



Norfolk Police and Crime Panel

Minutes of the Meeting held on 21 April 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 Tim Adams | Norfolk County Council |
| Cllr Gordon Bambridge | Breckland District Council |
| Cllr Sarah Butikofer | North Norfolk District Council |
| Cllr Graham Carpenter | Norfolk County Council |
| Cllr Jonathan Emsell | Broadland District Council |
| Cllr James Easter | South Norfolk Council |
| Mr Peter Hill | Co-opted Independent Member |
| Cllr Cate Oliver | Norwich City Council |

Officers Present:

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| Paul Sanford | Chief Constable for Norfolk (CC) |
| 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 |
| Karen Haywood | Democratic Services Officer |
| Mark Stokes | Chief Executive, OPCCN |
| Jill Penn | Chief Finance Officer, 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 Mike Smith-Clare and Cllr Colin Manning.

2. Minutes

- 2.1 The minutes of the meeting held on 1 February 2022 were agreed as an accurate record and signed by the Chair.

3. Members to Declare any Interests

- 3.1 There were no interests declared.

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

4.1 No urgent business was discussed.

5. Public Questions

5.1 No public questions were received.

6. Police and Crime Plan for Norfolk 2016-2021 – performance monitoring

6.1. The Panel received the report providing an overview of the progress made against delivering two of the strategic priorities within the Norfolk Police and Crime Plan for 2016-2022 (Priority 2: Support Rural Communities and Priority 3: Improve Road Safety).

6.2 The Chair highlighted that this was the final performance report on the Commissioner's exiting Police and Crime Plan. The Panel had noted the publication of the new Police, Crime & Community Safety Plan on 31st March and looked forward to monitoring progress during future meetings.

6.3 In introducing the report, the PCC made the following points.

- The PCC drew attention to page 28 of the agenda and work that had been carried out regarding Operation Randall, Operation Galileo (hare coursing), Operation Huff (theft of GPS technology on agricultural vehicles) and Operation Seabird (protection of nesting seabirds and seals).
- The continuing development of drones mentioned on page 26 and the past investment made in drone technology would potentially pay dividends amongst the uncertainty of the National Police Air Service. The Constabulary were fortunate as the past investment meant they had credible air capability throughout any future uncertainty.
- With regards to road safety, the focus had been reducing the number of casualties, and the trend appeared to be downwards but there could be a post-covid upturn.
- The PCC highlighted on page 35 the excellent work carried out by Speedwatch volunteers. The level of participation within those groups reflected the level of concern about road safety within communities. The PCC reported that, with reference to page 34/35, the Constabulary was only one part of criminal justice system, so enforcement actions needed to be underpinned by sanctions. The disruption of the driver awareness courses arisen from the Covid pandemic had not helped. The PCC was also concerned at the delay of getting those more serious cases into court.
- Through the engagement carried out with public, the PCC had noted the speeding in residential areas and rural areas, and the perception of that speeding and the concern of the speeding were a constant theme of the engagement with the public. It is a deeper issue of anti-social behaviour which affected the lives of others in the community where those speeders were living.

6.4 During the discussion, the following points were raised;

- 6.4.1 The Panel asked the PCC what more work he envisaged would be carried out around supporting rural communities, what his strategic outlook was and what he would like to see being done on issues regarding the seals, especially the mistreatment. The PCC reassured that this issue was on the radar and recognised that there was an issue as it was reported regularly. However, he had to adopt a hard-line view as to where it sat as a priority amongst others and what resources could be attributed to it. The CC added that he was very much aware of it and was one of many demands he and the Constabulary faced. They offered their full support when the disturbance to seals hits the threshold of triggering Royal Society Prevention Cruelty to Animals (RSPCA). There was a broader challenge of working on the communications campaign and awareness, balancing advertising the beauty of those places with attracting more contact with those creatures.
- 6.4.2 In answer to a question regarding Operation 'Huff' and the work around the theft of agricultural machinery, the PCC explained that engineering a way out of the problem would probably have greater effect than preventing people from stealing. The PCC had no direct engagement but was aware that the insurance industry was having a lot of engagement with National Farmers Union (NFU). The CC added that through National Policing Lead of Vehicle Crime, there had been various engagements with industry of providers. Modern, high-cost equipment was retrospectively being installed into old machinery vehicles which had no security. From an investigate perspective the knowledge and understanding of the market of these products was improving constantly leading to bespoke operations to try and target the dealers of these units.
- 6.4.3 The Panel reported that as elected members they were regularly approached by members of their communities with regards to speeding and road offences. Although these concerns were often particular to an area, they were also issues that affected the whole of the county. The PCC was asked whether a reduction of speed limits could be part of the problem. The PCC reported that he heard those concerns daily, and it wasn't just a matter of speeding, but anti-social behaviour and it was a priority for him. The possible solution of reducing speed limits would start with Highways as that was where the responsibility lay for setting the limits. Where the Constabulary had data regarding the speed limit for a particular location, it would be in their favour to support the reduction. Although there was funding available to Norfolk County Council, it was not enough to share between 540 parishes who all had an issue. It was important to address the fundamental problem of speeding motorists whether this be through education or to design out the problem with future inventions such as driverless cars. Unfortunately, it was just human nature. It was high on the PCC's radar, but currently there was no solution. The CC added that he too regularly heard the issue. In 2020, 4.59 billion miles were driven on Norfolk roads. Norfolk had one of the biggest road networks across the country with a huge amount of activity on the roads. There were 46,000 speeding enforcements last year through various means and over 1000 vehicles ceased. The enforcement funds further investment through the Countywide Safety Partnership which enabled the Constabulary to increase the rural speeding vans from 4 to 6. All the enforcement available would not solve the problem and he agreed with the PCC that through designing out the problem, through the roads would help, but more importantly to change the mindset of drivers and to just make it unacceptable.

- 6.4.4 The Chair reported that in 2023/ 2024 that the Norfolk County Council Road Safety Fund would be focusing on the Breckland and South Norfolk areas which may have an impact on the highway and the speed limits.
- 6.4.5 The PCC would keep road safety high on the agenda and would continue to have conversations with the CC and relevant organisations including NCC.
- 6.4.6 The Panel highlighted that in other areas of Europe, icons were used to signify where people had died because of road traffic accidents. This was used with the aim of reducing speeding and reminded drivers that speeding could cause fatalities. A longer-term view was needed to reduce casualties on the Norfolk roads, and drivers needed to be influenced and educated at the point of speeding. This would not only prevent speeding, but prevent individuals from entering the criminal justice system, keep people out of courts, keep speeding fines down and prevent them from adding to the statistics. The PCC was interested in any way he could influence and educate drivers. There had been a similar suggestion made at a recently attended Road Safety Conference by the PCC and CC. Road Safety was part of his Police and Crime Plan and the OPCCN had been looking at how messages could be given out across the County.
- 6.4.7 The Panel asked if there was a correlation between the falling numbers of subscribers to the Operation Randall newsletter mentioned on page 29 of the agenda and less rural crime being reported mentioned on page 30. The PCC explained that the last rural forum attended by the PCC had been poorly attended. This was assumed to be positive and that farmers didn't feel as though they had issues to report and therefore didn't attend. A change in a new system of the newsletter and the GDPR obligations had created the fall in subscribers. Not everyone had re-subscribed. The figure relating to the number of hours spent on rural policing was a post-Covid correction. Due to people being furloughed, they had more hours available to work as a Special Constable. With people returning to work this availability had now returned to pre-Covid levels. The CC added that he was more concerned with the future than the past in terms of the rural crime figures. With the rising costs of living and particularly fuel, it could cause a rise in the rural crime. The 'NFU Mutual Annual Crime Survey' metric mentioned on page 26 gave the Constabulary real insight to the crime they could be expecting and had alerted them to thinking that they may have to put extra resources into this area, which they had started to do. The CC agreed with the rationale given by the PCC with regards to the crime policing but it had also been a case of scaled back training for Specials due to the covid restrictions. Investment was now being made into recruitment and training to increase the number of Specials.
- 6.4.8 The CC reported that in the last year 55% of those who had left the Specials had joined the Constabulary as a regular officer. Over 200 officers were being recruited over the next 3-year period. The CC was optimistic that the number of Specials would revert to where the CC wanted them to be. There was also an offer to join the special in a specialist role, which might appeal if there was of particular interest to them.
- 6.4.9 The PCC explained that engagement with younger people did happen in ways such as Operation Impact Team who demonstrated with a very badly crashed vehicle that had been involved with a road traffic accident. This engagement was easier to do with bigger cohorts such as schools and colleges, but not as easy with

the smaller groups. It could also be a role that could be carried out by a partner which would mean the Constabulary were not relied on so heavily and this was a debate that needed to be had on a national level.

- 6.4.10 In principle, the Constabulary did not object to a reduction in the speed limit and the response to each application was decided on a case-by-case basis. There could be scenarios that the Constabulary may decide that the resources would be better spent elsewhere, as there would be the expectation that there would then be enforcement of that reduced speed limit.
- 6.4.11 The PCC explained that 'Operation Randall' was a 'shop front' to the patrolling of the rural community. The PCC had been looking at the expansion of the reach of the operation such as giving extended training to other officers. The number of officers limited to rural policing was not exclusive to Operation Randall. The PCC would attend, for instance, meetings of the National Farmers Union, and would bring back points to the Constabulary to be researched and answered to those who asked them. The CC added that Operation Randall was led by an officer who was a former farmer so had extensive experience in both arenas. The drone team (made up of eight people), when not flying drones would patrol at the officer's instruction. There were also officers deployed from other areas, who patrolled in response to the crime data. This number varied daily dependant on the demands of the radio and the crime data.
- 6.4.12 The CC reported that he had officers trained in wildlife crime offences and there was a wide range of offences seen such as egg thefts and dog breeding. Unfortunately, it wasn't near the top of the priority list and policing could not meet all the demands that came its way. Other priorities such as sexual abuse, child exploitation was where the resources had to be assigned. However, there were several trained officers who worked well with the organisations such as RSPCA when needed.
- 6.4.13 The PCC explained that Norfolk had one of the best developed drone kits in the Country. The UK air space was a crowded air space and the opportunity given by the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) to take part in the 'Beyond Visual Line of Sight' pilot was a huge step forward. The CC added that he was delighted to have been selected to be one of the pilot teams involved. It was a 2–3-year programme and excited to be at the front end of the project. Drones were a fantastic addition to the Constabulary, having used them 1745 times in the last calendar year and this project was about convincing the CAA that policing could fly drones responsibly and carefully.
- 6.5 The Panel **NOTED** the update about progress with delivering the Police and Crime Plan for Norfolk 2016-2022. The Chair reminded the Panel that the PCC had previously agreed to provide the Panel with a briefing on the format of his new performance monitoring reports. This would hopefully be combined with a visit to the Constabulary's new training centre at Hethersett and current Panel members would be advised of the date as soon as possible.
- 6.6 At this point in the meeting, the Chief Constable left the meeting.

7. **Information Bulletin – questions arising to the PCC**

- 7.1 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.
- 7.2 During the discussion, the following points were noted;
- 7.3 The PCC reported that his recent visit to RAF Barnham was his first visit there. He had met Tim Passmore (PCC for Suffolk), and they had looked at training taking place there and viewed the site and what it offered. There was a lot of interest in the site due to its potential. The Ministry of Defence were currently talking about leasing the site but hadn't confirmed anything. Due to the events in Ukraine, there could be a need for an expansion of defence which could be an obstacle in taking negotiations forward.
- 7.4 The Panel asked, with reference to page 44 of the agenda, if terms such as 'boost' of funding could be expanded to give more detail for the Panel.
- 7.5 With reference to the 'Time to Talk' session on page 44-46 of the agenda, the Panel questioned if there had been significant take up by residents and if there were any issues that had been raised with the PCC. From the PCC's perspective, they had been very successful, and all three sessions had been over-subscribed. All sessions had raised at least one issue that had been followed up by the Chief Constable. Going forwards, the sessions might need to be managed to ensure availability for the public as some places had been taken up by Parish Councils who were offered their own separate sessions. Overall, the sessions had been successful, and some had identified individuals who would be useful in other capacities. They were additional opportunities to face-to-face meetings to engage.
- 7.6 The PCC reported that NIDAS (Norfolk Integrated Domestic Abuse Service) was settling nicely. It was led by Leeway, and supported by five of the seven district councils, with discussions continuing with the other two who hoped to be part of it soon. The key to the partnership was providing resource and it now had £6.5 million available to it over 5 years. By concentrating the resource, it had made the funds go further. It was now signposting more for alleged perpetrators, so they could be supported as well, in terms of counselling etc. The Director for Policy and Commissioning also explained that with regards to the 'Enough is Enough' campaign all the partners were also involved in the Community Safety Partnership. It was using resources awarded through the safer street fund and information was being disseminated throughout the county. All partners involved were those that sat in the community safety arena. There had been three rounds of 'Safer Streets' funding, with the fourth round now in progress. The third round was focused on violence against women and girls and OPCCN were awarded funding for a campaign to affect the behaviour of men and boys, as well as funding to undertake a bystander campaign in the education sector and wider work in the night-time economy. They were working with NCC school's teams to develop the bystander campaign. The PCC acknowledged that it was important to recognise the wider work of the OPCCN who were carrying out great work with all partners.
- 7.7 The Panel asked how the figures relating to the arrests on the back of the drink-driving campaign had related to the previous year. In the absence of the CC, the figures were not known but they would be included in a future report. The PCC was

concerned that a greater problem seemed to be drug driving, and this was more complex and more difficult to capture due to the lesser technology involved.

7.8 The Panel **NOTED** the report.

8. **Complaints Policy Sub Panel – Update**

8.1 The Panel received the report giving an update from the Complaints Policy Sub Panel.

8.2 The Chair of the Sub Panel had no updates to the report.

8.3 The Panel **NOTED** the update.

9. **Norfolk Police and Crime Panel Annual Report 2021-22**

9.1 The Panel received the report which set out the Panel's activity during the past year.

9.2 The Chair would ask the Scrutiny Manager to make sure that a final version was published on the Panel's webpage and circulated to each member of the Panel. The Chair encouraged the Panel Members to share it with their colleagues and update them about the work of the PCP.

9.3 The Panel **AGREED** the draft annual report and **APPROVED** publication of the Panel's annual report 2021-22.

10. **Work Programme**

10.1 The Panel received the work programme for the period June 2022 – April 2023.

10.2 The date for the visit to the training facilities in Hethersett and private Panel briefing would be circulated once it was agreed.

10.3 The Panel **AGREED** the work programme.

Meeting ended 12.30pm

**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.