



Norfolk Police and Crime Panel

Minutes of the Meeting held on Monday 30 October 2023 at 11am at County Hall, Norwich

Panel Members Present:

Air Commodore Kevin Pellatt (Chairman)	Co-opted Independent Member
Cllr Brian Long (Vice-Chair)	Norfolk County Council
Cllr Sue Catchpole	Broadland District Council
Cllr Kieran Murphy	South Norfolk Council
Cllr Alexandra Ware	King's Lynn and West Norfolk Council
Cllr John Toye	North Norfolk District Council
Cllr Alison Webb	Breckland District Council
Cllr Stuart Dark	Norfolk County Council
Cllr Cate Oliver	Norwich City Council
Mr Peter Hill	Co-opted Independent Member

Officers Present:

Giles Orpen-Smellie	Police and Crime Commissioner for Norfolk (PCC)
Nicola Ledain	Committee Officer, NCC
Jill Penn	Chief Finance Officer, OPCCN
Jo Martin	Scrutiny Support Manager, NCC
Mark Stokes	Chief Executive, OPCCN
Gavin Thompson	Director of Policy and Commissioning, OPCCN
James Stone	Head of Performance and Scrutiny, OPCCN
Simon Atherton	Independent Custody Visitor (ICV) Scheme Administrator

1. To receive apologies and details of any substitute members attending

- 1.1 Apologies were received from Cllr Jade Martin and her substitute Cllr Trevor Wainwright, Cllr Graham Carpenter, Cllr Tristan Ashby (substituted by Cllr Alison Webb) and Cllr Beth Jones (substituted by Cllr Cate Oliver).
- 1.2 It was also noted that Chief Constable Paul Sanford had sent his apologies.

2. Minutes

- 2.1 The minutes of the meeting held on 27 April 2023 were agreed as an accurate record and signed by the Chairman.

3. Members to Declare any Interests

3.1 There were no interests declared.

4. To receive any items of business which the Chairman decides should be considered as a matter of urgency

4.1 There was no urgent business was discussed.

5. Public Questions

5.1 No public questions were received.

6. Police and Crime Commissioner for Norfolk's Draft Annual Report 2022-23

6.1 The Panel received the PCC's draft annual report for 2022-23 which presented the progress made during the last financial year in meeting the Police and Crime Plan. The report also provided performance metrics for each of the priorities and an overview of the main areas of activity.

6.2 The Chairman thanked the PCC for the information provided and asked the PCC to introduce the report.

6.2.1 In introducing the report, the PCC highlighted that the report covered year 2 of the PCC's three-year term and was the first annual report since the introduction of a quarterly reporting cycle. The PCC reported that policing had had a difficult year with various negative press stories, but despite this Norfolk was doing well, with Police Officer numbers rising, crime levels decreasing and public confidence had remained at a constant level. The OPCCN had launched the Norfolk Integrated Domestic Abuse Service (NIDAS) and had also secured various streams of funding for commissioned services. Additional officers required by the uplift target had been achieved on time and had exceeded the nationally required number of 224. The PCC reported that crime statistics were generally down and where they were not, good work was being done to reduce them. In referring to table 5, page 111 of the agenda, the PCC noted that public confidence had remained at a high level with 85% believing that Norfolk Constabulary were doing a good job, and 79% of respondents had confidence in the policing of their local areas. The Crime Survey of England and Wales which was published on 19 October 2023 had placed Norfolk Constabulary top for the percentage of public who rated their Constabulary good or excellent when asked how good the Police were in their local area. Norfolk continued to be one of the safest counties to live and the PCC offered his congratulations to those who worked or volunteered in the police or crime arenas.

6.3 The Chairman thanked the PCC for his introduction. During the discussion, the following points were raised:

6.3.1 With reference to the term 'other income' on page 58 and page 59 of the agenda, the PCC explained that the core income came from a Home Office grant and the precept. There was additional non-core funding of £28 million in the current financial year which was specific funding such as additional funding to support the

police uplift programme. This was non-negotiable funding and would be categorised as 'other income'. It would also include fees and charges such as for football matches which were also set nationally.

- 6.3.2 The PCC explained that the term 'secondary abandonment' referred to those 101 calls that the control room received from other blue light services which then had to be put on hold due to higher demands or priorities which were then received.
- 6.3.3 On page 91 of the agenda the referrals into the Norfolk Community Law Service using the Ministry of Justice Domestic Abuse Sexual Violence Ringfenced Fund were higher than the actual support levels carried out. The Director of Policy and Commissioning explained that the support levels were lower predominantly due to the assessment process of the individual after being initially referred.
- 6.3.4 The PCC highlighted that the answering of 101 calls was a problematic area. Call handlers answered 101 calls when they were not answering 999 calls. There was a priority service in place to deal with 101 calls but there was a greater call abandonment rate. The PCC reported that he wished to introduce an Artificial Intelligence service to answer 50 101 calls simultaneously and route them accordingly. The PCC recognised that the 101 issues could be a reputational risk when callers were moved on if other priorities.
- 6.3.5 The Panel referred to table 9 on page 113 and asked if there were any 999 calls that were not answered. The PCC explained that Norfolk Constabulary had the fastest call answering time in England and Wales. The target time to answer a 999 call was approximately 8 seconds and there was a very low abandonment rate. On rare occasions a call could be answered just outside of the target time due to the high number of calls. The PCC confirmed that all calls that had stayed connected to the Constabulary would have been answered as they would have been recognised as an emergency.
- 6.3.6 The Panel referred to page 55 and page 56 of the agenda and the detail regarding road safety. They noted that over the last 20 years the number of deaths on the Norfolk roads had decreased. The PCC was asked if he was comfortable that the Constabulary were addressing all four of the 'Fatal Four' and were not concentrating too much on one of those. Road safety was high on the PCC's priority list and he reported that the Constabulary were carrying out as much road safety as possible against other competing priorities and the resources available. However, he acknowledged that people were still losing their lives on the roads, including 39 in the last year which was tragic for all concerned. The PCC admitted that he would want to have more resources in the hope that it would reduce the casualty total.
- 6.3.7 The Panel noted that the public perception survey figures on page 111 of the agenda stated some encouraging figures with 80% of the public reporting that the Police were doing a good job. However, it was also noted that there was a 20-26% drop in satisfaction relating to areas such as anti-social behaviour and the Police understanding of crimes in the community. In responding to the question, the PCC acknowledged that the Constabulary were dealing with crime as well as the perception of crime. Much of the public hoped that when there was an incident, the Police would come immediately and deal with the situation, however this was not always possible as each call was prioritised based on the seriousness of the incidence. If an incident such as anti-social behaviour was not

dealt with at that time, it could be followed up by a Beat Officer in the following days if they were not needed elsewhere. The PCC did highlight that anti-social behaviour was an area which would be receiving extra funding from Government for new initiatives and resources.

- 6.3.8 The Panel noted that table 11 on page 114 of the agenda indicated that there had been a 258% increase in the disruption of serious and organised crime. The Panel questioned the PCC if he was confident that was an accurate reflection of the work being carried out within the Constabulary or were there other factors. The PCC confirmed that it was a combination of a few factors. There was some very good work being done which was led by the Eastern Region Serious Organised Crime Unit (ERSOCU) of which Norfolk had representation and there was a joint Norfolk and Suffolk Serious Organised Crime Capability. There had also been a change to the crimes that were recorded following some feedback by an HMIFRS Inspection. The PCC was confident that these figures related to Norfolk alone.
- 6.3.9 With reference to page 74, point 7.3 of the agenda, the PCC explained that that the third priority focus of “promoting a co-ordinated countywide response to Violence Against Women and Girls (VAWG) to tackle high harm behaviours / criminality” was about having a public health approach to a very complex area. The Police could respond to individual incidences about violence against women and girls but it was a very complex area and needed to be a public health approach, and this was where NIDAS could assist. A lot of the violence within relationships did not get reported as a crime, as it could be reported elsewhere to other charities and agencies. This was often preferred by the victim as they would rather not re-live the situation to a Police Officer. VAWG was a deep society issue, and the PCC reminded the Panel that the Constabulary could only help with the criminal aspects.
- 6.3.10 The PCC noted that 20% of serving Police Officers had some kind of mental health issue. ‘Right Care, Right Person’ was an initiative that would enable workloads to be reasonable and allow statutory care to be picked up by those agencies where they should sit. It would hopefully generate 40 additional Officer hours per day. Police Officers had to deal with unpleasant situations and incidents, and also deal with the pressure that the public put upon them.
- 6.3.11 The Panel noted that the number of active County Lines had reduced by 59% since 2019, as reference on page 78. The PCC reported that as a result of Norfolk Constabulary identifying the County Line business model in recent years and working with the Home Office and other Constabularies, Norfolk had and were sustaining 100% conviction rate and 100% guilty plea rate. If a County Line were to be disbanded, it would be filled by another supplier which could then add to the gangs and knife crime problem which currently was not an issue in Norfolk.
- 6.3.12 With reference to page 63 of the agenda, the PCC highlighted that he had attended Easton College, City College and would be attending Lowestoft College talking to groups of students about the role of the PCC and policing. In response to the Panel’s question regarding the opinion of young people in the County, the PCC explained that this was on his radar as he was looking at bringing in a young person over the age of 18 to attend the Independent Advisory Group (IAG). Having identified a potential candidate, they would represent the youth voice. A lot more work was being done with the youth and the Director of Policy and

Commissioning explained that the young people who currently sat on the IAG provided a critical friend role and offered a different dynamic. He agreed that that section of the report could be expanded to include details of the outcomes, including the opinions of the young people and session attendee numbers, of those visits of the PCC to the educational establishments previously mentioned. The PCC added that he would be very pleased to attend other colleges in the county,

- 6.3.13 The question-and-answer sessions in Norwich and Great Yarmouth had not been well attended with the few that did attend receiving a more informal one to one session. However a meeting specifically concerning road safety which Duncan Baker MP had organised was well attended by approximately 150 people and had been a very useful meeting. Based on this, the PCC suggested that meetings that dealt with specific issues could be held.
- 6.3.14 The review of the Safer Neighbourhood Action Panel process had not yet been considered by the PCC but it was expected that he would be briefed in due course. He was keen to promote SNAPs and for Parish Councils to nominate an attendee. He felt that it was not feasible for Police Officers to attend Parish Council meetings due to the number of parishes in Norfolk and the time could be better spent on Police matters. The PCC tried to attend at least one SNAP per month.
- 6.3.15 The Panel asked for assurance from the PCC regarding the void that could happen in the process with agencies in the implementation of 'Right Care, Right Person' The PCC explained that currently the Constabulary received 27,000 (74 per day) calls per year to their control room which related to mental health which was approximately 1 call in every 6. Currently 70% of those calls were responded to the Constabulary. With the implementation of 'Right Care, Right Person' the aspiration was to reduce that response rate to 40%. The Constabulary had a statutory duty to attend to call where there was an immediate threat to life or immediate harm, and this would undoubtedly remain the case. The calls which they wouldn't be attending were those which did not evidence an immediate threat to life or harm. 'Right Care, Right person' had initially started in Humberside in 2019. Norfolk would be one of last Constabulary nationally to implement it and this had been intentional so there had been opportunity to monitor how it worked elsewhere, learn lessons, and ensure agencies had capacity to respond to those calls which would be their responsibility. There was a worst-case risk where someone was left who should not be left and the Constabulary had a duty of care to their Officers to ensure that the system worked. It would be implemented in December 2023 or January 2024 which ensured that all the agencies had the cover in place to respond to those calls that the Police would no longer be respond too. It was inevitable that there could be initial problems, and these would be dealt with on an individual basis. The Panel would monitor how the system worked, and the PCC assured the Panel that there was not a casual attitude to this process and the aim was to ensure that there was not a gap in the cover of responding to the calls.
- 6.3.16 The Panel observed that it was possible that people from different demographics may have different perceptions of crime and asked the PCC whether it would be possible to drill down into the public perceptions data in the report to better understand that. The PCC confirmed that the data in the report consisted of headlines from the Crime Survey of England and Wales and referred to a recent

Constabulary presentation which he thought might further break down the data with additional demographic and geographic detail. If that was the case, he would make that available to the Panel. The PCC confirmed that the survey was used because it was entirely independent of Norfolk Constabulary.

6.4 At this point in the meeting, the Panel took a 5-minute break.

6.5 Following discussion, the Panel agreed that it wished to make the following recommendations to the PCC:

1) That more detail might be provided in the Annual Report, in the section on promoting a countywide response to Violence Against Women and Girls (VAWG), to provide some additional depth to how this has been done.

2) That more detail might be provided in the Annual Report about youth engagement, to demonstrate the extent to which the PCC had sought to hear the views of young people on policing and community safety in Norfolk.

6.6 The Panel agreed that the Chairman would write a letter to the PCC to confirm the outcome of the Panel's discussion, in place of a report.

7. Independent Custody Visitor (ICV) Scheme – Annual Report 2022-23

7.1 The Panel received the annual report 2022-23 which provided an overview of the scheme and outcomes from visits between 1 April 2022 and 31 March 2023.

7.2 The Chairman thanked the PCC for the report and asked him to introduce the report.

7.2.1 In introducing the report, the PCC explained that scrutiny was a core part of his role and this scheme provided him with a level of scrutiny that was on the ground. It was essential that whilst detainees were in the care of the Constabulary they were treated with care and dignity as many were possibly quite vulnerable. He also highlighted that the Norfolk ICV Scheme was acknowledged nationally as good practice and therefore the public could be reassured.

7.2.2 The ICV Scheme Administrator added that the scheme was considered to demonstrate good practice because of the good work of the volunteers. He highlighted that the scheme volunteers assisted the Constabulary through their Scrutiny Panel and issues currently being reviewed included the use of strip searches and how juveniles were treated as detainees.

7.3 During the discussion the following points were noted;

7.3.1 Recruitment and retention of the volunteers nationally post pandemic had been difficult. There was excellent retention in Norfolk and part of the ICV Administrator's role was to maintain engagement with the volunteers. This was achieved by meeting regularly, a monthly newsletter, and ensuring that the volunteers were valued as part of the wider Police community with access to certain employment benefits. It was hoped that this would lead to better retention. If volunteers chose to leave the scheme, the reasons why were closely reviewed in an aim to improve the scheme. A leaving interview and service award was also given.

- 7.3.2 With regards to page 137, the Panel identified that most visits to the Police Investigation Centre (PIC) took place Monday to Thursday 7am to 7pm, with nighttime visits much less. The ICV Administrator explained that the volunteers were those who still had very busy lives. Although the visits were varied and unexpected, those volunteers visiting King's Lynn sometimes had an 80-mile round trip and wanted to avoid traffic which meant that most visits ended up being between 10am and 1pm. It was important to be reasonable to the volunteers when asking for visit times whilst still having visits taking place 24/7. If the service asked volunteers to visit at unreasonable times of the day and night, there was the risk that the volunteers would leave.
- 7.3.3 In referring to page 140 of the agenda, the Panel asked how many volunteers would be able to take on the responsibility of a ICV to those arrested under the Terrorism Act (TACT) once the additional training had taken place. The ICV Administrator explained that those detainees would spend very little time in the regional PIC with them being swiftly moved to the national centres of London or Manchester. Norfolk had one volunteer who was trained in that area and has been part of the Eastern region rota for three years without being called upon. There was further discussion to be held in November about the viability of having TACT trained volunteers without being utilised.
- 7.3.4 The Panel thanked the work of the volunteers and questioned if there was any effort being made to recruit the younger volunteers. Although efforts were made to recruit those up to the age of 45, those were the hardest to recruit and had the highest turnover. It was important that those recruited, regardless of age had a broad range of skills who could talk to the detainees as well as question and challenge the Constabulary about things that might have been identified on the visit.
- 7.3.5 Councillors offered to help promote the scheme as much as they could. The ICV Administrator welcomed this and reported that the custody side of Policing was often the hidden side and therefore the scheme was not widely known about. He explained that the website had been updated with more details of the scheme and there were discussions with the communications officers in the OPCCN to help widen the knowledge of the scheme.
- 7.3.6 The ICV Administrator reported that he was only aware of one incident across the country that had occurred in the past. All interactions with detainees were risk assessed and discussions were held with the custody sergeant and the ICV. Vulnerable detainees were prioritised and if a detainee was unable to be seen for any reason the ICV had the power to inspect the ICV custody record to ensure that the Police had been doing their job and the detainee had been given access to the relevant services. The biggest demand of the ICV was the number of visits which could be 2-3 visits per month of up to 4 hours per visit and having to write a report. The biggest barrier to overcome was the environment of the PIC where there could be bad language, demanding situations, and unpleasant smells.
- 7.4 The Chairman reminded the Panel that a visit to the PIC would be very useful for Panel members and this was being organised. A link to the ICV website would be circulated to Panel Members to help them raise awareness about the scheme.
- 7.5 The Panel **NOTED** the report and commended both the ICV Scheme manager and

Norfolk's ICVs for the work they did to ensure a safe environment for detainees

8. PCC Complaints Monitoring Report

8.1 The Panel received the report reviewing complaints received since the last monitoring report was received on 27 April 2023.

8.2 The Panel **NOTED** the report.

9. Complaints Policy Sub Panel

9.1 The Panel received the report giving an update from the Complaints Policy Sub Panel.

9.2 The Chair of the Sub Panel highlighted the following points:

- On 31 August 2023, the Government introduced the granting of powers to Chief Constables in the determination of Officers. The Sub Panel were actively monitoring this with OPCCN to gain further insight of this challenging topic.
- Clarification was needed on the qualification requirements of the Legally Qualified Chairs and the associated panel members. This had been a particularly challenging time for PCC's and was being continually monitored.
- Statistics relating to the time taken for the review of complaints due to the complexity of the complaints and the complaints upheld percentage were shared and the Sub Panel had noted these.
- The Independent Office of Police Conduct had shared some performance data analysis and there had been improvement but there were still challenges. The Sub Panel had noted the importance of maintaining effective collaboration.
- There had been no complaints received towards the PCC.
- The OPCCN had expressed their commitment to the Sub Panel's approach and acknowledged the effective communication between them.

9.3 The Panel **NOTED** the report.

10. Information Bulletin – questions arising to the PCC

10.1 The Panel received the report summarising both the decisions taken by the Police and Crime Commissioner for Norfolk (PCC) and the range of his activity since the last Panel meeting.

10.2 The PCC reported that the Community Safety Partnership alongside other agencies in the County had moved with commendable swiftness following the Hamas attack on Israel on 7th October 2023. So far, the PCC was not aware that there had been any specific issues with antisemitism although there had been some small pro-Palestinian rallies. The Director of Policy and Commissioning added that they had been working with Norfolk Constabulary on a dashboard alert

system which captured any concerns and enabled the appropriate community groups to be brought together at that point to act accordingly.

- 10.3 The delay of the publication of the 2022/2023 public accounts was due to the lack of auditor resources, which is a national issue. There was due to be a meeting between OPCCN and the auditors the following week and the Panel would be kept updated. The Panel expressed their concern at the delay of the completed audits for the OPCCN and for those of Local Government who were experiencing similar issues.
- 10.4 The PCC reported that the Collaboration meetings between the PCC and the Suffolk PCC were now private meetings following the reconfiguration of the meetings in 2022. He reported that the meeting on 4 October 2023 was the first one of 2023 and the next meeting would be held in February 2024.
- 10.5 The Panel **NOTED** the report.

11. Work Programme

- 11.1 The Panel received the work programme for the period January 2024 to October 2024.
- 11.2 The rearranged visit to the Constabulary's Hethersett Old Hall School training facility and the combined visit to the Police Investigation Centre and Control Room would be organised.
- 11.3 The Panel **AGREED** the work programme.

Meeting ended at 1.17pm.

**Air Commodore Kevin Pellatt, Chairman,
Norfolk Police and Crime Panel**



If you need this document in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact 0344 800 8020 or Text Relay on 18001 0344 800 8020 (textphone) and we will do our best to help.