



Unconfirmed Minutes of the Suffolk Police and Crime Panel held on 18 March at 10:30 am in the Conference Room East, West Suffolk House, Bury St Edmunds.

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 |
| Cllr Mark Bee | Waveney District Council |
| Cllr Mary Evans | Suffolk County Council |
| Cllr Albert Grant | Ipswich Borough Council |
| Cllr Peter Gardiner | Suffolk County Council |
| Cllr Brian Harvey | Forest Heath District Council |
| Cllr Diana Kearsley | Mid Suffolk District Council |
| Cllr David Rose | Babergh District Council |
| Cllr Patricia Warby | St Edmundsbury Borough Council |
| Cllr David Wood | Suffolk County Council |

Other participants and local authority officers

| | |
|----------------|---|
| Paul Banjo | Scrutiny Officer, Suffolk County Council |
| Susan Cassedy | Democratic Services Officer, Suffolk County Council |
| Tim Passmore | Police and Crime Commissioner |
| Claire Swallow | Deputy Chief Executive of the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner |

1. Apologies for Absence and Substitutions

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Colin Hedgley.

2. Declarations of Interest and Dispensations

There were no declarations of interested or dispensations reported.

3. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

The minutes of the meeting held on 29 January 2016 were confirmed as an accurate record.

4. Status Review of PCC Objective 2 – ‘Solving Crime’

At Agenda Item 4 the Panel questioned the PCC about the progress towards achieving his strategic objective of ‘Solving Crime’, as set out in his Police and Crime Plan 2013-2017.

The PCC advised the Panel that as much as half of crime went unrecorded with less than a quarter of those recorded being solved. This issue he took very seriously. The PCC highlighted the changing pattern of crime and that cybercrime was not specifically recorded as such.

The Panel wished to know when the full benefits of the additional resource would show in the performance statistics. The PCC expressed his disappointment that the Constabulary had taken up until January 2016 to use all of the additional resources provided to it and added that the new investigation hub should help to improve the solved rate in time.

In noting the additional resources to tackle 'hidden harm' and protect vulnerable people the Panel raised concern about whether the level of resource was sufficient given that the Constabulary's solved rate in this area was still 40% lower than similar police forces. The PCC advised that the Chief Constable had reassured him that he did not require any further resources.

The PCC advised that there had been additional investment in the IDVA Service which he hoped would reduce the domestic abuse reoffending rates. There had also been a £60,000 investment in training frontline officers to ensure they understood the complexity and signs of domestic abuse in order to improve solved rates.

The Panel raised concern about the lack of accurate staffing numbers and the PCC confirmed that it was difficult to obtain precise numbers. The Panel requested that the PCC obtain details from the Constabulary about the roles and staffing levels in the Protecting Vulnerable People Directorate, both over time and geographically.

The Panel noted the absence of any 'solving crime' performance statistics since October whilst the new ATHENA data recording system was being deployed. The PCC informed the Panel that there were lessons to be learnt with regard to the ATHENA data recording system, the deployment of which was years behind schedule. Although the PCC considered that the original concept had been sound however, he was not convinced that the scoping had been carried out in an appropriate manner as the system had not been an 'of the shelf' purchase. The PCC explained that the reason for the delay in its deployment was partly due to the changing pattern of crime and suggested that the project management needed to be tightened up. He did however advise that the system would allow data exchange and the challenge would be the uploading of old data. The PCC added that the under-investment in the Constabulary's IT systems was a major problem.

With regard to cybercrime the PCC confirmed that he had a close working relationship with Suffolk County Council's Trading Standards Department.

The Panel requested that at the October 2016 Panel meeting there should be an item scrutinising the PCC's performance monitoring methodology, including the deployment of ATHENA, risk register monitoring, and the monitoring, management and awareness-raising of cybercrime.

5. Report from the Task & Finish Group to look at Community Safety Partnership (CSP) and the Safe and Stronger Communities Group (SSCG), in relation to the PCC

At Agenda Item 6 the Panel questioned the PCC about his views on the CSPs and the SSCG in relation to enabling crime and disorder reduction in Suffolk following the Panel setting up a Task & Finish Group in order to look at their inter-relationships and funding arrangements.

The PCC stressed that funding the CSPs was not the responsibility of the PCC. He was of the opinion that the boundaries for the CSPs, particularly for the West of the county, needed to be reviewed and be better aligned with the policing boundaries which had recently changed following the Suffolk Local Policing Review. He advised that the CSPs were local and the SSCG was Suffolk wide and stressed the importance of the two not duplicating work.

In noting that CSPs were statutory, a Panel Member questioned whether they still had a place in society and if Section 17 of the Police and Crime Act required updating. The Panel, in acknowledging that any changes to CSPs had to be agreed by the Secretary of State, agreed that the boundaries did need reviewing and also that CSPs needed to become more community focussed using local knowledge.

The PCC considered the SSCG to be a marvellous idea but its establishment did need to be progressed at a faster pace. He was of the view that the SSCG's 'deep dive' on domestic abuse (DA) had stalled due to not having buy-in from the top.

The PCC advised that there was currently no quantitative data on domestic abuse problems across Suffolk. With regard to the consideration of in depth externally commissioned research in order to quantify the problem of DA in Suffolk, the Deputy Chief Executive of the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner considered that this should only be carried out after the SSCG had completed its 'deep dive'. She advised that the SSCG had stated this would be completed in May 2016. There would be issues however on how any conclusions from such a piece of work would be taken forward and by whom. She advised that the County Council also had responsibility to overcome the problem but the PCC had no authority to make other partners address the findings of any research undertaken.

A Member of the Panel encouraged the PCC to use his position to ensure local CSPs were effective for the sake of his Plan and expressed deep concern regarding the PCC and Ipswich CSP being aware of the concerns regarding Child Sexual Exploitation in central Ipswich.

Decision: The Panel agreed:

- i) to write to the CSPs, noting their important role, sharing the findings of the Task Group, and suggesting that CSPs examine their current configurations and seek to operate in line with the Home Office Policy guidance of 8 May 2015.
- ii) to recommend to the PCC that he seeks to work with the CSPs in line with the Home Office Policy guidance, so that the local need is reflected in the PCC's Police and Crime Plan.
- iii) to write to the SSCG, sharing the findings of the Task Group, and the opportunity for the SSCG to give further clarity about its function and relationship with statutory bodies such as the PCC, the CSPs and the Local Safeguarding Children Board (LSCB).

- iv) to recommend to the PCC, and to suggest to the SSCG, that consideration be given to commissioning an external organisation (such as University Campus Suffolk) to undertake research to quantify the domestic abuse problems in Suffolk.
- v) to schedule on its Forward Work Plan a further review of this topic in approximately 1 year.

Reason for decision:

- i) & ii) The Panel noted the Home Office guidance from 2015 (Appendix 4 of the report) setting out how the CSPs and the PCC should inter-relate and the fact that it was not clear how the PCC worked with the CSPs and that there was an opportunity for the CSPs to work more in line with this guidance.
- iii) The Panel, in noting the SSCG Terms of Reference (Appendix 5 of the report) was of the opinion that the SSCG needed to be more clearly defined with information on its function, powers, relationships and whether it was a policy making body.
- iv) The PCC advised that there was currently no quantitative data on domestic abuse problems across Suffolk and that the only data held was that of the Constabulary. The Panel noted that other agencies may hold their own data but this was not readily accessible by the Constabulary and other organisations in the DA Forum.
- v) The Panel, in thanking the members of the Task and Finish Group scheduled a further review of the subject in 6 to 12 months depending on how things had progressed.

6. Information Bulletin

The Panel noted the Information Bulletin at Agenda Item 6. In response to a Panel Members concern, the Deputy Chief Executive of the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner clarified that those DA organisations which had applied for a grant from the Safer Suffolk Fund had been advised that they would need to wait until the outcome of the SSCG's 'deep dive' before further grant money would be allocated.

7. Forward Work Programme

The Panel noted the items on the current Forward Work Programme and that the next informal workshop was to take place on 9 May 2016.

8. Urgent Business

There was no urgent business.

9. Date and Venue of the Next Scheduled Meeting

Tuesday, 19 July 2016 at 10:30am in Room G01S, Riverside Campus, 4 Canning Road, Lowestoft, Suffolk, NR33 0EQ

In noting that it was Councillor Albert Grant's last meeting the Panel wished him well in his retirement and thanked him for his hard work and commitment.

The meeting closed at 12.32 pm.

Chairman