



WALTHAM FOREST COMMUNITY SAFETY BOARD

A REVIEW

by LCP2

WALTHAM FOREST COMMUNITY SAFETY BOARD - A REVIEW

by Richard Hunt, LCP2

1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 The overall impression is of a CPEG which, in broad terms, is acting effectively in terms of its remit and intentions. There are however reservations in some respects.

Governance

1.2 The CSB's governance structure is sound, apart from a redundant management committee tier.

Membership

1.3 The membership is reasonably constituted in terms of size and scope under the CSB model. If there are major omissions they mostly relate to the newer communities (eg Eastern European, Somali).

1.3.1 Younger people have been a conspicuous omission until recently but this has been addressed through the Youth IAG and associate membership. Full membership should be considered.

1.3.2 Membership numbers are in part restrained by the practice of giving representation in particular sectors (eg faith groups) to one component or an umbrella body. It will always remain a bone of contention whether this is a satisfactory approach. The policy will need to be kept under review [**recommendation 5**].

1.3.3 Similarly, numbers are kept down by clustering Safer Neighbourhood Panels representation through the six community councils. It should be considered whether this permits adequate channels of communication or other modes of SNP representation should be considered; and whether the CSB should be more proactive in bringing SNPs together.

1.3.4 There are differing views on how satisfactorily the membership reflects Waltham Forest's ethnic diversity. This review's conclusion is that there is a degree of BME under-representation.

1.3.5 These issues should be addressed in a membership review (which is understood to be intended).

1.3.6 Applications for new or replacement membership should be handled by the Executive and not debated in full CSB.

1.3.7 There is a suspicion that some members speak for themselves rather than those they represent and may not cascade information and opinion to and from their sectors as intended. They should be reminded of their obligations from time to time.

Engagement

1.4 Relatively speaking, the CSB appears to have reasonable levels of engagement with the borough's communities, while having work to do in relation to some. Recent progress in youth engagement is promising and striking.

1.4.1 The CSB has excellent buy-in from other partners, especially Police and local authority, and is probably one of the leading London CPEGs in that respect. It is also trail-blazing in its incipient involvement with Council community safety scrutiny processes: LCP2 will follow developments with interest. There is a danger however of buy-in being jeopardised by poor meetings management [see 1.5.4 below].

Meetings

1.5 The range of issues addressed by the CSB is good. If anything, the CSB has to beware of becoming too wide-ranging which can, and on occasion does, lead to unmanageable agendas.

1.5.1 To address this, the CSB could consider setting up sub-groups to deal with particular issues on its behalf (which is effectively what happens, across London, with stop and search) - but finding participants with the necessary levels of time and commitment could be difficult.

1.5.2 Every CPEG faces the issue of how to make public [non-member] input work and a number of methods are tried. It is only to be expected that Waltham Forest CSB will on occasion find it problematic. Its current approach - no set space for questions but controlled opportunity to intervene throughout the meeting - is arguably as valid as any but requires firm handling. The Executive may need to review the balance between an open, democratic forum and a business-like Board [**recommendation 16**].

1.5.3 Face the People meetings (as well as SNPs) can be a more suitable forum for some public concerns. The CSB could in any event follow other CPEGs' lead in seeking a proactive role in relation to them.

1.5.4 There is a feeling in a number of quarters that the CPEG is reverting to old ways and that meetings are too long and unfocussed: there is a danger of people (including partners) voting with their feet if they feel their time is not well spent. Remedies could include stricter chairing (which would be welcomed by a number of consultees); constructive support from the membership in keeping contributions to debate relevant and (for the public as well) not turning questions into speeches; and managing agendas differently. Themed meetings, and other less 'committee-style' approaches, could be considered.

Activity

1.6 Most of the CSB's work/action plan centres on scrutiny. CPEGs are generally expected these days to engage proactively in other ways also. The CSB's major achievement in that regard is widely, and rightly, perceived to be the establishment of the Youth IAG - and this should be sustained - but other forms of outreach activity should also be explored [**recommendation 18**].

CSB development

1.7 There are a number of areas of developmental work (for the CSB) which could usefully be pursued.

1.7.1 The planned capacity building training for members could be invaluable and should be introduced as soon as possible [**recommendation 19**].

1.7.2 The present Chair's incumbency (three year maximum) is due to end in a year's time (assuming his re-appointment at the 30 September AGM). If there are not obvious natural successors (people with time and inclination as well as ability) within the group, succession planning becomes an imperative. On the face of it, SNPs should be one potential source of chairing talent.

1.7.3 These concerns are not unique to Waltham Forest: LCP2 could be asked to give priority to further training in chairing skills / techniques and succession planning.

2. INTRODUCTION

2.1 The Waltham Forest Community Safety Board held its inaugural meeting in September 2007 after a review of the Waltham Forest Police / Community Consultative Group, which had been in existence since 1979 (pre-dating the Scarman report). The Board strives (as did the PCCG before it) to be a means of meeting the legislative requirement for consultation between the police and the public ("obtaining the views of people in that area about matters concerning the policing of the area") in the borough.

2.2 The legislation (PACE 1984 and Police Act 1996) always contained a parallel duty for the police to obtain the co-operation of the public in preventing crime in the area. More proactive roles for CPEGs (Community Police Engagement Groups - the currently preferred generic term for such bodies as the PCCG or CSB) have latterly come more to the fore. CPEGs are nowadays seen as having - and are required by the MPA to have - an 'engagement' role which goes well beyond mere consultation.

2.3 The Waltham Forest CSB has commissioned LCP2 (London Communities Policing Partnership - the umbrella body for London CPEGs) to carry out a review of its progress to date. Richard Hunt, Administration Manager for LCP2, undertook the review.

This report was first drafted shortly before the 30 September 2009 meeting and does not take account of any developments at or since that meeting.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Access has been had to the CSB's public records - constitution, membership list, meeting minutes, annual report, work plan, service level agreements, etc. The CSB's funding bid to the MPA has also been seen.

3.2 The reviewer attended one full meeting of the CSB (on 24 June 2009: the January meeting had been cancelled because of problems with the Town hall lifts; the March meeting coincided with a long-standing leave commitment).

3.3 The reviewer held in-person interviews with the CSB Chair, the CSB Administrator, the MPS Borough Commander, the Council's Lead Member for Community Safety, and the Council's Director, Strong & Safe Communities; and by telephone with the CSB member representing disability interests.

3.4 An electronic questionnaire was circulated in August to all 'community sector' members of the CSB with a view to giving them the opportunity for input and, especially, to air concerns. Seven responses were received (out of a possible 20 or so) [*Appendix A*]. That is not in itself a broad enough sample from which to draw major conclusions but some indicative comments were elicited. An absence of response could be taken to broadly indicate an absence of major concern on the part of the non-respondents.

4. GOVERNANCE

4.1 The CSB governance documents comprise a 'constitution & rules', to which are attached a diagrammatic representation of the CSB's structure and composition and 'the seven principles of public life', which members are expected to follow. Additionally the reviewer has seen a statement of aims, an equal opportunities statement, a membership list, a 'description of post' of Chair, membership and officer application forms, etc.

4.2 The version of the constitution which was provided could do with some tidying up of 'typos' and the like - which do not give the best impression - but seems essentially sound and to cover the usual areas appropriately. Whilst there is always scope for re-thinking a constitution, this should not be regarded as a high priority or time particularly well spent at present. However, in the event of a review, it would be worth bearing in mind a couple of matters which came to light incidentally in the course of this review.

4.2.1 It would seem doubtful whether there is a business case for both a Management Committee and an Executive Committee as envisaged in section 4 ("Composition"); and optimistic to expect that either - let alone both - would be routinely attended by agencies' senior representatives. Indeed it is understood that events have rather borne that out and that effectively only the Executive Committee meets. Attendance there of, say, a Borough Commander would be something of a pipe-dream for most CPEGs and there

are, in practice, advantages in any case in securing the attendance of, say, a community inspector who is likely to be more involved in day-to-day practicalities. Conversely, for that to work satisfactorily, open and ready two-way communications with the Borough Commander are needed at other times both for the community inspector and the CSB Chair. We believe this does generally apply in Waltham Forest (though things have perhaps become a little looser as the Borough Commander approaches his imminent retirement). For these reasons we **recommend** [1] that reference to a Management Committee be taken out of the constitution.

4.2.2 There is also material in the rules - about, for example, business and time allocations at meetings (eg one hour set aside for public input) - whose worth one might query as it is freely contravened in practice. [**recommendation 1**]

5. MEMBERSHIP

5.1 The Waltham Forest CPEG makes a conscious effort to subscribe to the MPA's (then) preferred 'community safety board' model for community / police engagement, initially trialled in Islington and Hammersmith & Fulham. Insofar as the CSB model can be said to have distinguishing features, foremost among them would be a relatively compact membership, tightly drawn - but in a way which embraces all sectors of the local community and at the same time gives special attention to 'hard-to-reach' groups and ones "that interact with the police in disproportionate numbers". The concept is highly dependent, for its validity and success, on the wearing of 'multiple hats' by much of the membership.

5.2 The MPA's 'Practical Handbook for CPEGs', published in 2008, whilst incorporating lock, stock and barrel much from the CSB model and the MPA's review of the trial boroughs, takes a slightly more relaxed view of how a CPEG should look, allowing that membership will generally be larger (about 40 maximum) than the original CSB model aspired to and that local circumstances will be significant [*Appendix B*]. The Handbook came too late to influence the formation of the Waltham Forest CSB.

5.3 The 'Composition' document appended to the CSB constitution shows a membership of 28, of whom 20 are to come from the community and 8 from 'service providers' / 'statutory partners'. The CSB was therefore seeking to conform with the original CSB model. By the end of the July 2009 meeting, that had become a membership of 30 [see 5.12 below for comment on the appointment process]. Additionally there are 6 'associate members' who are full members in all but name and voting rights. Five of these are places created for representatives of the Youth IAG. It would probably be more accurate therefore to say that the effective membership is now around 36.

5.4 The range of 'communities of interest' reflected in the CSB membership seems broadly as one (and the MPA) might hope. The more obvious omissions - which have been commented on by some - are from younger people and from the newer communities (notably Eastern European but also Somali). The former is addressed by the formation of a Youth IAG and the invitation to about five of their members to attend

and take part in meetings [but see comment in 5.6 below about membership status], and in that respect Waltham Forest is probably more advanced than most other London CPEGs. The latter (newer communities shortfall) does require attention [**recommendation 3**] - though in that regard the borough is in much the same boat as most others. LCP2 is aware of the problem and hopes to arrange some training around the issue within the next twelve months. In the meantime, Bexley and Lambeth are boroughs which have made some progress and could be consulted.

5.5 In shrinking membership to CSB-model dimensions, Waltham Forest has of necessity reduced entire interest sectors - eg faith, disability - to a single representative. It will no doubt always remain a bone of contention whether this is satisfactory, particularly perhaps in the case of faith groups which correspond to or overlap with distinct ethnic communities. We believe the CSB has met the problem in one instance by giving associate membership status to a particular faith group representative.

5.6 As the MPA has moved away from trying to restrict membership to something in the order of 25, it is questionable whether the distinction between full and associate membership serves (in the case of the youth sector at least) any useful purpose; and whether, to the contrary, it sends a slightly unfortunate message. We **recommend** [4] that the CSB review and rationalise the different classes of membership.

5.7 The CSB also manages to keep numbers down by channelling Safer Neighbourhood Panel representation (20 Panels) through the six Community Council members. The MPA Handbook says that all of a borough's SNPs should be represented but that it may be more practical to give representation to clusters of SNPs. The Waltham Forest approach appears a reasonable compromise but its effectiveness is dependent on the community councils being an effective forum for pooling the concerns of the SNPs in their area. We therefore **recommend** [6] that the CSB review the effectiveness of Community Councils as channels for two way communication with Safer Neighbourhood Panels and, depending on the outcome, explore other mechanisms for securing SNP representation.

5.7.1 Some CPEGs [eg Camden, Kingston] are proactive in bringing together their borough's SNPs on a regular basis. We **recommend** [7] this be considered. There could also be advantages in identifying SNP chairs with an interest in the 'bigger picture' and even in graduating through to office with the CSB.

5.8 Of course a comprehensive range of membership in theory and a comprehensive range in practice can be two rather different things. It may be that what looks admirable on paper looks rather different in the flesh. The comment has been made in interview that some members have not been regular attenders. There appear to be only two who have not attended at all in the past year - admittedly two too many, especially as they represent significant sectors, but there may have been extenuating circumstances - and only one other who has attended less than two of the four meetings in that time (due to illness we understand). We conclude that the overall attendance levels of the community members are typical of volunteer CPEG members. We **recommend** [2] that attendance

levels be reviewed as part of the membership review - which may lead to an invitation to some organisations to reconsider their nominations.

5.9 It is a recurrent syndrome with CPEGs that older - retired - people will tend to be prevalent. There is a degree of inevitability about this: committee-room meetings are not normally appealing to young people; parents and economically-active adults tend to have less available time, even if they have the energy and inclination.

5.10 Perceptions of how well the CSB reflects Waltham Forest's ethnic diversity vary. Paraphrasing: amongst the 'key players' spoken to directly, one would rate it bad; one poor; and two (including the only one of these himself from ethnic minority) adequate to good. Questionnaire respondents did not comment adversely (see Appendix A, Qn.1). The impression gained from attendance at one meeting was that there was a reasonable degree of diversity, although it was not always possible to distinguish between CSB members and visiting members of the public. The presence of Youth IAG members probably assists, particularly if there is otherwise a shortfall of African-Caribbean members. We **recommend [2]** that a review of the ethnic diversity of the membership of the Board be undertaken as a priority. It is worth adding the rider, though, that when representation is sought from constituent groups, the ethnicity (or gender or age) of the nominee is not usually within the CSB's control.

5.11 It can also be the case that members who do attend are not necessarily performing in the hoped-for manner. Particularly, they may be inclined to give vent to views which are personal to them rather than typical of the community they have been invited, and appointed, to represent. We have no direct evidence of this happening in Waltham Forest, but it has been brought to our attention by more than one interviewee or survey respondent that this does occur. Such behaviour can be destructive - both of the value attached to that member's stated opinions and of the willingness of other members to continue participating. We **recommend [8]** that the Executive should send periodic reminders to the membership about the requirement to engage reciprocally with the communities they are representing, to cascade information in both directions, and to represent accurately their members' views to the CSB. It would be helpful if this issue is addressed in the planned capacity building training for members.

5.12 Two new members of the Board [para.5.3 above] were appointed at the June 2009 meeting. One of the appointments was 'competitive', there being two nominations from Neighbourhood Watch representatives. We have been informed that there was 'history' to the case and that it had already preoccupied an earlier meeting. In our experience conducting such a process in the full gaze of the full group, the public, press and all other attenders, is a wholly unproductive process - time-consuming for all and demeaning for the applicants. We therefore **recommend [9]** that questions of individual membership should henceforth be referred to the Executive for determination (without right of appeal). If the membership at large cannot place that degree of trust in the Executive and/or suspects abuse of powers, then they should dismiss the Executive and elect a new one.

6. ENGAGEMENT

6.1 The Waltham Forest CSB's success, or otherwise, in engaging with the borough's communities is in large part a factor of such considerations as its breadth of membership, its members' level of participation, its openness, its activities and outreach. These are mostly matters touched on elsewhere in the report (eg section 8 below). The overall impression is of a group which is reasonably well known to and used by the people of the borough, while at the same time having work to do in terms of engagement with some significant sectors. Recent progress in youth engagement is promising and striking.

6.2 A key feature of the Waltham Forest CSB is the depth of its engagement with the partner agencies in the CDRP [Crime & Disorder Reduction Partnership or, in Waltham Forest parlance, 'SafetyNet']. It is clear, from interviews with the MPS Borough Commander and the Council's Community Safety lead member and head of Community Safety Service, and from other sources, that there is a genuine desire to engage reciprocally - to 'make it work'. Waltham Forest is probably one of the more successful London boroughs in that regard. (See, however, comments in 6.4 below on 'buy-in')

6.3 Waltham Forest is definitely in the vanguard in terms of participation in the implementation of the new duty on local authorities to engage in scrutiny of statutory agencies' community safety activities. We understand that there is to be a place for the CSB Chair on the Crime & Disorder (Overview & Scrutiny) Committee (though this will of course serve to add to the calls on the Chair's time). We **recommend [11]** that the Chair, or perhaps a nominated member of the Executive, takes up this offer.

6.4 We have not spoken directly to the other services - fire, criminal justice system, etc - but it is evident from the CSB's work plan and meeting agendas that the CSB is making commendable efforts to engage with them. However there is an inevitable danger that those services for whom community safety is not the core function will regard CSB meetings as a relatively low priority. The CSB seems to be doing a good job of involving them, but there will be an inevitable tendency for them to drift away, particularly if meetings have frustrating features [see below], and/or to delegate attendance to less senior levels. It has been put to us that there are already signs of this occurring. We accept that this is very difficult to correct. However we do **recommend [10]** that all efforts are made to maintain contact with these other services through the medium of the CDRP.

7. MEETINGS

7.1 The CSB meets 5 times a year (with longer gaps over the summer months), with one meeting in 2009 cancelled (access problems). Attendance by members (including associates) has ranged from 16 (June 2008) to 25 (January 2008). It has been basically stable at around 20 over the last twelve months, with a recent increase (23 at the June 2009 meeting) attributable to the influx of Youth IAG associate members.

7.1.1 The total attendance recorded in the minutes [ie inclusive of non-members] has ranged from 25 (September 2008) to 57 (September 2007 inaugural meeting). As it is quite possible that there has been some inconsistency in recording practice and that not all members of the public will have signed in, we believe that these figures should be regarded as minima. The total attendance of 47 at the most recent meeting (June 2009) would appear to suggest reasonable levels of public interest being sustained.

7.2 The finishing times of meetings are largely unrecorded but the last two have taken 3 hours 10 minutes and 2 hours 40 minutes. The chances are that meetings of that length are either rambling and frustrating for attendees - particularly for agency professionals (and others) who have already done a day's work - or, if they are well focussed and purposeful, then very demanding and exhausting. The CSB would be lucky to sustain the attendance and commitment of competent people at that rate. We are concerned at the length of these meetings and **recommend [12]** that the Executive consider setting a time limit of 2 hours.

7.3 Meetings are invariably held at the Waltham Forest Town Hall. We understand that the question of taking meetings out into different areas of the borough has been considered but the balance of advantage is felt to be in favour of staying at a central - generally accessible - venue. One factor is said to be a lack of suitable alternatives. The questionnaire to members elicited only one adverse comment on venue location, the respondent wanting to see some meetings in the south of the borough.

7.3.1 The June 2009 meeting was relocated [from the council chamber] to a large committee room, which attracted a good deal of criticism because of its lack of an induction loop system to assist people with a hearing impairment. (As an earlier meeting had to be cancelled because of lift breakdown, it does not appear that the Town Hall is necessarily an ideal venue.) It is to be hoped that this was a 'one-off' and we gather some assurances have been given about bookings of the chamber being protected.

7.4 At each meeting the CSB receives updates from the Borough Commander, the Partnership and the MPA. The CSB has so far received 'presentations' on Tasers (TSG), the Borough Criminal Justice Group (HM Court Service), accommodation for ex-offenders (ClearSprings), the Youth IAG ('MY'), Operation Payback (probation service), Pioneer Areas (council), the 'Youth Offer' (council) and (scheduled for September 2009) mental health & police liaison (NE London NHS Foundation Trust & police). Other topics debated have been those generated by the agency reports and internal issues such as the CSB's own action plan.

7.5 The range of issues addressed in meetings by the CSB has thus been reasonably good, involving a number of agencies - which should have the benefit of helping tie them in, while enhancing members' awareness and involvement. However, the subject matter of the topic at the June meeting (the Youth Offer), whilst of interest, did not seem to be addressed from a perspective appropriate for the CSB, being a report on the commissioning process designed for another body. It may hardly need adding that the corollary of wide-ranging agendas can be unmanageable meetings. There may be a need for tighter agenda planning [**recommendation 13**]

7.6 If the CSB struggles to contain its business effectively within reasonable time constraints - and there is a certain amount of feeling to that effect - there is a range of approaches which could be adopted. These include stricter chairing, more disciplined contribution by members, and tackling the style and content of the meetings.

7.6.1 Waltham Forest's meetings - from the look of agendas, location of meetings, seating arrangements, style of presentation and debate - could be described as "committee style". A number of other CPEGs (including Bexley, Camden, Kensington & Chelsea) have moved away from this towards other formats, such as widely-advertised themed meetings, informal discussions, 'break-out' sessions, etc. We **recommend [14]** that the CSB explore such other approaches in order to freshen up its meetings before interest wanes.

7.7 If the themed approach were adopted for some or all of its meetings, it leaves the question of how the more routine business is dealt with. Options include: meeting more often; making the update reports less frequent; reducing discussion of them; delegating detailed consideration (and pursuance) of some subjects (eg crime figures) to sub-groups. (The last-mentioned may be the same as what the CSB's action plan refers to as special interest groups). The sub-group approach is in effect what happens across London, with stop and search for example - but there is a danger that it can founder on finding participants with the necessary levels of time and commitment. When it works well, though, it enables a group of members (which would not as a minimum have to be more than a lead person and one other) to develop interest and in-depth knowledge in a particular topic and to report back to the whole group, highlighting any issues for its attention, and thereby reducing the possibility of, for example, unsatisfactory aspects of crime figures being overlooked. [**recommendation 15**]

7.8 Community Safety Boards are required to provide a forum not just for their membership but in some degree or other for the general public too. The MPA Handbook, for example, states: "provision should be made at each meeting to enable any person attending to address or ask questions of the CPEG upon issues identifiable within its terms of reference". Every CPEG faces the issue of how to make public input work and a number of methods are tried. Some set aside a section of the meeting (usually start or end) for questions etc and would generally otherwise limit participation. Under that system, some ask for questions to be pre-submitted to improve the chances of informed response and of filtering out inappropriate ones (eg non-strategic issues better addressed by safer neighbourhood panels).

7.8.1 This is indeed what the constitution & rules indicate for Waltham Forest, with one hour allotted for public questions. In the light of experience, the current Chair favours giving the public the opportunity to intervene throughout the meeting. There are pros and cons to all approaches, and there was no evidence of this one creating undue problems at the June 2009 meeting (with one exception: see next paragraph). We **recommend [16]** that the CSB should continue with whatever it finds works best for it, but it will be necessary both to be flexible about it and to handle misdirected intervention diplomatically but firmly.

7.8.2 The exception concerned the family of a young victim of youth violence. It appears that a confusion of messages between the family and one of the agencies left the family under the erroneous impression that knife crime was to be discussed and the CSB administration unaware of their intention to attend and speak. The incident was unfortunate but we do not think that it points to a systemic problem so much as a need for clear communication between Executive members on all occasions.

7.9 CPEGs operate nowadays in an environment in which policing / community safety consultation and engagement occurs in other arenas too. Safer Neighbourhood Panels and Face the People meetings also form part of the landscape. In terms of involvement in Face the People, Waltham Forest CSB seems a little behind some other London boroughs (eg Camden, Tower Hamlets), where the CPEGs are the drivers. There is a clear linkage with the CPEG remit and the Face the People meetings presumably provide an opportunity for rationalising public input at the CSB and siphoning off some less appropriate interventions. [**recommendation 17**]

8 ACTIVITY

8.1 It is of course expected of CPEGs - not least by the MPA, the funders - that they will engage in proactivity as well as 'old fashioned' consultation with the police and others. The CSB's work plans [for 2008/09 & 2009/10] seem largely focussed on scrutiny - of the police (including stop & search), of the Partnership, of the borough Criminal Justice Group - which clearly leads to much activity and engagement. Other planned activity largely relates to developing the Youth Independent Advisory Group, which (despite its somewhat misleading title for those who associate IAG with bodies selected and convened by the MPS) is widely, and rightly, regarded as a considerable accomplishment. It would not be surprising however if the MPA, particularly, were to expect evidence of more extensive outreach work in the near future. We see no structural reason why the CSB should not be capable of developing in that direction, though the capacity of individual members could be an issue.

8.2 The present review does not purport to undertake a critical assessment of WF CSB's performance against its plans, which we regard as the proper role of the MPA in its periodic SLA review meetings and funding application decisions. We have not been made aware of significant concerns about outcomes on the part of the MPA and we understand the Link Member to have indicated satisfaction.

9 DEVELOPMENTAL

9.1 The CSB is intending to introduce capacity building training for members and is, as we understand it, in the process of discussing the course content with a prospective trainer and seeking funding. We cannot comment on the merits of the specific proposal but potentially such training could be invaluable.

9.2 The present Chair's incumbency (three year maximum) is due to end in a year's time (assuming his re-appointment at the 30 September AGM). If there are not obvious natural successors (people with time and inclination as well as ability) within the group, succession planning becomes an imperative [**recommendation 20**]. Safer Neighbourhood Panels may be a useful resource in this respect.

9.3 These concerns are not unique to Waltham Forest: LCP2 could be asked to give priority to further training in chairing techniques [see 1.5.4 above] and succession planning [**recommendation 21**].

10 CONCLUSIONS

See Executive Summary (section 1 above).

11 SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Governance

1. Tidy up the constitution [*para.4.2 above*] and, at an appropriate time, amend it in relation to Management Committee [1.2 & 4.2.1] and business / time allocations at meetings [4.2.2].

Membership

2. Review membership, particularly in relation to ethnic balance. [1.3.4/5 & 4.9]
3. Address the newer communities shortfall in membership. [1.3 & 4.4]
4. Consider giving Youth IAG reps full membership status. [9.3.1 & 5.3 & 5.6]
5. Keep 'umbrella body' membership principle under review. [1.3.2 & 5.5]
6. Consider whether SNP representation via community councils is successful or whether other methods should be used. [1.3.3 & 5.7]
7. Do more to 'keep tabs' on the borough's SNPs and their issues, eg bringing together the borough's SNPs on a regular basis. [1.3.3 & 5.7]
8. Send periodic reminders to the membership about the requirement to engage reciprocally with the communities they are representing, to cascade information in both directions, and to represent accurately their members' views to the CSB. [1.3.7 & 5.11]
9. Reserve membership matters (other than major policy considerations) to the Executive. [1.3.6 & 5.12]

Engagement

10. Guard against drift away of those services for whom community safety is not the core function and ensure contact is maintained through SafetyNet. [1.4.1 & 6.4]
11. Take up the offer of a place on the Crime & Disorder (Overview & Scrutiny) Committee. [1.4.1 & 6.3]

Meetings

12. Address the length of meetings - eg stricter chairing, more disciplined contribution by members, tackling the style and content of meetings. [1.5.4 & 7.2 & 7.6]
13. Tighten up agenda planning. [1.5 & 7.5 & 7.8.2]
14. Explore other approaches in order to freshen up meetings - eg widely-advertised themed meetings, informal discussions, 'break-out' sessions, etc. [1.5.4 & 7.6.1]
15. If any such approach is adopted, explore other ways of dealing with more routine business, eg delegating detailed consideration (and pursuance) of some subjects (eg crime figures) to sub-groups. [1.5.1 & 7.7]
16. Review the balance between an open, democratic forum and a business-like Board. [1.5.2]
17. Consider a more proactive role in relation to Face the People meetings. [1.5.3 & 7.9]

Activity

18. Develop other forms of outreach. [1.6 & 7.1]

CSB development

19. Introduce the planned capacity building training for members as soon as possible. [1.7.1 & 5.11 & 9.1]
20. Undertake succession planning. [1.7.2 & 9.2]
21. Ask LCP2 to prioritise training in chairing techniques / skills and succession planning. [1.5.4 & 1.7.3 & 8.3]

R.F.Hunt
LCP2
17 November 2009