


Water cannon
Why the Met's case doesn't wash

February 2014



Police and Crime Committee Members

Joanne McCartney (Chair)	Labour
Jenny Jones (Deputy Chair)	Green
Caroline Pidgeon (Deputy Chair)	Liberal Democrat
Tony Arbour	Conservative
Jennette Arnold	Labour
John Biggs	Labour
Victoria Borwick	Conservative
Len Duvall	Labour
Roger Evans	Conservative

Contact: Claire Hamilton

Email: Claire.hamilton@london.gov.uk

Tel: 020 7983 5845

Contents

Summary	4
1. Background	6
2. Examining the case for water cannon	8
3. Conclusion	17
Appendix A - Evaluations of water cannon	18
Appendix B - Endnotes	20
Orders and translations	23

Summary

The Police and Crime Committee has examined the Metropolitan Police's (the Met) case for purchasing water cannon by summer 2014. This follows the Mayor's announcement that he was minded to make available the necessary funds to the Met to purchase three second-hand water cannon as an "interim solution", prior to the Home Office deciding whether to buy new water cannon as a national asset.¹ The purchase of water cannon would represent a significant "departure" in public order policing tactics, as water cannon have not been used previously on the UK mainland.²

The Met has not set out a convincing case for why water cannon are needed as an interim arrangement for deployment in London by summer 2014. The examples that have been given as to when water cannon could have been used over the past ten years are unconvincing. In many cases, the examples contradict the assurances we have been given about when it would be appropriate to use water cannon. Indeed, the Mayor has said he would not have supported the use of water cannon in the cases that the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) has identified.

The Met is relying on a briefing prepared by ACPO that sets out the case for water cannon as a national asset. This national position does not adequately explain why water cannon are needed to police London's streets. Although much of the debate has considered the disorder in England in 2011, assessments have shown that water cannon would not have been an effective policing tool for quelling widespread disorder.

Furthermore, the Committee is concerned that the engagement process has been too limited. There has been no consideration of the national implications of the Met purchasing water cannon: despite it being an "interim solution" for London, the water cannon would be available for use by any police force in England and Wales. Police and Crime Commissioners from some of the country's biggest forces have said they do not support the use of water cannon.

In the event that water cannon were to be licensed by the Home Secretary, a London protocol would need to establish the criteria for their use in the capital, and the arrangements for consultation with the Mayor. At present there is a difference of opinion between the Mayor and the Met about how the Mayor would be consulted on the use of water cannon. If licensed the Committee would want assurances that there are appropriate safeguards in place to prevent the use of water cannon at peaceful protests and also to minimise the risk of injury.

1. Background

- 1.1. Water cannons are one of a range of tactics the police could potentially use to tackle disorder.³ They are not currently licensed for use on the UK mainland, although they have been used extensively in Northern Ireland since the late 1990s. It is the decision of the Home Secretary to license water cannons.
- 1.2. The Mayor is seeking an “interim solution” to make water cannons available to the Met by summer 2014, prior to the Home Office deciding whether to purchase new water cannons as a national asset. However, the Home Secretary has declined to make funds available to the Met to purchase the interim water cannons as a national asset. Therefore, the Mayor has written to the Home Secretary outlining his plans to make funds available to the Met for the “most economical interim solution.”⁴ This will take the form of three surplus German water cannons, which will cost in the region of £200,000 to £300,000 to meet the standards for use in the UK. Due to the age of the water cannons (23 years old), it is anticipated that they would have an operational life-span of two to three years.⁵
- 1.3. The Mayor launched a six-week engagement period in mid-January to outline the case for purchasing water cannons as an interim measure. After the consultation, the Home Secretary will determine whether or not to authorise the use of water cannons in England and Wales.
- 1.4. The national briefing outlining the case for water cannons, prepared by the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO), states that water cannons are needed to fill an operational gap in public order tactics. After dogs, baton rounds and shields, the police could escalate to baton rounds. They have said that water cannons are arguably less dangerous than some of these other public order tactics.⁶
- 1.5. The Met has said that water cannons would be “rarely seen and rarely used.”⁷ The consultation material made available by MOPAC gives a handful of examples where police believe water cannons would have been an appropriate tactic.

How the Committee conducted the investigation

- 1.6. The Committee launched its investigation on 29 January with a meeting with the Mayor to discuss the business case and governance protocols for introducing water cannon in London. The Committee then used part of its regular monthly question and answer session with the Met and Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime on 30 January to examine the operational aspects of the proposal and the plans for public engagement. Finally, the Committee invited Sir Hugh Orde, President of ACPO, and Sara Ogilvie, a policy officer from Liberty, to a meeting on 4 February to discuss the wider implications of introducing water cannon in London.

- 1.7. The Committee has used the findings from these meeting, as well as the consultation material made available by MOPAC, to inform its response to the consultation. It also reviewed the various reports that evaluated the response to the disorder in England in 2011, where they referred to the potential use of water cannon in the future.⁸

2. Examining the case for water cannon

The Met has not set out a convincing case for why water cannon are needed as an interim arrangement for deployment in London by summer 2014.

- 2.1. The Met has not made a convincing case for why it needs water cannon ahead of any decision by the Home Secretary to purchase them as a national asset. It is unclear why there is a rush to acquire water cannon for deployment by the summer. The ACPO briefing states that there is “no specific intelligence” to suggest there is an increased likelihood of serious disorder in England and Wales. The support for water cannon is instead based on an assumption that “ongoing and potential future austerity measures are likely to lead to continued protest.”⁹
- 2.2. Assistant Commissioner Rowley confirmed to the Committee that there is no specific intelligence that there would be disorder this summer. However, he stressed that the threat of violence was no different to the intelligence picture prior to the disorder in August 2011, and that there was “the potential for a spark” to develop into a similar incident.¹⁰
- 2.3. The decision to purchase water cannon now, rather than wait until the national project concludes, appears to be driven by frustration with the speed of the national process:

“There is quite a lengthy bureaucratic process that we have been going through with the Home Office in terms of their willingness to license them, which is perfectly proper and understandable... Here we are approaching a summer three years on from 2011 and ideally we would like it by then if that is achievable... We simply want it as soon as is sensible.”¹¹

- 2.4. The Met is relying on the briefing prepared by the ACPO that sets out the case for water cannon as a national asset. This national position does not adequately explain why water cannon are needed to police London’s streets. The Met, therefore, has not provided a case for why London must press ahead of the rest of the country: there is, for example, no specific intelligence about an increased risk of disorder in London.

- 2.5. Furthermore, the Met has not made a convincing case that water cannon are an appropriate tactic for London. It has not yet convinced us that water cannon's tactical limitations have been adequately addressed. As discussed with Sir Hugh Orde, water cannon have limitations that could be exacerbated in London:

*"They are a complicated bit of equipment. They are big. They weigh tons. They do not move quickly and in fact, when they do move, they take a lot of stopping, rather like a fire engine. They weigh a lot, so it is not something that can whizz around any city. They would not whizz around London."*¹²

The examples of disorder that the Met has chosen to demonstrate the potential for water cannon appear contradictory. The Met has not been able to explain how water cannon would have been deployed in these incidents.

- 2.6. The Met has not been clear about what "rarely seen and rarely used" means. The ACPO briefing has identified three incidents where water cannon could have been used previously in London: the Countryside Alliance march in 2004; the Gaza demonstrations outside the Israeli Embassy in 2008/9; and the student protests at the Millbank building in 2010. At MOPAC's public engagement event on 17 February 2014, the Met said it had identified one or two instances a year when water cannon may have been a suitable tactic, significantly more than the three examples in ACPO's briefing.
- 2.7. We are concerned that some of the examples that the Met has given conflict with its assurances about how water cannon would be used. At the public engagement event, the Met introduced other examples of events when they felt that the scale of disorder was such that water cannon may have been a justified tactic: the carnival against capitalism in 1999; in Tottenham during the disorder of August 2011; and to tackle disorder between fans at a Millwall v Birmingham football match.¹³ The Committee was previously told:
- That water cannon would not be used in peaceful protest, even to target pockets of criminality. Assistant Commissioner Rowley told us: *"We would never use it against peaceful protest. You are absolutely right that there are peaceful protests when you get small numbers of*

individuals who seek to cause disorder. We use other tactics to deal with them and we will continue to do so.”¹⁴

- That water cannon would not have been suitable for use in the disorder in Tottenham in 2011. The Mayor said to the Committee: *“Suppose we were to re-run Tottenham on a Saturday night. We would not be talking about water cannon. We would be talking about more assertive policing. Let us be absolutely clear about that... the answer to that feeling [of helplessness] is not just to equip the police with greater weaponry or greater firepower in the form of water cannon.”¹⁵*
- That water cannon would not be used routinely to police football matches. At one of our meetings, Assistant Commissioner Rowley said it would “definitely not”¹⁶ be used at a football demonstration to keep two groups apart, even if there was intelligence that there might be trouble between groups of football supporters.¹⁷

2.8. Members of the public attending MOPAC’s engagement event also questioned how water cannon would have been used. In many instances, they argued the examples concerned peaceful protest hijacked by a minority. This would have made deployment of water cannon difficult given the “pre-authorisation” process the Met has said it needs to prepare water cannon for use.¹⁸

2.9. Crucially there is also a difference of opinion between the Mayor and the Met as to when water cannon would be a suitable policing tactic. When asked about the three incidents that ACPO has identified when water cannon could have been used previously in London, the Mayor said that he would not have supported the use of water cannon:

“I was the Mayor during at least a couple of those events. Would I have wanted to see water cannon used against a student protest? Absolutely not... it would have been counter-productive.”¹⁹

Much of the debate has considered the disorder in England in 2011 but analysis has shown that water cannon would have been of very limited – if any – use in preventing or tackling those events.

- 2.10. Much of the media debate about the need for water cannon has focused on the disorder in England in 2011. However, reports reviewing police tactics stressed the importance of community engagement, accurate intelligence, and police officer deployment over and above the use of force.²⁰ Overall, the assessments found that water cannon would not have been an effective policing tool for quelling widespread disorder.²¹ The ACPO briefing states that water cannon would have had “limited effect” on this type of disorder,²² while the Met’s own review concluded that water cannon “is unlikely to have been an appropriate and practical option owing to the speed and agility of the disorder.”²³
- 2.11. However, the Met has said more recently that water cannon could have played a specific role during the disorder in 2011. As well as suggesting at MOPAC’s public engagement event that water cannon could have been used in Tottenham, the Met told the Committee that water cannon could have been deployed to protect the House of Reeves building in Croydon. The building was attacked by arsonists, and emergency crews attempting to access the building faced serious threats.²⁴ We were surprised that the option of water cannon as a possible tactic during the disorder was only raised on the eve of our public meeting with the Mayor on 29 January 2014, given that this approach was not referred to in any of the evaluations of the disorder.
- 2.12. There is some uncertainty about how quickly water cannon could have been deployed during this incident. Speaking to LBC radio, the Mayor said he thought it was “highly unlikely” that water cannon could have been deployed to Croydon. Sir Hugh Orde also spoke to us about his experience of using water cannon in Northern Ireland, and when asked whether water cannon could have been deployed in Croydon, he said:

“If you had a number of demonstrations going on in a city, you would have to work out the most likely place was going to be where that sort of tactic may be the most proportionate and the most effective... It is a limited resource. If you have multiple demands, you have to make a judgement. What you cannot do, or what is difficult to do quickly is to redeploy something as complicated as a water cannon. It is just too big.”²⁵

- 2.13. He also told the Committee that water cannon could “buy you space”, but had a number of limitations. He said effective use of water cannon was dependent on a good intelligence base, and deploying them post-event was “a waste of time.”²⁶

The decision to purchase water cannon is a significant departure for British policing but the consultation has been limited. The purchase of water cannon is not just a matter for London and the rest of the country needs an opportunity to debate this issue before a final decision is made.

- 2.14. This Committee previously scrutinised how the Met makes decisions to roll out less-lethal weapons for use on London’s streets.²⁷ We set out that MOPAC should be an advocate for the public interest, and act as a visible ‘critical friend’ when the police request expanded availability of weapons. MOPAC do not appear to have carried out any informed challenge of the Met’s proposal before the Mayor said he was minded to support it.²⁸
- 2.15. We also argued that the public must be able to scrutinise the Met’s rationale for new weapons before decisions are taken. An effective engagement process could “allow for broad consensus to be built among local communities and other stakeholders.”²⁹ We do not believe that MOPAC’s arrangements for limited consultation fulfil our recommendation to establish a “programme of public engagement” before such decisions are taken. A six-week engagement process and one public meeting³⁰ are arguably too modest to allow the public to influence the decision-making process. There are also legitimate concerns that the public consultation will be a ‘tick box’ exercise given the Mayor has already said that he is minded to support the Met’s application. The Mayor should clarify what weight he is giving to the public response.
- 2.16. The Committee has raised concerns about the opinion polls that the Met has relied on to demonstrate public support for water cannon. Each of the polls quoted was carried out in the aftermath of significant public disorder,³¹ when support for water cannon is likely to have been highest. It is, therefore, positive that MOPAC has listened to our concerns and will commission a new survey of 3,000 Londoners.³² This survey must be designed carefully to ask balanced questions, and should not focus too heavily on the disorder of 2011, when water cannon were likely to have had limited effect. We know that public opinion on this issue is mixed. Many polls do show public support for water cannon, but polling carried

out by the Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) after the disorder in 2011 found an almost equal split between those who believed that the police did not use enough force (49 per cent) and those who believed they got it "about right" (43 per cent).³³

2.17. MOPAC's consultation is focused understandably on stakeholders in London but it is not clear how the rest of the UK will be consulted on this proposal. The decision to purchase water cannon as an interim solution is not a matter affecting only London. If the Home Secretary agrees to license the interim solution in the capital, the Met's water cannon would "be available for deployment within the UK, as a national asset."³⁴

2.18. In its briefing on acquiring a national asset, ACPO sets out that "each force should consider how they will communicate and engage with internal and external stakeholders and local communities."³⁵ However, this is in reference to ACPO's national project to obtain new water cannon as a long-term asset, rather than the Met's proposal for an interim solution.

2.19. The elected Police and Crime Commissioners of five of the UK's largest police forces have already said that they do not see a need for water cannon.³⁶ However, if water cannon are licensed and purchased by the Met, any future deployment in London or the rest of the UK would be an operational decision and a matter solely for local police forces. The Police and Crime Commissioners could not prevent their deployment should the police decide they are necessary.

2.20. The Committee is concerned that the Mayor is able to take this decision, which affects the rest of the country, without a national debate. This contradicts the call by some Police and Crime Commissioners:

"Before we moved anywhere close to using them on our streets, there would need to be a full and proper public debate about when they would be used, how they would be used and why they would be used."³⁷

2.21. Furthermore, the Police and Crime Commissioner for the West Midlands has indicated he would be unwilling to provide funding for water cannon. While the Mayor may be willing to meet the cost of the interim water cannon – at up to £300,000 – it is less clear whether he would, or should, provide funding for a longer-term solution, which may cost up to £3 million.³⁸ He has already stated that the reason for purchasing second-hand water cannon at this stage is because London cannot afford to

invest in new equipment.³⁹ This may leave a funding gap if other forces are unwilling to meet the cost for a tool they do not want.

There is a difference of opinion between the Mayor and the Met as to how the Mayor would be consulted on the use of water cannon.

- 2.22. Once licensed by the Home Secretary, the deployment of water cannon would be an operational decision for senior Met officers. Assistant Commissioner Rowley said that the Met would not need to consult the Mayor:

“The national rules for the deployment of these devices are very clear. Once they have been acquired the deployments are left with local policing bodies. They have not provided any consultation with the Home Secretary or anything else. It is a courtesy and common sense that one should be informing them, but there is no wider consultation.”⁴⁰

- 2.23. The Mayor appears to take a different view about his role. He said that it is “only reasonable” that he should be consulted “not just on the circumstances on which this could be used but on whether it should be used in any particular circumstance.”⁴¹
- 2.24. The Met has said that the decision to make water cannon available needs to be “pre-authorised” in advance of its deployment, given the logistics of making water cannon available for use.⁴² In the lead up to a significant public order operation, the Mayor is likely to be asked whether he feels water cannon would be suitable for deployment at that operation. There may be an imbalance in public perception of the Mayor’s influence over that decision and his actual role, given it is an operational decision by the Met.
- 2.25. The Committee agrees that operational decisions should be made without political interference. However, it is the responsibility of politicians to “make the decisions about what the rules are, what we can use, and how we can do things.”⁴³ The Mayor’s primary role is to decide whether to provide funding to the Met. Once water cannon are available the Mayor effectively has no say on whether they should be deployed.
- 2.26. If licensed, the Committee is concerned that there could be tension in the future should the Mayor not agree with the Met’s decision to use water

cannon. The Committee, therefore, welcomes the Met's stated willingness to develop a London-specific protocol about decision-making which should clarify the Mayor's role. This would go above and beyond the College of Policing guidance.

The Met and Mayor have argued that water cannon would be “rarely seen and rarely used”. If licensed the Committee would want assurances about the safeguards that will be put in place.

2.27. The Mayor and Met have stressed that, if licensed, water cannon would be “rarely seen and rarely used”. The Met has said that it would only be used to tackle the most serious disorder and would “never be used against peaceful protest.”⁴⁴ Assistant Commissioner Rowley also assured the Committee that water cannon would not be used as a “show of strength.”⁴⁵

2.28. The Committee note ACPO's finding that “the mere presence of water cannon would constitute a use of force.”⁴⁶ At MOPAC's public engagement meeting, we heard concerns that the use of water cannon could lead to public order situations escalating. There are also concerns about its impact on peaceful protestors, and the risk of injury to those partaking in lawful protest. This was one of the biggest concerns expressed at MOPAC's public engagement meeting. Although Sir Hugh Orde said water cannon must be used proportionately, Liberty has argued that, given its indiscriminate nature, this is not possible, as it poses a risk to bystanders and peaceful protesters.⁴⁷ This could undermine people's right to protest:

“The deterrent effect on those genuine peaceful protesters would actually be quite severe... The thought of things like kettling or getting caught up in violence does put people off. If you have a disability or even if you just do not want to get involved in it, it is a real deterrent. It probably would not act as a deterrent to the proper bad, dangerous people but it would act as a deterrent to the people who genuinely want to exercise their right to protest.”⁴⁸

2.29. The Committee, therefore, stresses that, if licensed, water cannon must not be deployed to manage peaceful protests. We are concerned that the ACPO briefing refers to its potential as an effective deterrent, which could indicate that it may be deployed to manage more than the “highly violent

incidents of disorder” to which the Met refers.⁴⁹ If licensed, the London-specific protocol must include a specific assurance that water cannon will not be deployed at peaceful protests.

- 2.30. We have heard that the Met will operate water cannon within a number of frameworks, including guidance from the College of Policing and Science Advisory Committee on the Medical Implications of Less-Lethal Weapons (SACMILL). However, international experience shows us that safeguards do not always prevent misuse. At MOPAC’s public engagement meeting we heard from Dietrich Wagner, who was blinded by water cannon during an environmental protest in Stuttgart. This happened despite rules governing their use in Germany, including that water cannon should not be aimed at the face.
- 2.31. MOPAC has also now clarified the role of its Ethics Panel. The Committee notes that, should water cannon be licensed, the Panel will now be asked to advise the police on the use of water cannon *before* they are operational.

3. Conclusion

- 3.1. There is no convincing argument for the Mayor's decision to fund water cannon for the Met for deployment by the summer. The Met is pressing ahead for an "interim solution" without clear justification for its urgency. In doing so, it is preventing and avoiding a full and proper national public debate about water cannon.

Appendix A - Evaluations of water cannon

A number of reviews analysed the widespread disorder in August 2011. Below is a summary of conclusions from those reports that refer to the feasibility and appropriateness of introducing water cannon as a tactic for tackling disorder.

Home Affairs Select Committee

Policing Large Scale Disorder: Lessons from the disturbances of August 2011

Published 19 December 2011

The report states that it would have been “inappropriate as well as dangerous” to have employed water cannon during the disorder in August 2011. It adds that “such use could have escalated and inflamed the situation further”, and that what ultimately worked in quelling the disorder was the deployment of more officers on the streets.

HMIC

The rules of engagement: A review of the August 2011 disorders

Published 20 December 2011

The report states that water cannon could have been used during the disorder once the rioters started to put up barricades and throw missiles. It says water cannon are an effective means of dispersal and incur fewer injuries to the public in static and slow-moving situations, and provide a good tactical option to protect vulnerable areas and premises. However, the report acknowledges that they are of limited value in a fast-moving environment.

Metropolitan Police Service

4 Days in August: Strategic Review into the Disorder of August 2011

Published 14 March 2012

The report states that if water cannon had been available it would have been considered as a tactical option, but that it was “unlikely to have been an appropriate and practical option owing to the speed and agility of the disorder.”

National Water Cannon Project – ACPO briefing

National Water Cannon Asset (8 January 2014)

The briefing supports the introduction of water cannon as a national asset but states that water cannon “has limited effect on fast, agile disorder.”

Appendix B - Endnotes

-
- ¹ [Letter from the Mayor to the Home Secretary](#), 6 January 2014
- ² Police and Crime Committee, 29 January 2014
- ³ The College of Policing has set the criteria for using water cannon:
- When conventional methods of policing have been tried and failed or - because of the circumstances - are unlikely to succeed if tired.
 - In situations of serious public disorder where there is the potential for loss of life, serious injury or widespread destruction and whether such action is likely to reduce that risk.
 - Must only be used by trained officers.
- Taken from College of Policing - tactical options: water cannon
- ⁴ Letter from the Mayor to the Home Secretary, 6 January 2014
- ⁵ Letter from Assistant Commissioner Rowley to the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime, 17 September 2014
- ⁶ Assistant Commissioner Rowley, Police and Crime Committee, 30 January 2014
- ⁷ Letter from the Mayor to the Home Secretary, 6 January 2014
- ⁸ A summary of the conclusions from each report is attached in the additional information.
- ⁹ ACPO briefing on national water cannon asset (January 2014)
- ¹⁰ Assistant Commissioner Rowley, Police and Crime Committee, 29 January 2014
- ¹¹ Assistant Commissioner Rowley, Police and Crime Committee, 29 January 2014
- ¹² Police and Crime Committee, 4 February 2014
- ¹³ The Met showed videos of the carnival against capitalism and during the riots in Tottenham at MOPAC's public engagement event on 17 February 2014. Officers referred to the disorder between fans at a Millwall v Birmingham football match at a stakeholder engagement event on 17 February, as referred to in the note of stakeholder meeting 17 February 2014, submitted by Victoria Borwick AM.
- ¹⁴ Assistant Commissioner Rowley, Police and Crime Committee, 29 January 2014
- ¹⁵ Mayor Boris Johnson, Police and Crime Committee, 29 January 2014
- ¹⁶ Assistant Commissioner Rowley, Police and Crime Committee, 29 January 2014
- ¹⁶ Assistant Commissioner Rowley, Police and Crime Committee, 30 January 2014
- ¹⁷ The following exchange took place at the Police and Crime Committee on 29 January 2014:
- Len Duvall AM:** When you say it is not likely to be deployed, one of the tactics is to show that you mean business, if I can put it that way, and actually show that it is available. In that sense, at a football demonstration, your analogy, keeping two parts apart - again, we have some lively matches sometimes in London, sometimes unfairly some of them are tagged - you are going to have it present.
- Mark Rowley (Assistant Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service):** No, definitely not.
- Len Duvall AM:** Never? Definitely not? That is cast-iron? When we come through over the course of the meetings in terms of the consultation with Londoners, we will come away knowing that you will definitely not be routinely deploying on high-

intelligence matches where there might well be trouble between groups of football supporters?

Mark Rowley (Assistant Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Absolutely.

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): You will not be seeing them.

- 18 Note of stakeholder meeting 17 February 2014, submitted by Victoria Borwick AM
19 Police and Crime Committee, 29 January 2014
20 HMIC, for example, concluded that “rapidly increasing the number of officers on the streets remains the best option for deterring and dampening disorder with the least use of force.” [The rules of engagement: A review of the August 2011 disorders](#), HMIC, 2011
21 A summary of the conclusions from a number of reports made after the riots is included in the additional information.
22 ACPO briefing on national water cannon asset (January 2014)
23 [4 Days in August: Strategic Review into the Disorder of August 2011](#), Metropolitan Police Service (March 2012)
24 Assistant Commissioner Rowley, Police and Crime Committee, 29 January 2014
25 Sir Hugh Orde, Police and Crime Committee, 4 February 2014
26 Sir Hugh Orde, Police and Crime Committee, 4 February 2014
27 ‘Arming the Met: the deployment of less-lethal weapons in London’, London Assembly Police and Crime Committee, October 2013
28 Letter from the Mayor to the Home Secretary, 6 January 2014
29 ‘Arming the Met: the deployment of less-lethal weapons in London’, London Assembly Police and Crime Committee, October 2013
30 Letter from Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime to the Chair of the Committee, 7 January 2014
31 The Met quotes a YouGov poll carried out in 2010 in the aftermath of the student protests; a poll carried out by HMIC as part of its review of the 2011 disorder; and a YouGov poll carried out in 2012 which asked questions about the 2011 riots.
32 Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime Stephen Greenhalgh, MOPAC water cannon public engagement event 17 February 2014
33 HMIC report: Adapting to Protest - Nurturing the British Model of Policing
34 Letter from Assistant Commissioner Rowley to Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime, 17 September 2013
35 ACPO briefing on national water cannon asset (January 2014)
36 Five of six largest police forces do not want water cannon, The Guardian (4 February 2014)
37 Tony Lloyd, Police and Crime Commissioner for Greater Manchester, quoted in Five of six largest police forces do not want water cannon, The Guardian (4 February 2014)
38 The ACPO briefing says that new water cannon cost between £600,000 and £1million. A future of purchase of three water cannon would therefore cost up to £3million.
39 Mayor interviewed on LBC radio, 4 February 2014
40 Police and Crime Committee, 29 January 2014
41 Police and Crime Committee, 29 January 2014

-
- ⁴² Note of stakeholder meeting 17 February 2014, submitted by Victoria Borwick AM
- ⁴³ Police and Crime Committee, 4 February 2014
- ⁴⁴ Police and Crime Committee meeting, 29 January 2014
- ⁴⁵ Assistant Commissioner Rowley, Police and Crime Committee, 29 January 2014
- ⁴⁶ ACPO briefing on national water cannon asset (January 2014)
- ⁴⁷ Police and Crime Committee, 4 February 2014
- ⁴⁸ Sara Ogilvie, Liberty, Police and Crime Committee, 4 February 2014
- ⁴⁹ Assistant Commissioner Rowley, Police and Crime Committee, 29 January 2014

Orders and translations

How to order

For further information on this report or to order a copy, please contact Matt Bailey, Assistant Scrutiny Manager, on 020 7983 4014 or email: matt.bailey@london.gov.uk

See it for free on our website

You can also view a copy of the report on the GLA website:
<http://www.london.gov.uk/assembly/reports>

Large print, braille or translations

If you, or someone you know, needs a copy of this report in large print or braille, or a copy of the summary and main findings in another language, then please call us on: 020 7983 4100 or email: assembly.translations@london.gov.uk.

Chinese

如您需要这份文件的简介的翻译本，
请电话联系或按上面所提供的邮寄地址或
Email 与我们联系。

Vietnamese

Nếu ông (bà) muốn nội dung văn bản này được dịch sang tiếng Việt, xin vui lòng liên hệ với chúng tôi bằng điện thoại, thư hoặc thư điện tử theo địa chỉ ở trên.

Greek

Εάν επιθυμείτε περίληψη αυτού του κειμένου στην γλώσσα σας, παρακαλώ καλέστε τον αριθμό ή επικοινωνήστε μαζί μας στην ανωτέρω ταχυδρομική ή την ηλεκτρονική διεύθυνση.

Turkish

Bu belgenin kendi dilinize çevrilmiş bir özetini okumak isterseniz, lütfen yukarıdaki telefon numarasını arayın, veya posta ya da e-posta adresi aracılığıyla bizimle temasa geçin.

Punjabi

ਜੇ ਤੁਸੀਂ ਇਸ ਦਸਤਾਵੇਜ਼ ਦਾ ਸੰਖੇਪ ਆਪਣੀ ਭਾਸ਼ਾ ਵਿਚ ਲੈਣਾ ਚਾਹੋ, ਤਾਂ ਕਿਰਪਾ ਕਰਕੇ ਇਸ ਨੰਬਰ 'ਤੇ ਫ਼ੋਨ ਕਰੋ ਜਾਂ ਉਪਰ ਦਿੱਤੇ ਡਾਕ ਜਾਂ ਈਮੇਲ ਪਤੇ 'ਤੇ ਸਾਨੂੰ ਸੰਪਰਕ ਕਰੋ।

Hindi

यदि आपको इस दस्तावेज का सारांश अपनी भाषा में चाहिए तो उपर दिये हुए नंबर पर फोन करें या उपर दिये गये डाक पते या ई मेल पते पर हम से संपर्क करें।

Bengali

আপনি যদি এই দলিলের একটা সারাংশ নিজের ভাষায় পেতে চান, তাহলে দয়া করে ফো করবেন অথবা উল্লেখিত ডাক ঠিকানায় বা ই-মেইল ঠিকানায় আমাদের সাথে যোগাযোগ করবেন।

Urdu

اگر آپ کو اس دستاویز کا خلاصہ اپنی زبان میں درکار ہو تو، براہ کرم نمبر پر فون کریں یا مذکورہ بالا ڈاک کے پتے یا ای میل پتے پر ہم سے رابطہ کریں۔

Arabic

الحصول على ملخص لهذا المستند بلغة،
فارجاء الاتصال برقم الهاتف أو الاتصال على
العنوان البريدي العادي أو عنوان البريدي
الإلكتروني أعلاه.

Gujarati

જો તમારે આ દસ્તાવેજનો સાર તમારી ભાષામાં જોઈતો હોય તો ઉપર આપેલ નંબર પર ફોન કરો અથવા ઉપર આપેલ ટપાલ અથવા ઇ-મેઇલ સરનામા પર અમારો સંપર્ક કરો.

Greater London Authority

City Hall
The Queen's Walk
More London
London SE1 2AA

Enquiries 020 7983 4100
Minicom 020 7983 4458
ISBN 978 1 84781 163 9

www.london.gov.uk

This publication is printed on recycled paper