



Norfolk Police and Crime Panel
Minutes of the Meeting Held on Friday 4 April 2014 at 10.00 a.m
County Hall, Norwich

Main Panel Members Present:

Alec Byrne (Chairman)	Norfolk County Council
Mr R Bearman	Norfolk County Council
Mr I Graham	Broadland District Council
Mr Brian Hannah	Norfolk County Council
Mr Paul Kendrick	Norwich City Council
Dr Christopher Kemp	South Norfolk Council
Mr Roy Reynolds	North Norfolk District Council
Mr Lee Sutton	Great Yarmouth Borough Council
Mr Alexander D Sommerville, CPM	

Officers Present

Miss Sonya Blythe	Committee Officer
Mr Greg Insull	Assistant Head of Democratic Services

Others Present

Mr Stephen Bett	Police & Crime Commissioner for Norfolk
Mr Charlie Hall	Deputy Chief Constable for Norfolk
Ms Jenny McKibben	Deputy Police & Crime Commissioner for Norfolk
Mr Mark Stokes	Police & Crime Commissioner for Norfolk's Chief Executive

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

- 1.1 Apologies were received from Ms S Brooks, Dr A Boswell, Mr W Richmond, Mr B Long and Mr R Shepherd (Mr Reynolds sunstituting).

2 Members to Declare any Interests

- 2.1 None.

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

- 3.1 The Chairman advised that there were no urgent items of business to consider.

4 Minutes of the meeting held on 13 February 2014

4.1 The minutes of the meeting held on 13 February 2014 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman..

4.2 Matters Arising

5.2.10. Mr Sommerville noted that this had been a comment, not a question.

5. Police and Crime Plan for Norfolk – Refresh.

5.1 The Chairman welcomed the Commissioner for Norfolk and his officers to the meeting.

5.2 Mr Bett set out the intention of the Police and Crime plan refresh. He advised that the original plan would largely stay the same but would be refreshed to take account of new information which had been gathered in the past year, since taking office.

Ms McKibben added that the original plan had been written shortly after the election. It had now been refined and included a more effective use of funding, a review of policing objectives and a triangulated approach to the objectives which including monitoring areas around main issues. This would give a more comprehensive picture of how performance was monitored. After an intense year of holding discussions with partners key themes had been noted and service level agreements had been drawn up. An evidence based approach had been taken and there was now clear tracking through the process from application to grant.

Mr Bett advised that £100k had been given to the Norfolk Community Foundation, to be used to fulfil funding requests. They had received over £350k of requests and had given consideration to them all. Decisions would be taken by the relevant committee during April 2014 as to where the money was apportioned. The funding would be made available to all successful applicants for the full period of the Commissioner being in post to give monetary continuity. The Norfolk Community Foundation would monitor the recipients regularly.

5.3 The following questions were addressed to Mr Bett and his Team:

5.3.1 Question from Mr Graham. How well is the Police and Crime Plan going and could you provide a progress report on whether the policing objectives and performance measures set out on agenda page 24 of the report are being achieved?

Response by Ms McKibben. Targets had been looked at frequently and close scrutiny had been carried out. Progress had been covered at every public meeting which the Commissioner had held. Performance against target figures, which had been circulated, showed a credible performance and many targets in the five year plan had been reached in three years. Sexual attack detection figures had declined; in many cases this was due to the delayed reporting of such crimes. Activity and partnership working with other agencies had also been monitored in addition to performance.

Mr Hall circulated performance against target 2014/14 statistics for the Panel and gave explanations for any targets which had not yet been met.

Mr Betts agreed to provide copies of minutes from each public meeting to Panel Members, to demonstrate how the constabulary had been held to account. In addition performance against target figures would be circulated to the Panel each time the constabulary produced them or quarterly, whichever was sooner.

- 5.3.2 Question from Mr Hannah. This week the County Council had announced that it would no longer remove graffiti which was not offensive. Could you comment on this?

Response by Mr Bett. The Commissioner did not wish to comment until he knew more specific details on the decision. However he noted that each decision to remove graffiti had always been taken on its own merit due to the high costs involved. This could be an example of where local people worked together for the good of the community.

- 5.3.3 Question from Mr Sommerville. Are you also able to provide the conviction rates for the relevant items set out in the policing objectives on page 24?

Response by Mr Betts. Positive outcomes had been included within the circulated figures where known. Some statistics contained specific conviction rates whereas others contained whether the outcome had been positive. The conviction information was held by the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) rather than the Constabulary and so the information available was what had been provided by them. The Commissioner's office was looking to work more closely with the CPS regarding both more detailed conviction information and work around court and witness services. They were aware of problems with the statistics but had been conscious to take work on in manageable pieces.

- 5.3.4 Question from Mr Kendrick. The serious sexual detection rate of 35% had not been met. What measures had the constabulary put in place to achieve this rate?

Response by Mr Hall. A number of proactive measures had already been put in place, during which time the detection rate had increased by 10%. Reported attacks in this area had increased by 30% in the last year. The detection of crimes in this category was affected by the delayed reporting of the crime which meant forensic evidence was often not available. The 30% detection rate compared well against other forces. The Commissioner supported this area of work with funding to help victims stay engaged and was in talks with other services regarding how to better meet this target.

- 5.3.5 Question from Mr Bearman. Would you be able to provide us with regular data updates, perhaps quarterly, on progress against the Plan's objectives?

Response by Mr Hall.

Performance against target figures would be circulated to the Panel which would include the direction of travel from the last quarter.

- 5.3.6 Question from Mr Sommerville. Why do you consider it necessary to review style and branding as part of the refresh of the Plan?

Response by Ms McKibben. Minimal funding would be put into this in order to

ensure that the majority of funds were invested in commissioning. Some re-branding had to be carried out in order to raise the profile of the Commissioner to the public and to move away from the branding of the old Police Authority.

- 5.3.7 Question from Dr Kemp. With reference to the staffing resource of your Office (agenda page 47) is it correct that 3 members of staff out of the 13 are dealing with media relations?

Response by Mr Stokes. A full organisational and staffing review had recently been completed. More detailed information could be provided once the review had been completed and affected staff had been informed.

- 5.3.8 Question from Mr Byrne. You say on page 56 that one of the areas for review is to expand information about the role of this Panel. Could you please indicate what information it is that you would like to expand and whether you intend to consult upon this with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Panel first?

Response by Mr Bett. The Commissioner's office would be delighted to consult with the Panel. In order for the Panel to fully understand what the office of the Commissioner was trying to achieve, and thereby scrutinise more effectively, the Panel would be invited to tour the office and meet staff.

Mr Stokes added that in the future, information would be circulated to the Panel when it became available, as opposed to being produced for the Panel meeting.

6 Information Bulletin

- 6.1 Mr Bett commented that a large amount of work had been carried out around rehabilitation, including the hiring of a coordinator. A key priority for the forthcoming year was to manage issues around employment for prisoners who had been released from prison. This could reduce re-offending rates by 70%.

- 6.2 The following questions were addressed to Mr Bett and his Team:

- 6.2.1 Question from Mr Sutton. What percentage of offenders currently re-offend?

Response by Mr Bett. An offender integration programme had been started which had seen a drop in re-offending rates,

- 6.2.2 Question from Mr Reynolds. Is this going to be monitored?

Response by Ms McKibben. An integrated offender management team was in place. This identified those likely to re-offend and looked to address underlying issues. A Board had been established to manage this, which would meet for the first time in April 2014. The Board had the support of key partners. The programme would be developed to encompass all types of offences.

- 6.2.3 Question from Mr Sommerville. With regard to the Code of Conduct which you have adopted (agenda page 59) could you please explain how it will be applied and how any alleged breaches would be processed? How does it fit in with existing complaints procedures regarding the conduct of the Commissioner?

Response by Mr Stokes. It was a requirement that all Police and Crime

Commissioner offices had a code of conduct in place in order to manage complaints. The Chief Executive worked with all internal departments to ensure that all processes and code of conduct procedures were followed by the Police and Crime Commissioner's office.

- 6.2.4 Question from Mr Hannah. With regard to the new coordinator post aimed at improving support for ex-service personnel in custody, is this a new post or will the role be incorporated into an existing post? And could you comment on working with prisoners, especially in regards to bringing them back to their local area.

Response by Mr Bett. The post would be funded by military charities and not be charged to the Commissioner's office. The post holder would be based at the Commissioner's premises and work closely with other staff. In the future a second coordinator may be hired, also paid for externally. This was the first such role in the country and other Police and Crime Commissioners had made contact to discuss taking the idea forward in their counties.

- 6.2.5 Question from Mr Hannah. On agenda page 61, the Deputy PCC is quoted as saying "Norfolk must shift from a reactive crisis response to domestic abuse, to early intervention". This suggests there is currently no robust exchange of information between agencies and can you tell us what actions are being taken to address this?

Response by Mr Bett. Improved training would be made available to doctors surgeries to better identify signs of domestic and sexual abuse, with a view to stopping abuse before it actually started. Funding would be provided for this and it was hoped that every surgery in the county would take up the training.

- 6.2.6 Question from Mr Graham. Will the training include identifying child abuse?

Response by Mr Bett. Yes, work would be carried out regarding this and around preventing children growing up thinking that violence was the norm. The cost of the work would be very small compared to what it would save.

- 6.2.7 Question from Mr Byrne. Agenda page 59 refers to the transfer of staff to the employment of the Chief Constable. How is the transfer proceeding, and how many staff have transferred to date?

Response by Mr Stokes. The transfer is now complete and the Home Secretary had written to confirm that all responsibilities had been complied with. All operational policing matters were now the responsibility of the Chief Constable. The Commissioner had responsibility for staff within his office only.

- 6.2.8 Question from Mr Sommerville. Would it be possible to give an estimate of the officer time spent dealing with mental health issues? Has the mental health specialist post moved forward?

Response by Mr Betts. The mental health specialist was now in post and had been successful in assisting officers so far. It was not possible to give a precise estimate of time spent, but conversations with officers indicated that an increasing number of cases had connections to mental health issues. Work was being carried out with mental health charities to write a bid for two outreach

workers to be based in the control room.

- 6.2.9 Question from Mr Graham. Could we have an update on the proposed collaboration with Suffolk?

Response by Mr Bett. This was now in the hands of the Suffolk Police and Crime Commissioner, who was consulting with the public. He was holding a meeting on 30 April where a decision would be made. There was no animosity with Suffolk, despite this being alluded to by the press. The collaboration report had been written and signed off by the two Chief Constables, not the Commissioners. It had been expected that it would be taken forward but now that this was no longer clear Mr Bett had a backup “plan B” in place, which would be fully costed by the next Panel meeting if required.

- 6.3 It was proposed and duly seconded that the Panel would endorse and express its support the business case which had been jointly written by the Chief Constables of Norfolk and Suffolk to engage in collaborative working and a shared control room.
- 6.4 **RESOLVED** that the Panel would publish a press release to endorse and support the business case written by the Chief Constables of Norfolk and Suffolk to establish more collaborative working and a shared control room.

7 Work Programme

- 7.1 The Assistant Head of Democratic Services presented the Work Programme (Item 7).
- 7.2 Mr Bett invited the Panel to attend the Police and Crime Commissioner headquarters and the Operational and Communications Centre on 4 July, on the rise of the Panel meeting, for a tour and to meet key staff.
- 7.3 **RESOLVED** that:-
- The forward work programme, be agreed
 - The Panel would attend the Police and Crime Commissioner headquarters and the Operational and Communications Centre on 4 July, on the rise of the Panel meeting.

8 Exclusion of the Public

The Panel was advised that the Police and Crime Commissioner wished to speak to the Panel on an issue that would involve the disclosure of exempt information, as defined in paragraph 2 of schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 – information relating to individual members of staff.

It was proposed and duly seconded that the public be excluded while the issue was discussed. The Panel confirmed the exclusion on the grounds that the public interest in maintaining the information outweighed the public interest disclosing the information.

- 9 **RESOLVED** that the public be excluded whilst the information was discussed.

The meeting closed at 12:05pm

CHAIRMAN



If you need this document in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact Democratic Services on 0344 800 8020 or 0344 800 8011 (textphone) and we will do our best to help.

