



Dorset Police and Crime Panel

Minutes of a meeting held at County Hall, Dorchester
on 10 September 2015

Present: **Members**

Borough Poole

Co-opted members:

Phil Eades
Ann Stribley

Dorset County Council

Fred Drane
Ian Gardner

Purbeck District Council

Bill Pipe

Independent Co-Opted members

Iain McVie
Mike Short (Vice-Chairman)

Officer advisers to the Police and Crime Panel:

Debbie Ward, Chief Executive, Dorset County Council
Mark Taylor, Head of Assurance, Risk and Audit
Fiona King, Senior Democratic Services Officer, Dorset County Council

Also in attendance:

Martyn Underhill, Dorset Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC)
Colin Pipe, Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC)

Officer advisers to the Police and Crime Commissioner

Dan Steadman, Chief Executive to the Police and Crime Commissioner
T/C Superintendent Thorp, Head of Corporate Development
Superintendent Mark Callaghan, Director of Intelligence, Dorset Police
Mr JP Oosthuizen, Operation Genesis Lead

(Note: These minutes have been prepared by officers as a record of the meeting and of any decisions reached. They are to be considered and confirmed at the next meeting of the Dorset Police and Crime Panel on **10 November 2015**.)

Apologies for Absence

35. An apology for absence was received from Karen Rampton (Borough of Poole).

Code of Conduct

36. There were no declarations by members of any disclosable pecuniary interests under the Code of Conduct.

Panel Governance – Proposed changes to the Rules of Procedure for the appointment of Chairman/Vice-Chairman

37. The Panel considered a report by the Chief Executive, Dorset County Council, which provided clarification for members on the legal basis of a decision which would allow the Panel to elect any Panel member (including an independent member) to act as either Chairman or Vice-Chairman.

Resolved

38. That the proposed changes to the existing Rules of Procedure, as set out in Appendix A to the report be agreed.

Reason for Decision

39. To ensure that the Panel's Rules of Procedure were fit for purpose.

Election of Chairman

Resolved

40. That John Adams (Bournemouth Borough Council) be elected as Chairman for the remainder of 2015/16.

Appointment of Vice-Chairman

Resolved

41. That Mike Short (Independent Member), be appointed as Vice-Chairman for the remainder of 2015/16.

Minutes

42. The minutes of the meeting held on 9 June 2015 were confirmed and signed.

Matters Arising

Minute 22.1 – Precept Approval

43. Following a question from the Vice-Chairman regarding feedback on the unsuccessful bid in relation to the strategic alliance, the Chief Executive to the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC), advised that the criteria for the Police Innovation Fund was subject to change and the feedback received was that the strategic alliance work was business that was already planned to be done and in this instance was not considered to meet the criteria set for the Fund.

Representation to the Joint Committee

Public Speaking

44.1 There were no public questions received at the meeting in accordance with Standing Order 21(1).

44.2 There were no public statements received at the meeting in accordance with Standing Order 21(2).

Petitions

45. There were no petitions received in accordance with the County Council's petition scheme at this meeting.

Panel Governance – Appointment of Substitute Members to the Complaints Sub-Committee and Lead Members for designated themes

46.1 The Panel considered a report by the Chief Executive, Dorset County Council, which proposed changes to the Rules of Procedure to make provision for the appointment of named substitutes for members of the Dorset Police and Crime Panel (PCP) Complaints Sub-Committee, for the Chairman of the PCP to serve on the Complaints Sub-

Dorset Police and Crime Panel – 10 September 2015

Committee and for the appointment of Lead Members to take specialist responsibility within designated themes.

46.2 The Chief Executive, Dorset County Council, advised members that work was ongoing on a revision to the complaints procedure and that a meeting of the Complaints Sub-Committee would be convened in the near future to take this work forward in readiness for presentation to the Panel at its meeting on 10 November 2015.

46.3 Following a question from the member from Purbeck District Council regarding further information relating to the designated themes, the PCC advised he was content for members to contact his office for any further information that may be required.

Resolved

47.1 That the following members be appointed as substitute members on the Complaints Sub-Committee:

- Phil Eades, Borough of Poole
- Barbara Manuel, East Dorset District Council
- Bill Pipe, Purbeck District Council
- Mike Short, Independent Member

47.2 That the Chairman of the Dorset Police and Crime Panel be appointed as a member to the Complaints Sub-Committee. For completeness the membership of the Complaints Sub-Committee was confirmed as:

- Ian Gardner (Chairman), Dorset County Council
- Bernie Davis (Vice-Chairman), Christchurch Borough Council
- John Adams, (Chairman of the PCP), Bournemouth Borough Council
- Bobbie Dove, Bournemouth Borough Council
- Iain McVie, Independent Member

47.1 That Lead members, as identified in Appendix B of the report, be appointed to take specialist responsibility within designated themes.

Reason for Decision

48. To ensure that the Panel's Rules of Procedure were fit for purpose.

Complaints Update

49. The Panel considered the minutes from the Complaints Sub-Committee meeting held on Tuesday 7 July 2015.

Noted

Response to the Recommendations from the Committee on Standards in Public Life

50.1 The Panel considered a report by the Chief Executive, Dorset County Council, which included a proposed response to a letter received from The Chair of the Committee on Standards in Public Life.

50.2 Members were content with the suggested responses and offered no further comments.

Resolved

51. That the proposed response to the recommendations from the Committee on Standards in Public Life be finalised and submitted as per Appendix B of the Chief Executive's report.

Reason for Decision

52. To ensure that the Panel's scrutiny arrangements were effective, robust and demonstrated good ethical governance principles.

Progress against the Police and Crime Plan (Quarter 1)

53.1 The Panel considered a report by the Commissioner which informed members of the progress against the Police and Crime Plan and Priorities 2013 – 17 for Quarter 1. Members noted that the main data in the report related to April 2014 – June 2015.

53.2 The PCC highlighted the Niche records management system which had been recently introduced to allow for the seamless transfer of digital information between agencies. However, as the system went live on 21 May 2015 this was part way through the reporting period and whilst Dorset Police considered the data to be a fair representation of current performance the data had not yet been validated. Currently 22 Police Forces were now using the same system which would result in better quality data.

53.3 The PCC provided commentary for members on a few key areas of activity and highlighted the priorities in the Plan. The Panel was also updated on the other sections of the plan and how performance in those areas was being managed. It was noted that recorded crime had increased which was the first increase for 18 years. Improvements had been made to the satisfaction of victims in crime.

53.4 The Vice-Chairman noted the marked improvement in victim satisfaction but asked what work had been undertaken for the people that were not happy. The Head of Corporate Development advised that the 'Making a Difference' planning place survey looked in detail at what people were saying which was under review. One of the continuing themes in the detail was that the Police were not consistently keeping victims of crime updated in line with their expectations.

53.5 The Vice Chairman felt it might be helpful to show the fluctuation of volunteers numbers in a graph format rather than figures.

53.6 In response to a question from one member from Dorset County Council about ensuring people had confidence in reporting crimes, the PCC referred to the National Rural Crime Network which had held a survey of rural communities which showed that public confidence and public reporting of crime in rural areas was low and this highlighted the need to include rural areas in the funding formula. When the PCC was elected he undertook to lobby for increases and fair policing in Dorset. Initial indications were that current proposed changes showed some success in this aspiration with either a neutral or improvement to the Police funding formula in the future. There had been a 20% increase in shoplifting recording as this was an area both he and the Police were focussing on increasing the confidence in businesses to report.

53.7 It was anticipated to have confirmed by December 2015 what the funding changes would be.

53.8 Following a question from an Independent member about guaranteeing that any additional funding as a result of commissioning, partnership and funding activity was well spent, the PCC advised that the £2m was not part of the Police budget but from the Government specifically awarded to the PCC. The PCC was content to share the detail of commissioned and grant services with the Panel at its meeting on 10 November 2015.

53.9 In relation to the crime figures members felt it might be worthwhile to have a comparison of headline crime and for the 'value for money' aspect to be highlighted.

53.10 In response to a question from the Chairman regarding staffing costs of £400k, the PCC advised members that he had expected this amount.

53.11 Members of the Panel asked the following questions to the Police and Crime Commissioner and his Treasurer, who responded accordingly:

1a. Can the Commissioner please explain why the budget column does not agree with the presentation as set out in Appendix B to the Police Budget Requirement 2015/16 report as approved on the 5 February 2015. Previously the panel was provided with a schedule of all virements from the original budget as part of the quarterly reports.

This is mainly due to items carried forward from 2014-15 and adjustments relating to items such as the South West Forensics service and use of the body armour reserve. A virement schedule was produced and circulated and will be included in all future reports.

1b. Why does the budget table in the PCC Plan not match that in the Q reports, the only area that appears to be the same is the bottom line figure of £110.9M. Examples of discrepancies where the terminology is the same are:

- IS - Plan states £2.9M yet the latest Q report quotes £4M.
- Procurement - Plan states £282k yet the latest Q report quotes £4M.

The Police and Crime Plan objective analysis is done in a different format and at a much greater level of detail compared to the monitoring report with the staffing costs split across the functional areas. They are not therefore directly comparable although obviously come back to the same overall budget.

2. Can the Commissioner explain why no details of the actual expenditure incurred has been set out in the table in section 3.1 as has been the established reporting practice in previous reports to this panel. Also can the Treasurer explain why no capital financial monitoring statement has been included as per previous established practice.

We haven't provided this in the past for Quarter 1 where there is little to report but happy to do so in future and it will be automatically included in the reports for the rest of the year.

3. Can the commissioner please summarise the key decisions and choices that he has taken to actively manage the £2m preliminary overspend for 2015/16.

Part of the projected overspend relates to the use of temporary staff in support of the change programmes, including Strategic Alliance and the Smarter Systems programme. Funding has previously been set aside to meet these costs within the Workforce Change Reserve and in funding for the relevant capital schemes, so these costs will be offset.

The balance of the overspend relates to police staff, the risk line and income budgets. Action to reduce this will be taken during the year through turnover and identification of in-year savings.

At present however, in the absence of a firm plan, it has been recognised that the remaining overspend can be fully mitigated by removing the revenue contribution to capital in 2015-16. A review of the capital programme showed that over the medium term the capital programme could be sustained without this, primarily due to additional capital receipts now received and anticipated since the budget was set.

The use of this available funding has been applied, which has the effect of bringing the forecast overspend down to the £20k shown in the summary table.

4. Can the Commissioner highlight the potential implications and consequences on the approved capital programme of Dorset Police from the preliminary proposal not to set aside £1.3m revenue in 2015/16 as agreed as part of the approved budget to part fund the recognised capital programme.

The projected capital receipts from a number of forthcoming sales are in excess of the budgeted sums. These will allow for the revenue provision for capital expenditure to be freed up in 2015-16 without any impact on the recognised capital programme.

5. Can the Treasurer please explain to the panel the extent to which the £500k of additional in-year savings which had to be identified when the original budget was set (risk line) have been assumed to be deliverable as part of the projected forecast for the year.

As at end of Q1 no savings had been allocated against the risk line of £511k. However, as stated in paragraph 3.7, £86k had been identified at the time of writing the report. Other savings will be identified as the MTFP is updated which includes challenge of all budget spend but particular focus around underspent budgets.

6. Can the commissioner provide an explanation as to why there has been a higher level of Police Officers leaving the force (100 compared to 65) than assumed and what is happening to these individuals.

As shown in the Strategic Overview to Agenda Item 9, Dorset Police has highlighted the increase in turnover as not only a local issue but a national issue, potentially because of changes in societal norms relating to employment and potentially the impact of recent changes to terms and conditions.

Noted

(The Vice Chairman took the Chair from this point for the remainder of the meeting)

Cyber Crime

54.1 The Panel received a presentation on Cyber Crime from Detective Sergeant (DS) Mark Callaghan, Director of Intelligence for Dorset Police. He highlighted to members of the Panel the 3 areas of crime that were focussed on in this respect: Pure cyber crime, Cyber enabled crime and Traditional Crime. The 4 P plan was explained: Prevention, Protect, Pursue and Prepare.

54.2 DS Callaghan highlighted what had been achieved so far e.g. media campaigns, volunteers, closer working with partners (Project Spotlight) and an increase in crime reporting and recording. The next steps included: Business crime, constant

development/training, students on 12 month contracts (continual learning), public surveys continual prevention and website development for staff.

54.3 The member from Purbeck District Council had noticed a large increase in Dorset Alerts being sent out which he reported had been well received by the public.

54.4 In relation to internet threats from abroad, officers advised work was ongoing with Interpol and that nationally this was being reviewed.

Noted

Operation Genesis

55.1 The Panel received a presentation from Mr JP Oosthuizen who had been the project lead since August 2013 on Dorset Police's strategic review of neighbourhood policing for Dorset. He advised members that 44 recommendations had been made in the final report and also highlighted the new roles in local communities. Plans were underway to create a new neighbourhood academy for Dorset later in the year.

55.2 In response to a question from a member from Bournemouth Borough Council about staff numbers, officers advised that there had not been any recommendations made in respect of numbers around the model.

55.3 The Panel was advised that PCSOs had a total of 31 powers and research had found that they were not using the powers they currently had. The evidence now refocused the role to bridge the gap between the Police and the public.

55.4 In response to a question from a member from Bournemouth Borough Council about PCSO powers, the PCC advised that he would shortly be meeting with officers in Bournemouth to review the powers for Bournemouth PCSOs as a result of particular issues in Bournemouth, and it could be that PCSOs in Bournemouth had different powers to other PCSOs in Dorset.

55.5 Following a question from the Vice Chairman about the PCC's view of Project Genesis, the PCC advised that it endorsed his view of evidence based policy. He added that hot spot policing, which PCSOs carried out, was also evidence based.

55.6 One member from Dorset County Council asked about the carry card that PCSOs held which explained their delegated powers and was advised that it was similar to the warrant card carried by Police Officers. An example would be passed to members for their information.

Noted

Strategic Alliance

56.1 The Panel received an update from the Chief Executive to the PCC and noted it would be timely to schedule a meeting with the lead members on this project to provide a more detailed update.

56.2 He advised members that more detailed business cases had now been completed and that they were now in the implementation phase for a large part of the programme. To date £3.2m savings had been identified, and it was noted that the financial costs and benefits of the Alliance had been reviewed. The Chief Executive to the PCC also advised that a favourable draft report had been received from KPMG, who were the external auditors, and when the report was finalised he undertook to share it with the lead members from the Panel. It was also agreed that an update meeting would be scheduled with lead members as they had not met to discuss progress for a while.

56.3 In response to a question from the Vice Chairman regarding a timeline for this work, the Chief Executive to the PCC advised that by April 2016 a further 20 business cases would be approved.

Noted

Appointment of a Deputy PCC

57.1 The Panel considered a report by the PCC which provided details of the proposed appointment of a Deputy PCC (DPCC) for Dorset, the status of the appointment and the criteria by which the PCC had made that appointment.

57.2 The PCC explained to members of the Panel his justifications of why a deputy was required and asked that they view this as a positive move, with no cost to the public, other than appropriate reimbursement for any necessary travel or subsistence expenses. He confirmed that the appointment was a voluntary position valid until seven days after the scheduled PCC elections in 2016.

57.3 The Vice Chairman asked that the Panel be given visibility of any tasks which the proposed Deputy could be asked to undertake in a remunerated or consultancy role for the OPCC or elsewhere to which the PCC agreed.

57.4 Following a question from a member from the Borough of Poole about the allocation of a DPCC in the forthcoming budget in February 2016, the Chief Executive to the PCC advised that in theory he would have to include a budget for this and would be guided by what was happening nationally. He estimated the cost would be somewhere in the region of 80% of the PCC's salary. However, if it was found that a Deputy was not required the money would be reallocated and also confirmed that the post would be funded through the existing OPCC budget.

57.5 Several members made reference to a recent press release which stated that members of the Panel at a previous meeting had 'urged' the Commissioner to appoint a deputy. Feedback from members was that they had no recollection of this and felt it was not within their remit to urge the Commissioner to appoint a deputy. The PCC confirmed that his wording to the press was that the Panel had 'urged him to consider' appointing a deputy. He recalled this discussion at a previous meeting when the issue of covering for the PCC in the event of illness had been referenced, but apologised if his recollection was different to the Panels.

57.6 Following a question from the member from Purbeck District Council to the PCC about how much of his role he planned to hand over to a deputy, especially during the election campaign, the PCC advised that there was none planned.

57.7 The Panel asked Mr Pipe several questions relating to his previous work to which he replied he had spent 30 years as a civil servant with most of that time spent in the Ministry of Justice. He had been a magistrate for 15 years and therefore had a good understanding of the criminal justice system. He added he had undertaken volunteering roles for most of his life and was content with the conditions that the PCC had laid down for this role.

57.8 Mr Pipe confirmed he was not a member of any political party. His areas of interest included restorative justice and the rehabilitation of offenders.

Dorset Police and Crime Panel – 10 September 2015

57.9 Following a question from a member from Bournemouth Borough Council about his membership of a local hospital trust, Mr Pipe confirmed he was on the Council of Governors for the Royal Bournemouth Trust but that he had resigned a while ago as he had concerns over how the governance at the Trust was working.

57.10 A motion was put forward by a member from Bournemouth Borough Council and was seconded, to 'accept' rather than 'support' the PCC's decision to appoint a deputy. This motion was not supported and following discussion, the Panel agreed to support the recommendation to appoint Mr Pipe to the post of Deputy PCC.

57.11 The Vice Chairman thanked the Commissioner for a detailed outline of the process and for the information received from Mr Pipe.

Resolved

58. That following a full and comprehensive discussion the Panel supported the temporary, until the PCC elections in 2016, the voluntary appointment of Mr Colin Pipe, to the post of Deputy PCC for Dorset.

Reason for Decision

59. To assist the Panel in conducting a fair review of the process followed by the PCC and the suitability of the preferred candidate.

Dates of Future Meetings and Programme of Future Business

60.1 The Panel considered and agreed its Work Programme for 2015.

60.2 Members were reminded of the dates for future meetings during 2015, as follows:

- Tuesday 10 November 2015, 10.00am
- Thursday 10 December 2015, 10.00am, Training and Development Session for all members

2016

- Tuesday 12 January 2016 – finance briefing for all members
- Thursday 4 February 2016
- Friday 19 February 2016 – Reserve date
- Friday 10 June 2016
- Thursday 8 September 2016
- Tuesday 8 November 2016
- Thursday 8 December 2016 – training session for all members

Noted

Questions

61. No questions were asked by members of the Panel.

Meeting Duration: 10.00am – 1.20pm