



Norfolk Police and Crime Panel

Minutes of the Meeting held on 27 June 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 Donald Tyler	King's Lynn and West Norfolk Council
Cllr Mike Smith-Clare	Great Yarmouth Borough Council
Cllr Margaret Dewsbury	South Norfolk Council
Mr Peter Hill	Co-opted Independent Member
Cllr Cate Oliver	Norwich City Council

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
Jo Martin	Scrutiny Support Manager, NCC
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 Jonathan Emsell, Cllr Tim Adams, Cllr Graham Carpenter and Cllr James Easter, substituted by Cllr Margaret Dewsbury. Apologies were also received from the Chief Constable.

2. Election of Chair

- 2.1 Cllr William Richmond was duly elected for the ensuing year.

3. Election of Vice-Chair

- 3.1 Air Commodore Kevin Pellatt was duly elected for the ensuing year.

4. Minutes

- 4.1 The minutes of the meeting held on 21 April 2022 were agreed as an accurate record and signed by the Chair.

5. Members to Declare any Interests

- 5.1 Cllr Margaret Dewsbury declared an 'other' interest as although she sat on the Panel as a representative of South Norfolk Council, she was a Cabinet Member for Norfolk County Council with responsibility for the Norfolk Fire and Rescue Service.

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

- 6.1 No urgent business was discussed.

7. Public Questions

- 7.1 No public questions were received.

8. Balanced Appointment Objective

- 8.1 The Panel received the report asking it to consider whether the balanced appointment objective was being met and the continuation of independent member co-options.
- 8.2 Having considered the report, the Panel **AGREED**;
- 1) the balanced appointment objective was being met;
 - 2) the continuation of Air Commodore Kevin Pellatt and Mr Peter Hill as co-opted independent members.

9. Panel Arrangements and Rules of Procedure – Review

- 9.1 The Panel received the report setting out the Norfolk Police and Crime Panel Rules of Procedure, Panel Arrangements, and guidance for handling complaints about the conduct of the Police and Crime Commissioner.
- 9.2 The Panel:
- 1) **ENDORSED** the amended Panel Arrangements (at Annex 1 of the report).
 - 2) **ENDORSED** the Rules of Procedure (at Annex 2 of the report).
 - 3) **ENDORSED** the guidance for handling complaints about the conduct of the Police and Crime Commissioner (at Annex 3 of the report) and **APPOINTED** the following members to be involved in the process:
 - Peter Hill
 - Kevin Pellatt
 - Mike Smith-Clare
 - James Easter
 - Sarah Butikofer
 - 4) **APPOINTED** the following Panel Members to the Complaints Policy Sub Panel (at Annex 4 of the report):

- Peter Hill
- Kevin Pellatt
- Mike Smith Clare
- James Easter
- Sarah Butikofer

9.3 It was noted that the next Complaints Policy Sub Panel meeting would take place on Wednesday 6 July 2022.

10. Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) Review Part Two

10.1 The Panel received a report which outlined the recommendations which had been included in the Written Statement by the Home Secretary on 7 March 2022 following an internal review by the Home Office to help strengthen the role of Police and Crime Commissioners. These recommendations aimed to better equip PCCs to reduce crime and protect the public, solidify their position within the criminal justice system and make it easier for the public to hold PCCs to account.

10.2. The Chair invited the PCC to comment on how the Recommendations were being taken forward and give his views on the local implications. The PCC made the following points;

- Much of the work suggested by the Review was just beginning or yet to start. It was likely that the recommendations would be carried forward via a variety of legislation and associated policy guidance. However, the OPCCN and PCC were looking carefully at the aspirations set out in the Review and were getting ahead of wider debates both at national and county levels.
- The purpose of the PCC Review was to expand the role. The PCC concept would stay and was expected to expand, and it would evolve through various ways. The PCC was particularly interested in the Criminal Justice System and there was scope for it to evolve such as the example of West Yorkshire where they had elected a County Mayor with PCC functions and this had been carried forward into nine other counties. The PCCs understanding was that Norfolk would not follow the example of West Yorkshire.
- With regards to 'Transparency' in The Review, the PCC confirmed that he always endeavoured to make sure he and his team were always transparent in all that they did. The OPCCN were creating a new process which would scrutinise their transparency and that was currently being looked at by APCC. It was hoped that would be exported to other OPCCNs soon. That scrutiny process would also engage Norfolk's public through the Independent Advisory Group.
- With regards to the section about 'Clarifying the Relationship between PCCs and Chief Constables (CCs)', the Home Office had recently consulted a revision of the Policing Protocol Order 2011. The proposals suggested greater powers for the Home Secretary to the detriment of PCCs and CCs and the OPCCNs response had asked the Home Office to reconsider its position.
- Through the Government intentions of the Review of the PCC role, there were difficulties over the personal conduct of some PCC's. The PCC expressed that PCCs had to be part of the solutions of re-building the confidence in policing. There was a significant gap between the standards

expected of PCCs by the Nolan Principles and the standards required by law and this was an area that needed to be looked at.

- Work was being done to consider how Police and Crime Panels (PCPs) could best deliver their scrutiny functions, but the PCC suggested that Norfolk was already ahead of this, as there was a sensible relationship that existed between the PCC, OPCCN and the PCP. Relationships elsewhere were not so healthy or constructive.
- The Review should be taken in context along with the Levelling Up Bill and the Fire Reform White Paper amongst others. The PCC would have a professional interest in the levelling up agenda. Whilst Norfolk Local Authorities considered what this might mean for them, the OPCCN needed to consider where it sat in relation to any Norfolk structure. He was keen to be part of whatever deal they arrived at and equally keen that the OPCCN's part in that deal should offer value added. For example, Norfolk was well placed in having a single Countywide Community Safety Partnership (NCCSP) as well as having the Chair of the NCCSP co-located in the same office as the PCC. Any deal should strengthen and intertwine the work that the OPCCN carried out with the work of Norfolk County Council.
- The Review stated that it would look at expanding the PCC's role into fire governance. Where Norfolk's Fire and Rescue Service sat would depend on the outcome of Norfolk's County Deal. The PCC expressed that his own opinion on fire governance had not changed and that the Fire Reform White Paper and fire governance was a matter for Norfolk County Council. If he was approached by Norfolk County Council and Norfolk Fire and Rescue Service together and invited to take on fire governance, he would work with both Norfolk County Council and Norfolk Fire and Rescue Service to find the best solution in the interests of Norfolk, whether that was part of a County Deal or separately.
- The Review had offered an agenda of aspirations which would need further work but the OPCCN would consider solutions and what would work best in Norfolk. He was very encouraged by the breathing space that the Review had offered.

10.3 During the discussion, the following points were noted;

- 10.3.1 In response to a question regarding the detail of strengthening the Criminal Justice System, the PCC explained that this would probably be done through the Local Criminal Justice Board which was currently shared with Suffolk. The Review stated that it should be mandated that PCCs should chair the Criminal Justice Boards. The PCC was currently the Chair and he agreed that it needed someone of authority in that position. He added that there were currently different accountability arrangements of those agencies and organisations involved in the criminal justice system, with no one holding them all to account. This was causing delays in the court system, and as such the views of victims were being lost, with many wishing to withdraw from the proceedings due to the lengthy delays. If such an issue was raised at the Criminal Justice Board, organisations were not answerable to the Chair. There needed to be a PCC review which devolved authority and through an appropriate mechanism gave an effect on the ground which was fair to the victim.
- 10.3.2 The PCC was aware that an idea had been proposed around the Local Government Association and the Home Office and regional panel secretariats, but he was not aware what work had been done or where it had got to. The PCC

expressed the view that the Government were devolving greater power so regionalising would not follow the same logical sense.

- 10.4 The Panel **NOTED** the local implications arising from the Review and **AGREED** that there were no reports or recommendations that it wished to make to the PCC.

11. Overview of PCC Commissioned Services

- 11.1 The Panel received a report which updated the Panel on the services and interventions which were funded by the OPCCN through the commissioning budget and Ministry of Justice grants and how they were supporting the Police, Crime and Community Safety Plan 2022-24.

- 11.2 In introducing the report, the PCC made the following points;
- The PCC was grateful to spotlight the work done by his office with regards to commissioning. Describing the Police and Crime Plan, the PCC explained that it was a core of rope around which were many strands that made the rope stronger, and the commissioning strategy was one of those strands.
 - The total amount of funding received in the last financial year for commissioning was £2.7million. Of the core funding, half came from the Ministry of Justice grant and the other half came from other sources of funding. The OPCCN kept a watchful eye on available grants and acted swiftly to successfully bid for those grants.
 - Partnership working was an important part of the commissioning strategy. This allowed greater effect on the ground and more effective working. The role of the OPCCN in leading those partnerships were highlighted in the report.
 - Services were commissioned against contracts to ensure that the services were delivered. The work carried out added greater value to the work already carried out by the Constabulary, often stepping in to look after victims when the Constabulary had been the first port of call.

- 11.3 During the discussion, the following points were noted;

- 11.3.1 The PCC had stated that primarily the commissioned services supported the pillars in the Police and Crime Plan around preventing crime and supporting victims. The Panel questioned whether in future, the commissioning strategy would support any other areas of the plan. The PCC explained that it was a case of prioritising limited resources. With limited funds, the PCC explained that they were better to concentrate resources to have a bigger effect on a small number of things rather than offer limited help across the board. The current focus was on preventing crime and supporting victims, particularly given the national focus on improving public confidence in policing, but he would keep those priorities under review. The Director of Commissioning added that in terms of the work around domestic abuse and bearing in mind the demand on the Constabulary concerning domestic abuse, that work could be positioned under 'Sustaining the Constabulary' pillar. The 'Safer Streets' project could also fall under the 'Community Safety' pillar given the partnership working involved.
- 11.3.2 The Panel questioned how the effectiveness and the value for money of a commissioned service was measured. They asked if there was a time when a commissioned service did not perform as wished or as expected and how would it

be resolved. The PCC explained that a requirement for a service was identified through an agency or organisation that contacted the OPCCN. They would then analyse if there was a requirement, and they would develop a case and then go out to tender on a procurement and contract basis. Performance would be measured against the contract and whether the desired outcomes were being delivered. The most likely reason for a service to cease would be if the service did not meet the contract but this was rare due to most new projects being a pilot.

- 11.3.3 The report detailed work on the Integrated Domestic Abuse Service and the Panel questioned how far this had reached within education settings. The PCC referred to paragraph 4.3 on page 73 of the agenda and explained that OPCCN had provided Norfolk Integrated Domestic Abuse Service (NIDAS), but OPCCN could not do everything. There was a part for education to play in providing the solution to the current problem and how to educate the younger generation to prevent it in the future. It was not a conversation that had been had but it was an example of something that as part of a wider OPCCN and County Deal conversation could be delivered. It was on the PCC's radar, and it would be taken forward.
- 11.3.4 There was further good work that was being done by the OPCCN in conjunction with the Independent Advisory Group and Youth Commission. Since the arrival of the PCC he had re-energised the Independent Advisory Group and ensured that all groups of society were represented on the group. The group had a local network and a central committee which was always attended by either the Chief Constable or Assistant Chief Constable. Views were listened to by the Constabulary and were well regarded.
- 11.3.5 With regards to CARA (Conditional Cautioning and Relationship Abuse) on page 75 of the agenda, the Director of Commissioning assured the Panel that this project was accessible to the people of Norfolk. The reference to Hampshire in the report referred to where the project had originally been developed.
- 11.3.6 Although it wasn't possible to give a breakdown of what percentage of the budget was being spent on each of the nine elements mentioned in the report, the Director of Commissioning **agreed** to provide a written response that would outline what percentage of the commissioning budget was being spent on each of the PCC's pillars and how that spend was weighted.
- 11.3.7 The PCC confirmed that Leeway was one of OPCCN's commissioned services and were the lead partner for NIDAS. The PCC added that he always tried to commission Norfolk charities in the first instance as he believed that Norfolk should solve Norfolk's issues. There were national charities that could be approached if needed, and he emphasised that they would be approached if nothing appropriate could be found locally.
- 11.3.8 The Panel suggested that it would be useful to have a summary of the detail of the commissioned services so they could understand the depth of work being undertaken as well as the breadth of issues being addressed. The PCC was keen to promote and the services his office commissioned and **agreed** this could be arranged.
- 11.4 Having considered the overview of the PCC Commissioned Services, the Panel **AGREED** to request a report on improving public confidence in policing for a future meeting, with a focus on the Independent Advisory Group and Youth Commission.

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 During the discussion, the following points were noted;
- 12.3 The PCC had attended the first of the Association of Police and Crime Commissioner's (APCC) levelling up working group meetings. The PCC explained that one of the concerns of the APCC was the role of the PCC in this agenda, and they had the view that Mayor's should not take on the functions of PCCs. However, this had been done in West Yorkshire. The PCC felt that through various conversations he had with national counterparts, he was up to date with the conversations and that discussions were going in the right direction. He hoped that the APCC didn't opt for the 'one size fits all' approach. He added that Suffolk was intending to do something different from Norfolk, and this was of particular interest due to their collaborative work. The PCC intended to attend a future levelling up working group where a representative from the Department of Levelling Up Communities and Housing had been asked to attend as they were the owners of the project.
- 12.4 With regards to page 85 of the agenda and the survey on 101 and 999 services, the Panel asked if there was any feedback available from a Norfolk perspective. The PCC explained that the survey was run by APCC on a national basis. The results would be announced at the APCC general meeting on 13th and 14th July. In discussion with the Chief Constable, the PCC reported that Norfolk's data had been reviewed and was within a threshold of 10 seconds. Norfolk's average was 7.5 seconds for a 999 call. Data about the 101 service had been delayed until March 2023 because each Constabulary had different ways of dealing with the data and different procedures for following up 101 calls and handling 101 calls in the offices.
- 12.5 In terms of Norfolk and Suffolk Collaboration Panels, the PCC explained that there was a more formal arrangement with Suffolk as one third of his budget was spent on joint space with Suffolk and they had joint assets and various joint teams. There was no equivalent with other forces, but there was an Eastern Region Seven Force network where they met at least twice a year and in between on an as-and-when basis if needed. There was also joint procurement which helped achieve economies of scale.
- 12.6 The Panel **NOTED** the report.

13. PCC Complaints Monitoring Report

- 13.1 The Panel received the report reviewing complaints received since the last monitoring report was received on the 1 February 2022.
- 13.2 The Panel **NOTED** the monitoring information.

14. Norfolk Police and Crime Panel Funding

- 14.1 The Panel received the report reviewing the Norfolk Police and Crime Panel's expenditure for 2021-2022 and setting out the expected 2022-23 grant allocation and expected expenditure for 2022-2023.
- 14.2 The Vice-Chair commented on the value of the Eastern Region Network and the National Conference, which he regularly attended.
- 14.3 The Chair explained that details of the national Conference would be circulated in due course and to indicate if they wished to attend. He also asked that if members of the Panel had any training needs, to let him or the Scrutiny Support Manager know.
- 14.4 The Panel;
- **NOTED** the 2021-22 expenditure
 - **NOTED** the 2022-23 grant allocation
 - **NOTED** the areas of expenditure during 2022-23

15. Work Programme

- 15.1 The Panel received the work programme for the period September 2022 to June 2023.
- 15.2 The OPCCN Chief Executive confirmed that the next Public Accountability Meeting would be held on 3rd August at the Breckland Council Offices in Dereham. The time would be confirmed but was likely to be 10 or 10.30am.
- 15.2 The Panel **AGREED** the work programme with the additions agreed during the meeting

Meeting ended 12.33pm

**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.