



Partnership and Place Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Thursday, 9 February 2012 at 7.30 pm
Committee Room 4, Brent Town Hall, Forty Lane,
Wembley, HA9 9HD

Membership:

Members

Councillors:

Van Kalwala (Chair)
Clues (Vice-Chair)
Brown
Harrison
Hirani
Naheerathan
HB Patel
RS Patel

first alternates

Councillors:

Ogunro
Matthews
Lorber
Oladapo
Aden
Al-Ebadi
Colwill
Chohan

Second alternates

Councillors:

Daly
Allie
Leaman
Ketan Sheth
Adeyeye
Beckman
Kansagra
S Choudhary

For further information contact: Toby Howes, Senior Democratic Services Officer
020 8937 1307, toby.howes@brent.gov.uk

For electronic copies of minutes, reports and agendas, and to be alerted when the minutes of this meeting have been published visit:

www.brent.gov.uk/committees

The press and public are welcome to attend this meeting

Agenda

Introductions, if appropriate.

Apologies for absence and clarification of alternate members

Item	Page
1 Declarations of personal and prejudicial interests	
Members are invited to declare at this stage of the meeting, any relevant financial or other interest in the items on the agenda.	
2 Deputations	
3 Minutes of the previous meeting held on 13 December 2011	1 - 8
The minutes are attached.	
4 Matters arising	
5 Policing priorities in Brent	
The Borough Commander will be attending the meeting to discuss policing issues in Brent, including the use of Stop and Search.	
6 Community safety update	9 - 18
Members will be given a presentation on the draft crime strategy and a report on crime performance indicators is attached. There is also a briefing note on the Mayor's Office for Police and Crime.	
7 Date of next meeting	
The next meeting of the Partnership and Place Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting is scheduled to take place on Thursday, 29 March 2012 at 7.30 pm.	
8 Any other urgent business	
Notice of items raised under this heading must be given in writing to the Democratic Services Manager or his representative before the meeting in accordance with Standing Order 64.	



Please remember to **SWITCH OFF** your mobile phone during the meeting.

- The meeting room is accessible by lift and seats will be provided for members of the public.
- Toilets are available on the second floor.
- Catering facilities can be found on the first floor near the Paul Daisley Hall.
- A public telephone is located in the foyer on the ground floor, opposite the Porters' Lodge

This page is intentionally left blank



**MINUTES OF THE PARTNERSHIP AND PLACE
OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
Tuesday, 13 December 2011 at 7.30 pm**

PRESENT: Councillor Van Kalwala (Chair) and Councillors Brown, Harrison, Hirani, Naheerathan, HB Patel and RS Patel

An apology for absence was received from: Councillor Clues

1. Declarations of personal and prejudicial interests

None declared.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting held on 12 October 2011

RESOLVED:-

that the minutes of the previous meeting held on 12 October 2011 be approved as an accurate record, subject to the following amendment:-

Add 'Councillor Naheerathan' under 'present'.

3. Matters arising

Tenancy Strategy

In reply to an update request from Councillor Hirani, Cathy Tyson (Assistant Director – Policy, Strategy, Partnerships and Improvement) advised that the Tenancy Strategy was presently in draft form and was going through the initial consultation stages. A revised draft strategy would be put to a fuller consultation in the New Year.

Anti-Social Behaviour in Brent

Councillor Hirani sought an update in respect of closure orders in the Anti-Social Behaviour Act 2003 being used to close down khat houses in Brent. The Chair sought further information with regard to benchmarking with other local authorities, whether crime data per ward could be circulated to councillors and also whether information relating to racial hate crime was available.

Jacqueline Casson (Senior Policy Officer, Strategy, Partnerships and Improvement) confirmed that she would seek further information from Genny Renard (Head of Integrated Community Safety and Development, Strategy Partnerships and Improvement) on the issues raised.

4. Tackling employment issues in Brent

Andrea Lagos (Lead Language2work Personal Consultant, Strategy, Partnerships and Improvement) introduced the report and gave an overview of employment trends in Brent. She advised the committee that around 12,000 people, representing 9.3% of Brent's total workforce, were presently unemployed, compared to 8.3% average in London and 7.7% average nationally. Harlesden, Stonebridge, Kilburn and Kensal Green wards had the highest number of working age people in receipt of out-of-work benefits, whilst it was noted that 34.1% of those 16 years and under lived in households with less than 60% of the median income, which classified them as living in poverty. The rise of young people claiming benefits since October 2010 was in line with the lack of job vacancies and lack of experience, as well as the impact on increased educational fees.

Andrea Lagos advised that the Government's intention to "encourage responsibility and fairness in the welfare system" had also made a significant impact, which included replacing the welfare to work schemes with a single Work Programme, a re-assessment of people on Incapacity Benefits and reforming the welfare benefits system with a Universal Credit which was due to be introduced in 2013. Local housing allowance caps were to be introduced in January 2012 and was of particular concern to London boroughs, and in Brent, including in the most deprived areas where rents were comparatively expensive. The Work Programme was delivered through the council working with Jobcentre Plus and three Work Programme providers.

Terry Dackombe (Partnership Manager for Brent, Jobcentre Plus, Department for Work and Pensions) then addressed the committee. He explained that the majority of those receiving the Jobseekers Allowance (JSA) were first time claimants, many of whom were back in work within 13 weeks, whilst 90% of first time claimants returned to employment within 52 weeks. Members noted that participation on the Work Programme was mandatory for those on JSA aged 18 -24 years who had been claiming for nine months or more, and for those of 25 years plus who had been claiming for a year or more. Before claimants became eligible for the Work Programme, Jobcentre Plus would assist them in obtaining places on skills related courses run by the College of North West London (CNWL) and Brent Adult and Community Education Service (BACES). There was no eligibility criteria and claimants could apply to access the courses from the first day of their claim. Terry Dackombe emphasised that the courses provided skills certificates that were recognised by employers and not necessarily what customers would like to study. This was undertaken by assessing in what areas of employment there were most vacancies and what skills were in demand, which included office, administrative, hospitality, IT and care skills. CNWL had two employment advisers to assist in this area, whilst Jobcentre Plus had an employment adviser in Outreach. A minimum target of 50% of those who had completed their course to obtain sustained employment after 26 weeks was set and work placements, volunteering and post course provision was arranged for those who did not manage to find employment. Terry Dackombe explained that the courses had commenced in September 2011 and to date 23 had gained employment, although some courses were yet to finish. Jobcentre plus was also working in partnership with the Regeneration Team, drug treatment agencies and also Brent NHS to help improve access to psychological therapy.

Carl Headrish (Maximus Employment and Training), representing one of the Work Programme providers, was invited to address Members. Carl Headrish stated that Maximus was a global company that were new to working in Brent. Maximus had experience of running Work Programmes in areas such as Kent and Surrey and had teamed up with the Careers Development Group (CDG) to deliver in Brent. It was noted that Maximus had been the number one provider for the Flexible New Deal programme. Carl Headrish advised that efforts were being made to build a portfolio with a large number of partners in Brent and the delivery model included use of advisers, tutors and employment engagement staff. The committee heard that Maximus, like all other Work Programme providers, only received payment when a client had successfully gained sustainable employment. Clients received assistance in three separate ways, including:-

- Help at interviews, help into work and support in skills provision once in employment
- Increase in sign posting and seeking what employment opportunities were available
- Helping the harder to help, such as those with disabilities, the homeless and ex-offenders

Sukaina Jerai (Deputy Operations Manager, Work Programme - Ingeus), representing another of the Work Programme providers, then addressed the committee. Sukaina Jerai advised that Ingeus had been operating in Brent since 2003 and were based in Wembley Park. Upon clients approaching Ingeus, appointments would then be made where information would be obtained for a diagnosis check to be undertaken. The client would then be seen by an Insight Adviser for six weeks and were placed in various streams, these being:-

- Boost stream – for those willing to work
- Engagement stream – for those not wishing to work
- Steps to work stream – for ESF customers only who required a lot of support
- ELT stream – this did not fulfil a teaching function but to support its' clients into work

Sukaina Jerai explained that the streams ran in parallel with each other and internal workshops were held to help with matters such as access into work. Customers may also be referred to the ACE network which would help provide them with specialist support that could not be provided by Ingeus. The Employer Services Team would seek positions for clients, whilst the In Work Support Team kept regular contact with clients. The Rapid Response Team's role was to help those who had lost employment at short notice, whilst the Careers Academy helped customers with their longer term future.

The committee noted that George Fella, representing Reed in Partnership and the third Work Programme provider in Brent, had given an apology for absence.

Maggie Pulle (Deputy Principal, CNWL) was then invited to address the committee. She began by explaining that the College had some 8,000 adult students and was Skills Funding Agency (SFA) funded. CNWL had focused on providing the necessary skills for employability in the last three years. Around a third of adult students did not pay for their own courses as they were on benefits and there were

approximately 2,500 ESOL students. Projects had been created to help students to get straight into work and CNWL worked in partnership with Brent in2 Work and Quintain, particularly with regard to construction in Wembley. Maggie Pulle advised that employers advised CNWL of what skills they needed and CNWL would then put together the appropriate courses for students to acquire these skills. Members heard that although the economic climate had slowed progress with regard to the Quintain development, Quintain were briefing prospective tenants in December 2011 and it was possible that employment opportunities in construction may become available soon. Further employment opportunities with regard to the Willesden Green redevelopment project may also be a possibility. It was noted that CNWL were due to run courses in construction in January 2012.

Members then discussed the item in some depth. Councillor Hirani commented that there was concern that not all stakeholders were being properly engaged, including the council and CNWL and he asked for an update in respect of this at a future meeting. He enquired whether a set list of potential partners existed and whether ward statistics in relation to those referred to the Work Programme were available. It was also asked whether free courses for those with lower skilled jobs were available. Councillor Hirani asked what consideration was given in respect of apprenticeships and was the largest single problem attributable to there simply being not enough job vacancies at present. He also sought views as to how Members in their role as councillors could contribute.

Councillor Harrison enquired about the age range of those participating in the Work Programme and CNWL courses and were the courses suitable for all clients. She also asked what measures were in place to check that those who had gone into self-employment were still in sustainable employment. Councillor R S Patel asked what action was taken to involve the hard to reach and what degree of success there was in finding work for the unemployed with young families who may have problems finding the appropriate childcare.

Councillor Brown enquired if clients were allowed to join the Work Programme earlier than the prescribed criteria and if information was available with regard to the Work Programme providers' success rate in finding employment for their clients and the payments received as a result. He suggested that it would be useful for the committee to have updates on the number enrolled in CNWL courses and those who were in sustained employment and also to draw comparisons between Brent and London overall.

Councillor H B Patel asked whether most CNWL courses were organised in advance or specifically tailored according to the employment needs at any one particular time. With regard to customers, he enquired on the proportion directly referred to the CNWL compared to those who had been placed on courses by their employers. Councillor H B Patel sought more information on those who had been referred to the Work Programme, in particular what parts of Brent had they come from and were these from areas of high unemployment. He asked whether there were any measures in place to try and increase the number of employment vacancies and was there any action being taken to address the Housing Benefit cap. Councillor H B Patel enquired what steps were being taken to tackle unemployment in areas that were underprivileged. He also asked whether the notes of London Board meetings would be available to local authorities.

The Chair commented that regular dialogue between the council and the Work Programme provider was desirable to ensure that shared priorities were being addressed. He asked whether postcode data could be collected in respect of those referred to CNWL courses and Work Programme providers respectively. Details were sought with regard to what steps were being taken to help those in deprived areas. The Chair enquired what were the most difficult client groups to help. Information was requested on the council's approach with regard to apprenticeships and whether employers could be encouraged to offer apprenticeships during procurement exercises. The Chair also asked what options were available to those customers who had not found work within 13 weeks of claiming JSA but were yet to reach the threshold date to participate in the Work Programme.

In reply to the issues raised, Sukaina Jerai advised that Ingeus worked closely with Jobcentre Plus who referred clients to them through the Work Programme, and Brent in2 Work. As Ingeus worked across West London, clients could access a number of organisations, including Fit for Sport, the ACE network and Brent MIND. The list of organisations continued to grow and as the local knowledge base increased, more local providers could be added. Efforts were made both at local and national level to identify more job vacancies, such as liaising with superstores and at London level, the retail, security and administrative sectors were amongst those targeted. A work benefit calculation was available to help those who also had childcare commitments and to provide additional support. Sukaina Jerai felt that engagement with partners overall was high, however with regard to providing data, she stated that this could be provided by the Department of Work and Pensions, although providing meaningful data would be difficult at this stage. However, efforts would be made to identify trends and report back at a future meeting of the committee. Sukaina Jerai advised that the Department for Work and Pensions would hold records of London Board meetings.

Dominic Hunt (Ingeus) added that because the Work Programme was mandatory for JSA claimants after a certain period, it was difficult for Work Programme providers to target particular groups or areas. With regard to those with childcare commitments, an understanding of their situation would be obtained to help advise them accordingly. The hard to reach could also be assisted through ESF referrals. Concerning the Housing Benefit cap, clients would be signposted to the relevant organisations for assistance. Dominic Hunt welcomed councillors' help such as identifying any likely employment vacancies.

Carl Headrish explained that Maximus were looking at partner matching when building its customer base and a matrix of all service types was being developed. Maximus continued to work in partnership with the council, colleges and contractors. Carl Headrish explained that he would need to see what data could be provided regarding the locations of those entering the Work Programme and it was expected that the majority of long term unemployed would come from more deprived areas. Clients were sometimes encouraged to enter self-employment where appropriate and in such instances they would receive advice on how they could become competitive in their chosen trade. Such clients would then continue to be assisted through the in work support structure and receive advice on matters such as money management. Carl Headrish advised that the Work Programme providers were not funded to seek apprenticeships for clients and apprenticeships were more scarce for those that were 18 years or older.

Maggie Pulle advised that although the majority of courses were organised some time in advance, CNWL would also respond to particular events in Brent, such as providing courses in retail during the Wembley redevelopment. The courses enrolled a mixture of those who were already in work and looking to improve their skill set, those referred by Jobcentre plus and also ESOL students. Maggie Pulle confirmed that data by ward could be sent with regard to those students on JSA. The committee noted that courses were only free for those on benefits and any already in employment would be required to pay the course fee.

Terry Dackombe informed Members that the Work Programme contract was awarded on a regional basis. Members heard that Reed, for example, were working in partnership with 35 regional organisations and as each provider gained more local knowledge, more partnerships would be made. The age range of CNWL and Work Programme clients was wide and no one was excluded from a course on the basis of their age. Terry Dackombe advised that clients could choose to enter the Work Programme prior to the criteria thresholds if they so wished, otherwise they were eligible to enroll on either CNWL or BACES courses. If a particular course was over referred, the colleges were able to set up additional courses. As the Work Programme had only commenced in June 2011, it was too early to identify particular data trends at this stage. Previously, Brent had been declared an Employment Zone and under this organisations received the same funding regardless of who was brought into employment. However, under the Work Programme, providers were paid according to a graded scale and paid higher where clients of a more challenging nature had gained sustainable employment. Although the client database used by Jobcentre Plus did not include ward details, Terry Dackombe acknowledged that it would be beneficial to see who came from areas of greater deprivation such as Harlesden and Kilburn to see if an enhanced service could be provided in these areas. In addition, assistance could also be given to complex families and the hardest group to help tended to be ex-offenders. For particularly challenging cases, working in partnership with relevant organisations such as Addaction was essential as well as identifying potential organisations that may be more receptive to such clients. There had been some success in this area with regard to clients with mild mental health issues, however greater resources were required for challenging cases. Terry Dackombe advised that efforts were being made to identify potential employers who were willing to provide more training for the clients and Jobcentre Plus were also working with the National Apprenticeship Service on this issue.

Andrea Lagos advised that the Training and Development Team were seeking to increase apprenticeships within the council and also encouraging employers to offer such schemes. Work was also taking place with BACES to provide a pre-apprenticeship programme.

Cathy Tyson added that there would need to be careful consideration of the legal implications concerning procurement exercises using apprenticeships as part of the criteria, however this could be explored as one of the criteria on the Government's guidance on procurement included social value. She advised that monthly unemployment rates by ward were available and action was being taken to provide greater employment sustainability, particularly to help wards with higher levels of unemployment.

The Chair thanked the presenters and emphasised the need for regular dialogue with partners to ensure the shared priorities were pursued.

5. **Partnership and Place Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme**

Jacqueline Casson advised that at the request of the Chair, the Borough Commander had been invited to attend the next meeting to discuss policing priorities in Brent. There was also to be an item on the draft Crime Strategy.

6. **Date of next meeting**

It was noted that the next meeting of the Partnership and Place Overview and Scrutiny Committee was scheduled to take place on Thursday, 9 February 2012 at 7.30 pm.


7. **Any other urgent business**

None.

The meeting closed at 9.30 pm.

Z VAN KALWALA
Chair

This page is intentionally left blank

	<p style="text-align: center;">Partnership & Place Overview & Scrutiny Committee</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Report from the Director of Strategy, Partnership & Improvement</p>
<p>For Action Wards Affected: ALL</p>	
<p>Crime Performance Monitoring</p>	

1.0 Summary

- 1.1 The main part of this report is the table in section four of this report. It is based on earlier discussions that took place among the committee members.
- 1.2 Police attending the committee had suggested possible targets around the key crimes looking realistically at longer term trends, new counting rules, the anticipated impact of the Olympics and ever shrinking budgets. New suggested targets have been added to this report.

2.0 Recommendations

The Committee is recommended to:

- 2.1 Review and agree or amend the targets.
- 2.2 Agree to monitor this data quarterly and make comments and recommendations regarding the work programme associated with each crime type.

2.3 Agree to monitor the performance data from the Rape Crisis Centre that offers services to rape victims in Brent.

3.0 Structure and Data Sources

3.1 The data used covers the three previous quarters.

3.2 Where possible longer term statistical trends are indicated. The data used for this is made up of information covering the complete previous year.

3.3 All data is supplied by the Metropolitan Police Service Central Data Unit who supply the Integrated Community Safety Unit with a scorecard.

4.0 Detail

4.1 Rape, like all sexual crimes, is under reported. The level of this varies, some researchers estimate it as low as 17% while others say one in twelve rapes is reported.

www.rcne.com/downloads/RepsPubs/Attritn.pdf

www.rapecrisis.org.uk

4.2 With other boroughs Brent supports a rape crisis service, the most recent report is included with this report.

4.3 If members agree to the proposal in 2.3 they are asked to include receipt and review of this report with covering information into their work programme.

Data and Suggested Targets

All data is given as a rolling year to date. The data is supplied by the Metropolitan Police Service, Tactical Policing Scorecard.

Sanction Detections for Rape

Quarter One	Quarter Two	Quarter Three
3.8% = 1	14.3% = 8	19.5% = 15
Monitor Only		

4.4 2011/12 Personal Robbery - Crime Prevention Strategy Group heading: Living Safe in Brent

Quarter One	Quarter Two	Quarter Three
-------------	-------------	---------------

Meeting
Date

Version no.
Date

543 + 11.3%	1213 + 15.3%	1575 + 23%
Suggested Target	2012/13 Stabilise to levels mid point 2011	2013/14 Reduce from that level by 7.5%

Example Actions	Outcome	Lead Agency
Information project: encourage self care; jewellery bags	Reduction in potential victims	Brent Integrated Community Safety Team
Monitoring visiting Cash for Gold Shops	Improved monitoring for stolen goods; action against unscrupulous traders	Brent Police; Trading Standards; Brent Integrated Community Safety Team
Keep Your Kit Kids ! Property marking, awareness and self care	Greater awareness of personal safety for 11 to 14 year olds	Brent Integrated Community Safety Team
Integrated Offender Management, focus on acquisitive crime	Reduction in offences by prolific offender will deliver lower crime rates	Brent Integrated Community Safety Team

4.5 2011/12 Residential Burglary Crime Prevention Strategy Group heading: Living Safely in Brent

Quarter One	Quarter Two	Quarter Three
561*	1414**	2071 ***
Suggested Target	2012/13	2013/14

*Longer term trend at the end of Quarter 1 was up 3.8%

**Longer term trend at the end of Quarter 2 was up 5.8%

*** Longer term trend at the end of Quarter 3 was up 10.5%

Example Actions	Outcome	Lead Agency
Home Safe; awareness rising, monitoring and advising repeat victims	Home owners reminded about home security	Brent Integrated Community Safety Team
New Homes – Safe Homes Working with Regeneration and Major Projects to ensure all new homes have high	New and refurbished homes to achieve national security standards	Brent Integrated Community Safety Team

levels of security.		
Integrated Offender Management, focus on acquisitive crime	Reduction in offences by prolific offenders will deliver lower crime rates	Brent Integrated Community Safety Team

4.6 2011/ 12 Theft from Shops – Doing Business Safely in Brent

Quarter One	Quarter Two	Quarter Three
224*	537**	726 ***
Suggested Target	2012/13	2013/14

*Longer term trend at the end of Quarter 1 was up 3.8%

** Longer term trend at the end of Quarter 2 was up 13.5%

*** Longer term trend at the end of Quarter 3 was up 10.5 %

Actions	Outcome	Lead Agency
Building Brent's Businesses	Small and medium size enterprises informed and supported to improve security	Brent Integrated Community Safety Team
Integrated Offender Management, focus on acquisitive crime	Reduction in offences by prolific offenders will deliver lower crime rates	Brent Integrated Community Safety Team

5.0 Financial Implications

5.1 None

6.0 Legal Implications

6.1 None

7.0 Diversity Implications

7.1 None

8.0 Staffing/Accommodation Implications (if appropriate)

8.1 None

Background Papers

Contact Officers

This page is intentionally left blank

Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPC).

Briefing note

1. Summary

- 1.1 This paper is intended to provide member of the Committee with a brief over of MOPC.
- 1.2 As this body now oversees the Police Service details of how the complaints and problems will be dealt with is also included. The intention is to help Councillors assist their constituents.

2. Details

- 2.1 The Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime has been set up in response to the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act (2011) which reforms the accountability of police services and replaces police authorities across England and Wales with elected individuals. The rest of the country will elect their Police and Crime Commissioners (PCCs) in November 2012.
- 2.3 The MOPC is headed by the Mayor or, by his nomination, the appointed statutory Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime, currently Kit Malthouse. This means that the Mayor is directly accountable for policing performance in London. The MOPC makes this process and accountability clearer and gives Londoners a further voice in how their city is policed.
- 2.4 Through the MOPC the Mayor and Deputy Mayor will be directly accountable for police performance in the capital, setting the Met Police's strategic direction and allocating resources. Operational policing will however remain the responsibility of the Metropolitan Police Commissioner, Bernard Hogan-Howe.
- 2.5 The London Assembly will scrutinise the work of the MOPC through a new body, the Police and Crime Committee (PCC).
- 2.6 *The Police and Crime Committee (PCC)*
The London Assembly Police and Crime Committee (PCC) examines the work of the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime and reviews the police and crime plan for London. The Committee can also investigate anything which it considers to be of importance to policing and crime reduction in Greater London and make recommendations for improvements

3. Frequently Asked Questions:

3.1 Who will oversee the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS)?

The occupant of the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPC) is an elected individual tasked with holding the MPS to account on behalf of the public. This approach came into effect on 16 January 2012. The occupant of the MOPC may be supported by a Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime.

The City of London Police continues to be overseen by the [Common Council of the City of London](#). (External link)

In November 2012, elections will be held for Police and Crime Commissioners (PCCs), who will then hold to account the Chief Constables of most police forces outside London.

3.2 What has happened to the Metropolitan Police Authority?

The Metropolitan Police Authority was abolished in January 2012 and the occupant of the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime is now responsible for overseeing the Metropolitan Police Service

3.3 Who can make a complaint against the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPC) or a Deputy?

Anyone can make a complaint about the MOPC or their Deputy to the London Assembly's Police and Crime Committee.

3.4 How do I make a complaint about someone working for the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS)?

The department for recording and responding to complaints on behalf of the Commissioner is the Directorate of Professional Standards. You can contact the Directorate of Professional Standards at:

Metropolitan Police
DPS Customer Services
22nd Floor
Empress State Building
Lillie Road
London
SW6 1TR

3.5 How do I make a complaint about the Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS)?

The Commissioner of the MPS is accountable for all of the work of the MPS, and will be held to account by the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPC). To make a complaint about the Commissioner of the MPS you should contact the MOPC at:

Professional Standards Office
Mayor's Officer for Policing and Crime
10 Dean Farrar Street
London
SW1H 0NY

3.6 How will complaints about the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPC) or a Deputy be handled?

There are a number of routes through which complains about the MOPC or Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime can be channeled. In order for a complaint to be dealt with more quickly, you should make it directly to the London Assembly Police and Crime Committee.

The Committee will decide whether to record the complaint. The decision whether to 'record' a complaint is the first step in dealing with it. Members can expect the Committee to record the complaint unless it thinks either that the subject of your complaint has been, or is being, dealt with already through criminal proceedings, or that the complaint has been made before, but then withdrawn. This last section may be open to legal challenge where people have withdrawn for valid reasons we can expect it be reported or see precedents set through the courts.

If the complaint is recorded, the Committee will decide whether your complaint must be referred to the Independent Police Complaints Commission. When it receives a referral, the IPCC will decide whether the complaint requires investigation and, if so, what sort of investigation should take place.

If the Committee decides that your complaint does not need to be referred to the IPCC, or if the IPCC determines that your allegation does not need to be investigated, the Committee will take steps to resolve your complaint itself. The Committee may appoint someone to deal with your complaint on its behalf.

This page is intentionally left blank