

# EALING SAFER NEIGHBOURHOOD BOARD (ESNB)

## MINUTES OF PUBLIC MEETING

Wednesday 14 March 2018

@ 7.00pm

### PRESENT:

Richard Chilton  
Sara Kumar  
William Hardman  
James Guest  
Jags Sanghera  
Jamila Bibi Sawar  
Beata Felinczak  
Andrew Rollings  
Wendy Starkie  
Susan Lindo  
James Lawley-Barrett

### REPRESENTING

Chair of ESNB - Lay Member / ECPCG Representative  
Vice Chair and Community Member  
Chamber of Commerce  
Central Ealing Ward Cluster  
Southall Ward Cluster  
Community Member  
Victim Support  
Ealing Business Improvement District  
Independent Advisory Group  
Independent Custody Visitors  
Community Member

### COUNCILLORS

Ranjit Dheer - Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Portfolio holder-  
'Community Services and Safety,'  
Seema Kumar - Opposition Spokesperson.

### Also Present:

Jess Murray - Head of Service; Safer Communities Team, LBE  
Raj Kohli - Chief Superintendent; Met Police  
Aaron Clark -Met Police  
Ricky Kandohla -Met Police  
Paula Portas - Democratic Services Officer, LBE

**Apologies:** Apologies for absence had been received from Martin Mallam, Suzanne Fernandes, Andy Oliver, Don Tanswell and Alan Murray (as his interpreter was unavailable). Anu Khela, Mohamed Ali and Sarah Constable were also absent.

### 1. Welcome and Introductions

The Chair welcomed ESNB members and attendees to the ESNB public meeting, explained the structure and content of the meeting and introduced the speakers.

### 2. Presentation by ESNB on its Role, Achievements and Projects

The Chair gave a short power-point presentation outlining the key elements of the Ealing Safer Neighbourhood Board, as set out below –

What does the ESNB do?

- Sponsored by (London) Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) to provide borough level public engagement with the Metropolitan Police
- Is expected to provide local challenge to the Met
- Is expected to sponsor local crime related projects

What does ESNB not do?

- Has no formal powers
- Have a formal role with any other law enforcement bodies such as: -
  - Action Fraud, for fraud and online crime
  - British Transport Police
  - Ealing Council

Who is on the ESNB?

- Ward panel reps from each cluster
- Councillors
- Young people representative
- Victim Support
- Business representatives
- ICV and IAG representatives
- Community (open recruitment) members
- All members are volunteers

What have we reviewed?

- We have meetings every 3 months
  - Independent Custody Visitor arrangements
  - Stop & Search monitoring
  - Gangs and knife crime
  - Disability access at Acton police station
  - Victim Support
  - Ward panels
  - Neighbourhood Watch

What else have we done?

- Monitored police response times through membership of MetCC Community Forum
- Recruited several new members to ESNB
- Continued to look at crime levels
- Monitored the Pathfinder introduction of Basic Command Units
- Run some successful crime related projects

After the Chair had given his presentation, the Vice-Chair, Sara Kumar, addressed the meeting, and gave a short presentation on the current ESNB projects as set out below-

Each year MOPAC makes money available to SNBs to fund projects aimed at:

- Reducing key neighbourhood crimes.
- Increasing community confidence in the police.

This year there have been 8 projects in total, 2 have been successfully completed:

- Build a bike. This project had great success, with full attendance and one student taking carpentry classes as a result.

- Deaf and Hard of Hearing- The project had been successfully completed, special thanks were extended to Alan Murray for organising and fulfilling this project.

Six projects remain:

- 'Kick it out'- The project had several community safety events planned; data was being collected for crime engagement survey and seminars and presentations were currently underway.
- 'Babies of the borough'- This was a project about painting baby pictures on commercial shutters as crime prevention measure. The project was still under progress, waiting to complete on all sites agreed. Analysis would be undertaken by the University of Oxford at a later stage.
- Self-defence and Personal Safety- This project had been extremely successful. All classes organised were fully booked and in high demand. Further funding was being sought to reboot the project due to the high volume of requests.
- Ealing Street Pastors- This project was ongoing. Pastors had connected with GCSE students about the work they did in the community as well as doing local church visits. It successfully made referrals to charities for homeless people over the cold period.
- Safe Places- This project was still under progress. The scheme would be launched in mid-March 2018, as permission had been received from local police and Ealing Council.
- Neighbourhood Watch (NW) Reinvigoration Acton- This project had a slower progression. Ealing Council had been contacted to obtain permissions to put signs in lamp posts. A summit for all NWs coordinators in Ealing was being planned.

New Projects 2018/19

The ESNB was looking for new projects that worked towards reducing neighbourhood crimes and increasing community confidence in the police.

### **3. Questions to ESNB from the Public**

Following the Chair and Vice-Chair's presentations, questions were invited from the public. Attendees asked the following questions and made some comments:

- Question 1: Had there been any ward panel meetings in Southall Broadway?  
Response: It was clarified that there had been one ward panel meeting in Southall Broadway, where police officers had not been present. Ricky Kandohla said that there should be four ward panel meetings a year, taking place every three months. He gave assurances that he would consider the matter.
- Question 2: Having established PSPOs in West Ealing and Southall, was there any intention to set one up in Hanwell?

Response: The ESNB Chair said that PSPO were a Police and Ealing Council responsibility. Jess Murray, Head of Safer Communities in LBE, clarified that PSPOs were the responsibility for the Safer Communities Team. He explained that the Safer Communities team were examining the possibility of creating a borough wide PSPO. A consultative process would likely be initiated in 2018.

- Comment: There was pressure to install CCTV cameras rather than tackle people committing crime (such as drug related crimes) in the street. However, response times to 101 calls was excessive.  
Response: The Chair agreed that response times for 101 calls were not as good as they should be. Ricky Kandohla asked this resident to share his details and information with him after the meeting and committed himself to consider the specific matters of concern for him.
- Question 3: When collecting evidence for a PSPO did the Council look at Facebook groups (Hanwell Friends) and activity?  
Response: Jess Murray said that Facebook data was not necessarily collected. Reporting to 101 was more important in terms of creating a cumulative approach to examine the possible imposition of an injunction. It was clarified that, nevertheless, the PSPO process was consultative and Ealing Council and police officers were keen to seek resident's views.
- Comment: A complaint was made in relation to the case of two people in Hanwell suffering persistent harassment and making multiple 101 contacts. There was an extensive police file on their case. However, they had been sent to speak from one person to another in numerous occasions.  
Response: Ricky Kandohla said that such situation was unacceptable. He encouraged the resident to, as Chair of a Neighbourhood Watch, get in touch with her local sergeant to have a conversation about the case.
- Comment: Hanwell resident complained about witnessing, together with her son, a homeless person being attacked and thrown into the canal. When 999 was called, no answer was obtained. The resident tried to stop the attack and felt she was putting herself and her son in danger.  
Response: Ricky Kandohla noted that he was aware of the case. He said that there was room for improvement in the police's work with third sector organisations such as homeless charities. He noted that it was clear that Hanwell residents were unhappy, and asked those residents to collectively speak to him at end of the meeting.
- Question 4: When would a new toilet be installed in Southall Broadway?  
Response: Councillor Dheer noted that the public toilet in Southall Broadway had been closed due to its persistent use for drug selling and as site of anti-social behaviour. However, he said a new toilet there would be soon opening.

- Question 5: An update on the working of the Employer Supported Policing scheme was requested.  
Response: Ricky Kandohla explained that the scheme had not been successful due to the reluctance of employers to release employees from work duties and allow them to carry out shifts with the Met. He said that he would welcome the support from the business community.
- Question 6: What was the ESNB doing to advertise ward forums to the public?  
Response: The Chair explained that the ward panels were a Met police responsibility.

#### **4. Presentation on New ways of Reporting to and Engaging with the Police**

The Chair introduced Aaron Clarke, Acton Neighbourhood Inspector, Met Police, to present new ways of communicating with the Police.

Aaron Clarke explained that as Neighbourhood Inspector for Acton he had been looking at various ways to engage positively with communities. One of the initiatives, which was not a police led one, was Online Watch Link or OWL. He noted the following about OWL [owl.co.uk](http://owl.co.uk):

- The Borough Command Unit for Ealing, Hounslow and Hillingdon would be trialling OWL.
- OWL was a communications and contact platform for Neighbourhood Watches (NWs).
- Research showed that NW reduce the likelihood of crimes being committed and therefore there was a push to strengthen them.
- OWL was secured by design and approved by the Home Office.
- OWL allowed residents to engage with police officers on the go and see what officers were doing.
- OWL had been trialled in other areas such as Hertfordshire, Staffordshire, North Wales, Kensington & Chelsea, Redbridge, Tower Hamlets and Barnet.
- The intention was to integrate OWL along all policing, not just restricted to Neighbourhood policing.
- Police, NWs, Ward panel members, etc. would feed information in and this would be cascaded.
- OWL allowed a hierarchy of access to information (therefore allowing for the protection of data as necessary).
- OWL use was not intended as departure from local police presence but as an additional tool to aid that presence.
- OWL would help address the experience of residents shying away from helping NWs and the police for fear of retribution. OWL would sidestep those fears because residents would be able to provide information safely online.
- A slide was presented providing an example of the messages sent by OWL.

- A slide presented OWL maps containing icon representations of those households that had signed to OWL. That type of data would help police to target better their responses in the event of crime.
- OWLs key partners were NWs, local authorities, school and colleges, Safer Neighbourhood Boards, Ward Panels, Independent Advisory Groups (IAG), police and public.

Following the presentation questions were invited from the public. Attendees asked the following questions and made some comments:

- Question 1: Was OWL active in Ealing?  
Response: OWL was not yet live. The estimated timeline for it to begin working life was around 1 May 2018.
- Question 2: Did you need to have a NW scheme in your area to sign up to OWL?  
Response: No.
- Question 3: There were many cameras in the streets already, what was the point of residents registering their private CCTV with OWL?  
Response: This initiative was not about using local authority cameras. Some areas have hundreds of private cameras that helped solve many crimes. It would be a powerful tool.
- Question 4: Would there be a risk of neglecting places where people are already communicating such as local FB groups?  
Response: OWL was not meant to replace alternative ways of engagement. Facebook, twitter, face to face engagement between the police and the public would continue as usual. OWL is an additional platform.
- Question 5: Could training in OWL be delivered jointly to those meant to be involved?  
Response: There was already a level of joint training. However, it was not practical in many instances as the roles of those involved were too varied.
- Question 6: How could OWL be harnessed to help vulnerable residents?  
Response: It was possible to be in OWL as proxy for a vulnerable (elderly, infirm, etc.) family member and help keep them aware of events in their area even if they were not able to sign up themselves.
- Question 7: Would the police know who you were in OWL?  
Response: The police would know the details you use when registering. Therefore, if you send a message you would receive a response addressed to you personally. But OWL was not a surveillance instrument and would not allow the police to see whether you were online or not.
- Question 8: Would you be able to speak to a police officer via OWL?  
Response: OWL was not meant to replace calls to 101. It would not be a crime reporting system. When an officer was next on duty s/he would see your message, and reply to it. To build up statistics on crime the key way were calls to 101 and twitter.

## **5. Presentation by Ealing Police, Especially on their Organisational Changes.**

The Chair introduced Raj Kohli, Met Police Chief Superintendent, and Ricky Kandohla, Met Police Superintendent, to present the police's organizational changes.

Raj Kohli began his presentation by addressing the frustration he noticed from Hanwell residents present at the meeting. He noted that a Public Space Protection Order was a highly draconian measure. In his view, PSPOs needed to be the end of the process of sorting out the problems noted by residents, not the beginning. There was a need to understand what measures were appropriate and proportionate to deal with those problems.

He noted the following figures in relation to Ealing police and crime in the borough:

- Over 70% of Ealing residents relied on the police when they were needed.
- In 24 hrs. Ealing borough recorded 8 burglaries.
- Over 1 month Ealing recorded 10 robberies and 50 vehicles were stolen.

He noted that this figures showed that there was a healthy level of trust in the Police in Ealing. Crime figures were shared for residents to note that crime was not as high as sometimes was perceived to be.

Raj Kohli offered Hanwell residents present at the hearing his commitment to walk the area with them as plain clothes officer to better understand their problems.

In relation to the Met Police reorganization Raj Kohli and Ricky Kandohla noted the following points:

- There have been around 34,000 police officers in London over the last decades. This number would suffer only a small reduction. Neighbourhood policing would still be delivered through physical presence, supported by improved digital engagement.
- There would be an amalgamation of Ealing, Hillingdon and Hounslow boroughs as part of the new 12 Basic Command Units (BCUs). Raj Kohli to be Superintendent for Neighbourhoods for Ealing, Hillingdon and Hounslow BCU with Ricky Kandohla as his deputy.
- Five areas of work distinguished in the new Basic Command Units (BCUs) – which replaced the borough division— neighbourhood being one of them. Seventy to eighty officers would deal with high crime profile areas. Key issues to be tackled were moped crime, etc.
- All existing police officers would be mobilized to provide two PCs per ward.
- Recruitment of eighteen new police officers would take place to increase numbers in town centres (9-12-month timeline).
- A Neighbourhood Partnership & Prevention Hub (PPH) would deal with prevention of crime, licensing matters, anti-social behaviour, etc.

- Neighbourhood Partnership & Prevention Hub (PPH) would work within a framework of 5 thematic areas – vulnerable people/places, young people, social media/technology, CT/hate crime and alcohol/drugs.
- New system would ensure victims of crime, such as burglary, engaged with fewer officers.
- Police officers already working in Ealing would be kept in Ealing, and not moved to Hounslow or Hillingdon, except in instances when one area struggled to deal with specific issues. There would be an oversight function to monitor these movements.
- Business headquarters to be the centre of operations and provide support for officers in every function.

## 6. Questions to Ealing Police from the Public

Following these presentations questions were invited from the floor. Attendees asked the following questions and made some comments:

- Question 1: Issue of police officers in Southall holding meetings in McDonalds  
Response: Ricky Kandohla gave assurances that that practice had been stopped promptly, as there had been concerns about privacy issues. Meetings taking place now at Southall Town Hall.
- Comment 1: Concerns were expressed about mergers following from the pathfinder mergers. Reassurances sought in terms of the reductions in services.  
Response: Raj Kohli and Ricky Kandohla offered reassurances that mistakes made in the initial 'pathfinder' mergers would not be repeated. Those mergers had offered learning opportunities for the rest. There had also been more time to adapt to changes.
- Comment 2: Met was congratulated for their new way of thinking. Confidence was expressed that policing in Southall was going to improve.
- Question 2: The relations with transport police were queried.  
Response: Whilst there was cooperation, London Transport Police was independent from Met Police. It was suggested that the ESNB could invite London Transport Police to its meetings.

The Chair thanked officers, members and the public and drew the meeting to a close.

Meeting finished at 9.10pm

Richard Chilton, Chair