

Unconfirmed Minutes of the Suffolk Police and Crime Panel held on 29 January 2016 at 10:30 am in the Elisabeth Room, Endeavour House, Ipswich.

Present: Members

Manwar Ali	Independent Co-opted Member
Cllr Mark Bee	Waveney District Council
Cllr Patricia O'Brien	Suffolk County Council (Chairman)
Revd Canon Paul Daltry	Independent Co-opted Member (Vice-Chairman)
Cllr Mary Evans	Suffolk County Council
Cllr John Field	Suffolk County Council
Cllr Peter Gardiner	Suffolk County Council
Cllr Brian Harvey	Forest Heath District Council
Cllr Colin Hedgley	Suffolk Coastal District Council
Cllr Diana Kearsley	Mid Suffolk District Council
Cllr David Rose	Babergh District Council
Cllr Patricia Warby	St Edmundsbury Borough Council

Other participants and local authority officers

Paul Banjo	Scrutiny Officer, Suffolk County Council
Chris Bland	Chief Finance Officer, Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner
Susan Cassedy	Democratic Services Officer, Suffolk County Council
Chris Jackson	Chief Executive of the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner
Tim Passmore	Police and Crime Commissioner
Claire Swallow	Deputy Chief Executive of the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner
Gareth Wilson	Chief Constable

1. Apologies for Absence and Substitutions

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor David Wood (substituted by Councillor John Field) and Councillor Albert Grant. Due to the vacancy at St Edmundsbury Borough Council, Councillor Patricia Warby (substitute member for St Edmundsbury Borough Council) was in attendance.

2. Declarations of Interest and Dispensations

There were no declarations of interest or dispensations reported.

3. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

The minutes of the previous meeting were confirmed as an accurate record subject to the following amendments:

- i) Page 6, 3 (ii) amend to read 'to delegate to the Chairman'.
- ii) Page 7, paragraph 4 insert 'was' between 'what required'.

The Chairman reminded the Panel that the minutes provided a summary of the discussion and were not meant to be a verbatim record of the meeting.

4. PCC's Proposed Precept 2016/17

At Agenda Item 4 the Panel was being asked to consider the PCC's proposed precept and to respond to the report in accordance with the Act and the Regulations, including the Panel's power of veto.

Decision: The Panel, in having regard to all the information in the Report and Evidence Sets, and after questioning the PCC in relation to the content of the Report:

- i) agreed unanimously to approve the Police and Crime Commissioner's proposal to increase the precept by 1.958% in 2016-17; and
- ii) agreed that the Panel Chairman would make a formal report, on behalf of the Panel, on the PCC's precept, by the statutory deadline of 8 Feb 2016 (the formal report can be found at Appendix 1 and at the following link: <http://www.suffolk.gov.uk/community-and-safety/crime-and-public-safety/police-and-crime-panel-and-the-police-and-crime-commissioner/police-and-crime-panel-reports-and-recommendations-to-the-pcc/>).

Reason for decision: As set out at Appendix 1.

5. Status Review of PCC Plan Objective 4 – 'Caring for Victims and Vulnerable People'

At Agenda Item 5 the Panel questioned the PCC about the progress towards achieving his strategic objective of 'caring for victims and vulnerable people' as set out in his Police and Crime Plan 2013-17, dated July 2015.

The PCC advised the Panel that tackling domestic abuse (DA) was one of his top priorities and that DA was linked in many cases to both serious sexual offences (SSO) and child sexual exploitation (CSE). Following the UCS report on DA the first draft of the Constabulary's action plan had now been completed. He informed the Panel that the Suffolk Domestic Abuse Partnership had now been reformed with an executive group carrying out the functional work. The Strong and Safe Communities Group was gradually developing. The PCC paid tribute to the voluntary sector organisations involved in supporting

victims of DA including Compassion, Papworth Trust and Lighthouse Women's Aid.

The Deputy Chief Executive of the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (DCE of the OPCC), in recognising it was not suitable in every case, advised that there was a growing body of evidence that Restorative Justice had positive results for both victims of crime and perpetrators restoring the balance for both. There was a victim centred Restorative Justice Hub which was in its second year. The DCE of the OPCC informed the Panel that a total of £708,000 grant funding had been awarded by the PCC towards tackling sexual and domestic abuse with £198,000 going to support victims of SSO with over 800 people supported in 190 groups. Therapeutic support was also provided to children with 600hrs of support being provided in the last year. Further resources had been put into the Constabulary's Protecting Vulnerable People Directorate.

The PCC explained that the performance measures for Objective 4 were still below the base line despite the additional investment because these figures went back several months and it took time to train and recruit. He advised that there would be a delay in seeing the effect of the investment however, the national rankings of public confidence in the Suffolk Constabulary were very good.

The PCC confirmed that current facilities at Landmark House would be maintained following the co-location of the Independent Domestic Violence Advisory (IDVA) Service with the Constabulary' Domestic Abuse Team. This would improve services to victims whilst delivering savings.

In response to a Panel member raising concern with regard to report stating that frontline staff did not always have access to photographic and/or video recording equipment, the PCC advised that the constabulary was currently looking at smart phone technology. The Chief Constable added that the constabulary did have use of sufficient technology in the meantime.

The PCC confirmed that he took the safeguarding of children very seriously and he and the Constabulary understood that children should be listened to. The Chief Constable, in acknowledging that there had been examples of CSE in Suffolk, advised that these had been effectively dealt with. The PCC added that there was not a systematic failure in Suffolk as there had been in places such as Rotherham.

6. Serious Sexual Offences (SSO)

At Agenda Item 6 the Panel questioned the PCC about what he was doing in order to improve the Constabulary's SSO solved rate performance.

The PCC advised that the Constabulary's conviction rate, for those cases that were referred to and charged by the Crown Prosecution Service, was the highest in the most similar group and that the additional investment made into improving the solved rate had paid for 40 additional members of staff. He informed the Panel that 43% of SSO cases recorded were historic. The statistics for trust and confidence in reporting SSOs had increased by 100% in the last year and the high level of victim satisfaction was also encouraging. The PCC stressed that the lack of improvement in the solved rate was not down to inactivity and he hoped that there would be an improvement in the

solved rate next year. The PCC added that there had been improvements in the Sexual Assault Referral Centre (SARC) due to increased investment.

The PCC agreed to establish the figures for referrals made to SARC by other organisations or individuals that had not been reported to the police and agreed that further research was needed in order to quantify the scale of the problem. The PCC also advised that there was a dedicated officer who dealt with cases of forced marriage who met regularly with representatives from the Mosques. Now that the Constabulary had the ability to recruit it was now working with Ipswich and Suffolk Council for Racial Equality to encourage applications from different cultures and backgrounds. The PCC and the Chief Constable agreed to provide the figures for the reporting of cases of forced marriage.

In response to concern raised regarding Case Study C on page 100 of the report which highlighted how serious offences, that caused children serious harm, were not classed as serious sexual offences, the Chief Constable advised that this was due to the current classifications of crime.

The PCC advised that there were 3 PCSO school liaison officers to be funded by the rise in Precept. These would provide advice and support including how to keep safe online.

A Panel member noted from figures within the report that only 10.5% of recorded cases were referred to the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) however, a high percentage of these did result in convictions. The Panel Member raised his concern about the low number of referrals to the CPS and in response the PCC advised that there had been a huge increase in the number of recorded cases. He also explained that due to the ranking system having changed he had been unable to provide a National ranking for October 2015. The PCC acknowledged that the statistics could be clearer and agreed to provide a further breakdown and greater clarity.

The Chief Constable stressed the importance of victims of historic abuse having the ability to report cases to the police and of being taken seriously as many had had their lives ruined as a result of their experiences. A Panel member added that historic cases could also lead to new cases being resolved and that there was now a positive culture of people wanting to come forward.

With regard to Cybercrime and the safeguarding of children the PCC agreed that an easy to navigate multi agency approach with one point of contact was necessary. The Chief Constable added that there was currently good information on the website and that there would eventually be an online interaction facility. The PCC added there was to be a £120,000 investment made to improve technology used.

Decision: The Panel recommended to the PCC that there be a further breakdown and greater clarity of the figures for Serious Sexual Offences, including data on:

- (i) self-referrals to the SARC that do not get reported to the Police; and
- (ii) cases of forced marriage.

Reason for decision: The Panel considered that greater clarity was needed in order to establish the full scale of SSOs in Suffolk and avoid confusion.

7. The Police and Crime Panel's Annual Report 2015

At Agenda Item 7 the Panel received its draft Annual Report 2015 which summarised its undertakings and associated outcomes to December 2015.

Decision: The Panel unanimously voted in favour of approving the Annual Report for publication.

Reason for decision: The Panel considered that the draft report accurately reflected the Panel's undertakings and associated outcomes to December 2015.

8. Information Bulletin

The Panel noted the Information Bulletin at Agenda Item 8 and requested that the dates of the PCC's Accountability and Performance Panel be re sent to Panel Members.

9. Forward Work Programme

The Panel noted the items on the current Forward Work Programme and that the next informal workshop was taking place on 19 February 2016 and noted that the Task and Finish Group would be reporting back to the Panel at this meeting in March 2016.

10. Urgent Business

There was no urgent business reported.

11. Date and Venue of the Next Scheduled Meeting

Friday, 18 March 2016 at 10.30 am in the Conference Room, West Suffolk House, Bury St Edmunds.

The meeting closed at 12.21pm.

Chairman

Suffolk Police and Crime Panel

Outcomes of Consideration of the PCC's Proposed Policing Precept for 2016/17

On January 29th 2016 the Suffolk Police and Crime Panel considered a recommendation of the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) for Suffolk regarding the proposed precept level and Council Tax requirement for 2016-17 for policing in Suffolk. Eleven of the thirteen members of the Panel were present, including two substitute members. The PCC was accompanied by his staff and by the Chief Constable. The agenda and papers for the meeting are available on the [Suffolk County Council website](#).

The Panel reviewed the PCC's proposed precept report, the PCC's proposal to increase the precept by 1.958% in 2016-17, and the associated Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP).

The PCC informed the Panel that the savings target had reduced significantly as a result of the Home Office announcement in December. The PCC advised that there is the need to transform the Constabulary's mode of operation as crime moves 'indoors' and online. A great deal of focus is being put on dealing with domestic abuse / violence, serious sexual offences and cyber-crime. Safer Neighbourhood Teams are the bedrock of local policing; original proposals would have resulted in just 50 Police Community Support Officers (PCSO); the PCC's decision will now ensure that there are around 107, with a good balance between the numbers of PCSOs and Police Officers. The increase in precept would enable targeted investment in 20 extra Officers and 3 PCSOs having special focus on schools. Medium term plans include the transfer of parking responsibility into a self-financing scheme operated by the local authorities.

Panel members asked the PCC questions about his confidence in getting organisations together to collaborate and commit to the savings required, Town & Parish Council matched-funding of PCSOs, reduced PCSO evening working hours, the comparative costs of PCSOs and Police Officers, the skill sets required for dealing with cybercrime, how well publicised was the PCC's recent online public survey of his precept proposals, and how well the proposals and the new approach to local policing have addressed concerns that were raised in last year's HMIC 'PEEL' report into Efficiency.

The Decision of the Panel

The Panel:

- 1) Agreed unanimously to approve the Police and Crime Commissioner's proposal to increase the precept by 1.958% in 2016-17.
- 2) Agreed that the Panel Chairman would make a formal report, on behalf of the Panel, on the PCC's precept, by the statutory deadline of 8 Feb 2016.

A copy of this report of the Panel will be put on the County Council's [website](#).

Councillor Patricia O'Brien

Chairman of the Suffolk Police and Crime Panel

2 February 2016