



Dorset Police and Crime Panel

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

Present:

Members

Borough Poole

Karen Rampton

Co-opted members:

Phil Eades

Ann Stribley

Bournemouth Borough Council

Vacancy

Co-opted members:

John Adams (Chairman)

David Smith

Christchurch Borough Council

Bernie Davis

Dorset County Council

Fred Drane

Ian Gardner

East Dorset District Council

Barbara Manuel

North Dorset District Council

Andrew Kerby

Purbeck District Council

Bill Pipe

West Dorset District Council

John Russell

Weymouth & Portland Borough Council

Francis Drake

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 – Clerk to the Panel

Mark Taylor, Head of Assurance, Risk and Audit, Dorset County Council

Denise Hunt, Senior Democratic Services Officer, Dorset County Council

Also in attendance:

Martyn Underhill, Dorset Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC)

Richard Bates, Treasurer to the Police and Crime Commissioner

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

(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 **4 February 2016**.)

Joint Statement

62. The Clerk to the Panel (Chief Executive of Dorset County Council) read aloud a joint statement by the Chairman of the Police and Crime Panel and the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC). A copy of the joint statement is attached as Annexure 1 to these minutes.

Apology for Absence

63. An apology for absence was received from Bobbie Dove (Bournemouth Borough Council).

Code of Conduct

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

Minutes

65. The minutes of the meeting held on 10 September 2015 were confirmed and signed.

Matters ArisingMinute 55.4 and Minute 55.6 – Operation Genesis

66.1 A Member of Bournemouth Borough Council stated that a review of powers had not been relayed to Bournemouth police community support officers (PCSOs) and that there appeared to be a difference of opinion between PCSOs and the academic view expressed in the Operation Genesis report which he had difficulty in obtaining.

66.2 The PCC advised that he could provide a redacted copy of the report, which was an academic privately owned document and not a report of his office. A review of the powers of PCSOs was an operational matter that was not within the remit of the Panel.

66.3 It was confirmed that a copy of the carry card held by PCSOs which explained their delegated powers would be re-circulated to the Panel.

Minute 57.4 – Appointment of Deputy PCC

66.4 It was clarified that a decision on whether or not a Deputy PCC was required would be taken by the PCC.

Representation to the Joint CommitteePublic Speaking

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

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

Petitions

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

Dorset Police and Crime Panel Complaints Sub-Committee

69.1 The Panel considered the minutes of the Complaints Sub-Committee meeting held on 20 October 2015. It was proposed by Councillor Bernie Davis to adopt the Dorset Police and Crime Panel Complaints Protocol which was seconded by Councillor John Russell and agreed by the Panel.

69.2 The Chief Executive to the PCC explained that there were some points where greater clarity and amplification in the Protocol might be helpful. For example, any complaint of a criminal nature might benefit from a sense check of the context behind the complaint before being sent to the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC). This would avoid a situation where it was simply referred straight back to the Panel. He offered to provide some additional wording to the Protocol for consideration by the Panel in order to clarify the process. He also considered that the reference to "dip sampling" in the report required further clarification.

69.3 The need to introduce an element of consistency and clarity in the process was recognised by the Panel. It was therefore suggested that any further amendments to

the Complaints Protocol provided by the Chief Executive of the PCC would be highlighted on the Protocol and circulated to members of the Panel.

Resolved

70.1 That the Dorset Police and Crime Panel Complaints Protocol be approved;

70.2 That any further minor amendments to the Complaints Protocol be discussed with the Chief Executive and circulated to the Panel.

Progress against the Police and Crime Plan (Quarter 2)

71.1 The Panel considered a report by the PCC which informed members of the progress against the Police and Crime Plan and Priorities 2013 – 17 for Quarter 2. The PCC highlighted elements of performance against the Plan during this quarter. He stated that he had received the Panel's written questions on the day prior to the meeting leaving insufficient time to answer them. He asked that a notice period of 4 days was given for questions and advised the Panel that this timeline had not been adhered to on previous occasions.

71.2 The Chairman drew attention to the data validity warning contained in the report and asked when there could be confidence in the data provided. The Panel was advised that although the operational statistics were reliable, there remained some statistics that were inaccurate and it was anticipated that this would be resolved during the following 3 month period.

71.3 Following a question regarding the effect of the year's delay in re-negotiation of the funding formula, the Panel was informed that the PCC had lobbied for a review of the formula and that a favourable increase was anticipated in Dorset in the region of £3.5m which represented the financial cost of the one year delay. It was also asked whether this was a gain in real terms given the reduction in central government grant. It was confirmed that although Dorset's share in relative terms would improve under the new formula, further financial reductions were likely to result in a shortfall.

71.4 Councillor Drane asked about the level of mental health training for officers. The PCC advised that he represented PCCs nationally on mental health and that training in this area had been very poor 3 years ago. Since writing to the College of Policing on this issue, a mental health package had been incorporated in police training. He had also introduced further training in Dorset with 3 practitioners delivering bespoke training to police officers. It was confirmed that the Panel champion for mental health would be invited to attend this training.

71.5 The Vice-Chairman asked about the Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH) and the Panel was informed that the MASH for vulnerable young people would be relocated to Poole Police Station and that a project officer had been recruited to make the transition easier. It was the aspiration of the PCC to provide a MASH to address vulnerable people of all age groups.

71.6 The Vice-Chairman asked why the local target for answering 999 calls of 95% was set higher than the national target of 90%. The PCC advised that he considered that 95% was an appropriate target and that the same team provided both the 101 and 999 services. The 101 service was improving with 5 complaints this year compared with 50 in 2014. Further to a request, it was confirmed that a site visit to the call centre would be arranged for members of the Panel.

71.7 Councillor Kerby wished to receive assurance that the police were being trained consistently on reporting, due to the constant changes in reporting of crime. The PCC advised that keeping the police force up to date with changes in crime reporting was

proving difficult and asked that the member write to him outlining his concerns in order that he could bring this to the attention of the police force.

71.8 In response to a question the PCC confirmed that he had attended several local authority committee meetings, but would not continue to do so from 1 November 2015 due to the PCC election period.

71.9 The Panel discussed issues in relation to cyclists, cycle paths and enforcement. The PCC stated that there were different approaches to cycling across Dorset and that it would be preferable to have a single approach and to join up the cycle paths. He advised that he would be meeting with the Transport Minister regarding some of the issues that the government did not currently intend to address.

71.10 The written questions to the PCC by the Panel are attached as Annexure 2 to these minutes.

Noted

Commissioning of Services by the Police and Crime Commissioner

72.1 The Panel considered a report on the commissioning of services by the PCC which provided an outline of the new processes in place since 2013 with transparency highlighted as a key factor. The PCC had recently won an award for transparency and going over and above what was required in the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act. The process was now sufficiently robust in order for the PCC to have “arms length” engagement in the awarding of grants. The aim was to bid for grants to encourage the voluntary sector, identify gaps in service delivery and to facilitate and pump prime initiatives and the Panel received a short presentation on a number of schemes that had been funded.

72.2 The Vice-Chairman asked about the benchmark to measure the success of initiatives and the Panel was informed that the PCC had invested in a member of staff to liaise with the groups in receipt of funding and to assist in shaping how they delivered the services as well as identify any assistance from partner organisations. The project was assessed on its conclusion and a further bid for funding could be made in a new application. It was highlighted that district councils could also act as facilitators and the PCC confirmed that a meeting had been arranged at North Dorset District Council in this regard.

72.3 A question was asked in relation to repayment of a grant and it was explained that in the event that there was no likelihood of a project succeeding beyond the ambition stage then the PCC would seek to reclaim the grant.

Noted

Violent Crime

73.1 The Panel received a presentation on Violent Crime from David Thorp, Head of Corporate Development. He explained that there had been an overall increase of 28% in recorded violent crimes and that Dorset was favourably placed 7th nationally and 2nd out of the regional forces in relation to violent crime. A drive in national crime reporting requirements had led to an increase in the volume of violent crime and several examples were given of reportable crimes where there had been no bodily harm and no complaint made.

73.2 The Panel expressed concern that the inclusion of these crimes had led to an increase in the recorded violent crime rate that caused unnecessary concern. The Panel also felt strongly that the examples given were unlikely to be considered to be common assault by the general public. Councillor Kerby proposed that a joint statement be issued with the PCC indicating the opposition of the Panel to the recording of such matters and where no complaint

had been received. This was seconded by Councillor Pipe. The PCC shared the concerns expressed by the Panel and offered to lead on drafting the joint statement.

Resolved

74. That a joint statement be prepared that expresses the concerns of the Police and Crime Panel and the Police and Crime Commissioner on the way in which crimes resulting in no bodily harm and no complaint are recorded.

Dates of Future Meetings and Programme of Future Business

75.1 The Panel considered and agreed its Work Programme for 2015 and also agreed the proposed general coverage for the training session on 10 December 2015.

75.2 Members were reminded of the dates for future meetings as follows:

2015

- 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

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

Meeting Duration: 10.00am – 11.55am

Dorset Police and Crime Panel – 10 November 2015

The Chairman of the Police and Crime Panel and the Police and Crime Commissioner have asked that a joint statement be made on their behalf. Both are eager to ensure that clarity exists in respect of the principles and procedures which support statements which are issued through the media.

The Chairman of the Police and Crime Panel has therefore requested me, in my capacity as Clerk to the Panel, to undertake a review of the Panel's existing arrangements and develop an appropriate 'Media Protocol'.

In summary, the key principles for inclusion in the Protocol will be as follows;

- The Chairman, or in their absence, the Vice Chairman will be approached in the first instance by the Communications Team to provide a quote or interview expressing the views of the Police and Crime Panel. The Chairman has the authority to speak officially on behalf of the Panel to the media, through the Communications Team. All official responses will be subject to an appropriate level of consultation with Panel members to ensure they represent the views of the Panel.
- Any personal views expressed by Panel members to the media must be clearly recorded as such and it should be made clear that they are not speaking on behalf of the Panel.
- If any member of the Panel is approached by the media for comment, they should be referred to the Police and Crime Panel Communications Team to arrange an official response in consultation with the Chairman.

The Protocol will also recognise that, due to the specific and different roles and responsibilities of the Police and Crime Panel and the Police and Crime Commissioner, it is necessary to acknowledge that the Media Protocol **must** allow for differences of opinion to be expressed. The protocol will therefore **not** seek to restrict or influence the message of either party.

However, working together through a co-ordinated approach will help manage the quality, consistency and reliability of information released to the media. This will benefit the public and will protect the reputation of each organisation.

I am pleased to be able to confirm that the review process is underway and a draft Media Protocol will be brought to the next meeting of the Panel for due consideration and approval.

Clerk to the Panel
November 2015

Finance Questions

1. Can the Commissioner explain why more "Actual staff and PCSO's" are currently being employed compared to the budget (section 3.13 / 3.14) of the report.

Additional staff have been employed in IS, Media and HR Change to support workload in these areas where short term resources are needed to support delivery of critical change programmes such as smarter systems and strategic alliance.

2. Has the Dorset Police establishment been finalised yet?

Currently in the process of being finalised and we will be in a position to do so once the results of the spending review and finance settlement are known.

3. Can the Commissioner explain the rationale for using the £1.3m budgeted revenue contribution to capital, not needed to cover capital expenditure due to higher levels of capital receipts, to remove the £511,000 budgeted target for in-year savings. Does this mean officers will now not be trying to identify these savings? (Table on page 32).

A review of the capital programme as part of the MTFs identified that the planned revenue contribution to capital could be used to offset a number of variances including the risk line.

Dorset Police made significant reductions in the budget to achieve a balanced budget in 2015/16. This included the introduction of a risk line on none staff budgets. To date, savings have been achieved in vehicle fuel, equipment and printing, which partly offset the risk line. However, cost pressures in other areas, such as the cost of uniforms, overtime and recruitment costs have offset these savings. The use of this funding to offset the risk line in no way detracts from the expectation of further savings being sought from procurement and other areas throughout the remainder of this financial year and beyond.

4. Can the Commissioner explain why the budget for "Grant, Trading and Reimbursement Income" has had to be reduced by £385,000, again covered by the reduced revenue contribution to capital? (Table on page 32).

This is primarily the reduction of £321k in road safety grant from local authorities, which was unknown at the time the budget was set. The other variation is the Counter Terrorism grant which again was not known when the budget was set and was £64k lower than anticipated at £1,545k.

5. Can the Commissioner explain why the Smarter Systems ICT Capital programme will spend over half a million pounds more than its budget and why around a quarter of a million of additional minor building works capital expenditure more than budget will be undertaken in the current financial year? (3.15. / 3.16 of report).

The Smarter Systems programme includes increased provision of mobile policing solutions, which will significantly increase the flexibility of the workforce and will be funded in part from savings over the next couple of years.

The minor building works budget includes activity related to the relocation of operations from Ferndown and will be recouped through the sale of this property.

6. Can the Commissioner explain more about the detail of the assessment that supported his determination to set aside an extra £2.7m in a Change Management Reserve (section 3.20/3.21).

The one-off cost of change through the Strategic Alliance is anticipated to be significant, with reductions in police staff numbers plus the cost of changes to IT systems and estates as part of the Alliance, and the cost of the programme team.

The current provision was therefore likely to be insufficient and we also want to leave this reserve with sufficient funding to deal with future changes which will no doubt be necessary. Reserves have therefore been reallocated to achieve this.