



Norfolk Police and Crime Panel

Minutes of the Meeting held on 6 February 2018 at 10am in the Edwards Room, County Hall, Norwich

Main Panel Members Present:

Mr W Richmond (Chairman)	Norfolk County Council
Mrs S Butikofer	Norfolk County Council
Mr M Storey	Norfolk County Council
Dr Christopher Kemp (Vice-Chairman)	South Norfolk Council
Mr Colin Manning	Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk
Mr Paul Kendrick	Norwich City Council
Mrs Marlene Fairhead	Great Yarmouth Borough Council
Mr Fran Whymark	Broadland District Council
Mr Frank Sharpe	Breckland District Council
Air Commodore Kevin Pellatt	Co-opted Independent Member
Mr Peter Hill	Co-opted Independent Member

Officers Present:

Mr Harvey Bullen	Assistant Director Finance, NCC
Mr Greg Insull	Assistant Head of Democratic Services, NCC
Mrs Jo Martin	Democratic Support and Scrutiny Team Manager, NCC

Others Present

Mr Simon Bailey	Chief Constable, Norfolk Constabulary
Mr Martin Barsby	Director of Communications and Engagement, Office of Police and Crime Commissioner for Norfolk, OPCCN
Mr Lorne Green	Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) for Norfolk
Mr John Hummersone	Chief Finance Officer, OPCCN
Ms Sharon Lister	Director of Performance and Scrutiny, OPCCN
Mr Mark Stokes	Chief Executive, Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Norfolk, OPCCN
Dr Gavin Thompson	Director of Policy and Commissioning, OPCCN
Ms Vicky Day	Head of Rehabilitation, OPCCN

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

- 1.1 Apologies had been received from Mr Trevor Wainwright (Mrs Marlene Fairhead substituting).

2. Members to Declare any Interests

2.1 Mr Francis Whymark declared an 'other' interest that he worked for Children's Services at Norfolk County Council.

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

3.1 There was no items of urgent business.

4. Minutes

4.1 The minutes of the meeting held on 28 November 2017 were confirmed by the Panel as an accurate record and signed by the Chairman.

4.2 The minutes of the extra-ordinary meeting held on 22 January 2018 were confirmed by the Panel as an accurate record and signed by the Chairman.

5. Public Questions

No public questions were received.

6. Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) for Norfolk's proposed police precept for 2018/19.

6.1 The Panel received the report detailing the Commissioner's budget consultation 2018/19, the process for the Panel's decision-making regarding the precept and the forecast police budget from 2018/19 to 2021/2022. The Panel also noted receipt of an updated budget report from OPCCN (Annex 2, from page 34) with amended figures.

6.2 The Chairman welcomed the Commissioner and his team to the meeting.

6.3 The Director of Communications and Engagement introduced Annex 1 of the report which included the method and timescales for the 2018/19 budget consultation and its results. The consultation had run from 29 November 2017 until 22 December 2017. It was highlighted that 2088 people had responded to the consultation with 59% of those who took part opting to pay an extra 2% through the policing element of their council tax.

6.4 The Commissioner asked the Chief Finance Officer to outline the budget that was presented to the Panel. In doing so, he explained that the key aspects when considering the budget had been the increase in demand on the police force, changes in the nature of crime, rising costs and continuing austerity. Since 2010 the police revenue grant had been reduced by £22m and £34m worth of savings had been found, but between £9m and £14m would still have to be found over the financial planning period, dependant on the outcome of the Panel's decision. The grant settlement had been confirmed on 31st January 2018. While no new money had been provided in the settlement, the Home Office had maintained the grant at the 2017/18 cash level and permitted PCCs to raise council tax by up to £12 (5.5%) per year. Three options had therefore been considered by Norfolk's PCC. Option 1 (freeze) would have a brutal effect on local policing and was never the planning model, Option 2 (2%) would still require savings of £14m to be found and therefore result in an overall reduction in local policing, while Option 3 (5.5%) would

enable more resources to be put into local policing and ensure that reserves did not fall below the minimum level.

- 6.5 The PCC then addressed the Panel (see Appendix A), and confirmed that he proposed to raise the police precept by 5.5%, which would increase Band D Council Tax by £11.97 per annum or 23p per week. The PCC also confirmed that as a condition of this he had asked the Chief Constable, who had agreed, to: invest in 23 additional personnel to increase the number of police officers and specialist staff dedicated to local policing under the new Norfolk model; to reinforce police involvement in schools by ensuring school engagement was a focus for the deployment of the additional local policing personnel to be recruited; to ensure the development and delivery of a robust communications programme to increase public awareness of all the ways they can access and engage with their police; to develop a communications strategy specifically aimed at the vulnerable, frail and elderly; to ensure that local policing surgeries are held at set, regular times on dates and in locations widely advertised to maximise awareness and accessibility and to revisit the police telephone system (101) to ensure it was fit for purpose.
- 6.6 The following points were noted in response to questions by the Panel:
- 6.6.1 Police officers had the full support of the Chief Constable in doing the right thing when they were the only emergency service available to support vulnerable individuals. There was a cost involved when the police were called out to support or assist another emergency service. However, only the numbers of such incidents were recorded, not the lost hours. The Chief Constable confirmed that demand was considerable but officers were given the confidence and support to act as necessary.
- 6.6.2 The Panel asked for the format of the consultation report to be reviewed for future years, with the detail of questions asked made available alongside the summary of responses.
- 6.6.3 Panel Members were disappointed that central Government was not giving extra support to police forces when it was clearly needed. Members were, however, pleased that the PCC intended to use a maximum increase to address concerns regarding visible policing and support for schools that the Panel had raised at a previous meeting.
- 6.6.4 If Option 3 were to be agreed, the PCC confirmed that the Chief Constable would receive all the additional money raised to distribute and spend as he saw fit in order to achieve the priorities of the police and crime plan. It would mean 17 new police officers above the current projection and 6 staff who would be dedicated to schools. As the PCC holds the Chief Constable to account, he would be able to monitor this closely. The OPCCN would not receive any of the additional precept money. The PCC added that his salary (£70k) was set by the Home Office and had remained at the same level since the position had been created in 2012.
- 6.6.5 The report seemed to suggest that the commissioning budget would reduce in later years although evidence had suggested that there would be an increase in demand for commissioned services. The Chief Finance Officer confirmed that the base budget for commissioning would remain the same, but owing to slippage in the commissioning programme when the PCC took office (a time lag followed the election of a new PCC, who set priorities for a new policing and crime plan and the associated commissioning intentions) there had been some underspends in his first year of office, which was now being brought forward.

- 6.6.6 The Panel noted the efficiency rating that HMIC had recently given the Constabulary ('good'), but asked what new efficiency measures could be foreseen now that all the 'big hits' were likely to have been addressed. The PCC said that the only real remaining savings to be drawn from collaboration with preferred partner Suffolk would be through revisiting the matter of the joint control room. Approximately £800k per year could be saved (jointly) if the two forces were to operate from Wymondham. No seven force collaboration savings had been included in the current version of the Medium Term Financial Plan. The seven forces had an agreement to explore joint HR, IT, procurement and criminal justice (all support services), as well as high-end specialist services, but as it was a medium-long term plan the benefits would not be seen until 3-5 years' time. Jointly, the seven forces had the second highest spending power in the country after the Metropolitan police.
- 6.6.7 The neighbourhood policing model was based on there being beat managers in all areas. The police surgeries would be organised by beat managers and take place in those areas where the public enquiry desks will be closed. They would be organised at the times to achieve the greatest footfall and would be advertised well, but would be flexible. There was currently 14 dedicated schools officers with the extra 6 being recruited as a condition of this precept proposal, going into various schools offering services which would hopefully include primary schools. Therefore this would only mean an overall reduction of 4 officers. There was a strong role to play with teachers and Headteachers to ensure key messages were communicated and to give children the confidence to go to officers to give them information or ask for help.
- 6.6.8 The specialist planning unit would continue to organise and plan safety and security for regional events such as the Cromer Carnival and therefore would not be impacted by the savings generated from the loss of PCSOs as they had different roles to play. There would now be a significant uplift in officers, and only a small deficit in visible uniformed police officers.
- 6.6.9 In response to concerns about the adequacy of reserves, the Chief Finance Officer explained that he had a statutory responsibility to ensure there were sufficient reserves. If Option 3 were to be agreed, this would protect them as much as possible. In his view, 6% felt reasonable, but anything lower would not. Reserves had helped support the constabulary deal with increasing demands over a number of years, but they needed to be maintained at a level sufficient to support one-off major incidents. Home Office specialist grants could be applied for in those circumstances, but the rules for issuing those grants were currently being reviewed. The Auditor would also scrutinise the use of reserves.
- 6.6.10 The Chief Finance Officer confirmed that the budget was lawful and there had been a robust effort by the Constabulary to drive out the necessary savings to balance the budget. The consequences of each option were outlined clearly in the report with Option 3 protecting reserves.
- 6.6.11 Option 3 which included the maximum increase in 2019/20 would be used as the financial planning assumption. This was not pre-empting the PCC's consultation in late 2018. Two years of relative certainty would be followed by a Spending Review and the likely introduction of a new police funding formula in year 3.
- 6.6.12 The Chief Constable maintained a consistent dialogue about social media service providers' responsibility to policing, in his role as national lead for child protection. He

hoped this would ultimately bring enough traction to drive a different response from companies and encourage them to do more to prevent on-line abuse.

6.6.13 There would be ongoing transition for the force restructure. 60-70 PCSOs would be redeployed as well as investing in two new investigation hubs. There would be more officers 'on the beat' and more sergeant posts than before. It was hoped that by the Autumn, all new positions would be recruited to but the infrastructure changes would take longer to implement, perhaps up to two years.

6.6.14 The Panel;

- **NOTED** the Police and Crime Commissioner for Norfolk's 2018/19 revenue Budget and Capital Programme, the Medium Term Financial Plan 2018/19 to 2021/22, and the funding and financial strategies.
- **VOTED** unanimously to support the Police and Crime Commissioner for Norfolk's proposed precept for 2018/19 to increase the policing element of Council Tax by 5.51%, and to thank the PCC, his staff and the Chief Constable for the excellent information provided both before and during the meeting.
- **AGREED** that the Chairman should write to the Commissioner to formally report the outcome of the Panel's consideration of the precept proposal.
- **NOTED** that the reserve meeting on 15 February 2018 would be cancelled.

7. **Police and Crime Plan for Norfolk 2016-2020 – performance monitoring**

7.1 The Panel received the report from the OPCCN which updated them with an overview of the progress made against delivering two of the strategic priorities within the Norfolk Police and Crime Plan for 2016-2020.

7.2 The Chief Constable explained that although there had been a reduction in the number of volunteers allocated to the Constabulary's Rural Crime Force, they were now giving more hours and were more effective.

7.3 Noting the series of fatal accidents in recent months on the A47, and that the numbers of killed and seriously injured (KSI) collisions in Norfolk were on the rise again, the PCC confirmed that he would be supporting the local campaign to dual the A47. It was also noted that a member working group of NCC's Communities Committee had been set up to develop a revised strategy for road safety, as part of which it would explore the KSI statistics. OPCCN would be participating in this work. The Chief Constable confirmed that a sustained 365-day-per-year campaign was seeking to deter use of mobile phones while driving. OPCCN **agreed** to provide further information on the demographic breakdown of those caught speeding, in order to determine whether the plan was being targeted in the right way.

7.4 The tactical delivery plan, which had been written and agreed with cross-border forces including Lincolnshire, Cambridgeshire and Suffolk, had been implemented approximately a year ago and was considered daily.

7.5 Early statistics indicated that as more offenders were being caught for rural crime, the rural community were feeling safer. There was a good relationship between farmers and the Constabulary.

7.6 The 'Dashcam' project had meant that footage could be downloaded from dashboard cameras in order to catch speeders and other motorist offenders. The footage could be

used to charge the offender although a written statement also needed to be provided, and this was not always given.

7.7 The Panel **NOTED** the update about progress with delivering the Police and Crime Plan for Norfolk 2016-2020.

8. Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Norfolk – Commissioned Services Update

8.1 The Panel received the report from the OPCCN which updated them on the activity, projects and services commissioned by OPCCN to prevent and reduce offending in Norfolk.

8.2 The OPCCN explained that investment has been made into strategy services especially strong rehabilitation pathways. The 'WONDER' (Women Offenders of Norfolk, Diversion, Engagement and Rehabilitation) programme addressed causes of reoffending. It had been a very successful pilot, with funding from Ministry of Justice, which took place initially in Wymondham and King's Lynn. The Ministry of Justice had then provided further funding to enable the project to be rolled out across the county in every Police Investigation Centre.

8.3 Close work was carried out by OPCCN with District Councils through projects such as the Community Chaplaincy Scheme, which allows Chaplains to support prisoners from Norwich over a number of months leading up to and beyond their discharge.

8.4 The Panel also heard about the Court mentor Programme. In February 2017, the OPCCN and Norwich Prison began piloting a court mentor role. Costing £2.5k over a six month period, the role based on an identification of need and previous good practice was set up to offer support and guidance to defendants and their families and friends, regardless of the court disposal. The role provided a serving, category D offender, with an opportunity to develop new transferrable skills around mentoring to aid their rehabilitation on release from prison and was undertaken at Norwich Magistrates Court all day on Tuesday and Fridays (guilty plea days).

8.5 The Panel **NOTED** the update from the OPCCN about its Commissioned Services.

9. PCC Complaints Monitoring Report

9.1 The Panel received the report from the PCC's Chief Executive and Norfolk County Council's Head of Democratic Services which provided them with details of ongoing complaints relating to the Commissioner, FOI (Freedom of Information) requests to the OPCCN and complaints and FOI requests relating to the Police and Crime Panel.

9.2 The Panel **NOTED** the monitoring information.

10. Complaints Handling Sub-Panel – Update

10.1 The Panel received the report from the Chairman of the Sub-Panel which updated them on various matters of complaint handling. Introducing his report, Kevin Pellatt highlighted that the timetable for changes to the police complaints system had been put back significantly with the transfer of responsibility for the appellate function from the Chief Constable to the PCC now unlikely to take place before summer 2019. He also

highlighted that further guidance and regulations were expected in relation to changes to the handling of PCC conduct complaints, and of particular interest to the sub-panel was the proposal to give PCPs greater investigatory powers. The sub-panel would consider the new guidance when available, and make recommendations to the Panel about whether or not its PCC conduct complaints procedure should be amended.

10.2 The Panel **NOTED** the update from the Complaints Policy Sub-Panel.

11. Information Bulletin – questions arising to the PCC

11.1 The Panel received the information bulletin from the OPCCN which updated them on both the decisions taken by the Police and Crime Commissioner for Norfolk (PCC) and the range of his activity since the last Panel meeting.

11.2 The Panel **NOTED** the information bulletin.

12. National Representative Body for Police and Crime Panels

12.1 The Panel received the report from the Democratic Support and Scrutiny Team Manager which asked them to consider the proposal to establish an LGA Special Interest Group.

12.2 It was highlighted that options considered had included both a national association of PCPs, and a Special Interest Group (SIG) within the LGA. The view at the national conference was that a SIG was the most appropriate model to adopt. It was unclear whether the Home Office grant was available to cover the subscription fee. Further advice was being awaited.

12.3 The Panel;

- **ENDORSED** the proposals, and in principle a contribution up to £500
- **AGREED** that either the Chairman or Vice-Chairman should represent Norfolk's PCP at the inaugural meeting.

13. Work Programme

13.1 The Panel received the work programme which scheduled agenda items for the rest of the year.

13.2 The Panel **AGREED** the work programme and noted that there could be a need for an extraordinary meeting to discuss the outcome of the PCC's decision relating to Fire Governance.

Meeting ended at 12.20pm

**Mr William Richmond, 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 Customer Services on 0344 800 8020, or Text Relay on 18001 800 8020 (textphone) and we will do our best to help.