF COMMON COUNCIL**

The Order of the Court of Common Council 19 April 2012 appointing the Committee and setting its Terms of Reference was received.

**4. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN**

The Committee proceeded to elect a Chairman in accordance with Standing Order No.29. The Town Clerk read a list of Members eligible to stand and Henry Pollard, being the only Member who expressed his willingness to serve, was duly elected as Chairman of the Committee for the ensuing year.

**5. ELECTION OF DEPUTY CHAIRMAN**

The Committee proceeded to elect a Deputy Chairman in accordance with Standing Order No. 30. Simon Duckworth, as the immediate past Chairman, in Common Council and willing to serve, was accordingly declared as the Deputy Chairman for the ensuing year.

**Vote of Thanks to the Past Chairman**

Deputy Joyce Nash paid tribute to Simon Duckworth, the immediate past Chairman.

**RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY:**

That at the conclusion of his four year term of office as Chairman of the Police Committee, his colleagues wish to express to

**SIMON D'OLIER DUCKWORTH, DL**

their sincere thanks and appreciation for his most exceptional dedication to the work of the Police Committee.

SIMON has fostered a positive environment for change which has brought about a more modern and dynamic form of policing governance. One key milestone was the introduction of two members from outside the Common Council, thus furthering the Committee's ability to represent and engage with our business and resident communities. He was also instrumental in driving forward a more rigorous and structured system to monitor and scrutinise the performance of the Force through the creation of more focused and effective Sub-Committees.

HE has provided the Committee with a consistent, reasoned and visionary strategic direction. He played an essential role in the two most recent senior appointments made at the Force, thus shaping the new style of leadership needed to secure the continued delivery of excellent policing services to the Square Mile and the nation. This very aim has been a foremost theme of his Chairmanship, despite the financial and operational challenges faced by the police service during in this testing year for London.

IN this regard, utmost recognition should be given to Simon's unparalleled commitment to ensure the City remained at the heart of the national policing agenda. His unflinching endeavours to argue the City's case for protecting our counter-terrorism capability, as well as for consolidating and expanding the Force's national responsibilities in respect of Economic Crime have been a major step in securing a sustainable position for the Force. With insight and

talent, he has built effective relationships with Her Majesty's Government as well as with a number of crime-fighting agencies. His positioning no doubt influenced his appointment, in 2011, to the strategic management board of the Serious Fraud Office, a key partner to the City of London Police.

HIS skilfulness and competence have indeed been recognised not just within the City, but by others in the policing world. Over the past few years, he has represented the Association of Police Authorities at several national entities overseeing Olympic security preparations. He has also more recently been appointed to assist on the creation of the new body which will represent police and crime commissioners from November 2012.

IN taking leave of him as their Chairman, his colleagues wish to thank Simon for the gracious and energetic way in which he has presided over the meetings during the past four years, for all the accomplishments under his leadership, and wish him much success in his continued service in the City Corporation and in other bodies.

**RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY:** That it be referred to the Town Clerk to arrange for the Vote of Thanks to be presented in a manner acceptable to the recipient.

## **6. MINUTES**

The public minutes and summary of the meeting held on 27 January 2012 were approved and agreed as a correct record.

### **MATTERS ARISING**

(1) **EDHR** (p2) – The Lead Member advised that the statement of policy connected to the Force's Quality of Service and Equality, Diversity and Human Rights (EDHR) Strategy had now been published.

The Chairman expressed his thanks on behalf of the Committee to Deputy John Barker, Vivienne Littlechild, Robert Merrett and Alderman Simon Walsh for their contributions over the past years now that their service on the Committee had come to an end.

## **7. SUB-COMMITTEES AND OTHER APPOINTMENTS**

The Committee considered a report of the Town Clerk concerning the appointment of Members to Sub-Committees and various other internal and external bodies for the ensuing year.

The Chairman reminded Members of the decision reached at the January meeting of the Committee, where it was agreed that the Sub-Committees should each comprise five Members with the option of co-opting a further person, so as to help spread the workload more evenly among Members. With this in mind, he also made reference to the previous convention that the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Police Committee sat on each of the Sub-Committees, commenting that, whilst it was of course appropriate to maintain the ability for them to attend every meeting, they should not be automatic Members of each Sub-Committee.

In terms of membership, the Town Clerk had received expressions of interest from Members about which Sub-Committees they would be interested in serving on and, using these expressions of interest, a method of distributing the membership to ensure balanced Sub-Committees in terms of numbers and skills had been sought. With this in mind, the Chairman proposed the memberships for the three Sub-Committees and these were agreed.

The co-option of individuals to each Sub-Committee was also discussed, and it was proposed that, in light of her active and keen involvement as a Member of the Professional Standards & Complaints Sub-Committee in the recent past, Vivienne Littlechild would be an ideal candidate. It was consequently agreed that she be invited to sit on Sub-Committee as a co-opted Member.

With regard to the Performance & Resource Management Sub-Committee, the Chairman referenced discussions which had taken place in past few months in respect of ways to better share communication between the Police Committee and the Audit & Risk Management Committee. Given the Sub-Committee's particular remit, it was suggested that it would be appropriate for it to consider co-opting a Member from the Audit & Risk Management Committee, so as to ensure that this important link was established, and this was agreed.

In respect of the Economic Crime Board, it was agreed that, given it was a new Sub-Committee which would be developing its work programme over the course of the coming year, it would be most appropriate for that Sub-Committee to review the issue of co-option at its first meeting.

It was also noted that, in the past, the Chairmen of the Sub-Committees had been elected at their respective first meetings; however, with each not due to meet again for some time, the Chairman suggested that it would be sensible to make these appointments immediately, given that most decision makers were present and so as to enable all Members to engage immediately in their respective areas of expertise. This was agreed and, following debate, it was also agreed that it would be sensible to align the Lead Members for Special Interest Areas with the Chairmanship of the various Sub-Committees. Consequently, Simon Duckworth was appointed Chairman of the Economic Crime Board; Deputy Doug Barrow as Chairman of the Performance & Resource Management Sub-Committee, and Deputy Joyce Nash as the Chairman of the Professional Standards & Complaints Sub-Committee.

RESOLVED: That:-

- i) the content of the report be noted;
- ii) the terms of reference of the three Sub-Committees be agreed as set out in the report;
- ii) the appointment of Members to the Economic Crime Board, the Performance and Resources Management Sub-Committee, and the Professional Standards and Complaints Sub-Committee be agreed as follows:-



**Professional Standards and Complaints Sub-Committee**

Deputy Joyce Nash (Chairman)

Alderman Alison Gowman

Brian Harris

Helen Marshall

Deputy Richard Regan

**Performance and Resources Management Sub-Committee**

Deputy Doug Barrow (Chairman)

Deputy Keith Knowles

Robert Duffield

Don Randall

**Economic Crime Board**

Simon Duckworth (Chairman)

Mark Boleat

Alderman Ian Luder

Helen Marshall

Deputy Richard Regan

- iii) the timing of meetings be agreed as follows:-
  - 8 times a year for the Police Committee
  - 3 times for its first year for Economic Crime Board;
  - Quarterly for the Performance & Resource Management and Professional Standards & Complaints Sub-Committees
  
- iv) the appointment of representatives to the various internal and external bodies be agreed as follows:-
  - a) **Streets and Walkways Sub Committee:**  
Alderman Alison Gowman
  - b) **Safer City Partnership:**  
Henry Pollard
  - c) **Association of Police Authorities (APA) and its successor bodies:**  
Simon Duckworth

**8. SPECIAL INTEREST AREA SCHEME 2012/13**

The Committee considered a joint report of the Town Clerk and Commissioner of Police setting out proposed arrangements and appointments for the Police Committee Special Interest Area (SIA) Scheme for 2012/13. The report also informed of key developments in each of the areas over the past year and provided an overview of the priorities for each special interest area over the next twelve months to assist the individual Lead Members to better scrutinise progress and measure success.

The suggestion to stop the Specialist Crime SIA from the Scheme was discussed and it was felt on balance that this area meshed well with that of

Public Protection; it was subsequently agreed to merge the two areas with the Chairman taking the role of Lead Member.

The division of the Community Engagement portfolio so as to create a Lead Member each for both the residential community and the business community was discussed, with it agreed that Don Randall should continue as the Lead for the business community. He subsequently offered to cover both roles for the interim period until such time as a suitable Member for the community engagement role was identified and the division of work areas could be finalised.

In respect of the new Public Order & Road Safety SIA, Alderman Gowman indicated that she felt her role as the Committee's representative on the Streets & Walkways Sub-Committee linked well and it was agreed that she should be the Lead Member.

A suggestion was made that Members should be reminded when the annual review was coming up so as to facilitate greater involvement in the preparation of the update reports; further, the reports should contain a list identifying those priorities which had been set out for the area the previous year so as to allow progress made to be measured more effectively.

RESOLVED: That:-

- (a) the achievements set out in the respective area reports for the year 2011/12 be noted, and the key priorities identified for the year 2012/13;
- (b) Lead Members be appointed for the below areas in the Scheme as follows:-

<b>Business Improvement and Performance Management</b>	-	Deputy Doug Barrow
<b>Professional Standards and Human Resources</b>	-	Deputy Joyce Nash
<b>Equality, Diversity and Human Rights</b>	-	Alderman Alison Gowman
<b>Counter-terrorism</b>	-	Simon Duckworth
<b>Specialist Crime/Public Protection</b>	-	Henry Pollard
<b>Economic Crime / Fraud</b>	-	Simon Duckworth
<b>Accommodation</b>	-	Keith Knowles
<b>Community Engagement</b>	-	Don Randall
<b>City First</b>	-	Alderman Ian Luder
<b>Public Order and Road</b>	-	Alderman Alison Gowman

**Safety**

**Independent Custody  
Visiting Panel**

- Deputy Joyce Nash

**9a. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT UPDATE**

The Committee received a joint report of the Town Clerk and Commissioner providing an update on recent community engagement activities, community priorities and forthcoming events.

With regard to appendix B, it was noted that no feedback from the Crime Prevention Association meeting had been recorded; the Assistant Commissioner commented that he was presenting at the next meeting and would ensure feedback was included.

RESOLVED: That the report be received and its content noted.

**9b. EQUALITY, DIVERSITY AND HUMAN RIGHTS**

The Lead Member took the opportunity to mention a report that had recently been received by the Community & Children's Services Committee concerning an inspection into safeguarding services which commended the City of London Police for their excellent and proactive work, with a Portsoken Ward Officer singled out for particular praise.

RECEIVED.

**10. HMIC REPORT – “WITHOUT FEAR OR FAVOUR” INTEGRITY THEMATIC INSPECTION**

The Committee received a report of the Commissioner outlining the recommendations made by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary following their recent report on the issue of Police Integrity and setting out the current position for the City of London Police in managing integrity issues through its Professional Standards Department.

A Member noted that the report stated that all instances of offers of hospitality should be recorded even if declined and expressed concern that this appeared excessive and impractical; he commented that he personally received a large number of invitations of which he was never even aware of, as they were dealt with by his Executive Assistant. Recording every single offer declined would require a significant and disproportionate amount of time and he urged that common sense be applied.

The register of hospitality on the Force's website was also mentioned, with a Member commenting that it recorded only up until July 2011 and should be updated so as to ensure transparency. The Commissioner gave assurances that he personally reviewed a hard copy of the register on a monthly basis so knew that the information was kept up to date and scrutinised, and advised that he would look in to the issue and take appropriate action.

RESOLVED: That the report be received and its content noted.

**11. SHARED SERVICES UPDATE**

The Committee considered a joint report of the Town Clerk and Commissioner detailing work undertaken to date in identifying areas for collaboration and shared services between the City of London Corporation and City of London Police.

The Commissioner commented that in some areas collaboration and change was sought not in order to save money, but rather in order to enhance the effectiveness and resilience of the particular service.

RESOLVED: That:-

- a shared service for Occupational Health be approved;
- a pilot scheme for call-handling be endorsed; and
- progress of work in the areas of Public Relations, Human Resources and Information Systems be noted.

**12. QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**

**Committee Dates**

A Member made reference to the meeting scheduled for 21 September 2012, commenting that it clashed with a St Matthew's Day event and asking if consideration could be given to rescheduling it given the number of Members who might be involved. The Chairman advised that he would be looking at this and a number of other future dates, as he was aware that a number of changes to dates may be appropriate.

**13. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**

There were no additional, urgent items of business for consideration.

**14. EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

RESOLVED--That under Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items on the grounds that they involved the disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Exempt Paragraphs</b>
15a	3
15b	3
16	7
17	4
18	7
19	3
20	3

**SUMMARY OF MATTERS CONSIDERED  
WHILST THE PUBLIC WERE EXCLUDED**

**15a. NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

The Committee approved the non-public minutes of the meeting held on 27 January 2012.

**15b. LEADERSHIP TEAM MEETING NOTE**

The Committee received the notes of the Leadership Team Meeting note of 2 March 2012.

**16. COMMISSIONER'S UPDATES**

The Commissioner of Police was heard concerning on-going and successful operations undertaken by the City of London Police.

**17. CITY FIRST CHANGE PROGRAMME UPDATE**

The Committee received a report of the Commissioner presenting an update on the City First Change Programme, summarising the current position and outlining the next steps.

**18. OLYMPIC, PARALYMPIC GAMES AND DIAMOND JUBILEE UPDATE**

The Committee received a report of the Commissioner providing an update on preparations made to date with regards the Olympic and Paralympic Games and the various Diamond Jubilee events.

**19. PROVISION OF EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE CAPABILITY**

The Committee agreed a report of the Commissioner relative to the provision of Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD) capability.

**20. ORANGE TELECOMS AERIAL**

The Committee agreed a report of the City Surveyor concerning an agreement with Orange Personal Communications Services Limited.

**21. QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**

There were no questions.

**22. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE COMMITTEE AGREE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**

There were no urgent items.

**The meeting closed at 1.20pm**

-----  
**CHAIRMAN**

**Contact Officer: Gregory Moore  
Tel. no. 020 7332 3113  
e-mail: [gregory.moore@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:gregory.moore@cityoflondon.gov.uk)**

This page is intentionally left blank

**THE LATE POLICE PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS AND COMPLAINTS SUB  
COMMITTEE**

**FRIDAY, 27 APRIL 2012**

**Minutes of the meeting of the LATE POLICE PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS  
AND COMPLAINTS SUB COMMITTEE held at Guildhall, EC2, on FRIDAY, 27  
APRIL 2012 at 10.15 am.**

**Present:**

**Members:**

Henry Pollard (Chairman)  
Deputy Doug Barrow  
Brian Harris  
Deputy Joyce Nash  
Richard Regan

**Officers:**

Ignacio Falcon  
Rashmi Chopra

Town Clerk's Office  
Comptroller & City Solicitor's

City of London Police

Assistant Commissioner Frank Armstrong  
T/Supt John Hyams  
Chief Inspector Norma Collicott

} Professional Standards  
Directorate

**1. APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Simon Duckworth.

**2. DECLARATIONS BY MEMBERS OF ANY PERSONAL AND PREJUDICIAL  
INTERESTS IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THIS AGENDA**

There were none.

**3. MINUTES**

The public minutes and summary of the meeting held on 27 January 2012 were agreed.

**4. QUESTIONS**

There were none

**5. URGENT ITEMS**

There were none.

**6. EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

RESOLVED – That under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items on the grounds that they involved the disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Exempt Paragraphs</b>
7	1, 2 & 5
8	1
9	1

### **SUMMARY OF ITEMS CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC WERE EXCLUDED**

#### **7. NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

The non-public minutes of the meeting held on 27 January 2012 were agreed.

#### **8. PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS CASES INVOLVING RACIAL DISCRIMINATION ALLEGATIONS**

The Committee considered a report of the Commissioner of Police.

#### **9. STANDARD ITEM ON PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS ACTIVITY**

The Committee considered reports on Professional Standards activity for the period 1 January 2012 to 31 March 2012, as follows:-

(a) **Statistical Information (for the period 1 January 2012 to 31 March 2012)**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Commissioner of Police.

(b) **Organisational Learning Forum**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Commissioner of Police.

(c) **Complaints Information Bulletin**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the IPCC.

(d) **Summary of Cases**

(e) **Misconduct Hearings**

The Sub-Committee noted that there were no Misconduct hearings dealt with during the period.

(f) **Misconduct meetings**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Commissioner of Police.

(g) **Conduct and Complaint Cases**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Commissioner of Police.

(h) **Complaint Cases**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Commissioner of Police.

(i) **Police Appeals Tribunals**



The Sub-Committee noted that there were no Police Appeals Tribunal cases dealt with during the period.

**10. QUESTIONS**

There were no questions considered whilst the public were excluded.

**11. URGENT ITEMS**

There were none.

**The meeting closed at 11.20 am.**

-----  
**CHAIRMAN**

**Contact Officer: Iggi Falcon**

**tel. no. 020 7332 1405**

**e-mail: [ignacio.falcon@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:ignacio.falcon@cityoflondon.gov.uk)**

This page is intentionally left blank

<b>Committee:</b> Police	<b>Date:</b> 1 <sup>st</sup> June 2012
<b>Subject:</b> Community Engagement Update	<b>Public</b>
<b>Report of:</b> Commissioner of Police POL 30/12	<b>For Information</b>
<p><b><u>Summary</u></b></p> <p>At your Committee on 27<sup>th</sup> April, this report was approved in its new format. It was agreed that this regular report would contain only details of issues being raised at Ward Level and what the Force response has been to these issues where appropriate.</p> <p>The Force has undertaken appropriate and proportionate engagement in relation to the recent policing operations as a result of “Occupy” protests.</p> <p>Rough sleeping has appeared as a priority for our community and the Force is taking positive action with relevant partners to address this.</p> <p>All other Wards concerns are detailed at Appendix A. It shows numbers of actual incidents dealt with by CoLP and actual numbers of issues raised by members of the Community at Panel meetings and through other engagement with Ward Officers. The correlation is clear.</p> <p>Details of significant meetings and events from this reporting period are in Appendix B for the information of Members.</p> <p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p>It is recommended that the report be received and its contents noted.</p>	

## **Main Report**

### **Background**

1. At your Committee on 27<sup>th</sup> April, the new reporting format for this regular report to your Committee was agreed. It will contain only details of issues being raised at Ward Level and what the Force response has been where appropriate.

## **Occupy LSX**

2. The Occupy Movement held a demonstration in the City as part of their wider May Day protest. This culminated in a number of protesters in Paternoster Square. Six arrests were made following conditions being placed on their assembly. Stakeholder engagement was carried out prior to, during and after the event
3. An additional protest ensued on Thursday 3<sup>rd</sup> May outside the City Grange Hotel in Carter Lane targeting the Climate Conference being held at that location. A small number of arrests were made for minor criminal damage offences; and positive engagement was again carried out specifically with the City Grange Hotel, surrounding businesses and residents. The protesters dispersed peacefully following a containment.
4. On Saturday 12<sup>th</sup> May 2012, twelve arrests were made during the groups 'Meet the 1%' event that started at St Paul's. Several city premises were visited by the group, which comprised of representatives from Occupy London, Anonymous, UK Uncut, and Socialist Workers. Later in the day some of the group started to set up tents near the Royal Exchange. Relevant legislation was used and the group was given 45 minutes to leave, arrests were made appropriately. Stakeholder engagement was through the normal channels.

### **Other issues raised at Ward Level (see Appendix A for full Ward breakdown)**

5. Rough sleeping has now been raised as an issue for both our business and residential community. The number of people sleeping rough in the City had risen dramatically over the last two months to 39. Territorial Policing has engaged with The Safer City Partnership and the City Corporation's preferred rough sleeper outreach charity – Broadway, in order to provide a fresh approach to Operation Poncho.
6. The recent combined partnership approach has proven very successful with the numbers reducing from 39 to 19 as at 4<sup>th</sup> May.
7. The positive action against begging reported to your Committee in the March report continues.

### **East Area (Portsoken Ward)**

8. Issues in relation to regular anti social behaviour on the Mansell Street Estate have been addressed through level 1 tasking which has seen a decrease in rowdy youths. Activity continues in relation to this Ward concern. The community have begun to raise concerns regarding the proposed reduction in Ward / Community Officers as part of the City First change programme. A message of reassurance will be given to residents and businesses as part of the engagement strategy and through the normal channels, e.g City Wide Residents meeting on the 30<sup>th</sup> May 2012.

### **South area**

9. No significant concerns since last report.

### **West Area**

10. Concerns continue to be raised in relation to Castle Baynard Ward and Bread Street Ward, regarding the noise from two licensed premises in/ near Carter Lane. A licensing review was held on the 4<sup>th</sup> May in relation to both of the licensed premises, the result of which is that conditions on an earlier closing time of midnight have been imposed.

### **North Area**

11. The largest numbers of concerns regarding anti-social behaviour (both alcohol and non alcohol related) are still raised in this area; they are borne out by the actual number of incidents recorded, primarily in the Bishopsgate corridor.
12. The top ten licensed premises lists are produced weekly and attention is being given to these licensed premises through targeted tasking for regular visits and patrols. Targeted patrols have resulted in a low number of incidents for both violent crime and anti social behaviour. A number of concerns have been raised in relation to one particular club, which is now subject of a licensing review. Effective tasking has mitigated residual risks associated with this venue. Aldersgate and Cripplegate Wards have raised concerns about cycling on pavements, poor road use around the Barbican with emphasis on footpath cycling in the Beech Street Tunnel. There have been however, four positive comments on Barbican Talk regarding improvements to the junction.

Tactical considerations are ongoing in conjunction with Op Atrium, which is the dedicated Operation for tackling issues relating to cycling.

13. There have been complaints from residents at the Golden Lane Estate about noise emanating from a licensed premises on the Goswell Road on Friday nights. Regular patrols and licensing visits are being undertaken in response to this. A complaint was made to the local MP regarding the matter. Officers met MP Mark Field on the 11<sup>th</sup> May and took him to the relevant licensed premises to explain the exact nature of the complaints from residents. They then took Mr Field to another licensed premises where there are significant ASB issues being experienced in order to provide context around the Barbican resident complaints. This was received extremely well, and Mr Field is planning another visit to examine the context around the entire night time economy.

#### **Significant meetings /events**

14. Details of significant meetings and events from this reporting period are in Appendix B, for the information of Members.

#### **Conclusion**

15. This report informs Committee members of community engagement activity undertaken by the Force at Ward level.

#### **Contact:**

*T/Supt Dave Lawes*

*Uniformed Policing Directorate*

*020 7601 2602*

*[david.lawes@cityoflondon.police.uk](mailto:david.lawes@cityoflondon.police.uk)*

Community Concerns By Ward	Rowdy/Inconsiderate Behaviour Alcohol Related (Actual Incidents)		Community / Public Generated		Rowdy/Inconsiderate Behaviour Non - Alcohol Related Actual Incidents		Community / Public Generated		Begging/Vagrancy (Actual Incidents)		Community / Public Generated		Violence Against Person (s) (Actual Incidents)		Community / Public Generated		Malicious Communication (Actual Incidents)		Community / Public Generated		Noise (Actual Incidents)		Community / Public Generated		Drugs (Actual Incidents)		Community / Public Generated		TOTAL ASB CAD's	TOTAL COMMUNITY RAISED CAD's
	Month	Apr		Apr		Apr		Apr		Apr		Apr		Apr		Apr		Apr		Apr		Apr		Apr		Apr		Apr		
Aldersgate		2		2		2		1																					4	3
Bassishaw						2		1		1		1																	3	2
Bishopsgate		11		10		9		6		3		3										1		1					24	20
Broad Street						1		1																					1	1
Coleman Street		1		1		2		2		2		2																	5	5
Cripplegate						6		6														2		2					8	8
Billingsgate						1		1																					1	1
Bread Street		1		1		1		1																					2	2
Bridge		1		1						2		1		1		1													4	3
Candlewick		3		3																									3	3
Cheap						2		2		1						1		1											4	3
Cordwainer						1		1														1		1					2	2
Cornhill		1		1		2		2		2		1		1		1													6	5
Dowgate										1		1																	1	1
Langbourn						1		1		2		2																	3	3
Queenhithe										2		2																	2	2
Vintry		1		1		4		4		3		3																	8	8
Walbrook																													0	0
Castle Baynard		6		6		2		2		3		2																	12	11
Farringdon Within						3		1					1		1														4	2
Farringdon Without		2								1																			3	0
Aldgate						2		1		1		1		1								1		1					5	4
Lime Street																													0	0
Portsofen 2`1		2		2		2		2		1		1				1		1				1		1					8	8
Tower		1		1		2		1		7		6																	10	8
APRIL Total		32				45				32				4		2					6			2				123		
APRIL Community Raised				29				36				26			4			2					6			6		2		105

Non Community Gen. CAD's  
18

Total Com. Generated CAD's  
105

CADS In Total  
123

Area Key  
NORTH  
SOUTH  
WEST  
EAST

This page is intentionally left blank



## **Appendix B**

### **City of London Crime Prevention Association (CoLCPA)**

On 18<sup>th</sup> April 2012, officers from the Force delivered their regular crime and counter terrorism updates at the monthly meeting of the City of London Crime Prevention Association (CoLCPA).

The meeting included the following presentations:

An update was given on general crime issues, including the Force's crime reduction operations and Policing activity surrounding the Occupy protests. An Additional presentation was given by the head of Security for the Disney Corporation.

No specific issues were raised by members to the City Police.

### **Attendance at the MPS Mental Health programme Board**

The Force was represented at the MPS Mental Health programme Board, where all London Police Forces sit alongside NHS Commissioners, Mental Health Trusts , and Head of the Care Quality Commission .

The panel provide a forum for discussion for Mental Health Issues Pan London and their relevance to our communities. Specific terms of reference were drawn up in order to ensure that specialist provision of services is consistent across the many business areas affected by mental health issues.

This page is intentionally left blank

<b>Committee:</b>	<b>Date:</b>
Police	Friday 1 June 2012
<b>Subject:</b> Independent Custody Visiting Scheme Annual Report	<b>Public</b>
<b>Report of:</b> Town Clerk	<b>For Information</b>
<p><b><u>Summary</u></b></p> <p>This report completes the requirement to update Members on the progress of the City of London’s Independent Custody Visiting (ICV) Scheme, presenting the Panel’s Annual Report and informing Members of some of the recent issues raised by the ICV Panel in relation to custody provision in the City. Issues raised at the Panel meetings over the past year include access to the custody suites, how the Visitors are introduced by custody staff, increasing visits during the Olympics period, and how best to time their visits.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Members are asked to note the contents of this report.</p>	

## **Main Report**

### **Background**

1. The existing Independent Custody Visiting Scheme has been operational, in its current form, since November 2007. As part of the Scheme, Members agreed at your meeting in May 2009 that a regular report would come to Committee on an annual basis, and this report fulfils that requirement.

### **Visits to the Custody Facilities**

2. Members will recall that Custody Visitors make unannounced visits in pairs to custody suites to monitor and report on the treatment and conditions of individual detainees on an entirely independent and confidential basis. They are there to look, listen and report on conditions in custody at the time of their visit, and report what they see through to the Force and the Committee. The City Visitors have all been trained in conjunction with the Independent Custody Visiting Association.
3. The visits take place on a weekly basis for Bishopsgate Police Station and a minimum of quarterly for Snow Hill as agreed in the Scheme. Each visit is recorded by the two visitors who complete a short form covering any issues for

concern following meetings with the detainees. Copies of each completed form are then sent to the Divisional Chief Superintendent, the Scheme's Administrator in the Town Clerk's Office, and the Commander for action if necessary.

4. Meetings of the ICV Panel continue to take place on a quarterly basis and are attended by all Custody Visitors together with representatives from the Town Clerk's Department and the City Police, as well as the Committee's representative Mrs Deputy Nash.
5. The Panel then reviews the record of visits since the last meeting and is able to ask detailed questions of the representatives of the Force with custody responsibilities about any issues which concern them. Finally, the Panel considers more general aspects and the administration of the Scheme such as the visit rota and availability. With Max Jack's three-year tenure as Chairman coming to an end last July, the Panel subsequently elected Peter Tihanyi as its new Chair and your officers would like to record their thanks to him for his contribution to the Scheme over the past year.

## **2011/12**

6. This year the Panel has produced its third Annual Report, which is attached at Appendix A. This reports on the Panel's performance over the last 12 months, provides information about the visits made and issues raised as a result and, finally, sets out the Panel's objectives for 2012/13. Issues raised at the Panel meetings include the following:
  - a. **Access to the Custody Suite** – The issue of access to the Custody Suite caused considerable debate over the year, with Visitors keen to ensure that they were not delayed at the station front desk and still able to perform unannounced visits. Consultation with other Forces indicated that immediate access was not in place elsewhere owing to safety concerns and ultimate a balance was struck whereby Visitors are able to enter the suite after a brief check to ensure it is safe whilst not being delayed any further than absolutely necessary so as to maximise the 'surprise' nature of visits.
  - b. **Introduction to Detainees** – following the introduction of an agreed standardised format for Custody Officers to use when introducing Visitors, the level of take-up by those in custody has increased significantly. Visitors are still able to self-introduce whenever they feel it is appropriate, and it is felt that this approach combines the best of both options.
  - c. **Healthcare Provision** – the Panel continues to take a great interest in the way healthcare is provided and will continue monitor the arrangements in the coming year following the recent change in service provider.
  - d. **Custody Usage** – the Panel receives regular data from the Force on the usage of the Custody Suites and compares this against the timing of their visits on a regular basis so as to ensure that the timing of future visits better reflects the usage of the Custody Suites.
  - e. **Design of Custody Forms** – the form used to record visits has been redesigned in line with Visitors' desires and is now in use.

- f. **Training** – Visitors are keen to ensure that they are kept up-to-date on issues affecting custody in addition to receiving regular updates on more general issues.
- g. **Olympics Period** – given the anticipated influx of people to the London area, it was agreed that a greater number of visits should be undertaken during the Games period.

### **Legal Implications**

- 7. In accordance with Section 51 of the Police Reform Act (2002), the City Corporation is required to have in place an Independent Visitors Scheme.

### **Community Strategy & Other Significant Implications**

- 8. The ICV Scheme supports the ‘safer and stronger’ aspect of the sustainable Community Strategy.

### **Conclusion**

- 9. The Independent Custody Visiting Scheme is now well established and the Panel is pleased to present its annual report to the Police Committee. Further updates on this Scheme will continue to be provided to Members on an annual basis.

### **Contact:**

Gregory Moore  
gregory.moore@cityoflondon.gov.uk  
020 7332 3113

This page is intentionally left blank



City of London

# Independent Custody Visiting Scheme

**Annual Report**

June 2012

# Foreword

The year 2011/12 continued to be a productive and successful one for the City ICV Panel. There were some changes to the make-up of the panel with one visitor leaving and another re-joining.

I took over as Chairman of the Panel in July 2011 following the resignation of Max Jack, who had been Chair for the past three years and indeed was the first Chairman of the Panel. I must thank Max, along with Clare Chadwick and Gregory Moore for their hard work in establishing the way the Panel is set up and functions. I am delighted that Deputy Joyce Nash will continue as our Police Committee liaison member for the coming period.

Visits to Bishopsgate Police Station have continued on a weekly basis. Snow Hill Custody Suite is used only in an overflow capacity and as a permanent Bail Return facility. The Police Committee is keen that the ICV Panel visits once a quarter; it has proved difficult to visit when the custody facility is in use as an overflow but has been managed on two occasions in the past year.

In March 2012 I was invited to attend the City Police Custody Users Forum, which is held once a quarter. As I was present the ICV scheme was on the agenda; however, this is mainly an internal police meeting as to how other police officers use custody and, as such, it would not be appropriate for Visitors to attend on a regular basis. I have though asked that we be invited once a year to keep the forum apprised of developments with regard to custody visiting.

I look forward to continuing to work with my fellow visitors in the coming year and thank them for their support and hard work.

**Peter Tihanyi**  
**Chairman**  
**ICV Panel**



Welcome to the 2012-13 annual report of the City of London Independent Custody Visiting Scheme.

The Court of Common Council, as the police authority for the Square Mile, has a responsibility for securing an efficient and effective police service in the City of London and holding the Commissioner of the City of London Police to account. Under paragraph 51 of the Police Reform Act 2002, the City of London is required to have in place an Independent Visitors Scheme.

Independent custody visiting schemes have been around since the 1980s following the Lord Scarman Report and became mandatory in 2003. The Scarman Report recommended a system of independent unannounced inspection of detention arrangements in police stations by local community members. Custody Visiting Panels remain a vital important means

of securing police accountability for the local communities they serve.

City Visitors are volunteers who give up their free time to provide independent scrutiny of the treatment of those held in police detention and the conditions in which they are held. They play a vital role in bringing together police and communities closer together and enhancing public perception of police procedures and practice in relation to custody.

We would like to thank all the City's Visitors for their commitment to the Scheme. The Police Committee fully appreciates their hard work and dedication to the Scheme and the contribution this makes to the overall confidence the community has in the City of London Police.

**Henry Pollard**  
Chairman  
Police Committee

**Deputy Joyce Nash, OBE**  
ICV Panel Member  
Police Committee

# Introduction

## **THE CITY OF LONDON INDEPENDENT CUSTODY VISITING SCHEME (ICV SCHEME)**

The purpose of this report is to give an account of the work of the City of London ICV Scheme in the period 1 April 2011 to 31 March 2012. It aims to:

- report on the Panel's performance;
- provide the local community and the Police Committee with information about the visits made and what they have revealed about the treatment of detainees;
- set out issues and concerns that the visits have raised; and,
- set out the objectives for the 2012/13.

The City of London Corporation, in its role as the police authority for the City of London, has a statutory duty to have in place an independent custody visiting scheme. The operation of the Scheme is the responsibility of the Police Committee.

Independent custody visiting is governed by a range of legislation and guidance including the Police and Criminal Evidence Act (PACE) 1984 and Home Office Codes of Practice and National Standards.

Independent Custody Visitors (ICVs) are members of the local residential and business community who volunteer to visit police stations unannounced to check on the treatment and welfare of people held in police custody. They must:

- be over 18;
- be independent from the police force and the police authority; and,
- have no direct involvement in the criminal justice system.

The City of London ICV Panel currently consists of 10 visitors who visit the custody suites at Bishopsgate Police station once a week and at Snow Hill, where the custody suite is only used for 'bailbacks' or as an overflow for Bishopsgate, at least 4 times a year. A member of the Police Committee attends the quarterly Panel meetings and, in addition, representatives of the Force attend for part of the Panel meetings so that any queries or problems that have arisen out of custody visits can be addressed. The meetings are supported by staff from the Town Clerk's department in Guildhall.

## **THE ROLE OF INDEPENDENT CUSTODY VISITORS**

Visits are always made in pairs, and are unannounced. The objective of all visitors is to monitor and report on the treatment and conditions of individual detainees and to check that their rights and entitlements have been upheld.

During their visit, ICVs are escorted by a custody officer or gaoler at all times. Every detainee being held is offered the opportunity to speak with the custody visitors, but may choose not to. Visit interviews are carried out within sight, but out of hearing, of the escorting officer. Strict rules of confidentiality apply so that detainees are identified by their custody numbers only, and the details of what visitors see and hear are treated as confidential. ICVs are not concerned with any alleged offence and maintain their independence and impartiality at all times. They do not provide advice to detainees; they are there to look, listen and report on conditions in custody at the time of their visit.

After every visit, custody visitors fill out a report form recording details of the visit. The information about the visit in the form includes details of problems that were resolved immediately and those that required further action. Copies of the reports are provided for the Commander, the Territorial Policing Chief Superintendent, and the Scheme Administrator on behalf of the Police Committee. The ICV Panel will follow up and discuss at the next review meeting any concerns that cannot be resolved during visits. If necessary, more serious issues can be highlighted directly to the Police Committee.

## **PANEL MEETINGS**

The quarterly Panel meetings allow Visitors to discuss each visit and any issues that have arisen. In addition, short update or information sessions are often included on each agenda so that Visitors are kept up to date with any national developments concerning the custody environment. Topics discussed this year included:

**Self-Introduction** – The Panel had previously looked at this issue and on balance decided not to introduce an automatic system of self-introduction. Elsewhere in London, the results of the pilot schemes did not show a greater increase in the number of detainees taking up the offer of an interview. The Panel asked the Force to ensure that custody staff introduce visitors in an agreed standardised format instead and a significant improvement in the quality has since been noticed, with the level of take-up by those in custody increasing as a result. But the Panel has reserved the right for individual Visitors, with the agreement of the Custody Sergeant of the day, as and when the need is perceived, to self-introduce.

**Healthcare Provision in the Custody Suite** – with the change to a new service provider for healthcare provision in custody suites, the Panel took a particular interest in this issue,

being keen to ensure that there was no deterioration in service level. Visitors monitored the issue closely throughout the year, feeding their concerns back to officers at Panel meetings, with their assessment taken in to account leading up to the decision to revert to the previous service provider.

**Snow Hill Police Station Custody Suite** – Since 2009 the Snow Hill custody suite has only been used for ‘bail back’ and occasionally as an overspill facility for Bishopsgate, resulting in a large number of unproductive visits. As a result it was agreed by the Police Committee at its meeting in May 2010 that scheduled visits to Snow Hill that a mechanism be introduced in place of scheduled visits to attempt to match visits to when the custody suite was in use. Whilst not as efficient as was hoped in ensuring regular visits to the suite over the past year, the mechanism continues to be used alongside the scheduled quarterly visits.

**New Custody Forms** – with the Panel keen to ensure that completing paperwork associated with visits was as easy as possible for the Visitors and that the appropriate information was easily available for the Administrator, the reporting Forms were redesigned throughout 2011. Taking into account best practice elsewhere and Visitors’ feedback, these forms were introduced and have now replaced the older format of report form in both Custody Suites. However, the Panel has agreed to review their working in practice as an ongoing procedure.

**Training** – the Panel is keen to ensure that it receives regular training and keeps up-to-date with custody issues and undertook a variety of training and learning exercises over the year, including learning about the role of the Independent Advisory Group and its relationship with the City of London Police. With some Visitors expressing an interest in exploring alternative methods of training, an element of self-learning was also introduced to

enhance the training process, with a number of refresher module tests and learning documents utilised by the Panel to renew their knowledge of various elements of the custody process. Further training and learning sessions are being arranged for the ensuing year, beginning with a session on explaining the role of the Substance Misuse Team in the Custody process.

**Custody Usage** – with the Panel keen to ensure the spread of visits to Custody Suites was appropriate to the volume of usage at particular times, action was taken to ensure that Visitors were provided with times of all visits made alongside the level of usage of the Custody Suites which has been provided by the Force. A comparative analysis showed that the timing of visits currently reflects quite well the level of the Custody Usage, with this monitored on a quarterly basis to ensure this continues to be the case.

**Access to the Custody Suite** - entrance to the Suite has been an issue for the ICV Visitors, who would prefer direct access to allow for more efficient unannounced visits. Visitors' passes currently allow them to pass the front desk at Bishopsgate Police Station but, once they enter the Custody Suite, they have to wait until access is given to them by the custody officers. This issue was debated at some length over the course of the year with the Force making the point that this delayed access was standard for all people awaiting entrance to the Custody Suite, even most Police officers, the only exception being those who worked within the Suite on a daily basis. Investigation showed that this was also the case elsewhere in the country, in order to ensure that the safety of all Visitors is paramount and that the Custody Suite is safe before they are able to enter.

In addition to the points above the Panel have raised a number of other issues with the Custody Manager

- 1) **Use of Handcuffs** - The Panel asked for more information as to the appropriate use of handcuffs and the way in which this should be recorded in custody logs.

Outcome – the Acting Chief Inspector for Territorial Policing talked Visitors through the procedure and was able to respond to their concerns.

- 2) **Olympics Period** - With the forthcoming Olympic and Paralympic Games expected to lead to a substantially greater volume of people in the London area, the merit of altering the Panel's scheduled rota of visits over the Games period was debated.

Outcome – It was agreed that a greater number of visits would be undertaken during the period, and the wider discussion sparked by the debate culminated in this principle being extended to cover other events as appropriate in future.

- 3) **Custody User Group** – Following discussion, the Panel expressed interest in the work of the Force's custody user group, a body comprised of representatives from various interested parties including the Police Federation, substance misuse professionals, custody sergeants, health and safety and so on, which sought to ensure that the minimum national standards were adhered to and surpassed where possible.

Outcome – the Chair of the Panel attended a meeting of the Force's Custody User Group and was well received. He felt that its operational nature did not mean that a representative of the Panel needed to regularly attend.

## Visit Statistics

During 2011/12 a total of 52 visits were undertaken. The following tables look at the nature of these visits in greater detail.

### NO OF VISITS

Station	Target No of Visits	Achieved	% of Target
Bishopsgate	52	50	96
Snow Hill	4	2	50
<b>Total</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>93</b>

### DAYS OF VISITS

	No of Visits	%
Monday	10	19
Tuesday	10	19
Wednesday	10	19
Thursday	13	25
Friday	6	12
Saturday	3	6
Sunday	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>100</b>

### TIME OF VISITS

	Bishopsgate	Snow Hill
<b>00.01 – 06.00</b>	0	0
<b>06.00 - 12.00</b>	29	1
<b>12.01 – 18.00</b>	13	1
<b>18.01 – 00.00</b>	8	0

### DAYS OF VISITS / TIMES – COMBINED

	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday	Sunday
<b>00.01 – 06.00</b>							
<b>06.00 -12.00</b>	3	4	9	9	2	3	
<b>12.01 – 18.00</b>	5	3		3	3		
<b>18.01 – 00.00</b>	2	3	1	1	1		

## NO OF DETAINEES VISITED

	Total number of detainees in Suite at time of visit	No of detainees offered visit	No. of detainees accepted visit
Bishopsgate Q1	45	34	24
Bishopsgate Q2	72	53	46
Bishopsgate Q3	54	44	39
Bishopsgate Q4	47	37	32
Snow Hill Q1	0	0	0
Snow Hill Q2	0	0	0
Snow Hill Q3	0	0	0
Snow Hill Q4	5	3	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>218</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>141</b>

## ISSUES AND CONCERNS ARISING FROM VISITS

This list of issues and concerns reflects the range of issues that have been raised by detainees in the City of London in the last year and, in addition, other issues which have been reported by ICV Panels elsewhere for which there has been a nil return in the City of London.

	Bishopsgate	Snow Hill
<b>No of Total Visits</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>2</b>
Report Form with no matters requiring a police response	29	1
Comments individual officers - Positive	9	0
Comments individual officers – negative	1	0
Infrastructure / furnishings / fittings	3	0
Cleaning, tidiness and general hygiene - positive	3	0
Cleaning, tidiness and general hygiene - negative	2	0
FME Service and FME room	4	0
Perceived risk to detainees?	3	0
Procedures not followed	0	0
Rights and entitlements seemingly delayed	3 (satisfactory explanation in each case)	0
Periodic checks (15, 30 minutes) not maintained	0	0
Personal hygiene requests– (showers, washing etc)	1	0
Requests for food and drink	1	0
Temperature and availability of blankets	3	0
Requests for literature	4	0
Requests for phonecalls	3	0
Other	5	1

## **2012/13**

The City of London ICV Panel wants to ensure that it meets its objectives in ensuring that custody in the City of London. It has set itself the following targets for 2012/13:

- to increase the number of visits to at least 95% of target;
- to continue to promote and raise awareness of the work of the ICV Panel;
- to continue with refresher training as well as specific issues such as detainees held under Code H and Mental Health;

- Greater involvement with the national Independent Custody Visit Association;
- To provide an enhanced number of visits during the Olympics period; and,
- To monitor the introduction of self-introduction elsewhere.

## **Conclusion**

The City of London ICV Scheme provides an independent check on the treatment of detained persons. Through the dedication of the volunteer visitors, an appropriate level of scrutiny of the Force is achieved on which the Police Committee and the community can rely.

This page is intentionally left blank



# Agenda Item 7

<b>Committee(s):</b> Police	<b>Date(s):</b> 1 <sup>st</sup> June 2012
<b>Subject:</b> Fees and Charges 2012/13	<b>Public</b>
<b>Report of:</b> Commissioner of Police  POL 33/12	<b>For Decision</b>
<b><u>Summary</u></b>	
<p>This report seeks Member's approval to the schedule of fees and charges for the financial year 2012/13, in accordance with Financial Regulations. In addition, explicit approval is sought for continued use of the same hourly charge rates for private services provided by the City of London Police (CoLP) as that calculated by the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS), and the adoption of the schedule of rates determined by the MPS for the provision of market non-competitive activities.</p>	
<b>Recommendations</b>	
It is recommended that your Committee:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Agrees Appendix 1 to this report and thereby gives explicit approval for continued use of the hourly charge rates for private services provided by the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS). These charges have not increased from 2011/12.</li><li>• Agrees Appendix 2 to this report and thereby implements the schedule of rates for the provision of market non-competitive activities, and in particular agrees to follow the MPS scale of charges for 2012/13.</li><li>• Agrees Appendix 3 in relation to miscellaneous Force fees and charges.</li></ul>	

## **Main Report**

### **Background**

1. The Force has an obligation to review all fees and charges levied annually. This is done in accordance with the ACPO Guidance available and, in liaison with the MPS to ensure uniformity of charges across London.

2. On 5 September 2006, your Committee approved the selected use of the MPS rates for 2006/07 and similar approvals were obtained for subsequent years. The rationale for adopting this policy is set out below, and still applies. The report therefore seeks approval for this arrangement to continue during 2012/13.

### **Current Position**

3. Powers to recover costs for policing services from third parties are provided under sections 24 and 26 of the Police Act 1996; section 18 of the Police Act 1996 enables goods and services to be provided, and an appropriate charge to be made.
4. These goods and services fall into two categories:
  - Market competitive goods and services – where charges are set in accordance with “what the market will bear”.
  - Market non-competitive activity – which is essentially a by-product of core policing activity.
5. Appendix 1 refers to charges for the use of Custody by the UK Border Agency. Negotiations are continuing at a national level to agree one charge for all Forces. The City of London continues to adopt the MPS rates until the national rates are agreed.

### **Options**

6. The Force currently adopts the MPS schedule of hourly rates for private service and market competitive goods and services. This approach was adopted because the City of London works in partnership and collaboration with the MPS on a number of operations including core policing services covered by mutual aid agreements and private services, for example policing football matches. In addition both Forces have similar cost drivers for many services.
7. The MPS has a responsibility to review its charges in line with ACPO protocol and has done so for the 2012/13 year. The charges at Appendix 1 have been held at 2011/12 levels as Police Officer salaries have not increased this year. The attached charges at Appendix 2 have been revised for a percentage increase in line with inflation.

8. The alternative is for the City of London Police to set its own fees and charges. However, the two Forces have similar cost bases for salaries and London rates for accommodation, and the MPS rates are calculated to recover full costs. If the City of London Police were to raise its charges above those levied by the MPS it is likely that less total revenue would be generated, as potential clients would probably choose to contract the MPS. The CoLP would not choose to charge less than the MPS for obvious reasons. Finally the ACPO Guidance states: “It should be remembered that there is a balance to be struck between precision and materiality, whilst striving to maintain a consistent approach to the charging methodology”.

### **Proposals**

9. This report proposes that the City of London Police continues to adopt the MPS Fees and Charges for the 2012/13 financial year. This approach is consistent with the spirit of the ACPO Guidance on Charging for Police Services, and seeks your Committee’s formal approval to continue this practice into the Financial Year 2012/13.
10. The proposed rates are set out in Appendix 1 for private services of police. Appendix 2 contains the rates for market non-competitive activities. It is further recommended that other fees and charges as determined by the Force be approved as set out in Appendix 3.

### **Conclusion**

11. The Force seeks to achieve consistency with the MPS on its Fees and Charges, so as not to create unnecessary competition within the London area. The approach to adopt the MPS fees and charges supports this.

### **Background Papers:**

Fees and Charges 2011-12

### **Appendices**

Appendix 1: Charges for City of London Police: Private Service and Detention of UKBA Prisoners.

Appendix 2: General Fees and Charges 2012/13.

Appendix 3: Other Fees and Charges

### **Contact:**

*Eric Nisbett, Director of Corporate Services*

0207 6012202

[Eric.nisbett@cityoflondon.pnn.police.uk](mailto:Eric.nisbett@cityoflondon.pnn.police.uk)

This page is intentionally left blank

### CHARGES FOR CITY OF LONDON POLICE

Service	Charge	Authority	Notes
For use in Private Service Charging Scenarios	<p>Uniformed Police Constable 5 days or more notice - Hourly Rate £60.00 (£59.03) less than 5 days notice – Hourly rate £70.90 (£69.52) Bank holiday hourly rate £90.00 (£88.55)</p> <p>Uniformed Police Sergeant 5 days or more notice - Hourly Rate £73.10 (£72.41) less than 5 days notice – Hourly rate £86.34 (£85.38) Bank holiday hourly rate £109.65 (£108.69)</p> <p>Uniformed Inspector 5 days or more notice - Hourly Rate £70.90 (£70.21) less than 5 days notice – Hourly rate £70.90 (£70.21) 5 days or more notice - PCSO Hourly Rate (£32.61) (£28.76) less than 5 days notice – Hourly rate £32.61 (£28.76)</p> <p>Civilian Driver 5 days or more notice - Hourly Rate £28.69 (£27.04) less than 5 days notice – Hourly rate £28.69 (£27.04)</p>	Rates quoted in line with proposed Metropolitan Police Service Charges from 01.04.2012	Reviewed annually. Cost includes average basic pay; London weighting/London allowance; Employer’s pension liability; Employer’s national insurance contribution, overtime premium (Police Constable & Sergeant only); uniform costs; accommodation allowances; competency related threshold, and . A departmental charge is also added to recover non-pay and overhead costs. Additional premium added where event organisers give less than 5 days notice of an event or the event occurs on a public holiday. Escort Police Car charges are different to MPS as CoLP use relates to long distance security escorts for the Bank of England. The MPS have an all-inclusive daily rate assuming local usage (£35 fuel charge). This would result in insufficient reimbursement for long distance journeys Charges are subject to VAT

	<p>Other Charges</p> <p>Escort Police Motorcycle £88.00 (£85.00)</p> <p>Escort Police Car 1 £120.00 (£116.00)</p> <p>Escort Police Car per mile £0.43 (£0.42)</p> <p>Horse Box per day £541.00 (£525.00)</p> <p>Horse Box per mile £0.82 (£0.79)</p> <p>Police Dog per day £60.30 (£58.83) plus expenses incurred</p> <p>Police Horse per day £162.31 (£158.35)</p>		
Charges for detention of prisoners in CoLP accommodation – UK Border Agency	<p>0-12 hours - normal detention £296.00</p> <p>0-12 hours - constant supervision £956.00</p> <p>Up to 24 hours - normal detention £435.00</p> <p>Up to 24 hours - constant supervision £1,876.00</p> <p>2 Days - normal detention £745.00</p> <p>2 Days - constant supervision £3,748</p> <p>3 Days - normal detention £1,055</p> <p>3 Days - constant supervision £5,619</p> <p>Force medical examiner visit £142.50</p>	Charges introduced by the MPS until ACPO and UKBA reach an agreement.	<p>ACPO negotiations with the UK Border Agency in respect of a fixed charges cost model to cover all reasonable costs. Discussions are ongoing. In support of the ACPO discussions the MPS have applied this range of charges for the normal and close supervision of immigration detainees. These charges are for accommodation only and exclude FME and interpreter costs as well as a 5% administration charge applied to all reimbursement invoices issued.</p> <p>Calculated based on the current Force medical contract in place. MPS charge unspecified fees for medical examiners.</p>

Note: 2010-11 rates are shown in brackets

## General Fees and Charges 2012-13

Item	Detail	Amount	Conditions
<b>Copies</b>			
EAB, CRB & Collision Report.	Evidence and Actions Book, Collision Report Books & Collision Report.	£131.00	Up to 25 pages of a single Evidence and Actions book (EAB) collision report book (CRB) & Collision Report.
EAB, CRB & Collision Report.	In excess of 25 pages per incident.	£3.60	Max 2 additional pages from same single EAB/ CRB or Collision Report above 25 pages on one A4 sheet.
Statements.	Other than in EAB, CRB or Collision Report (including typed).	£31.00	The charge is limited to maximum of 3 pages per statement. Additional pages £3.60 per page.
Witness Statements.	Copy of witness statement (witness does not agree to disclosure of personal details).	£47.00	Per statement, up to 3 pages. Additional pages £3.60 per page.
Witness Statements.	Copy of witness statement (witness does agree to disclosure of personal details).	£36.00	Per statement, up to 3 pages. Additional pages £3.60 per page.
Plan.	Copy of Plan (other than in EAB, CRB or Collision Report).	£36.00	Per plan.
Reports.	Vehicle examination report, Reconstruction Report, Collision reconstruction report.	£3.60	Per page.
Self Reporting/minor accident form.	Copy of Self Reporting/minor accident form.	£31.00	Per report. Cost of providing copies to third parties, other than the person who completes the form.
Other.	All other copies.	£3.60	This represents the cost per page of providing non-specific copy documentation required for civil proceedings.
1-10 Photographic Prints (Non digital and digital contained on the MPS photographic imaging database).	1 – 10 Photographs from same or different image.	£26.00	The charge is limited to a single request containing a maximum of 10 photographs from same or different image, including the first photo. Additional photograph(s), in groups of 10, are £26.00 for each request.
1-10 Photographic Prints (Non digital and digital contained on the MPS photographic imaging database).	Cost per album.	£9.00	Full photo album cost = Number of photo(s) cost (in groups of 10) + number of album(s) cost.
Photograph(s): (Non Digital and Digital contained on the MPS photographic imaging database) 1 – 10 Images on CD.	First compact disc (CD) containing 1-10 images.	£17.50	First CD holding 1 – 10 images from an incident.
Photograph(s): (Non Digital and Digital contained on the MPS photographic imaging database) 1 – 10 Images on CD.	Each subsequent compact disc (CD) containing 1-10 images.	£4.00	Each subsequent compact disc (CD), from the same incident, holding 1-10 images (Non digital and digital contained on the MPS photographic imaging database).
1-10 Negatives/Prints that require scanning onto MPS database.	Cost of scanning 1-10 negatives/prints that are not contained in MPS photographic imaging database.	£18.00	Cost of scanning 1-10 negatives/prints that are not contained in MPS photographic imaging database. Cost to be added to 1-10 photographic prints with/without an album or the first CD containing 1-10 images.
Audio Tapes.	Audio tapes.	£37.00	Per tape.
Video Tapes, DVDs & Fatals – reconstruction videos/DVDs.	Video tapes and DVDs.	£170.00	Per tape/DVD.

All prices are correct at the time of publication and are with effect from 1 April 2012 until 31 March 2013. All Services are provided at the discretion of the Commissioner of the City of London Police or his representative. On every occasion a payment, in relation to general fees and charges, is received a receipt MUST be issued.

### City of London Police Service General Fees and Charges Contd.

Item	Detail	Amount	Conditions
Photo-copies. Rough data. Fatal / Serious Personal Injury Accidents. Limited Particulars.	Medical Reports and Personal Records. Copy of rough data.  Limited particulars (Road Traffic Accidents).	£0.50 £23.50 Full Cost  £31.00	Per page – where required for legal proceedings (includes VAT). Per page. To include all fees detailed above that are applicable to a specific situation.  Per form 517 (Particulars of Accident as recorded by Police).
<b>Cancellation Charges</b> Prior to Search. Prior to Dispatch. Documents Copied.	Cancelled prior to search commencing. If search is made prior to cancellation. If search is made and documents ready for dispatch.	No Charge £49.00 Full Fee	Refund any fee paid. Per item searched for. Full fee.
<b>Charges for Civil Cases</b> Statements.  Interview. Interview. Witness Allowance.  Witness Allowance.	Request for a statement to be written by a Police Officer. Interview a Police Officer in a Civil Case. Interview with Police Staff for a Civil Case. Attendance at court in Civil Actions.  Attendance at court in Civil Actions.	£134.00  £134.00 £134.00 £35.75  £71.50	Per statement.  Per interview. Per interview. Less than 4 hours. Per police officer / police staff, per day. Reasonable travel expenses up to 70 miles from court to be added for police staff. Reasonable travel expenses in excess of 70 miles to be added for both police officer and police staff. More than 4 hours. Per police officer / police staff, per day. Reasonable travel expenses in excess of 70 miles to be added for both police officer and police staff.
<b>Alarms</b> Registration.	Registration by Central alarms.	£52.18	Per alarm (includes VAT).
<b>Data Protection</b> Search.	Data protection/criminal record search.	£10.00	Per search on an individual.
<b>Memorandum of Understanding ACPO &amp; Insurers / Loss Adjusters</b> Appendix D (a)  Appendix D (b)	Supply of information [crime/lost property ref. No., date & time offence reported, reporting person] where there is a specific reason to check a claim.  Supply of information [additional to the above] where there is a specific reason to check a claim.	£20.00  £75.00	In respect of each request form (Appendix D [a]) submitted by Insurance Companies [who belong to Association of British Insurers] / Loss Adjusters [acting on their behalf].  In respect of each request form (Appendix D [b]) submitted by Insurance Companies [who belong to Association of British Insurers] / Loss Adjusters [acting on their behalf].

All prices are correct at the time of publication and are with effect from 1 April 2012 until 31 March 2013. All Services are provided at the discretion of the Commissioner of the City of London Police or his representative. On every occasion a payment, in relation to general fees and charges, is received a receipt MUST be issued.



## City of London Police Service General Fees and Charges Contd.

Item	Detail	Amount	Conditions
<b>Requests for Disclosure of Information from a Regulatory or Governing Body</b>			
Request for information	Request for disclosure of information from regulatory or governing body - up to 2 hours work	£75.00	Under the Notifiable Occupation Scheme, forces have an obligation to disclose certain information. Initial disclosure is without charge and sufficient information will be provided to conduct an adequate risk assessment (i.e. risk posed to children, vulnerable adults, national security and probity and administration of justice). Occasionally, the regulatory or governing body will request further supporting information to aid their own internal investigations and ACPO have agreed that there should be a charge in respect of this additional information.
Request for information	Request for disclosure of information from regulatory or governing body - each subsequent hours work after initial 2 hour period	£25.00	Please refer to above commentary.
<b>Overseas Visitors</b>			
Nominal Registration.	For citizens of countries in the registration scheme.	£34.00	Each registration including spouses, dependants and replacements.
Fingerprints.	Fingerprinting of persons wishing to obtain visas and/or clearance certificates etc. – First set.	£63.00	For visa application: applications for employment in a securities industry or overseas appointment; personal identification purposes etc.
Fingerprints.	As above – Each subsequent set.	£32.00	As above.
<b>Payroll Administration</b>			
All wage and salary related costs.		Full Cost	Full Cost + ERNIC + Employers Pension Contributions.
Administration Fee.	For paying salaries of non CoLP personnel.	£15.00	Per person per month + VAT.
<b>Pedlars</b>			
Issue.	On grant of a pedlar licence.	£12.25	Per licence.
<b>Seconded Officers</b>			
All wage and salary related costs.		Full Cost	Full Cost + ERNIC + Employer's Pension Contribution Rate (24.2% of Basic Pay, London Weighting and Competency Related Threshold Payments).
Administration Charge.	Police Officer	£400.00	Per person per month.
Administration Charge.	Police Staff	£279.00	Per person per month.
<b>Firearms Certificates</b>			
Issue.	On grant of a firearms certificate.	£50.00	Per certificate.
Renewal.	On renewal of a firearms certificate.	£40.00	Per certificate.
Variation.	Variation where No. of weapons is increased.	£26.00	Per certificate.
Replacement.	On replacement of lost or destroyed certificate.	£9.00	Per certificate.

All prices are correct at the time of publication and are with effect from 1 April 2012 until 31 March 2013. All Services are provided at the discretion of the Commissioner of the City of London Police or his representative. On every occasion a payment, in relation to general fees and charges, is received a receipt MUST be issued.

### City of London Police Service General Fees and Charges Contd.

Item	Detail	Amount	Conditions
Table 1 or 2 full.	Reissue because table 1 or 2 full.	No Charge	No other amendment required.
<b>Shotguns Certificates</b>			
Issue.	On grant of a shotgun certificate.	£50.00	Per certificate.
Renewal.	On renewal of a shotgun certificate.	£40.00	Per certificate.
Replacement.	On the replacement of a shotgun certificate.	£8.00	Per certificate.
<b>Explosives Certificates (Health and Safety (Fees Regulations 2006)</b>			
Contact the CoLP Firearms Licensing Policy Officer.		Varies	Telephone number 0207 6012268
<b>Museum Licences (Firearms Amendment Act 1988)</b>			
Issue.	On grant of a museum licence.	£200.00	Per licence.
Renewal.	On renewal of a museum licence.	£200.00	Per licence.
Extension.	On extension to additional premises.	£75.00	Per licence.
<b>Firearms Dealers</b>			
Issue.	Certificate of Registration.	£150.00	Per certificate.
Renewal.	Renewal of certificate.	£150.00	Per certificate.
Fairs & Exhibitions.	In respect of game and table fairs and exhibitions.	£12.00	Per certificate.
<b>Visitors Permits (Shotgun &amp; Firearm)</b>			
Issue Unit.	On the grant of a visitors permit.	£12.00	Per certificate.
Issue Group.	On the grant of a group visitors permit (6 or more).	£60.00	Per certificate.
<b>Coterminous Certificates (Shotgun &amp; Firearm)</b>			
Discount.	Reduced charge for shotgun certificate.	£10.00	Shotgun certificate holder applying for grant or renewal of a firearms certificate.
Issued.	Granted at the same time.	£60.00	Shotgun and firearms certificates together.
Renewed.	Renewed at the same time.	£50.00	Shotgun and firearm certificate together.
<b>Vehicle Removals (As revised by the Removal, Storage and Disposal of Vehicles (Prescribed Sums and Charges) Regulations 2008).</b>			
Removal.	Removal of vehicle.	Varies	Removal of vehicle in contravention of RTRA 1984, PRA 2002 or RTA 1988.
Storage.	Storage per day.	Varies	Storage of vehicle in contravention of RTRA 1984, PRA 2002 or RTA 1988.
Disposal.	Disposal of vehicle.	Varies	Disposal of vehicle in contravention of RTRA 1984.
<b>Freedom of Information Act</b>			
Prescribed costs.	Hourly charge where providing a response exceeds 18 staff hours.	£25.00	Cost of determining whether the information is held, locating and retrieving it, extracting it from other information and redacting (removing) information that is exempt from release. Note: CoLP are <b>NOT</b> obliged to supply information where prescribed cost is estimated to be above £450.00. Consult the Information Access Office for further guidance in these cases.

All prices are correct at the time of publication and are with effect from 1 April 2012 until 31 March 2013. All Services are provided at the discretion of the Commissioner of the City of London Police or his representative. On every occasion a payment, in relation to general fees and charges, is received a receipt MUST be issued.

Disbursement costs.		Above £20.00	Full Cost	Additional cost incurred (above £20.00) such as printing, photocopying or postage.
<b>Metropolitan Police Service General Fees and Charges Contd.</b>				
Item	Detail	Amount	Conditions	
<b>Restoration of Property found in London's 'Black Cabs - London Cab Order 1934</b>				
This is now the responsibility of Transport for London (TFL).				

City of London Police, Financial Services, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Snow Hill Police Station, 5 Snow Hill, London EC1A 2DP

This page is intentionally left blank

**OTHER FEES AND CHARGES**

<b>Service</b>	<b>Charge:</b>	<b>Authority</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Bernard Morgan House	Accommodation Rates	Determined by Force Authorised by Police Committee	Currently under review – subject of a separate report to Police Committee July 2011.
Territorial Policing - Wards Policing Crime Prevention Equipment	Attack Alarms - £5.00	Determined by Force Authorised by Police Committee	Prices include VAT In previous years the Force sold other types of alarms, but this is the only type still sold.

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank



By virtue of paragraph(s) 1, 2, 5 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank



By virtue of paragraph(s) 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank