



Norfolk Police and Crime Panel

Minutes of the Meeting held on 22 November 2021 at 10am 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	North Norfolk District Council
Cllr Graham Carpenter	Norfolk County Council
Cllr James Easter	South Norfolk Council
Cllr Cate Oliver	Norwich City Council

Officers Present:

Paul Sanford	Temporary Chief Constable for Norfolk (CC)
Giles Orpen-Smellie	Police and Crime Commissioner for Norfolk (PCC)
Sharon Lister	Director of Performance and Scrutiny, OPCCN
Jonathan Hall	Committee Officer, Norfolk County Council, NCC
Jo Martin	Democratic Support and Scrutiny Team Manager, NCC
Gavin Thompson	Director of Policy and Commissioning, OPCCN
Mark Stokes	Chief Executive, OPCCN
Jill Penn	Chief Finance Officer, OPCCN

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

- 1.1 Apologies were received from Cllr Mike Smith-Clare, Cllr Sarah Butikofer, Peter Hill and Cllr Gordon Bambridge.

2. Minutes

- 2.1 The minutes of the meeting held on 21 September 2021 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 Commissioner for Norfolk's Police and Crime Plan 2022-24

- 6.1 The Panel received the report which set out the PCC's draft Police and Crime Plan 2022-2024.

- 6.1.1 The PCC introduced the draft plan and highlighted that it needed to be in place not later than 31 March 2022. He confirmed that his predecessor's plan would be in place until 30 March 2022 to allow development of his own plan. This was being developed collaboratively by himself, the CC and the rest of the team from OPCCN. Mental health had not been mentioned specifically in the plan, but in the emerging strategy from OPCCN that was being addressed by the commissioning of services and in relation to this, there had been a slight amendment to the draft plan since the publication of the agenda; pillar 6 had been added to the plan titled 'Early identification and diversion to the appropriate agencies for those suffering with Mental Health issues.'

The PCC confirmed that the plan would form a benchmark to be able to hold the CC to account. It had taken note of national direction and all relevant requirements, but also local advice from a range of views gathered during the election period which had been translated into Norfolk context. The plan works closely alongside that of the Norfolk Community Safety Partnership.

The PCC explained the plan in the context of a temple. There were ground ethical values and standards, which the Police must live up to those expected of them and which should be the bedrock of policing, after which was sound financial planning. The PCC then explained the six pillars of the plan, with the commissioning strategy and the effective communications strategy lying over the pillars.

The PCC finished his introduction by thanking all those who had worked on the Plan, and paid tribute to his team at OPCCN who had worked particularly hard.

- 6.2 During the discussion, the following points were raised;
 - 6.2.2 The Panel asked if the 'Street Safe Campaign' would be continuing throughout this plan, and if the Constabulary were reporting back to Local Authorities about the captured data to help make those areas highlighted from the data safer. The PCC confirmed that 'Street Safe Campaign' should continue through the new plan. In the aftermath of the murder of Sarah Everard and the wider concern of violence against women and girls, it was certainly an emphasis. There would obviously be a need to ensure that the funding remained in place. With regards to reporting back, this was in early stages. It needed a better and bigger sample where the hotspots were then more conversations could take place. It was hoped that as well as Officers in those hotspots, there could be other methods of making those areas safer, such as street

lighting. The CC confirmed that the website was owned by the Home Office and had initially been set up for 3 months, which was now being extended. If the Home Office continued to provide the platform, the CC confirmed that they would continue to utilise it and could look at developing their own. Norfolk had the third highest response rate in the Country which was positive. The data was starting to highlight some hotspots, and there were some common factors of those hotspots. It was the hope of the CC, to provide a presentation at the Community Partnership to share the information with local councils.

- 6.2.3 The cyber unit would be predominantly based at Halesworth, but all stations would have the capacity to deal with fraud at the lower end. The CC added that they were moving towards a tiering of capabilities, with three tiers ranging from being able to report and capture data, to the high-tech of analysing mobile phones and other equipment.
- 6.2.4 Each objective outlined in the plan would eventually have measurable performance indicators alongside it. The PCC was currently trying to identify one set of measurables that would fit all areas. However, some areas which were dealt with by the PCC were subjective which complicated matters. It was also highlighted that in addition to the plan there were the operational plans that sat beneath it, which would feed into the PCC's plans and provided data which the PCC would use to measure if the objectives were being achieved. The PCC added that he would look to alter the reporting format to one which gave the Panel the data in a format which was more useful.
- 6.2.5 There had been no preliminary judgements made with regards to the modelling of the medium-term financial plan. It had been based on what had previously been in the medium-term plan. The PCC explained that he had modelled various scenarios and in the recent comprehensive spending review, the Chancellor had given PCC's certain flexibility to increase up £10 per year for each year of the three-year comprehensive spending review settlement. The PCC added that it was too early to comment if the funding for commissioning services from the Ministry of Justice was likely to change in view of the spending review. The Chancellors' settlement was expected on the 27 November 2021. It was noted that how central Government decided to allocate funding would potentially make a difference to the amount of funding that Norfolk received. Each Constabulary department were currently working on their in-house budget with an aim of reporting that in early December 2021.
- 6.2.6 The PCC explained that the vetting process for Norfolk Constabulary was working fine with a degree of backlog due to recruitment of officers, general turnover, and the uplift programme. Norfolk generated a reasonable demand of the vetting service which in turn had to be resourced. He was not aware of any major problems in Norfolk. The CC clarified that every new joiner to the Constabulary would be subject to a comprehensive level of vetting, plus there was a periodic re-vetting of current staff. There was currently a 40-day delay for a new joiner which was manageable and a reflection of the depth of the checks they had to undertake. He added that although vetting was extremely important, it wasn't the solution as it only informed employers what someone had done, not what someone would do. The Constabulary were making additional investment, human and technological, to strengthen the defences. Vetting was also currently undergoing a review, which would identify what would need looking at, but he was confident that Norfolk was in a strong place. Social media, however, was an area of concern for all areas of the Police Force. Norfolk currently checked social media activity, but it was so extensive that there

was a need to prioritise and check for a certain period, and if no red flags were shown, the checking would cease.

Panel members commented that there needed to be a system of whistleblowing for colleagues to report if they were concerned. The PCC confirmed that he was making provisions for this. The PCC also confirmed that a bid had been submitted to the Home Office for funding for the 'Safety of Women at Night' fund but had been unsuccessful.

- 6.2.7 The Chair highlighted that the new Plan provided an opportunity for the Panel to review what information was needed to monitor its delivery and review the Panel's Forward Work Programme. In view of that, he proposed that the Panel set up a time limited task and finish group to carry out that piece of work, together with the PCC.
- 6.3 The Panel unanimously **ENDORSED** the PCC's draft Police and Crime Plan 2022-2024 as presented and with the addition of the following objective under Pillar 6 (Safer and Stronger Communities): Early identification and diversion to the appropriate agencies for those suffering with Mental Health issues.
- 6.4 The Panel also **AGREED** to establish a task and finish group to review the information it needed to monitor delivery of the Plan and the Panel's Forward Work Programme
- 6.5 The Chair advised that a letter would be sent to the PCC to confirm the outcome of the Panel's discussion, in place of a report.

7. Police and Crime Commissioner for Norfolk's 2022/23 Precept Consultation

- 7.1 The Panel received the report outlining how the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCCN) proposed consulting on the Commissioner's proposals and publishing the results.
- 7.2 In introducing the report, the PCC highlighted that the precept consultation was a statutory duty. The Chancellor, on 27 October 2021, announced that PCC's had flexibility in increasing the precept to £10 per year of each year of the comprehensive spending review settlement which equated to 3.59% (20p per week). However, it was not known what the Home Office allocation was going to be. The Chancellor gave a better comprehensive settlement than was expected, but there would be unexpected and additional pressures such as pay rises and other costs which would have to be absorbed by the budget. The Home Office could also wish to top slice the amount that goes to each County. It was hoped that there would be a 3-year settlement announced which would enable the PCC and CC to be able to plan longer term. The earliest date when the outcome would be known was the week beginning 6 December 2021, but it was expected to be later in the month. The PCC would then need to confirm his recommendation for the precept and circulate the consultation, the outline of which was presented in the report.
- 7.3 During the discussion, the following points were raised;
 - 7.3.1 The Panel was interested to know how the PCC was approaching the precept consultation compared to predecessors, particularly around achieving a higher turnout. The PCC explained that the problem with conducting a consultation in

December / January was that no-one was particularly interested in engaging. There would be an online survey, virtual audiences as listed in the report, as well as some face-to-face consultation. The previous consultation achieved just under 1000 responses which compared to several other consultations was reasonable. However, he felt it would be better to have a bigger sample to be able to learn from and know what the public's mandate was, as he was their elective representative.

- 7.3.2 The PCC explained that alongside the digital aspect of the consultation, there would be an associated media campaign which would alert residents to the consultation with the aim of reaching those people who might not always contribute and with the greater aim of reaching a broader spectrum. The Panel expressed concern for those residents who were not able to respond digitally, either because of poor connectivity or because they did not have access to the internet. The PCC confirmed that there would be a hard copy means of responding to the consultation as the more people he could get to respond, the better. Members commented that the consultation could be promoted to parish councils etc and they could help distribute to those within their parish without digital access, and then collect in. The PCC confirmed that the Norfolk Association of Local Councils were being contacted with the hope they could help.
- 7.3.3 Website access was not only an issue in rural areas but also urban areas. Members suggested that the consultation could be advertised in libraries to help those who don't have the digital access at home.
- 7.4 The Panel **NOTED** the overview of the Police and Crime Commissioner's (PCC) 2021/22 precept consultation. The Chair confirmed that details of the consultation would be circulated to Panel Members once it had been launched

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

- 8.1. 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 2016-2021 (Priority 1: Increase Visible Policing and Priority 4: Prevent Offending).
- 8.2 In introducing the report, the PCC confirmed that his predecessor's Plan would remain in place until the end of March 2022, and while that Plan was in place, he expected to be held fully accountable for the progress being made against it.
- 8.2.1 During the discussion, the following points were raised;
- 8.2.2 The PCC explained that the Moonshot teams were still a huge success, with all three teams still operating. The PCC had first-hand experience of observing with them and experiencing the effectiveness of the teams. They were settled in, and if funds were unlimited a fourth team could be set up, however, there were conflicting priorities. The CC added that there had been no decrease of the Moonshot activity despite the Panel not hearing about them as much as previously. It had been successful initiative and they were a permanent fixture.
- 8.2.3 The PCC explained that the precept was not purely designed to fund front line duties. Most of the last precept income was used to increase the capabilities of the control room and the responses of 101 calls and this effect was now being seen. He acknowledged that there was a concern of the extraction of police officers for other tasks, such as training. As policing was becoming more under scrutiny, the training had become more demanding. The new police qualification structure

would mean that new recruits would be extracted for a greater number of duties. It was a fine balancing act and would be dependent on the needs of the community and the draws on the Constabulary.

The CC explained that an Officer was available for front line duties once all training had been completed and they were able to drive a response car. However, the training programmes were becoming longer and with the implementation of the Home Office Uplift Programme there would be a lag between the time of arrival and the time the Officer was considered as ready for front line duties. There had been a delay with driver training in particular and there was a waiting list for drivers who were trained and ready for blue light runs. Recently, an investment had been made into additional driver trainers to try and address this issue.

- 8.2.4 The Panel had concerns that the data in the report didn't reflect the priorities under scrutiny and felt there was a future need to define the data. The PCC added that as part of the new plan, he hoped there would be a new reporting mechanism, in view of reducing the amount of paperwork and time that was being put into the papers for each meeting. He wanted to include data that was useful for the Panel and what they wanted to see. It was suggested that data and trends over a period rather than a snapshot maybe more beneficial.
- 8.2.5 The PCC was wary of suggesting that Norfolk was county lines free as it was just one model of drug supply. Norfolk was doing very well in the fight of county lines, but they needed to maintain and control that fight. The PCC added that if there was a user market in Norfolk, there would be a supply, and county lines was just one method. The successful approach in Norfolk was prioritising those groups who posed the greatest risk, such as the exploitation of the vulnerable and children and those who use extreme violence. There had been a reduction in the number of the vulnerable people involved in those groups. The method in which those gangs operated was very fluid, and they used a variety of transport methods. The Constabulary always tried to be one step ahead, and with the support of the OPCCN were trying to take the preventative approach and cut off supply.
- 8.2.6 The engagement posts described at page 45 of the report were police staff roles rather than police officer roles. The greatest problem of providing consistency of police officers in areas of the county was the demographic of the constabulary, which was now emerging, and it was highlighted that a third of the force would be in the third year of the uplift programme. At the other end of the demographic, there were several officers reaching pension age and were retiring as uncertainty with the police pension had caused experience staff to leave the service earlier than they would. This meant that there was a gap emerging and managing the consistency was a challenge.
The CC added that the engagement posts would move out into the community and work alongside the community officers to help make communications local to the residents.
- 8.2.7 The Panel was pleased to read the commissioning services update and the work that had gone into various services. The PCC clarified that 'in-kind contribution' that was referred to on page 51 referred to the resources from the OPCCN that were given as part of the projects such as researchers etc.
- 8.2.8 The PCC confirmed that the 49 safer neighbour areas would continue as part of the neighbour policing strategy.

- 8.2.9 Hate crimes were now a much wider known issue, and the increase of hate crimes noted on page 62, could be a consequence of this. Across all districts within the last year there had been an increase in hate crime. The CC added that some analysis had been produced which plotted on a timeline serious world events and the reporting of local hate crimes which had shown there was a correlation between the two. Specifically, to North Norfolk, in response to members' question, there had been some well publicised events in Sea Palling which had an impact on the reporting of the hate crimes in that area.
- 8.2.10 The CC explained that demand was particularly increasing in the South Norfolk and the Broadland areas of the county, mainly because of the population growth in those areas hence the rise in hate crime figures in South Norfolk. He added that achieving the response times in those areas struggled. The Government's Uplift campaign would help to address those issues but would take some time to see those effects on the ground.
- 8.3 The Panel **NOTED** the update about progress with delivering the Police and Crime Plan for Norfolk 2016-2021.

9. Complaints Policy Sub Panel – Update

- 9.1 The Panel received the report giving an update from the Complaints Policy Sub Panel.
- 9.2 The Sub Panel's Chair added that himself and the Scrutiny Manager had conducted two seminars at the recently attended conference and had received positive feedback with the seminars being oversubscribed.
- 9.4 The Panel **NOTED** the update.

10. Information Bulletin – questions arising to the PCC

- 10.1 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.
- 10.2 During the discussion, the following points were noted;
- 10.2.1 The Emergency Services Network was still being implemented, but there had been several issues which had caused delay.
- 10.2.2 The Chief Finance Officer explained that the accounts had been ready on 31 May 2021, but the accountants were not able to resource the audit. It was hoped that the audit committee at the end of November would see the final audited accounts
- 10.2.3 The Chair was pleased to see from the report that collaboration meetings with Suffolk OPCCN and PCC were taking place. The PCC added that the collaboration was going well with an encouraging collaboration plan in place. The PCC was in constant contact with the Suffolk PCC, as were the CEO's. There was a large amount of business that was shared, and there were similar priorities. The next meeting was taking place on 1 December 2021 with a PCC / CEO meeting.

10.2.4 The Panel **NOTED** the report.

11. Police (Fire) and Crime Panel Conference 2021

- 11.1 The Panel received the report which set out details of the recent Police (Fire) and Crime Panel Conference 2021. The conference had been attended by Vice Chair Air Commodore Kevin Pellatt and Mrs Jo Martin, Democratic Support and Scrutiny Manager. The Chair thanked them both for attending.
- 11.2 The Vice Chair highlighted that it had been a very useful conference. They had met with the Chair of Suffolk Police and Crime Panel who had suggested observing each other's meetings from time to time.
- 11.3 The Panel **NOTED** the report and considered matters that had risen from the conference.

12. Work Programme

- 12.1 The Panel received the work programme for the period January 2022 – December 2022.
- 12.2 The Chair reminded Panel Members of the extraordinary meeting taking place on 2 December 2012 and encouraged as many Panel members to attend as possible.
- 12.3 The Panel **AGREED** the work programme.

Meeting ended 11:55am

**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.