



Norfolk Police and Crime Panel

Minutes of the Meeting held on 10 September 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 Kevin Maguire	Norwich City Council
Mr Frank Sharpe	Breckland District Council
Mr Mike Smith-Clare	Great Yarmouth Borough Council
Mr Peter Hill	Co-opted Independent Member

Officers Present:

Mr Greg Insull	Assistant Head of Democratic Services, Norfolk County Council (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
Ms Sharon Lister	Director of Performance and Scrutiny, OPCCN
Mr Mark Stokes	Chief Executive, Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Norfolk, OPCCN
Mr Gavin Thompson	Director of Policy and Commissioning, OPCCN

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

- 1.1 Apologies had been received from Mr Francis Whymark, Mr Richard Shepherd and Air Commodore Kevin Pellatt

2. Members to Declare any Interests

- 2.1 There were no interests declared.

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

3.1 There were no items of urgent business.

4. Minutes

4.1 The minutes of the meeting held on 19 June 2018 were confirmed as a true and accurate record and signed by the Chair.

4.2 With reference to paragraph 13.3, it was confirmed that an update on the Community Speed Watch campaign would be provided to the Panel.

4.3 The minutes of the meeting held on 19 July 2018 were confirmed as a true and accurate record and signed by the Chair.

5. Public Questions

5.1 One public question had been received; see Appendix 1 of these minutes.

5.2.1 Cllr Margaret Dewsbury was present and asked the following supplementary question:

I understand that the feedback provided during the PCC's public consultation will be reviewed and that a final version of the business case, based on facts gathered via the public consultation, rather than assumptions, will be provided to the PCC for him to consider a way forward. Given the feedback from the County Council, I would expect the draft business case would need some significant amendments to address the points raised.

The final business case could be considerably different than the version that the public has been consulted on. The PCC may of course decide not to progress this process any further. However, in the event he decides to submit it to the Home Secretary, will the Police and Crime Panel be considering this new Business Case in public before it is sent and if so would they like NCC Communities committee to contribute to the scrutiny to ensure references to NCC figures and working practices are accurate? Considering the case in public will help ensure the public can be fully aware of what is being proposed for their services.

5.2.2 The Chairman said that he thought the final business case would be available to view before and if it was submitted to the Home Office. Should the Communities Committee wish to put forward comments on an amended case, he assumed it would be able to do so.

6. Police and Crime Commissioner for Norfolk's 2017-2018 Annual Report

6.1 The Panel received the Commissioner's draft Annual Report 2017-2018, which contained the PCC's view of his achievements during 2017-2018, the challenges that had arisen during 2017-2018, and known future challenges.

6.2 The Panel questioned why there seemed to be a mismatch in the performance metrics

between the high percentage of people who had confidence in the police, and the lower percentage of people who agreed that the police dealt with community priorities. The Chief Constable confirmed that the Constabulary needed to understand community priorities better, and was seeking to improve the way it engaged with local communities as part of implementation of Norfolk 2020. The reduction in rural crime in the Country had contributed to the improved confidence of local communities.

- 6.3 With reference to the metric on page 28 of the agenda papers, which referred to the 'percentage of rural emergencies responded to within target time', the Panel asked why the percentage had decreased over time. The Chief Constable explained that increasing demand had made it harder to respond within the target time, and described how calls were prioritised. To reassure the Panel, he went on to explain how during the previous weekend, a 72-hour period comprising Friday, Saturday and Sunday, 95% of 999 calls had been answered in under 3 seconds. While the average time taken to answer 101 calls had increased, Norfolk Constabulary's performance was still enviable when compared nationally with other forces. It was confirmed that the gradual decrease in response to rural emergencies had not been because of the reduction of Special Constables, and the Chief Constable explained that the Constabulary was about to embark on a recruitment campaign. The Panel acknowledged that the direction of travel for call response time performance was positive and suggested that the measures for future performance monitoring might be changed, for example by including national average comparisons for Priority 7 indicators, in order that strong performance might be made clearer.
- 6.4 The Panel noted that the number of Killed and Serious Injury (KSI) collisions involving vulnerable road users had increased, and asked the PCC what more he could do with partners to help with this. The Chief Constable explained that this was likely to be a consequence of there being more road users, even though cars, highways and education were all improving. The PCC added that partnerships were already in place, and while the Constabulary was working closely with them, more could always be done. The Panel noted that Norfolk County Council's Casualty Reduction Member Task and Finish Group was due to report to the Communities Committee about improving road safety in the near future. It was suggested that the PCC might embolden his partnership work in this area to reduce a controllable loss of life.
- 6.5 The Panel queried whether the performance metric for the PCC's first priority (Increase Visible Policing) could be better titled. Given that most indicators were about actual and funded posts, the effect of the neighbourhood policing restructure on the data suggested a reduction in visible policing. The Chief Constable explained that the data reflected a snapshot in time, and was being compared to a three-year average which could distort the figures. However, the force was currently down by only 20-25 funded uniform positions. The best had been done with the resources that had been given, and the previous year's precept increase had added 17 police officers and 6 staff (who would be dedicated to schools) to the original Norfolk 2020 model. It was suggested that the metric name could be changed to better reflect the data and focus on the delivery of an efficient and effective police service.
- 6.6 The PCC acknowledged that future challenges would be predominantly about funding.
- 6.7 The Panel asked what work needed to be undertaken to help those who are released from prison, and what local authorities could do to help reduce reoffending. The PCC highlighted that District Councils could be more involved in helping with the housing or accommodation issues. The Director of Policy and Commissioning (OPCCN) explained

that partnership organisations were aware of issues such as rough sleeping and the broader problems that this could lead to for ex-offenders and local communities. A working group, led by the Chief Executive of Norwich City Council, was carrying out work around the pathway to secure accommodation for those who had been released from prison. It was noted that across the Country, there was a need for more engagement by the criminal justice system with housing authorities.

- 6.8 The Panel acknowledged the information given by the PCC in the report about the Gateway to Employment scheme, but it was suggested that additional data should be included in the report to demonstrate the effectiveness of the scheme, including: how many individuals were supported by the scheme, how many are now in full employment, and how many have re-offended.
- 6.9 The Panel highlighted the worrying increase in Serious Sexual Offence, Domestic Abuse and other Violence with Injury crimes, as well as the decreasing solved rate and the increase in percentage of cases where victims did not support prosecution. While recognising the complex nature of those crimes, the PCC was asked what additional support might be provided to support the most vulnerable members of the community who were at risk. The Chief Constable explained that this was incredibly complicated, and data had been affected by both the increasing confidence of victims of historic abuse in coming forward, as well as recent changes in the way that incidents are recorded. In his view it was about victim support as well as policing and assured the Panel that the Constabulary was doing everything it could. It was suggested that actual numbers be provided alongside percentage data for the relevant indicators.
- 6.10 The Panel asked how the forecast 2021/22 budget gap of £9m would be bridged. The Chief Constable explained that £4.6million savings had already been found, and he was confident that he could make the remaining savings through future initiatives, for example through the 7 Force Collaboration work. Central Government would be lobbied for a fairer funding settlement and the Chief Constable would be encouraging the PCC to raise the precept.
- 6.11 The PCC was asked if he would support any pilot initiatives that the Chief Constable wished to initiate, such as that by Thames Valley, Hampshire and West Midlands who were planning to test every motorist they stop in a bid to clamp down on drivers with defective eyesight. The Chief Constable explained that the Constabulary should be able to test new ways of working, with all safeguards in place, and that the public should feel confident in his force doing so.
- 6.12 The Panel **RESOLVED** to recommend:
- That the PCC considers changing the description of the metric, to focus attention on the delivery of an efficient and effective police service (Priority 1 - Increase Visible Policing).
 - That the PCC seeks to embolden his partnership work in this area, to reduce controllable loss of life (Priority 3 – Improve Road Safety).
 - That the PCC provides further information within his report and future performance monitoring, to demonstrate the effectiveness of the Gateway to Employment scheme, including: how many individuals were supported by the scheme, how many are now in full employment, and how many have re-offended (Priority 4 – Prevent Offending).
 - That actual numbers be provided alongside percentage data for relevant indicators (Priority 5 – Support Victims and Reduce Vulnerability).

- That the PCC considers changing the measures for future performance monitoring, in order that strong performance might be made clearer, for example by including national average comparisons for each (Priority 7 – Good Stewardship of Taxpayers' Money).

7. Police and Crime Commissioner oversight of the Criminal Justice System

- 7.1 The Panel received the report which set out an update on how the PCC is delivering his duty to bring together community safety and criminal justice partners, to make sure local priorities are joined up. It also described the work being undertaken to develop an enhanced role for PCCs across the criminal justice system, nationally and locally.
- 7.2 The Panel questioned the PCC about the possibility of his future oversight of the Community Rehabilitation Company (CRC). The Director of Policy and Commissioning (OPCCN) confirmed that the Norfolk and Suffolk Criminal Justice Board (N&SCJB) was keen to develop and scrutinise the effectiveness of the CRC, and while there were plans to develop local PCC oversight it was too early to understand what exactly this might mean in practice.
- 7.3 The Panel noted the lack of representatives from the magistrates or the judiciary services on the N&SCJB.
- 7.4 The Panel **NOTED** the report.

8. Information Bulletin – questions arising to the PCC

- 8.1 The Panel received the information bulletin which provided an update 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.
- 8.2 The Panel heard that there had been an unprecedented response to the consultation relating to Governance of the Norfolk Fire and Rescue Service. The OPCCN thanked all who had submitted a response and confirmed that it would require a great deal of work to collate all the comments received. A full report would be published in due course, and would contain: a full evaluation of the consultation, a sensitivity analysis on the comments provided, a summary of comments in tabular form, together with a response to each from OPCCN, as well as responses to key stakeholders and confirmation of any amendments made in producing a final business case for submission to the Home Secretary should that be the PCC's decision. The PCC would take an appropriate time to consider his decision.
- 8.3 The PCC was asked whether he would respect a majority view in favour of the service remaining with the County Council, if that was the result of the consultation. The PCC confirmed that his decision would be led by evidence, rather than opinion.
- 8.4 The venue for the PCC's public question and answer session in North Norfolk was due to be confirmed later in the week.
- 8.5 The Panel **NOTED** the information bulletin.

9. Work Programme

- 9.1 The Panel received the work programme which scheduled agenda items for the rest of the year.
- 9.2 The Panel noted that Kevin Pellatt had been appointed Chairman of the Complaints Policy Sub Panel when it met on 3 September 2018. On his behalf, Dr Kemp reported that:
- The timetable for the policing complaints reforms had slipped. Implementation was now anticipated on 1 April 2019, at which point PCCs would become the review body for appeals about the outcome of policing complaints.
 - The Independent Office for Police Complaints is re-drafting statutory guidance, and it is expected that this will be completed in time to support implementation. However, drafting was dependent on the wording of Regulations, which are expected to be finalised during the autumn.
 - The new police super-complaints system was due to be implemented on the 1 November 2018. 16 organisations had been approved as being designated bodies for police super complaints, which will enable them to raise issues on behalf of the public about harmful patterns or trends in policing.
 - The Government had consulted on proposals for a more transparent and easily understood PCC complaints process. As a result, it intends to give PCPs greater investigatory powers to seek evidence pertinent to a complaint through the appointment of an independent investigator. No further indication had been given of whether new Regulations and statutory guidance would be made available alongside those for policing complaint reforms.
 - The Sub Panel was due to meet again in November, at which point it hoped to consider in detail any issues arising from Norfolk and Suffolk PCCs' decision to adopt the mandatory oversight model for police complaints, and any implications for the PCP.
- 9.3 The Panel **AGREED** the work programme and noted that there may be a need for an extraordinary meeting in October to discuss the outcome of the PCC's decision relating to Fire Governance.

Meeting ended at 12.15pm.

**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.

POLICE AND CRIME PANEL
10 September 2018

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

Q1. Question from Cllr Margaret Dewsbury, Chairman of Norfolk County Council's Communities Committee (the Fire and Rescue Authority)

The Panel will be aware that the PCC is carrying out a public consultation on proposals to change governance of the Fire and Rescue Service. The consultation is a useful opportunity to understand public views. Therefore, I have written to the PCC requesting a full copy of comments submitted to the consultation so that the Fire and Rescue Authority can ensure suggestions and learning within the comments can be captured and acted on. Will the Panel also seek to review, in full, comments relating to the Police Service?

Response by the Chairman of the Norfolk Police and Crime Panel

The Panel will consider, in due course, the PCC's decision on whether to submit his case (for change of governance of the Fire and Rescue Service) to the Home Secretary. To do so, the Panel will request a report on the outcome of the PCC's consultation. If that report shows that the public and key stakeholders have used the opportunity to comment on other matters, such as the policing service, the Panel will be able to question the PCC about those comments and how they will be addressed.