



Norfolk Police and Crime Panel
Minutes of the Meeting held on Wednesday 15th April 2015 at 10.00 a.m.
Edwards Room, County Hall, Norwich

Main Panel Members Present:

Mr Fred Agnew	Norfolk County Council
Mr Keith Driver	Norwich City Council
Mr Ian Graham	Broadland District Council
Dr Christopher Kemp (Vice-Chairman in the Chair)	South Norfolk Council
Mr William Richmond	Breckland Council
Ms Sharon Brooks	Co-opted Independent Member
Mr Alexander D Sommerville, CPM	Co-opted Independent Member

Officers Present

Mr Greg Insull	Assistant Head of Democratic Services
Mrs Jo Martin	Democratic Services and Scrutiny Support Manager

Others Present

Mr Stephen Bett	Police and Crime Commissioner for Norfolk
Mr Mark Stokes	Chief Executive, OPCCN

- 1. To receive apologies and details of any substitute members attending**
 - 1.1 Apologies were received from Mr Alec Byrne, Mr David Harrison, Mr Brian Long, Mr Richard Shepherd and Mr Trevor Wainwright.
- 2. Members to Declare any Interests**
 - 2.1 No declarations of interest were made.
- 3. To receive any items of business which the Chairman decides should be considered as a matter of urgency**
 - 3.1 None

4. Minutes of the meeting held on 3rd February and 12th March 2015

- 4.1 The minutes of the meeting held on the 3rd of February and the 12th March 2015 were confirmed by the Panel as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

5. Public questions

- 5.1 There were no public questions received.

The Chairman proposed that items 8 and 9 be taken first to allow Mr Bett and Mr Stokes to leave the meeting as their presence was not required for items 6 and 7.

The Panel **agreed** to discuss items 8 and 9 before returning to the order of business set out on the agenda.

6. Information bulletin – questions arising to the Commissioner

- 6.1 The Panel received the report that summarised for the Panel both the decisions taken by the Commissioner and the range of his activity since the last Panel Meeting.

- 6.2 The Panel members questioned the Commissioner regarding the recent press articles in the EDP and the East Anglian Daily Times in which he had talked about his view of the potential merger of the force control rooms in the future.

- 6.3 In response to questions put to the Commissioner the following points were noted:-

- Although the merging of the control rooms of Norfolk and Suffolk Constabularies was largely an operational decision; both Commissioners had to endorse the money that was allocated to this.
- It would not be possible to find the required savings unless forces collaborated more; £4.3m worth of savings per year would have been possible if the two forces had collaborated last year. If the control rooms were joined now there would be potential immediate saving of close to £1m.
- The cost to Norfolk Constabulary of pursuing the initial initiative, that was later vetoed by the Suffolk Commissioner, was half a million pounds plus officer time.
- A new account system had been put in place by Capgemini that had been on cost and on time and this could have included setting up the joint control room.
- The introduction of ATHENA, a region wide collaborative ICT project, would involve the use of the control rooms.
- Modern technology needed to be used more by police forces but this technology was expensive and needed to be shared amongst the forces.

- This Panel had discussed and supported the merger of the control rooms 18 months ago. It re-iterated its support and commented that it would be helpful to encourage more press coverage to keep the topic current.

The Chairman of Norfolk Police and Crime Panel had written to the Chairman of Suffolk Police and Crime Panel to communicate the Panel's views about the merger and discuss opportunities for joint scrutiny. Mrs J Martin (Democratic Services and Scrutiny Support Manager) confirmed that she would contact the officer supporting Suffolk's PCP to provide an update on the Panel's discussion.

6.4 The Police and Crime Commissioner agreed that as the ATHENA project was moving forward that he would provide a breakdown of what the project entailed and outline how essential the control rooms were within this to the next Panel meeting.

6.5 The Panel questioned the Commissioner on the distribution of the Home Office funding for sexual abuse victims.

In response to questions put to the Commissioner the following points were noted:-

- £349k had been allocated to Victim Support in Norfolk and Suffolk. This organisation had a good infrastructure in place and the Commissioner had decided to monitor their performance outputs for the next year.
- The Commissioner informed the Panel that £2m of the £4.85 million for survivor support organisations had been allocated to Non Statutory groups that had been involved in the investigation in Rotherham, in particular voluntary bodies had been compensated.
- The Commissioner had received £4m worth of bids; the Home Office had set the criteria and the Commissioner had investigated each claim and had decided with the Home Office the allocation.
- The further £2.85m was divided up amongst companies that had applied, with nearly £18m worth of bids being submitted.
- There had been less bids then expected from the North-East and South-East of the country. The Commissioner was to make a visit to the North East to investigate with the Home Office why so few bids had come from this area.
- Two organisations from Norfolk had been allocated bids; Victim Support in Norfolk and Suffolk and the Magdalene Group.

6.6 Reference was made to the Commissioner's new duty in the Counter Terrorism and Security Act 2015, to have due regard to the need to prevent people from being drawn into terrorism. The Commissioner was asked what the level of risk was in regards to people in Norfolk being drawn into terrorism; the Commissioner responded that the risk was low.

7. Work Programme

- 7.1 The Panel received the report outlining the proposed work programme for 2015-2016.
- 7.2 The Panel discussed and **agreed** the need to have an item on the July meeting's agenda to discuss the police governance arrangements after the General Election in May.
- 7.3 It was decided that the agenda for the AGM in July was rather large and therefore the ATHENA item discussed earlier in the meeting would be pushed back to the October meeting. In the interim the Commissioner would provide a briefing note to members of the Panel which would outline the ATHENA project.
- 7.4 The Panel considered and **agreed** the proposed work programme for 2015-16 with the amendments above.

8. Appointment of co-opted independent member

- 8.1 The Panel received the report from the Scrutiny Support Manager which set out the principles of the recruitment process for appointing a co-opted independent member, provided the draft advertisement and application pack, and suggested a timetable for recruitment.
- 8.2 The following points were raised during the discussion:-
- It was up to the Panel to decide how to constitute the selection panel and it was noted that Mr Alexander Sommerville, CPM, could be a member of the selection panel if he chose not to re-apply for the position..
 - Other suggestions for membership of the selection panel were the Chairman, the Vice Chairman (if he was re-elected in the forthcoming elections) and 1 other member.
 - The Panel recognised that Mr Alexander Sommerville had brought a lot of knowledge and experience to the role and some members commented that his application would be welcomed, if he decided to re-apply for the position.
- 8.3 The Panel **AGREED**:
- a) to note the principles of the recruitment process and to delegate the authority to appoint the selection panel to NCC's Head of Democratic Services, in consultation with the Panel's Chairman and Vice-Chairman.
 - b) That the selection panel should comprise 3 members, the Panel's Chairman and two others.

9. Procedure for public questions

- 9.1 The Panel received the report from the Scrutiny Support Manager which set out the current procedure for public questions and invited the Panel to consider whether any amendments were required.

- 9.2 The Panel discussed the lack of response received from the public since the Panel introduced public questions.
- 9.3 The Panel believed the lack of questions received was down to the fact that the public generally did not understand the role of Police and Crime Panels. The fact that Panels could not impose any sanctions on Police and Crime Commissioners meant that they were seen to be lacking in effectiveness.
- 9.4 The Panel members commented that the system in place gave the public the opportunity to submit questions and that the lack of questions submitted was not due to the process being restrictive but due to other factors.
- 9.5 The Panel **AGREED** that no amendments were required to the current procedure for public questions.

The meeting closed at 11.06 am.

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.