



Cumberland Lodge

exchanging views, inspiring minds

Webinar briefing

Towards Justice **Victim Perspectives on** **Past Injustices**

February 2021

Martina Y Feilzer



cumberlandlodge.ac.uk



#clTowardsJustice
@CumberlandLodge

Foreword



I am grateful to our freelance Research Associate, Professor Martina Feilzer, for preparing this short briefing document for us, ahead of our [Victim Perspectives on Past Injustices](#) webinar at 11.00am on Thursday 25 February 2021.

Our work on policing and criminal justice this year explores policing and criminal justice approaches to addressing past harms and injustices in society, in the UK. This briefing is designed to inform participants who are joining the last of three public webinars we are hosting in the lead-up to the 2021 Cumberland Lodge Police Conference, [Towards Justice: Law Enforcement & Reconciliation](#). This year's conference takes place virtually, in light of ongoing COVID-19 restrictions, in June 2021.

You can read more about our annual policing and criminal justice conference overleaf, and further details can be found on our website, along with information about how to join our webinars, at cumberlandlodge.ac.uk/whats-on. Video and audio-only recordings of the first two webinars in this Towards Justice series can be found [here](#).

Martina is producing a short briefing to accompany each of the webinars in this series. These will be incorporated into an expanded briefing to be circulated ahead of our summer conference, and later this year we will publish a summary report on all our key findings and recommendations from this work, to be launched in Westminster.

We hope you find this briefing, and the ensuing discussions, both stimulating and informative for your work and practice. Please take the opportunity to put any questions you may have to our guest panellists, during the live event, on Zoom.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Edmund Newell".

Canon Dr Edmund Newell
Chief Executive

About the author



Martina Y Feilzer is the author of this webinar briefing document. She has been commissioned to support our work on policing and criminal justice in 2021, as a freelance Research Associate. She is a Professor of Criminology and Criminal Justice at Bangor University and her research is on: public perceptions of criminal justice at local, national and European levels; the relationship between the media and public opinion of criminal justice; questions of legitimacy, trust in justice and penal policy; and comparative and historical criminal justice research.

Martina is Co-Director of WISERD, the Wales Institute of Social and Economic Research and Data at Bangor University, and Co-Director of the Welsh Centre for Crime and Social Justice. She is currently developing a research programme on the experiences of police officers going through periods of transition after regime change or past injustices.

Martina started her career as a Research Officer at the University of Oxford and joined Bangor University in 2007, as a lecturer. She has accumulated a wealth of experience in empirical research, in the field of criminal justice, and has worked on policy-relevant research in relation to youth justice, probation, parole and policing. She works with both quantitative and qualitative research methods, and prefers a mixed-methods approach to research.

Most recently, Martina has worked in collaboration with North Wales Police to develop police degree programmes under the College of Policing PEQF (Policing Education Qualifications Framework).

[@martina0074](https://twitter.com/martina0074)

Police Conference

Cumberland Lodge in Windsor Great Park has been creating a safe space for constructive dialogue on the most pressing policing and criminal justice matters, since 1981.

Guided by a steering committee of police leaders and serving officers, we run the renowned Cumberland Lodge Police Conference every summer, bringing together a multi-agency delegation of senior police officers, NGO leaders, lawyers, academics and senior civil servants, to tackle a key issue at the forefront of the policing agenda in the UK.

Our involvement in this arena goes back to the earliest days of the foundation, with meetings on policing matters having taken place here since the 1950s. Recently, we have explored topics ranging from surveillance to drug abuse and gang crime, multiculturalism, and relationships with the media.

Our guest speakers have included Government representatives, senior policymakers and All-Party Parliamentary Group chairs, prominent senior serving officers, NGO leaders, Police and Crime Commissioners, academics, MPs and Cabinet Ministers. Our Steering Committee is currently chaired by Chief Constable Olivia Pinkney QPM (National Police Chiefs Council lead for Local Communities), and her predecessor was Dame Sara Thornton DBE QPM, now the UK's Independent Anti-Slavery Commissioner.



Victim Perspectives on Past Injustices

The third [Towards Justice webinar](#) from Cumberland Lodge, on Thursday 25 February 2021 at 11.00am, focuses on the role of the victim in investigations of past harms and injustices and how the perspectives of victims should be acknowledged. This webinar takes on the form of a conversation between [Dame Vera Baird QC](#), Victims Commissioner for England and Wales, and [Assistant Commissioner Robert Beckley](#) QPM who is in overall command of ‘Operation Resolve’, the criminal investigation into the death of 96 people at Hillsborough, Sheffield, in 1989.

This briefing specifically addresses victims’ perspectives on past harms. It starts by developing an understanding of the concept of ‘victimisation’ in the context of past harms and goes on to explore different types of victimisation; the expectations of individual victims, groups of victims, and organisations speaking on behalf of victims; and the role of victims in responses to past harms.

Victims and victimisation

One key driver of today’s responses to past harms is evidence of past and ongoing suffering of those who have been affected – the victims of such harms – and an ambition to relieve some of that suffering. Some responses to past harms claim to put victims ‘centre-stage’, including truth and reconciliation commissions and other restorative justice approaches. Other types of response put the goal of preventing future harm and any victimisation that could stem from renewed conflict first, over victims’ perspectives. Responses to past harm not only reflect the specific circumstances of past harms and injustices, but also contemporary sensitivities surrounding the questions of harm and victimisation within state agencies and the wider community.

The concepts of victims and victimisation are more complex and problematic than they might first appear. For example,

more expansive definitions of victimisation include primary *and* secondary victims (i.e., both the people who are directly harmed or injured *and* those who are impacted as a result, including the families and friends of direct victims). They also consider the collateral effects of both crime *and* punishment (i.e., the suffering of the children of those who are convicted of crimes). In other words, there are both direct and indirect forms of victimisation. In instances of hate crime that are directed at members of specific communities, there is also an element of collective victimisation.¹

...there are both direct and indirect forms of victimisation. In instances of hate crime that are directed at members of specific communities, there is also an element of collective victimisation.

The [UN 1985 Declaration on Basic Principles of Justice for Victims of Crime and Abuse of Power](#) explicitly includes direct and indirect victims, as well as people who have suffered as a result of harms caused by those in power (including states and people or organisations who act on their behalf). The Declaration also refers to a wide range of harms, including physical and psychological injury, emotional suffering, economic loss, and the substantial impairment of fundamental rights.²

Nowadays, most states would claim that their systems of justice have victim concerns at their heart. However, victims were the ‘forgotten actors’ in criminal justice for much of the 19th and 20th centuries. Victims held a central role in holding offenders to account for interpersonal crimes during the 18th and early-19th centuries, which placed a significant burden on individuals, both in terms of costs and pressure from offenders. This position changed with the emergence of a professionalised police in the early-19th century. Once the power to bring charges moved to the police, victims became mere contributors and ‘means’ to the processes of justice.

This balance shifted again, during the latter parts of the 20th century, with various victims’ movements highlighting how poorly and insensitively some victims of crime were being treated by

the police and other criminal justice actors. Feminist movements that emerged in the middle of the 20th century focused on the victimisation of women as a result of domestic or sexual violence, and the lack of protection offered by the police, for example.

The 1980s saw the emergence of victimisation surveys in several countries – the British Crime Survey amongst them. During a significant increase in levels of crime and of victimisation as measured through police records and the British Crime Survey, in the 1990s, there were renewed criticisms of the marginalisation of victims within the criminal process; and a greater promotion of victim interests at national and international levels.³ The pressure of growing crime rates was felt by politicians and policymakers, and the focus on victims' suffering was exploited to advocate a more punitive approach to penal policymaking.

In the context of criminal justice, these movements for change have led to victims of past harm and injustice being afforded a special social status, as a result of being able to directly communicate their suffering (from 'sender' to 'receiver'). This status comes with an entitlement to sympathy – and potentially to compensation – but its complete and unambiguous conferral is often reserved for victims who fulfil the characteristics of the 'ideal victim', as identified by the Norwegian sociologist and criminologist Nils Christie.⁴ According to Christie, 'ideal victims' have the following key attributes:

- Weakness in relation to the offender
- Harmed whilst going about their legitimate business
- Perceived to be blameless
- No prior relationship to the offender
- Harmed by an unambiguously 'big and bad' offender
- Part of the law-abiding majority.

Anyone who falls short of these 'ideal victim' attributes, or who could be identified as blameworthy in some way, risks being dismissed and disbelieved in the early stages of the criminal justice process. This has led to failings to protect victims of child sexual abuse, for example, as highlighted most prominently in the recent Rotherham and Rochdale

child sexual exploitation scandals. In both cases, reports of sexual abuse by child victims, their parents and professionals were repeatedly ignored, and victim accounts dismissed, as the victims were regarded by the authorities as 'unreliable', 'troublesome' or being involved in criminal activity.⁵

Anyone who falls short of these 'ideal victim' attributes, or who could be identified as blameworthy in some way, risks being dismissed and disbelieved in the early stages of the criminal justice process.

More recently, in response to serious criticisms about police treatment of child victims of serious and repeated abuse – followed by the Jimmy Savile scandal, which received significant media attention, exacerbated by concerns about poor crime recording – and in an attempt to avoid 'letting down' more victims, some police services shifted towards a presumption of belief policy around the accounts of people who presented as victims. This was particularly applied in relation to claims of historic sexual abuse. Indeed, in 2014, Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Constabulary, Sir Thomas Winsor, stated that, 'the police should immediately institutionalise the presumption that the victim is to be believed'.⁶

A series of allegations of historic sexual abuse emerged in the years after the Savile scandal broke, and media and public interest in these cases was high. The presumption of believing complainant allegations had serious consequences for those who were falsely accused, however, including a number of prominent people who were investigated by the police and subjected to intrusive and extensive media attention. Following the high-profile case of [Carl Beech's false allegations](#) of sexual abuse by senior politicians, more critical police reports followed, such as the [Henriques Report](#) in 2016 and a number of damning inspections and investigations by the Independent Office for Police Conduct and Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services (HMICFRS) in

2020.⁷ In August 2020, the College of Policing issued new [guidance for Senior Investigating Officers](#) who investigate allegations of non-recent institutional child sexual abuse, which make no reference to 'believing' complainant accounts.⁸

When allegations lead to wrongful convictions in court, a miscarriage of justice occurs, creating victims of the state in the falsely accused.

At the heart of these competing arguments about how the police should treat victims of crime is the impact of policy changes on the people who are accused of criminal activity. When allegations lead to wrongful convictions in court, a miscarriage of justice occurs, creating victims of the state in the falsely accused.⁹ In 2018, the College of Policing [debated](#) the continued use of the word 'victim' in the investigative and judicial process, and whilst its general use was agreed upon, it highlighted the need to clarify the term and advocated for a clearer legal basis for its use. It also recommended removing the term 'believing' in the context of victim claimants, to one stating that 'victims can be confident they will be listened to and their crime taken seriously'.¹⁰

Victims needs and victims rights

The discussion above highlights the shift that has occurred in the way victims of past harm are treated within the UK's criminal justice system, in terms of their needs and rights. It reminds us that there are different perspectives to account for – those of individual victims, those of groups of victims, and victim movements. There are also significant differences when it comes to what victims want to happen after their victimisation has been acknowledged, and in the approaches that are taken by those in power to address the past harms.

In some cases, victims who are still experiencing harm may simply want their victimisation to stop, without much concern for what happens afterwards. Other victims want to forget

about their victimisation and seek to deny it; some seek punishment of the offenders as a form of revenge; some want to work towards forgiving those who harmed them, as part of a process of healing; and some are content to have their voices heard and set out the truths of their past, by communicating the harms they experienced in the hope of preventing future harm to others. In the context of domestic violence, for example, victim groups called for greater agency for victims, based on the assumption that victims wanted to be involved in decisions about the fate of their violent partners, but this has not been borne out by research, which revealed conflicting evidence.¹¹

This complex picture of how individuals respond to suffering and harm is further complicated when group interests need to be considered, and where whole communities see themselves as victims – as illustrated in Northern Ireland, which remains a deeply divided society, where both sides of the divide claim victimisation and past harm. As discussed in the Towards Justice webinar on 10 February 2021, on [Insights into Truth and Reconciliation](#), this complexity has hindered recent attempts to address ‘legacy issues’ from The Troubles that lasted from the late 1960s to the late 1990s.¹² It illustrates how assigning ‘victim’ status after community conflict is a contentious issue and has the potential to create further tensions rather than achieve the desired recognition of harm and community reconciliation.

...assigning ‘victim’ status after community conflict is a contentious issue and has the potential to create further tensions rather than achieve the desired recognition of harm and community reconciliation.

The process of identifying ‘victims’ and ‘perpetrators’ of past harms is generally considered to be an essential part of the process of healing and reconciliation, regardless of the approach taken, but it is not a neutral process and in most cases it is contested or influenced by a new political settlement. Assigning victim status is particularly problematic

in cases of large-scale conflict or where harms have been caused by state agents as well as community members.

Assigning victim status is particularly problematic in cases of large-scale conflict or where harms have been caused by state agents as well as community members.

As discussed above, designating people as either ‘victim’ or ‘perpetrator’ in relation to criminal justice processes, carries the risk of doing more harm than good, thanks to perceptions of the arbitrariness of a designation or of miscarriages of justice. The debate around victims’ and offenders’ rights is central to criminal justice policy but it perhaps rests on a false dichotomy; it creates mutually exclusive categories of ‘offender’ and ‘victim’ that do not necessarily reflect the realities of conflict or crime. Some of this has been driven by victim interest groups that want to push for punitive criminal justice responses, measuring their success by the degree of blame that is attributed to offenders.¹³

Secondary victimisation

The previous webinar in this series, [Insights into Truth and Reconciliation](#), set out different approaches to responding to past harms. Each of these takes victims’ perspectives into account, but to a greater or lesser extent, depending on their primary focus. For example, some examples of transitional justice focus more on the need to secure future peace than on responding to victims’ demands for formal accountability. Regardless of focus, any approach to past harms should consider the potential for ‘secondary victimisation’ resulting from the interaction between victims and others (in particular, agents of the criminal justice system, truth commissions or public inquiries etc.) once a victim has chosen to report a crime or past harm.

Negative consequences of victims’ interactions with the police and the courts are well-known, including having to relive past trauma or undergo questioning of accounts, which

can retraumatise or worsen the harm that people originally experienced. In setting up responses to past harm, clear communication with victims and victim groups about timelines, contact and possible outcomes, is important for helping to set realistic expectations. Raising hopes about certain outcomes of truth-telling, or holding up the promise of catharsis and healing, can leave victims feeling cheated if those expectations are not fully met.

In setting up responses to past harm, clear communication with victims and victim groups about timelines, contact and possible outcomes, is important for helping to set realistic expectations.

The duration and style of the formal processes of truth-finding, inquiries and criminal justice processes can cause victims to feel a loss of control over their own story, which can disempower people rather than enable them to participate fully and make their voices heard.¹⁴ The extent to which victims feel able to participate in public inquiries varies according to how the inquiries are framed, and this can lead to tensions during the early stages. As set out in the *Towards Justice: Insights into Truth and Reconciliation* [briefing](#) that accompanied the previous webinar in this series, the Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse was dogged by questions about the independence of its first chair and this disrupted the initial process and has overshadowed the work and achievements of the inquiry since.¹⁵ The question of meaningful participation for victims has also been raised in relation to the Grenfell Inquiry.

Victim groups will take it upon themselves to speak for the victims of past harm, and the examples above indicate the important role that these groups can play in highlighting concerns. They also emphasise the need for clear and transparent communication with victims and their representatives from the outset, with clearly outlined opportunities for participation.

Restorative justice has been hailed as a victim-centred approach to justice, and the South African Truth and

Reconciliation Commission (TRC) had victim reparation and rehabilitation as one of its clearly stated goals. Its aim was to:

*provide victim support to ensure that the Truth Commission process restores victims' dignity; and to formulate policy proposals and recommendations on rehabilitation and healing of survivors, their families, and communities at large. The envisaged overall function of all recommendations is to ensure non repetition, healing and healthy co-existence.*¹⁶

Restorative justice approaches recognise harms as violations of people, communities and relationships. They primarily focus on making good the harm caused to individuals and communities, and they require accountability from those who caused it. These approaches are conceived as being less formal than criminal justice proceedings and more inclusive, by seeking to involve everyone with a stake in what has happened. Restorative justice is based on a positive and, perhaps, idealistic notion of community, involving an expectation that the conflict or harm in question can be resolved, and all parties successfully reintegrated.

Restorative justice approaches can be used for all crimes – including serious violence, sexual abuse and murder – but there is an intense debate about how appropriate it is in cases of sexual assault and where there are significant differences in the social power and status of victims and offenders.¹⁷

Restorative justice approaches recognise harms as violations of people, communities and relationships. They primarily focus on making good the harm caused to individuals and communities, and they require accountability from those who caused it.

There are limitations to the restorative justice approach, and tensions with some important considerations of justice, such as proportionality, equity and consistency. Restorative justice is based on voluntary participation but where such approaches are institutionalised, the degree of genuine voluntariness of victim and offender participation has been questioned. Given

the different needs and wishes that individual victims of harm express, there is a risk that the consequences of past harms depend more on the individual victims involved than on established principles of proportionate and equitable sanction. Additionally, some restorative justice schemes have been accused of 'using' victims as vehicles to rehabilitate offenders, and questions have been raised as to whether restorative justice is principally about victims' needs or offenders'.¹⁸

In England and Wales, referral orders – a form of restorative justice - are used for most first court appearances for children and young people. Victim participation in youth offending panels is extremely low, however, and this kind of 'restorative justice' often results in relatively tokenistic outcomes, such as an order to write a letter of apology to the victims of a crime.

In the aftermath of larger-scale conflict, there is a concern that victims and their stories could potentially be used to legitimise new power arrangements. Nevertheless, in the context of community conflict such as that seen in Northern Ireland, the criminologist Anna Eriksson concludes that, '...good restorative practice has the potential of taking into account the political, social and economic factors that underlie and sustain criminal and antisocial behaviour in the transitional society'.¹⁹

Conclusion

Supporting individuals and communities to come to terms with past harms is an important process, and holding to account those who were responsible is also key to the maintenance of social order, the protection of victims, the prevention of future crime, and a state's ability to convince its citizens to trust it with their safety and security rather than taking the law into their own hands. This briefing suggests that we need to recognise the competing needs of victims of crime and the importance and implications of the designation of individuals and groups as 'victims'. Listening to victims in relation to the harm they have suffered is key to avoiding simplistic assumptions about their needs and being sensitive to how different approaches

to past harm might fulfil their expectations. It is important to try to avoid causing further harm and to recognise the different interests and perspectives involved – of the victims, of those who have caused harm, of the community they are a part of, and of the state. Sometimes, difficult decisions may need to be made about whether other aims of responses to past harm – justice and peace, for example – outweigh the interests of individual victims or groups of victims.

Join the conversation

Towards Justice: Victims' Perspectives on Past Injustices is streaming live on Thursday 25 February 2021 at 11.00am. It takes the format of a conversation between:

- [Dame Vera Baird QC](#), Victims' Commissioner, for England and Wales
- [Assistant Commissioner Robert Beckley QPM](#), Overall Command of 'Operation Resolve', the criminal investigation into the deaths of 96 people at the Hillsborough Stadium in Sheffield, England, on 15 April 1989.

Please register here in advance, to join this webinar live on Zoom as a non-video participant and submit questions to our guests:

https://us02web.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_C43xKOlcSM-XhuUV2ra4NA

Full details can be found on the Cumberland Lodge website, [here](#).

We are live-tweeting from this series [@CumberlandLodge](#), using the hashtag [#clTowardsJustice](#)

Endnotes

1. Dignan, J (2007). *Understanding Victims and Restorative Justice*. Cullompton: Willan.
2. United Nations (1985). Declaration on Basic Principles of Justice for Victims of Crime and Abuse of Power. <https://www.ohchr.org/en/professionalinterest/pages/victimsofcrimeandabuseofpower.aspx#:~:text=Victims%20should%20be%20treated%20with,harm%20that%20they%20have%20suffered> [Accessed 14 Feb 2021].
3. Goodey, J (2005). *Victims and Victimology: Research, policy and practice*. New York: Pearson.
4. Christie, N (1986). The Ideal Victim. In E Fattah (Ed). *From Crime Policy to Victim Policy*. New York: Springer.
5. Jay, A (2014). Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Exploitation in Rotherham, 1997-2013. <https://www.rotherham.gov.uk/downloads/file/279/independent-inquiry-into-child-sexual-exploitation-in-rotherham> [Accessed 15 Feb 2021].
6. HMICFRS (2014). Victims Let Down by Poor Crime Recording. <https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmicfrs/news/news-feed/victims-let-down-by-poor-crime-recording/> [Accessed 18 February 2021].
7. HMICFRS (2020). Metropolitan Police Service – An inspection of the Metropolitan’s Police Service’s Response to a Review of its Investigations into Allegations of Non-Recent Sexual Abuse by Prominent People. <https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmicfrs/news/news-feed/met-police-slow-to-learn-lessons-after-operation-midland/> [Accessed 15 February 2021].
8. Independent Office for Police Conduct (2020). Operation Kentia. <https://policeconduct.gov.uk/news/operation-kentia-learning-recommendations-drive-changes-search-warrants> [Accessed 16 February 2021].

9. College of Policing (2020). Senior Investigating Officer Advice: Investigations into allegations of non-recent institutional child sexual abuse of child sexual abuse by people with a high public profile. <https://www.college.police.uk/News/College-news/Documents/SIO%20advice%20August%202020.pdf> [Accessed 17 February 2021].
10. Hoyle, C, Speechley, N-E, and Burnett, R (2016). The Impact of Being Wrongly Accused of Abuse in Occupations of Trust: Victims Voices. https://www.law.ox.ac.uk/sites/files/oxlaw/the_impact_of_being_wrongly_accused_of_abuse_hoyle_et_al_2016_15_may.pdf [Accessed 15 February 2021].
11. College of Policing (2018). Review into the Terminology of “Victim/Complainant” and Believing Victims at Time of Reporting. <https://www.college.police.uk/News/College-news/Documents/Review%20into%20the%20Terminology%20Victim%20Complainant%20and%20Believing%20Victims%20at%20time%20of%20Reporting.pdf> [Accessed 15 February 2021].
12. Wemmers, J-A and Cousineau, M-M (2005). Victim Needs and Conjugal Violence: Do victims want decision-making power? *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*. Vol 22(4), 493-508.
13. Gray, A-M et al (2018). Northern Ireland Peace Monitoring Report, No 5. <https://www.community-relations.org.uk/sites/crc/files/media-files/NIPMR%205%20%282%29%20new%20version.pdf> [Accessed 2 February 2021].
14. McEvoy, K and McConnachie, K (2013). Victims and Transitional Justice: Voice, Agency and Blame. *Social and Legal Studies*, Vol 22, 489-513.
15. Christie, N (1977). Conflicts as Property. *British Journal of Criminology*, Vol 17(1), 1-15.
16. BBC News (2020). How does the Inquiry into Historical Child Sexual Abuse Work? 6 October 2020. <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-34965912> [Accessed 5 Feb 2021].
17. South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission (2021). The Committees of the TRC. <https://www.justice.gov.za/trc/trccom.html> [Accessed 15 February 2021].

18. See debate between Daly and Cossins:
- Daly, K (2006). Restorative Justice and Sexual Assault. *British Journal of Criminology*, Vol. 46, 334-356.
- Daly, K (2008). Setting the Record Straight and a Call for Radical Reform. *British Journal of Criminology*, Vol. 48, 557-566.
- Cossins, A (2008). Restorative Justice and Child Sex Offences. *British Journal of Criminology*, Vol. 48, 359-378.
19. Hoyle, C (2012). Victims, the Criminal Process, Restorative Justice. In M Maguire, R Morgan & R Reiner (Eds, 5th ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology* (pp. 398-425). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
20. Eriksson, A (2009). *Justice in Transition: Community restorative justice in Northern Ireland*. Milton, Oxfordshire: Willan Publishing. p.190.

Cumberland Lodge empowers people to tackle the causes and effects of social division.

Since 1947, we have been breaking down silo thinking and building interdisciplinary, cross-sector networks that make a difference. We are an incubator of fresh ideas that promotes progress towards more peaceful, open and inclusive societies.

We actively involve young people in all aspects of our work, and our educational programmes nurture their potential as future leaders and change-makers.

Our stunning facilities are available to hire for residential or non-residential conferences, meetings and special events. Every booking helps to support our charitable work.

Cumberland Lodge
The Great Park
Windsor
Berkshire SL4 2HP
cumberlandlodge.ac.uk
enquiries@cumberlandlodge.ac.uk
01784 432316

    @cumberlandlodge

Cumberland Lodge is a company limited by guarantee.
Company number 5383055
Registered charity number 1108677
© Cumberland Lodge 2021. All rights reserved