



Unconfirmed Minutes of the Suffolk Police and Crime Panel held on 9 October 2015 at 10:30 am at the Riverside Campus, Lowestoft.

Present:

Members

Councillor Patricia O'Brien	Suffolk County Council (Chairman)
Revd Canon Paul Daltry	Independent Co-opted Member (Vice-Chairman)
Manwar Ali	Independent Co-opted Member
Councillor Peter Gardiner	Suffolk County Council
Councillor Albert Grant	Ipswich Borough Council
Councillor Colin Hedgley	Suffolk Coastal District Council
Councillor Diana Kearsley	Mid Suffolk District Council
Councillor Tim Marks	St Edmundsbury Borough Council
Councillor David Wood	Suffolk County Council

Other participants and local authority officers

Susan Cassedy	Democratic Services Officer, Suffolk County Council
Paul Banjo	Scrutiny Officer, Suffolk County Council
Sue Morgan	Democratic Services Manager, Suffolk County Council
Tim Passmore	Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC)
Claire Swallow	Deputy Chief Executive of the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner
Phil Aves	Lowestoft Rising Change Manager

1. Apologies for Absence and Substitutions

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Mark Bee (Waveney District Council), Councillor Mary Evans (Suffolk County Council), Councillor Brian Harvey (Forest Heath District Council) and Councillor David Rose (Babergh District Council).

2. Declarations of Interest and Dispensations

There were no declarations of interest received or dispensations reported.

3. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

The minutes of the meeting held on Friday, 10 July 2015 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

4. Status Review of PCC Plan Objective 3 ('Preventing - Crime and ASB')

At Agenda Item 4 the Panel questioned the PCC about the progress towards achieving his strategic objective 3 ('Preventing – Crime and ASB').

The PCC was asked when the Panel would be able to see the budget saving options referred to in paragraph 10 of the PCC's report. The PCC advised that this would be available for the next Panel meeting. He also advised that when facing such difficult financial decisions it was important to look at the way in which constabulary operated. He reassured the Panel that, although there may be a reduction in number, Safer Neighbourhood Teams would remain. The PCC also stressed the importance of other public sector organisations playing their part and taking on some of the burden.

With regard to there being no base in Ipswich for the Constabulary to work from apart from Landmark House and the difficulties this caused, the PCC advised that this issue would be solved as soon as possible. He advised that a programme for mobile working had been started which consisted of each patrol car being used as a mobile office. The roll out of this programme however, did depend on there being no major reduction in funding coming out of the Chancellor's Autumn Statement. The PCC advised that the Government would be re-evaluating the Police Funding Formula which he hoped would be more balanced in future.

The Deputy Chief Executive of the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner advised the Panel that regular meetings took place between the Chairs of the Community Safety Partnerships (CSP) and PCC officers at which grant applications for local initiatives were considered. She also asked for the Panel's help in enabling the CSP Chairs to understand that the PCC no longer held money from the Home Office for CSPs as this source of funding ceased over two years ago.

Decision: The Panel resolved to:

- i) set up a small 'Task & Finish' group to look at Community Safety Partnerships and the 'Strong and Safe Communities Group for Suffolk' (of which the PCC was a member), in order to have better clarity of their inter-relationships and funding arrangements; and
- ii) recommend to the PCC that a full update be provided for the Panel's January 2016 meeting, on the PCC / Constabulary plans for Safer Neighbourhood Teams.

Reason for Decision:

- i) Both the Panel and the PCC were in agreement that there needed to be much greater clarity on how the CSPs worked along-side the Safer and Stronger Communities Group and the Panel considered that setting up a Task and Finish group, made up of a small number of Panel members, would be the most effective way of looking at the details.

- ii) The PCC had informed the Panel that options for budget savings had not been finalised due to the having to wait until after the Chancellor's Autumn Statement. The PCC suggested that he bring this information to the Panel at its next meeting.

5. PCC Annual Report for the Financial Year 2014/15

At Agenda Item 5 the Panel reviewed the PCC's Annual Report 2014/15.

The PCC informed the Panel that the report was a summary of the work carried out over the previous financial year. The PCC asked the Panel for its help to get the message out to members of the public that there had been a huge change in the pattern of crime and that police officers working on the street would be unable to solve the 'hidden harm' crime now taking place particularly on line.

With regard to illegal immigration and human trafficking the PCC advised that he had asked the constabulary to provide a report giving a guarantee that Suffolk's borders were safe. The PCC informed the Panel that there had been 12 cases of human trafficking in the previous year.

A Panel member expressed concern about the information provided within the report regarding volunteers and how this resource would be used and the risk of potential abuse. The PCC reassured Panel members that all volunteers were vetted and appropriate training was given.

The PCC advised that there had been a great deal of discussion around 'Stop and Search' and the concern that too many BME people were being stopped without the appropriate evidence. He stressed the importance of building trust and if mistakes were made, the importance of acknowledging them and making amends.

In response to a Panel members concerns, the PCC advised that he had never stated that police officers would not attend burglaries in future with victims only being given a crime number. However, he advised that the Chief Constable had stated that as usual, the police were unable to attend every incident. The PCC acknowledged how distressing this type of crime was to the victim and that complaints had been received about the police not attending in some cases and suggested that a phone call to the victim may help to identify if attendance was necessary.

In response to a Panel Member's question, the PCC confirmed that grants were given to domestic abuse services in areas of the county other than Waveney. The Deputy Chief Executive of the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner drew the Panel's attention to the list of grant awards contained in the Annual Report including those to Lighthouse and Compassion and agreed that domestic abuse services were very sparse in the West of the county. She advised that the PCC did expect organisations applying for grants to provide services across the county and were reminded of this on application.

Decision: The Panel recommended to the PCC, in light of the concerns about solving serious sexual offences (SSO), that a review of the Constabulary's investigative processes should be undertaken as part of a report from the PCC

to the Panel in January 2016 on what the PCC was doing in order to improve the constabulary's SSO solved rate performance.

Reason for Decision: The Chairman referred to page 9 of the PCC's Annual Report and the extremely low solved rate for serious sexual offences (SSO) and asked the PCC what he was doing in order to improve this. The PCC agreed that the solved rate was unacceptable and that he would continue to hold the Chief Constable to account. The PCC advised that there was a need to categorise the data with further investigation into the figures. The Deputy Chief Executive of the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner explained that one reason why there was an increase in SSOs was that the HMIC had now stated that more types of offences needed to be included under the heading of SSO. She advised that an intensive piece of work with the Constabulary was underway in order to understand all of the complexities.

6. Lowestoft Rising Partnership work update

At Agenda Item 6 the Panel questioned the PCC on how well the Lowestoft Rising partnership arrangement was contributing towards the achievement of the PCC's crime prevention and reduction objectives.

The PCC described Lowestoft Rising as a genuine and successful attempt to pool resources and explained that one area of further work was economic development and making the whole region more attractive to live in, pointing out that Lowestoft had huge potential.

With regard to strong leadership Phil Aves, Change Manager, Lowestoft Rising, advised that all the public sector Chief Executives sat on the Lowestoft Rising Sponsor Group and were committed to working together. Phil Aves provided the reduction of street drinking in Lowestoft as an example of what could be achieved when organisations pulled together to solve problems.

Decision: The Panel recommended to the PCC that he liaise with the Chief Constable and with Chief Executives of other Suffolk public organisations, to see how senior lead managers could be assigned, similar to the successful approach in Lowestoft Rising, to bring professional leadership to partnership initiatives in other parts of the county, such as in Ipswich.

Reason for Decision: In response to a Panel member asking how the PCC could influence public sector organisations in other areas of the county to work together in a similar way to those in Waveney, the PCC advised that there had to be buy in from the chief executives. He also stated that there needed to be one lead manager in each area to take on the responsibility of pushing the model forward. The PCC advised that development of similar partnership arrangements in other areas was down to leadership choices and priorities.

7. Financial Savings Update

At Agenda Item 7 the Panel questioned the PCC on his progress in delivering the savings anticipated in his precept and medium term financial plan for 2015/16.

The Panel noted the forecast underspend in the context of the very serious financial pressures, that any future precept increases would be linked to

specific deliverables, that there were unknown factors regarding the forthcoming Chancellor's Autumn Statement and the national funding formula, the PCC's desire to ensure continued funding for some specific areas (including voluntary sector, rural crime, 'hidden harm', SSO, cybercrime and roads policing), and that closing the future savings gap of £5m required other partner organisations to play their part.

The Chairman altered the order of the agenda. The minutes reflect the revised order.

8. Information Bulletin

At Agenda Item 9, The Panel noted the Information Bulletin.

9. Review of the panel arrangements, rules of procedure and operation of the Panel.

At Agenda Item 8, the Panel reviewed the Panel arrangements and rules of procedure.

The Chairman stressed the importance of members attending both the workshops and Panel meetings and if they could not attend to arrange for their named substitutes to attend if possible. The Panel noted that there had been good attendance of substitute members at the informal workshops.

The Panel noted the continuing concern with regard to the system for complaints against the PCC and the need for it to be monitored as the responsibility for the initial handling was currently delegated to the Chief Executive of the PCC's Office.

10. Forward Work Programme

The Panel noted the item on the current Forward Work Programme and that the next informal workshop was taking place on 2 December 2015.

11. Urgent Business

There was no urgent business.

12. Date and Venue of the Next Scheduled Meeting

The Committee noted that the next meeting would take place on Friday, 29 January 2016.

The meeting closed at 12.10 pm

Chairman

