



Norfolk Police and Crime Panel

Minutes of the Meeting held on 14 November 2022 at 11am at County Hall, Norwich

Panel Members Present:

Cllr William Richmond (Chair)	Norfolk County Council
Air Commodore Kevin Pellatt (Vice-Chair)	Co-opted Independent Member
Cllr Gordon Bambridge	Breckland District Council
Cllr Jonathan Emsell	Broadland District Council
Cllr Donald Tyler	King's Lynn and West Norfolk Council
Cllr Graham Carpenter	Norfolk County Council
Cllr Tim Adams	Norfolk County Council
Cllr Sarah Butikofer	North Norfolk District Council
Cllr Cate Oliver	Norwich City Council
Cllr James Easter	South Norfolk Council
Mr Peter Hill	Co-opted Independent Member

Officers Present:

Giles Orpen-Smellie	Police and Crime Commissioner for Norfolk (PCC)
Sharon Lister	Director of Performance and Scrutiny, OPCCN
Nicola Ledain	Committee Officer, Norfolk County Council, NCC
Jill Penn	Chief Finance Officer, OPCCN
Jo Martin	Scrutiny Support Manager, NCC
Paul Sanford	Chief Constable, Norfolk Constabulary
Mark Stokes	Chief Executive, OPCCN
Gavin Thompson	Director of Policy and Commissioning, OPCCN

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

- 1.1 Apologies were received from Cllr Mike Smith-Clare.

2. Minutes

- 2.1 The minutes of the meeting held on 27 June 2022 were agreed as an accurate record and signed by the Chair.

3. Members to Declare any Interests

- 3.1 There were no interests declared.

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

4.1 No urgent business was discussed.

5. Public Questions

5.1 No public questions were received.

6. Police Crime and Community Safety Plan 2022-24 Performance Monitoring

6.1 The Panel received the report which provided the first of the PCC's new style performance reports to the Panel and it sets out an overview of progress against all six strategic priorities (pillars) contained within the Plan.

6.2 The Chair thanked the PCC for the information provided and for the private briefing to the Panel on the new approach to performance monitoring. The Chair asked the PCC if there was anything he wished to say by way of introduction for the public record.

6.3 In introducing the report, the PCC highlighted that this was the first performance report against his Plan, which went live on 31 March this year. The information covered the first quarter of the new Plan. He explained that the format of report was still evolving, but he was asking the Constabulary to provide a rolling report covering all six pillars each time. The intention was to have the same format for all four quarters and the report for the fourth quarter would become the first draft of his annual report. The PCC had sought to streamline the information required by performance reports so that the same data was being used for his own purposes, hopefully for the Panel's purposes and any other reporting purposes such as to the National Policing Board. Developing different data for different bodies obscured what was going on and made it more difficult to be transparent, which was one of his statutory duties. Working with one truth meant the same data was being used for all purposes and contributed to greater transparency. The new format gave him the option, in scrutinising the Chief Constable, to explore issues from across the whole Plan or, if he chose to do so, to drill down in to one or more pillar. For example, at his last Accountability Meeting he had felt it was appropriate to major on the recent His Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services (HMICFRS) report on Norfolk Constabulary. He had taken that as both a separate agenda item and also asked additional related questions of the Chief Constable under each pillar. The PCC intended to provide the Panel with four reports a year, covering all six pillars and would leave it up to the Panel to decide whether it wished to scrutinise all six pillars each time or focus on a selection. He recognised this was a reduction in the number of reports the Panel had been used to, but he was keen to align the reporting to the four quarters of the financial year. The PCC suggested this begged a question about how many Panel meetings were held each year and he encouraged the Panel to consider a quarterly reporting and meeting cycle so that business was streamlined in a coherent manner.

6.4 During discussion, the following points were raised:

- 6.4.1 With reference to page 15, section 3.3, there was mention of eight graded judgements that had been assessed but only four were specifically mentioned in the report, with 'Treating people fairly and with respect' identified as being under improvement. The PCC explained he would be cautious with the way he responded to questions as he did not wish to subject the Chief Constable to the Panel's scrutiny. He had publicly scrutinised the Chief Constable about the HMICFRS report at his last Accountability Meeting, at which he had welcomed Councillor Easter's attendance. Eight areas had been inspected but were dovetailed into the four grades. With regards to the one mentioned, the Inspectorate was concerned about how reports on Section 60 Stop and Search were being written up. There was no suggestion from Body Worn Camera footage that this was being used inappropriately but officers had not perhaps included sufficient detail when reports were written up. The PCC, however, had challenged this in terms of the disproportionate time taken to write reports when Officers could be carrying out more effective duties. The Chief Constable added that this was the only area of the Constabulary's performance of policing that had worsened with every other area of policing remaining the same or had improved. The inspectors believed that slightly more detail was needed on the form to justify the searches. Training was being provided on that but PCC's challenge to the Inspectorate was valid. This issue did not relate to the report recently published by Baroness Casey which was an examination of the Metropolitan Police Service not of policing generally.
- 6.4.2 Panel Members had attended the previous week's national annual Panel conference and had been pleased to hear from an exceptional keynote speaker, Dr Sarah Charman, Professor of Criminology at the University of Portsmouth. The theme of the conference had been "Changing culture, moving things forward" and Dr Charman had spoken at length on her findings on culture across police forces. The PCC was asked what he was doing to support the Chief Constable in changing the public perception of policing. What was he doing to try to recover a poor situation, not caused by Norfolk Constabulary but one that reflected on it. The PCC explained that confidence in policing had been an issue and continued to be but unfortunately there was not a magic solution. In gaining confidence, it would start with exceptional policing which the Chief Constable was driving forwards, followed by the discipline procedures that had to be adhered too. It was making sure that Officers on the ground got it right and making sure that standards were adhered to. The PCC assured the Panel that the standards and values were there. However, there was no single mechanism to push this message out to the public and the engagement from the public differed depending on the demographic. Younger members would use more social media, whereas older members of the community may use different means. Work was being carried out with the OPCCN Communications Team to identify the audiences.
- 6.4.3 The Panel expressed concern about the reduction of the quantity of meetings as it could lead to less opportunity to scrutinise, less detail, and less volume. It could also impact on the outcomes at the Panel meetings. The PCC had been struck by the number of reports that had to be prepared for various different forums. It made logical sense to align with the financial year and would be more efficient and more consumable by those that were reading the papers. Regardless of the meetings or the reports, the Panel could choose to ask the PCC whatever it wanted and had access to whatever detail it requested. The PCC had an open mind but was keen to reduce the volume of the performance monitoring data.

6.4.4 The PCC explained that the abolishment of Police Community Support Officers (PCSO) made a saving of £1300 individually compared to a Police Officer. Whilst it was appreciated by the Panel the reasons they were abolished, there were other Constabulary's around the Country who had managed to keep their PCSO's. The PCC reported that he had been contacted by a number of Constabulary's who wanted to know how it had worked without the PCSO's. The decision to not employ PCSO's was considered as a lead, not a retrospective step. The Chief Constable added that the threat of crime in the country could only be solved by an Officer with the full range of police powers. Neighbourhood crime had reduced considerably such as burglary but crimes such as rape and child sexual abuse were on the rise, and the only way to combat these threats was to put the right asset in place. The PCC received a number of requests to attend parish councils. These meetings predominantly took place at the same time as one of the biggest threats of crime in the county, anti-social behaviour and whilst re-instating PCSO's was a matter of budget, he would prefer the Police Officers to be investigating crime than sat in meeting rooms. The PCP suggested that virtual joint meetings with several Parish Councils and the Constabulary could be considered which Cllr Butikofer would consider with North Norfolk District Council colleagues.

Cllr Gordon Bambridge left at 11.40am.

6.4.5 The Panel noted in the report that public perceptions of the Constabulary had reduced which was a shame as police seemed to be better resourced than ever. Following that, the Panel asked about StreetSafe and if it was still running. The Chief Constable replied that to achieve the desired outcomes better resources was not just about numbers but also about adequacy of funding. The Constabulary needed not just Police Officers, but back office staff and equipment. He confirmed that SteetSafe remained live and had resulted in patrols being directed to those areas where women felt less safe. There would also be a big publicity push as the festive party season started.

6.4.6 The Chair asked the PCC what was meant by "re-profiling of the Broadland Gate and Norfolk Professional Development Centre Schemes (3.3m)" on page 22 at paragraph 3.5 of the report. The Chief Finance Officer explained that the term referred to money which should have been spent on building services and supplies but was delayed into the next financial year. The money had been reprofiled into the financial year when it was due to be spent.

6.4.7 The Chair referred to page 24, paragraph 3.17 where it stated that the "The Digital Delivery team have been looking to develop improvements to frontline policing mobility through the 'OPTIK' system, enabling officers to react faster to incidents and record information at the first point of contact. Focus has been on usability enhancements, due to be released in summer of 2022, and further developments supporting the domestic abuse response for autumn 2022". The Chair asked if any further details could be provided. The Chief Constable explained that in Autumn 2022, there would hopefully be a new feature added to the Optik platform which was a new domestic abuse incidence risk assessment. Currently this was a paper form where it was inputted into the system at the Police Station taking up to 45 minutes. The new functionality would make this assessment quicker, more accurate and would free up hundreds of Officer's hours. It would also be more beneficial for the victim taking more accurate detail and less time.

- 6.4.8 The Panel noted from the report that the domestic abuse figures were still rising and had been doing so for a number of years. Considering several initiatives were supported by the PCC was something being missed and was there anything more that could be done. The PCC suspected that domestic abuse had been ongoing for years behind closed doors regardless of background. However, people now had the self-confidence to report it, which was a positive step. Society was becoming more receptive of people standing up and doing something about it. As a result this previously hidden crime was now much more in the public arena. However, the issue of domestic abuse was a societal problem which the Constabulary could not solve alone as often the victim did not want to take it further. There were ongoing Public Health initiatives across the country and more work was being done to inform and educate that domestic abuse was not acceptable. The PCC added that often the problem arose from males who didn't understand what a sensible relationship looked like, and young people were being brought up not knowing this. There was a society role to educate those young people and to break the cycle. The Chief Constable added that there were now more offences within domestic abuse such as coercive and controlling behaviour that had been added to the statute book. These figures had not been available before hence it appeared that the figures had gone up. Officers would attend a domestic abuse incident and report one crime whereas now they could report 3 or 4 crimes. It would be helpful to have comparable data to see the wider picture of domestic abuse
- 6.4.9 The Chief Constable explained that the public perception survey was undertaken via telephone, as mentioned at page 28, point 4.2 of the report because it gave a better spread and better coverage than conducting it via other means. It was also less expensive.
- 6.4.10 Following the recent HMICFRS report, the PCC assured the Panel that he was asking the Chief Constable to look at everything that hadn't received an outstanding grade, The Chief Constable added that he shared the ambition to make the Constabulary the best in the Country. The report was a good one and it made clear the Constabulary had improved in all areas but one. However, the recommendations would come at a cost and the Chief Constable would have to consider carefully which recommendations were a priority.
- 6.5 After being put to the vote, the Panel **AGREED** to move its meeting schedule to a quarterly programme, and officers would get in touch with OPCCN to draft a refreshed forward work programme for consideration at the next meeting.
- 6.6 Having considered the PCC's new approach to performance monitoring and the summary of progress towards delivering the six strategic priorities, the Panel **NOTED** the report.

7. Improving Public Confidence

- 7.1 The Panel received the report which provided an overview of how public confidence in policing is being addressed in Norfolk, with a focus on the PCC's Independent Advisory Group and Youth Commission. The report was provided following a request by the Panel at a previous meeting.
- 7.2 The Chair thanked the PCC for the information provided and invited him to introduce the report.

- 7.3 In introducing the report, the PCC clarified that the Independent Advisory Group (IAG) offered advice from various organisations throughout the country and referred to paragraphs 2.3 and 2.9 on page 66. IAG's were set up to build confidence within communities with their police and to be the Constabulary's critical friend. He highlighted that the Chair of IAG also chaired the Constabulary's Ethics Committee as the work overlapped. The Constabulary fully supported the work of the IAG and were represented at IAG meetings. The IAG was an evolving structure and had recently created a women's group following the death of Sarah Everard at the PCC's request.
- 7.4 The Youth Commission was set up in 2017 and the PCC added that with 17% of the population being under 18 years of age, it was important to build confidence with them as they were the future. The Youth Commission had contributed to a lot of great work including the recent work carried out on stop and search powers. Both the IAG and the Youth Commission had continued to do a great job in advising the PCC and the Constabulary and ensured that the policy stayed connected to the community and particularly to certain interest groups.
- 7.5 During the discussion, the following points were raised:
- 7.5.1 The PCC explained that both the IAG and the Youth Commission tried to have representative of the population in terms of ethnicity and other characteristics. Within IAG this was achieved easily by recruiting through several organisations. With the Youth Commission, members were identified through other forums that they were involved in such as school pupils. The Director of Policy and Commissioning added that when the group was set up, there was recruitment through application. Since then, events and activities organised by partners such as Children's Services at Norfolk County Council at their participation groups seemed to be well attended. They could be used to advertise the group and the work of the PCC.
- 7.5.2 The Panel asked that with reference to page 63, how long had the Stop and Search Scrutiny Panel had been operating as there was concern that if a panel existed it implied that it was still an area of weakness. The PCC explained that against the HMICFRS standards there had been an issue with Stop and Search which was identified in the inspection. By the time the report was published, the issue had been rectified. The Scrutiny Panel were not designed to be an inspectorate. The Chief Constable added that the Panel had been running for a number of years and their job was to assess the reasonableness of the searches. Whilst they had received the training, they judged it as a lay person and gave a basic opinion of whether the search was fair. The results of that audit were generally positive. Since the inspection, the reporting lines for all audits had been changed so inspectors were applying more scrutiny and dip sampling was taking place. As valuable as the Scrutiny Panel was, the change to internal practices would likely be the reason that standards had increased. The benefit of the Scrutiny Panel would hopefully show the public that the Constabulary took Stop and Search seriously. The Chief Constable added that the numbers of Stop and Search had reduced over the last few years, but the outcomes from those searches had remained the same, which suggested that they were being used in a much more targeted and sensible way.

- 7.6 Having considered the overview of how public confidence in policing is being addressed in Norfolk, with a focus on the PCC's Independent Advisory Group and Youth Commission, the panel **NOTED** the report.

8. Independent Custody Visitor (ICV) Scheme – Annual Report 2021-2022

- 8.1 The Panel received the annual report 2020-21 which provided an overview of the scheme and outcomes from visits between 1 April 2021 and 31 March 2022.
- 8.2 In introducing the report, the PCC welcomed the opportunity to highlight the normally unseen work that the Independent Custody Manager and volunteers carried out. He highlighted that in the reporting period there were 23 volunteers which was an increase of 8 (35%). In referring to page 88 and 90 of the report, it highlighted that in the reporting period there had been 14009 detainees and 180 visits had been carried out by the Independent Custody Visitors. The visits could be carried out at any time of day or night, and they were able to identify issues and suggest good ideas that could be recommended. It was not their role to visit every detainee in the custody suite. The PCC added that it was important that what happened in the custody suite was sound and detainees were treated with dignity.
- 8.3 The PCC reported that inspections had identified concerns regarding the ratio of male to female staff members as well as adequate facilities for female detainees. There had also been concerns about the meals provided to the detainees with some meals found to be past their best. Whilst the number of detainees was unknown at any given time which made it difficult to know how many to cater for, it was also important to provide suitable fresh meals. The PCC confirmed to the Panel that these issues had been rectified.
- 8.4 The Chair commended the work carried out by the Independent Custody Manager Simon Artherton and all the staff and volunteers involved.
- 8.5 Having considered how the PCC was delivering his statutory responsibility to establish and maintain an Independent Custody Visiting Scheme for the police force, the Panel **NOTED** the report.

There was a 5 minute comfort break at this point in the meeting.

9. Police and Crime Commissioner for Norfolk Draft Annual Report 2021-2022

- 9.1 The Panel received the PCC's draft annual report for 2021-22 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.
- 9.2 The Chair thanked the PCC for the information provided and invited the PCC to introduce the report.
- 9.3 In introducing the report, the PCC highlighted that the report included the last year of his predecessor. Whilst he had since produced his own plan, he had carried forward most of which was included in this plan to ensure continuity.
- 9.4 During the discussion, the following points were raised:

- 9.4.1 Although the PCC couldn't comment on the usage of road safety cameras which were in use and those which were not, he did emphasise that road safety was high on his agenda. In terms of enforcement there were approximately 27 yellow cameras around county, with the ones on the A11 in addition. The Constabulary enforcement work continued by using the mobile safety vans or by the large number of Speedwatch volunteers.
- 9.4.2 The Panel had observed that in 2020/2021 there had been 12k reports to Action Fraud. Only 5.8% of these issues were referred to the relevant Constabulary. The PCC explained that the issue with solving fraud was that it was not governed by county boundaries and needed a national and international response. There was a long way to go to counter fraud in the national and international level. Additional resourcing was being allocated to City of London Police which was the national lead on fraud related criminality. The Crime Agency was also receiving extra resources. He added that if external agencies tasked the Constabulary to solve a threat based in Norfolk then they would, but the majority of those threats were based outside of Norfolk, therefore it was more important to focus on prevention such as education, and focusing on the vulnerable. The Chief Constable added that it was difficult to detect some crimes considering so much of it was per abroad. The City of London Police would lose some of their capability to have the extra resource but it was the correct course of action.
- 9.4.3 The Panel asked the PCC if he felt that the objectives of the previous plan had been achieved. The PCC agreed that the overarching vision of the previous plan had been achieved, and the measure of that was that most of it was relevant and had been carried forward into his current plan.
- 9.4.4 The Panel asked if rural crime was less often solved in Norfolk compared to crime in urban areas. Whilst the PCC did not have the data to confirm this, he did suggest asking the question in the public arena of the Public Accountability Forum where he could in turn scrutinise the Chief Constable on that matter.

Cllr Tim Adams left the meeting at 12.45pm

- 9.4.5 At the recent Police and Crime Conference there had been considerable discussion about the uplift programme and the possible routes into policing such as the degree route, which would have advantages and disadvantages or the training by Sergeant route which would be more vocational. The Panel observed that the latter could provide savings and the new trainee Officer could work through the police Service vocationally rather than through an academic route. The Panel asked for the PCC's view on the routes. The PCC explained that recently 16 PCCs had asked the Home Secretary asking for non-degree routes to be preserved as a national decision had been made to move the route into policing through a degree route. The Home Secretary had recently confirmed that she would be reviewing that decision. Being a Police Officer included a variety of roles and it was never known what scene would be found at the end of a 999 call. The PCC commented that Senior Police Officers would probably require a Police Officer with a wider range of knowledge and education to be able to deal with a different context of policing. Although the PCC confirmed he didn't have a view, the time he had spent and the complexities of the policing that he had seen, he did feel that more than 10 weeks of training was needed, and that could be given under the training from the Sergeant route. However, having wrong Sergeant mentor could perpetuate further

issues, whereas in a classroom trainees would be taught from a syllabus. He felt that this was an operational matter for Chief Constables to decide. The CC added that he believed that the new entry routes should be properly tested and evaluated. Flexibility to be able to adapt the entry routes according to the local needs would be beneficial. In Norfolk, the detective roles were a particular struggle to recruit too. It was too early to judge the merits of the degree route, but the most important thing was the content of the learning and that it should be operationally focused.

- 9.5 Having reviewed the Police and Crime Commissioner for Norfolk's draft Annual Report 2021-22, the Panel **NOTED** the report. The Chair advised that a letter would be sent to the PCC to confirm the outcome of the Panel's discussion, in place of a report.

10. Police and Crime Commissioner for Norfolk's 2023/24 Precept Consultation

- 10.1 The Panel received the report outlining how the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCCN) proposed consulting on the Commissioner's proposals and publishing the results.
- 10.2 The Chair thanked the PCC for the information provided and invited him to introduce the report.
- 10.2.1 In introducing the report, the PCC explained that as part of preparing the budget, he would be considering a precept rise. The 3-year settlement as part of the Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) agreed last year was set when the world was a different place. With the Autumn budget statement due in the next few days, there was uncertainty how that would affect police funding. It was hoped that the police allocation would be revealed before Christmas.
- 10.2.2 The PCC explained that 45% of the core police budget of £197 million came from Norfolk households as part of the precept. The PCC was required to deliver a balanced budget. The indicative settlement had assumed that PCCs would take advantage of the maximum £10 precept rise (based on a Band D property) but he was also aware that the winter would be hard for many people with other added cost of living pressures. The PCC highlighted that he had to consider how the police could be effective on the ground whilst bearing the inflation rises too.
- 10.2.3 The PCC added that the Constabulary were looking across every department to save suggested efficiencies of 3% but putting these savings into practice would affect results on the ground. It was clarified that the OPCCN were also identifying efficiencies of 3%.
- 10.2.4 With regards to the consultation, the PCC had been intent on changing the nature of the consultation and had hoped that the consultation would be completed before Christmas. He had hoped that it would start earlier, last longer and include a wider range of engagement. However, because of the political turbulence the start of the consultation was delayed, and the end of the consultation had been extended to mid-January.
- 10.2.5 He assured the Panel that any recommendation of the precept would include a rigorous analysis, open and transparent workings out of how he had achieved that conclusion and he would be mindful of the economic situation facing the public.

- 10.3 The Panel **NOTED** the overview of the Police and Crime Commissioner's (PCC) 2023/24 precept consultation. The Chair confirmed that details of the consultation would be circulated to Panel Members once it had been launched.

11. Complaints Policy Sub Panel

- 11.1 The Panel received the report giving an update from the Complaints Policy Sub Panel.
- 11.2 The Chair of the Sub Panel highlighted that the report covered two Sub Panel meetings, that of 6th July 2022 and 7th November 2022. He brought to the Panel's attention paragraphs 2.24 and 2.25 of the report which noted that the Sub Panel were now able to compare the performance data relating to the outcome of complaint reviews against Norfolk Constabulary nationally and against most similar forces. The data for Norfolk was positive in terms of reviews and timeliness of completing the reviews. The number of reviews received was in line with the national average figure.
- 11.3 It was reported that the issue surrounding the indemnity of Legally Qualified Chairs (LQC) had not yet been resolved and had been made more complicated by the fact that the Chairs had been told that they might have to sit and give evidence at a mis-conduct appeal hearing. This could persuade the Chairs not to sit. The Panel heard that none of the Norfolk LQC's had refused to sit so far.
- 11.4 With reference to paragraph 2.7.4 the term "police" referred to the police force generically, not the Norfolk Constabulary specifically.
- 11.5 Taking the latest published report into the Metropolitan Police from Baroness Casey into account, the Panel asked the PCC if processes such as exit interviews were undertaken in Norfolk to try and understand how people felt when they left the police force. The Chief Constable assured the Panel that those interviews were carried out and they did receive value from them. He added that not every exit from the Constabulary was negative and over the last year Norfolk Constabulary had been having earlier performance discussions with employees about training to avoid entering misconduct routes.
- 11.6 The Panel **NOTED** the report.

12. Information Bulletin – questions arising to the PCC

- 12.1 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.
- 12.2 The Panel asked what organisations had received some of the extra £557k funding that had been received, as referred to on page 194. The Director of Policy and Commissioning would supply a written response, but in summary explained that the funding was to support victims and survivors of domestic abuse. Leeway, who were part of Norfolk Integrated Domestic Abuse Service (NIDAS) would receive some funding, as well as Norfolk Community Law Service in terms of legal support

and Advocacy After Fatal Domestic Abuse (AAFDA) to support those affected by domestic homicides. The response is attached at Appendix A.

12.3 The Chair referred to page 193 of the report and asked the PCC for his opinion on the crime statistic data from the Office of National Statistics (ONS) and what had contributed to a 5.3% increase in offences to June 2022. The PCC explained that crime generally was decreasing but certain types of crime were going up. In some areas of Norfolk reporting crime had increased due to greater confidence in the police. He had some concern over the ONS statistics as they tended to report 3 months behind and locally were reporting more up to date. It had been suggested on a national level that the same data was used which was more current. The Chief Constable added that the value of crime statistics had never been lower in terms of measuring the effectiveness of policing. It was extremely difficult to compare the last 12 months of crime due to the different nature of society due to the covid pandemic. A year ago, there was no time night economy, but more people were inside, so there was a shift of violence from the street to the household. The Chief explained that he always tried to provide an explanation for statistics as far as he was able too, but the pandemic was a huge variable in terms of explaining these figures. The other variable than needed be taken into account was better reporting. More audit resources had been put into place follow an earlier HMICFS report which meant that the crime data integrity was higher than and more offences were being recording than before. He felt that a better crime survey to consider was that of the Crime Survey of England Wales which asked the public about their experiences of crime. This currently showed that the trend was downwards in all areas of England and Wales except with regards to fraud.

12.4 The Panel **NOTED** the report and that written response to the question would be provided.

13. Work Programme

13.1 The Panel received the work programme for the period September 2022 to December 2023.

13.2 As the Panel had agreed previously in the meeting to move to a quarterly programme of meetings, a refreshed forward work programme would be considered at the meeting due to take place in February.

13.3 The Panel **AGREED** the work programme.

Meeting 13:30pm ended

**Mr W Richmond, Chair,
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.

12.2 Written response to question

Question

The Chair referred to the media story on p194 of the agenda (about receipt of extra funding to support victims and survivors of sexual violence and domestic abuse) and asked which organisations would receive the funding and how it would make a difference. OPCCN agreed to provide a written response.

Response

More funding to help victims and survivors of domestic abuse and sexual violence has been secured by the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Norfolk. The extra funding of £557,000 awarded by the Ministry of Justice is part of the Government's strategy to provide longer term support for frontline service providers over the next three years.

Out of the Norfolk-based bids made, the following five organisations have been successful:

- Advocacy After Fatal Domestic Abuse (AAFDA)
- The Sue Lambert Trust
- Norfolk Community Law Service
- The Magdalene Project
- Leeway Domestic Abuse and Violence Services for NIDAS (Norfolk Integrated Domestic Abuse Service)

Norfolk's Police and Crime Commissioner, Giles Orpen-Smellie, said: "This funding is so important for Norfolk and is very much welcomed. My office plays a vital role in commissioning services and awarding grants to ensure the criminal justice system puts victims first. Now more than ever we need to support victims, especially as some are having to cope with lengthy delays for court proceedings to take place. Providing meaningful support to victims is part of my Police and Crime Plan and will continue to be a top priority over the term of my office."

Funding recipient Sue Lambert Trust is a Norfolk charity providing a kind, safe, non-judgmental, and supportive range of services for people who have experienced sexual abuse and sexual violence, including domestic abuse. Anyone can self-refer to start the process of healing, rebuilding, and recovering. Sue Lambert Trust has been supporting people for more than 40 years. Their team listen, care and give people space and the professional support to begin healing.

The Chief Executive Officer for the Sue Lambert Trust, Clive Evans, said: "Sue Lambert Trust has been providing specialist therapeutic counselling and support work to our clients in Norfolk for 40 years and never has there been such a great demand. When people feel ready to talk about what's happened, our team are here to listen, to help people heal and re-build their lives. This funding will enable us to employ an outreach worker who will work primarily with under-represented groups and communities as well as coordinating our peer led support groups. With around 40 victims of sexual abuse and sexual violence taking the brave step to reach out to Sue Lambert Trust every month, we want to be there for them as soon as we possibly can. But we cannot deliver our life-changing services without essential funding from organisations like the PCC, combined with generous donations from the public and fundraising efforts by our kind supporters."

Norfolk Community Law Service is a local charity that provides access to free specialist legal services, for those with no means to pay. Their services cover debt, discrimination, domestic abuse, employment, family, immigration, welfare benefit appeals and other general civic legal matters.

Norfolk Community Law Service's Family Service Manager, Tamsin Roques, said: "Access to Legal Aid for victims of domestic abuse has diminished significantly locally, at a time when demand is increasing. We are delighted to have been awarded a grant from the OPCC. Our service is quite literally a lifeline for victims of domestic abuse and this multiyear funding will help to secure its future."

NIDAS, Norfolk Integrated Domestic Abuse Service is a domestic abuse support service for those assessed to be at high or medium risk of harm. The service also offers dedicated support for children and young people, recovery programmes, coordinated multi-agency support, court support, a Domestic Abuse Champion network, and training for professionals, across Norfolk.

Chief Executive of Leeway and NIDAS Delivery Partner, Mandy Proctor, said: "We are very pleased to have been successful in securing additional funding for NIDAS, which Leeway is delighted to be involved in the delivery of. Whilst NIDAS is not even one year old yet, it is encouraging to see how well received it has been from professionals and survivors alike. Everyone at NIDAS is committed to ensuring that we deliver the best possible support for those experiencing domestic abuse, regardless of where they live in the county, and this additional funding will further strengthen our commitment to doing that. We thank the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Norfolk for their continued support and dedication to tackling domestic abuse in the county."

A list of every application made can be found here: <https://www.norfolk-pcc.gov.uk/key-information/documents/>