



**Norfolk Police and Crime Panel**  
**Minutes of the Meeting Held on Friday 8 August 2014 at 10.00 a.m.**  
**Edwards Room, County Hall, Norwich**

**Main Panel Members Present:**

Mr Stephen Agnew	Norfolk County Council
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 William Richmond	Breckland Council
Mr Richard Shepherd	North Norfolk District Council
Mr Trevor Wainwright	Great Yarmouth Borough Council

**Officers Present**

Mr Greg Insull	Assistant Head of Democratic Services
Mrs Jo Martin	Democratic Services and Scrutiny Support Manager
Mrs Catherine Wilkinson	Committee Officer

**Others Present**

Mr Charlie Hall	Deputy Chief Constable for Norfolk
Mrs Sharon Lister	Performance and Compliance Officer
Ms Jenny McKibben	Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner for Norfolk

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

- 1.1 Apologies were received from Mr Brian Long, Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk, Ms Sharon Brooks and Mr Alexander Sommerville, Co-opted Independent Members.

**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 4 July 2014

- 4.1 The minutes of the meeting held on 4 July 2014 were considered. An amendment was made to page 1, adding that the location for the meeting was 'Gymnasium, Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Norfolk, Falconers Chase, Wymondham, Norfolk, NR18 0WW'. With this amendment the minutes were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.
- 4.2 The Chairman noted that the letter to the Home Office had been sent and awaited a reply.

#### 5. Police and Crime Commissioner for Norfolk's Draft Annual Report

- 5.1 The Panel received the report by the Democratic Services and Scrutiny Support Manager asking the Panel to review the Police and Crime Commissioner for Norfolk's draft Annual Report for 2013-14. Prior to discussion of the report Members expressed disappointment that the Police and Crime Commissioner had been unable to attend the meeting. His Deputy, Ms McKibben, confirmed that Mr Bett had been called away to the funeral of a close family friend and that Mr Bett would provide written responses for any points raised at the meeting that she was not able to answer.
- 5.2 The Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner presented the draft Annual Report, noting that progress was being made with the priority themes. A new format had been designed to make the information more accessible while ensuring the Commissioner remained accountable. The Performance and Compliance Officer outlined the highlights of the report.
- 5.3 During the discussion the following points were noted:
- It was **agreed** that a more detailed breakdown of violent and sexual crimes, divided into the three main population areas of Norwich, King's Lynn and Great Yarmouth, would be included. Although this could only be reported against the set targets, more detailed information could be provided to Panel Members on request.
- <sup>1</sup>
- The figures relating to the reduction of anti-social behaviour only reflected data gathered from the Command and Control System. Partnership working with Councils was valuable in that area, however it was not possible to record comparable data. Following a comparison exercise, there was confidence that the anti-social behaviour data presented in the report did provide a realistic picture of this target in Norfolk. However, it was **agreed** that it would be helpful for future annual reports to reflect joint working with other partners.
  - The main differences between this report and the former Police Authority reports were that there was an increased focus on work with other agencies, and that there was now a significant commissioning budget available.

---

<sup>1</sup> It was agreed that this minute be amended and was corrected at the committee meeting on 3 October 2014. Please view the minutes of that meeting in order to note the corrections made.

- Rural crime had not been specifically mentioned in the report as it was not a set target. However, performance in this area together with other wider objectives (e.g. cyber-crime) was monitored by the Constabulary and OPCC. Many priorities focussed on rural issues and daily management meetings would determine the resources required when a trend emerged in a rural area. It was **agreed** that an update should be provided to the Panel at a future meeting.
- It was suggested that information about the performance of comparable police forces should be included within the report, to provide some context. It was **agreed** that this would be included where possible. However, other police forces would be measuring different targets so comparable data may not be available for all. Performance information was measured against other forces with Norfolk comparing favourably against challenging targets. The latest HMIC report had concluded that Norfolk was one of four outstanding forces in the country, and the Deputy Commissioner agreed to circulate this report.
- The difference between detection rates and conviction rates was explained, noting that conviction information was held by the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS). A crime charged to court would be considered as a detection, as would cautions. Crimes were only charged with the agreement of the CPS. A piece of work had been requested, to track cases through from detection to conviction.
- It was noted that the wider 'justice journey' was explored however targets could only be set in areas that the police could influence. Issues such as CPS capacity to bring a conviction, and the quality of evidence provided, were scrutinised for improvement.
- The Deputy Commissioner shared the Panel's concerns regarding the Killed and Seriously Injured (KSI) figures, noting that the Commissioner was actively pursuing the re-establishment of the Casualty Reduction Board. There had been a growth in the number of KSI in Norfolk and a PhD intern had been appointed to examine any correlations. This was a much wider issue around driver education and enforcement.
- It was **agreed** that the regular public meetings between the Commissioner and the Chief Constable would be referred to as Police Accountability Forums, not Panels.
- Of the £20M savings to be made over the next four years, £16M had been identified. The remaining £4M would be identified over the coming year. PCSO resource would be trimmed across the county with targeted resourcing being introduced into key areas. There remained an element of uncertainty regarding future government funding. It was **agreed** that it would be helpful to include more detailed information about the likely impact of required efficiency savings on local communities in the report, together with information about how the Commissioner will seek to protect frontline services.
- It was **agreed** to correct the error on page 31, listing the make-up of the

Panel as county councillors and independent members, to reflect district council involvement.

2

- There had been a move away from a general ‘reduction of all crime’ target as this took the focus away from important areas where reporting of crime needs to be encouraged such as hate crime. The need for a general reference to the number of all reported crimes was discussed, however it was suggested that this could give the wrong message if in some areas crime figures went up as the result of a police campaign to encourage reporting. Figures could be provided to the Panel, with appropriate context.

5.4

The Panel **RESOLVED** to note the draft Annual Report and requested that Chairman of the Panel should write to the Police and Crime Commissioner to suggest the following amendments:

- Page 23: Anti-Social Behaviour - work towards the inclusion of anti-social behaviour data captured by other partners.
- Page 24: Violent and Sexual Crime within Key Night Time Economy Areas – figures to be provided for each of the three key areas (King’s Lynn, Norwich and Great Yarmouth).
- Police force performance: Include some data to illustrate how Norfolk Constabulary is performing against other similar rural county areas and emphasise the impact that these improvements are making.
- Include an overview of how rural crime is being tackled.
- Page 26: The ‘Police Accountability Panel’ to be re-named the ‘Police Accountability Forum’ to help clarify the local accountability structures.
- Page 31: Correctly describe the Panel as “....made up of county, city, district and borough councillors, as well as two independent members...”
- More detailed information about the likely impact of required efficiency savings on local communities and how the Commissioner will seek to protect frontline services in the face of cuts.

The Panel also **RESOLVED** that it would be helpful to include the following update items at future meetings:

- Progress with the Commissioner’s commissioning intentions, including the commissioning of local services for the support of victims of crime.
- An update on how rural crime is being tackled.

## 6. Information bulletin

6.1

The Panel received the information bulletin summarising the decisions taken by the Commissioner and the range of his activities since the last Panel meeting.

6.2

During the discussion, the following points were noted:

- The reference to ‘giving’ money to the Police should be changed to ‘made available’ as it was already public money.
- It was confirmed that Panel Members had received the Commissioner’s consultation on his draft Community Remedy for Norfolk, a new duty from

---

<sup>2</sup> It was agreed that this minute be amended and was corrected at the committee meeting on 3 October 2014. Please view the minutes of that meeting in order to note the corrections made.

the recent Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act. The Deputy Commissioner said that either an individual or collective response from the Panel Members would be welcomed. It was **agreed** that a summary of the consultation responses received would be provided to the Panel, however this would need to be before the next Panel meeting as the Commissioner was working to a tight national timescale with implementation due by 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2014. It was also **agreed** that a list of consultees would be circulated to the Panel.

- It was suggested that future consultations should be formally sent to the Chairman of the Panel rather than individual members, so that if it was appropriate for the Panel to respond a collective response could be considered.
- It was **agreed** that a regular list of new powers and duties of the Police and Crime Commissioner would be circulated to the Panel.
- The Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner noted that out of county, the Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner had attended national events which included meetings with other Police and Crime Commissioners. It was **agreed** that future information bulletins would include out of county activities.

6.3 The Panel **RESOLVED** to note the report and **agreed**:

- To ask the Commissioner to provide a summary of the Community Remedy Consultation responses together with a list of consultees
- That a regular list of new powers and duties of the Police and Crime Commissioner should be circulated to Panel Members.
- That future information bulletins should include the Commissioner's out-of-county activities.

## 7. HMIC's programme for regular force inspections

7.1 The Panel received the report asking the Panel to consider the consultation document and agree issues it wished to raise in response to the consultation questions. The Democratic Services & Scrutiny Support Manager noted that a response had been drafted by the Chairman and Vice Chairman for the Panel's comments, and suggested that the final response could be delegated to the Chairman and Vice Chairman.

7.2 During the discussion the following points were noted:

- The prospect of cutting the number of inspections was discussed. At present, inspections were thematic, and the proposals would broaden the extent of an individual inspection with a more whole-force approach.
- Each inspection was bespoke, with some paper-based exercise and some physical inspection which included interviews and focus groups, followed by reality testing. This approach was resource-intensive and a cut in the amount of resource required would be welcomed.
- The notice period given for an inspection could vary from 4 weeks to 48

hours.

- It was acknowledged that HMIC played a useful role in highlighting areas for improvement and holding the Commissioner to account. Inspections could benefit from examining partner organisation input however that would be on a voluntary basis.

7.4 The Panel **RESOLVED** to approve the draft response to the consultation, to be finalised by the Chairman and Vice Chairman and submitted by the deadline. Mr Driver voted against this motion.

## 8. Work Programme

8.1 The Panel received the Forward Work Programme 2014-15.

8.2 The Panel **RESOLVED** that the forward work programme be agreed with the following additions:

- Commissioning Intentions (October 2014)
- Tackling Rural Crime (December 2014)

8.3 The Panel also **agreed** that if the Police and Crime Commissioner was not able to attend the next meeting on Friday 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2014 for any reason, it should be rescheduled for a date convenient with his diary.

The meeting closed at 11.45am.

### 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.