



**Norfolk Police and Crime Panel  
Minutes of the Meeting Held on Friday 3 October 2014 at 10.00 a.m.  
Edwards Room, County Hall, Norwich**

**Main Panel Members Present:**

Mr Stephen Agnew	Norfolk County Council
Ms Sharon Brooks	Co-opted Independent Member
Mr Alec Byrne (Chairman)	Norfolk County Council
Mr Keith Driver	Norwich City Council
Mr Ian Graham	Broadland District Council
Mr David Harrison	Norfolk County Council
Dr Christopher Kemp (Vice-Chairman)	South Norfolk Council
Mr Brian Long	King's Lynn and West Norfolk Council
Mr William Richmond	Breckland Council
Mr Richard Shepherd	North Norfolk District Council
Mr A Somerville 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 Simon Bailey	Chief Constable for Norfolk
Mr Stephen Bett	Police and Crime Commissioner for Norfolk
Mr John Hummersone	Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Norfolk (OPCCN)
Mrs Sharon Lister	Performance and Compliance Officer
Ms Jenny McKibben	Deputy 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 Trevor Wainwright and Mr Brian Walker, Great Yarmouth Borough Council.
- 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 There were no urgent items of business.

#### 4. **Minutes of the meeting held on 8 August 2014**

4.1 The minutes of the meeting held on 8 August 2014 were considered by the Committee. The slight amendments that had been suggested by the Deputy Chief Constable were agreed by the Panel and the minutes were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

#### 5. **Procedure for public questions**

5.1 The Panel received a report by the Democratic Services and Scrutiny Support Manager setting out the proposed procedure for public questions to the Panel.

5.2 Various options around the deadline for receipt of questions were considered by the Panel. After discussion, it was **agreed** that questions should be received 10 working days in advance of the meeting to allow sufficient time for a response to be agreed. This procedure would be reviewed by the Panel after six months.

5.3 The following amendment to paragraph 7 on page 12 of the agenda papers was proposed and **agreed** by the Panel.

- ..... Questions that do not meet the criteria will be disallowed but where appropriate the question will be passed on to the appropriate organisation and the questioner advised of where the question had been directed to.

5.4 The Panel **RESOLVED** to agree

- the suggested amendments to the Rules of Procedure as set out in paragraph 2.1 of the report, subject to the amendment at paragraph 5.3 above.
- The guidance note on public questions as set out at Annex A of the report subject to the amendment at paragraph 5.3 above for publication on the Panel's webpage.

#### 6. **Raising the profile of the Panel**

6.1 The Panel received a report by the Democratic Support and Scrutiny Team Manager setting out the suggested additional communications activity.

6.2 During the discussion, the following points were noted:

- Some Members were not in favour of incurring any costs in promoting the work of the Panel and suggested that consideration should be given to using email and websites to publicise and promote the Panel's work. Those Members did not wish to spend any money on surveys or newsletters.
- Following a suggestion that any unused funds could be returned to the Home Office to be used in other areas, it was confirmed that this already happened.

- Officers were asked to write a short article about the work of the Panel which could be included in District Council news bulletin's, and which in turn could be disseminated at parish council meetings by the District Councillors who served on the Panel.
- The Panel accepted the offer from the Chief Constable to make the 'Police Direct' system available to the Panel at no cost, which could help raise the profile of the Police and Crime Panel with those members of the public who subscribed.

6.3 The Panel **RESOLVED** to support only the additional communications activity set out in the report that would not incur any costs.

## 7. Refreshed Police and Crime Plan for Norfolk

7.1 The Panel received a report by the Democratic Support and Scrutiny Team Manager asking the Panel to consider the refreshed Police and Crime Plan for Norfolk.

7.2 During the discussion the following points were noted:

- Although the profile of offending appeared to be changing, it was noted that this could be due to those victims who reported a crime having the confidence in the Police carrying out a full investigation.
- The Police and Crime Commissioner for Norfolk ("the Commissioner") informed the Panel that an eastern area office would be established to co-ordinate and tackle cyber-crime. The Commissioner would be working with the Chief Constable on this initiative, although the Panel noted there would be a need to ensure costs did not become prohibitive.
- The Panel was informed that all new housing estates were built to the "safer by design" standards. It was confirmed that Norfolk had fewer than five burglaries per day, although the Panel noted that with the dualling of the A11 nearing completion it would mean Norfolk was easier to get into and out of and would be a challenge to police. The Chief Constable was confident that the force would be able to rise to the expected challenges.
- The Chief Constable would let Members of the Panel know if Norfolk was one of the forces named in Operation Spade.
- The Chief Constable reassured the Panel that all victims and offenders of anti-social behaviour were known to Norfolk Constabulary. On a daily basis, operational partnership teams offered and managed the support service provided to victims.
- Following the unexpected rise in road traffic collisions, the Chief Constable informed the Panel that he had met with the Commissioner to analyse and understand the trend under the KSI statistics (Killed and Seriously Injured). The Panel noted that a significant amount of work was taking place to raise young driver awareness, although some of the recent

casualties were motor-cyclists driving high-powered motorcycles and not younger drivers. The Panel was pleased to note that the Road Casualty Reduction Board was being reconvened in the near future and would focus on what action could be taken to reduce the number of road traffic collisions.

- The Panel was reassured that the strategic priorities and targets included in the draft Plan remained reasonable, given the reducing resources available. The Value for Money report had been considered when savings plans for 2014-18 had been developed. The Commissioner would inform the Panel if he intended to vary these, but his intention was to maintain them for his term of office to enable the Panel and public to hold him to account.
- The publication of the consultation results may identify other emerging priorities which would need to be considered and factored into the Police and Crime Plan for Norfolk.
- Following a question about the possibility of raising the minimum driving age from 17, the Chief Constable said that he was not aware of any proposed changes at present but would check with the Chief Constable at Gloucestershire who had the lead role nationally for Roads Policing.

### 7.3 The Panel **RESOLVED**:

- to support the refreshed Norfolk Police and Crime Plan and the consultation that had been undertaken to inform the revisions.
- that it was satisfied with the comprehensive responses that had been provided to its questions.
- to request that the Commissioner provide a further update if additional amendments were to be made to the Plan, following his public consultation on police and crime priorities (which was due to close on 22 October 2014).

## 8. Commissioning Strategy Update

- 8.1 The Panel received a report by the Democratic Support and Scrutiny Team Manager providing an update on the Commissioner's Commissioning Strategy intentions, including the commissioning of local services for the support of victims of crime.
- 8.2 The Panel requested that any future reports which included colour-shading to highlight particular statistics, should be circulated with the agenda in colour.
- 8.3 The Panel noted that the Commissioner was exploring options for collaborative working and would keep the Panel updated.
- 8.4 The Panel **RESOLVED** to note the report.

## 9. Complaints Monitoring Report

9.1 The Panel received a report containing regular complaint monitoring information from the Commissioner's Chief Executive and the Norfolk County Council Head of Democratic Services.

9.2 The following points were noted during the discussion:

- Some Panel members expressed concerns about the continued delay in the IPCC's investigation of ongoing complaints. Members considered 8 months was an unacceptable amount of time to deal with a complaint.
- The Chief Executive OPCCN informed the Panel that he contacted the IPCC every two weeks to get an update on progress with the complaints and emphasised that he would keep the independent Panel Member informed of any progress. As he understood it, the IPCC had received a report from the City of London Police and it was in the process of being referred to the IPCC's Commissioner. However, there was still no clear indication of when the outcome would be reported, but he hoped to be able to update the independent Panel Member the following week.
- Of the 19 Freedom of Information requests published on the website, 6 were requesting information that was already publicly available.

9.3 The Panel **RESOLVED**:

1. to note the report.
2. That if no clear indication was received from the IPCC about the timescale for resolving the complaint, the independent Panel Member should report this to the Panel's Chairman so that he could write to the IPCC to formally request this.

## 10. Information Bulletin

10.1 The Panel received a report summarising the decisions taken by the Commissioner and the range of his activity since the last Panel meeting. The Panel noted that the Deputy PCC had not attended the future of Drug Policy event on 24 September, but had attended the Norfolk and Suffolk Criminal Justice Board meeting on 25 September.

10.2 The Panel **RESOLVED** to note the report.

## 11. Forward Work Programme 2014-15

11.1 The Panel received and **noted** the Panel's forward work programme 2014-15.

The meeting closed at 11.55 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.