



## Dorset Police and Crime Panel

Minutes of the meeting held at Purbeck District Council,  
Westport House, Wareham, BH20 4PP on Tuesday, 8  
November 2016

### **Present:**

John Adams (Chairman) (Bournemouth Borough Council)  
Mike Short (Vice-Chairman) (Independent)  
Bernie Davis (Christchurch Borough Council), Bobbie Dove (Bournemouth Borough Council),  
Fred Drane (Dorset County Council), Ian Gardner (Dorset County Council), Andrew Kerby  
(North Dorset District Council), Barbara Manuel (East Dorset District Council), Mohan Iyengar  
(Borough of Poole), Iain McVie (Independent Member), Bill Pipe (Purbeck District Council),  
John Russell (West Dorset District Council), David Smith (Bournemouth Borough Council) and  
Ann Stribley (Borough of Poole)

### Officers Attending:

Mark Taylor (Group Manager - Governance and Assurance), Richard Bates (Chief Financial Officer), Colin Pipe (Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner), Simon Bullock (Interim Chief Executive, OPCC) and Fiona King (Senior Democratic Services Officer).

(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 to be held on **Friday, 3 February 2017.**)

### **Apologies for Absence**

41 Apologies for absence were received from Norman Decent (Bournemouth Borough Council) and Francis Drake (Weymouth & Portland Borough Council).

The Chairman welcomed Cllr Richard Britton, the Chairman of the Wiltshire Police and Crime Panel, to the meeting.

Following a formal request from the Chief Executive to the OPCC on 14 October 2016 for the Panel to consider the interim appointment of Colin Pipe to the role of Acting Police and Crime Commissioner, the Chairman confirmed that following his email to all members of the Panel on 19 October 2016, members were content for this short term appointment to be made.

### **Code of Conduct**

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

### **Minutes**

43 The minutes of the meeting held on 8 September 2016 were confirmed and signed.

### **Matters Arising**

#### Minute 35 – Strategic Alliance with Devon and Cornwall

Following a question from the Chairman regarding a joint Police and Crime Plan, the Acting PCC advised that there were no plans at the present time for a joint Plan but they were working towards a top level umbrella plan which would have agreed elements across the whole Alliance. Underneath that would be the separate plans for Devon and Cornwall and Dorset, and team plans would sit under that.

Minute 36 – Police and Crime Commissioner – First 100 days in office

In response to a question from the Chairman regarding a meeting between the PCC and the Home Secretary in relation to border security, the Acting PCC advised that whilst there was a meeting held, the issue of border security was not covered.

The Chairman asked if the Acting PCC thought more could be done in relation to prescribed drugs that affected people's driving. The Acting PCC advised that officers shared the same concerns, the drug kits were aimed at illegal drugs but officers were alert to the fact that whilst instructions on prescribed medication might say do not drive a greater awareness of this issue was needed. One of the Independent members felt it would be helpful for the Acting PCC to report back to the Panel on work that was being done with health colleagues to educate people in prescribed drugs. Following a comment from a member about the number of Field Impairment Test trained (FIT) officers in Dorset, the Acting PCC undertook to respond outside of the meeting.

Members were advised that the interviews for the post of Chief Executive to the PCC had been rescheduled to take place on 18 November 2016.

### **Public Participation**

#### 44 Public Speaking

There were no public questions received at the meeting in accordance with Standing Order 21(1). However, Mr Mark Ellis attended the meeting to advise that he was still awaiting a written response to the questions he had submitted at the last meeting of the Panel. The Acting PCC advised that he was aware of the questions and his office had written to Mr Ellis shortly after his questions were submitted to arrange an appointment for him to meet the Commissioner in order to obtain the further information needed to respond fully. Mr Ellis had so far not taken up this offer. The Acting PCC undertook to speak with Mr Ellis outside of the meeting to make the necessary arrangements.

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

#### Petitions

There were no petitions received at the meeting in accordance with the County Council's Petition Scheme.

### **101 Service Improvement Panel**

45 Members considered a report by the Acting Police and Crime Commissioner which updated them on the progress on the 2016 manifesto commitment by the Police and Crime Commissioner to create a Service Improvement Panel to examine complaints about the Dorset Police 101 non-emergency service. The inaugural meeting of the Panel took place on 3 October 2016 and consisted of 2 members of the Police and Crime Panel, 3 members of the public and 3 representatives from the Community and Voluntary Sector.

The Acting PCC advised members that in terms of overall performance 72.1% of calls were answered within the given timescales and that 25% of calls to 101 were not relevant to police responsibility. It was widely recognised that people had often had difficulty understanding whether to call 101 or 999 and too many inappropriate calls were being received by the service. With this in mind the Acting PCC advised that an officer from the communications team would attend the next meeting of the 101 Service Improvement Panel to see what could be done. It was also noted that a new tranche of call handlers were now in post and another tranche were currently in training. There was a constant turnover of staff as it was on a shift basis and people tended to move on.

One member felt that the time taken to answer the original call was not the issue, it was the time taken to speak with someone to deal with the matter that took the time. The Acting PCC explained the method used to assess the priority of the calls which was a combination of the National Decision Making model and the THRIVE (Threat, Harm, Risk, Investigation, Vulnerability and Engagement) triage process.

One of the members of the 101 Service Improvement Panel was still unsure if the service was overloaded or under provided for. People were encouraged to contact the Police by telephone these days and she felt this should only be a few minutes, not the length of time they were currently taking.

Following a question from a member about what was being done by the PCC to reduce the 25% calls that shouldn't be made the Acting PCC recognised that members of the public needed more information. During the summer months events were held to let people know when people should and should not be calling. There was also more communication work ongoing. The Acting PCC highlighted that this was a national problem and was not just happening in Dorset, and that the Home Office were aware of this problem.

In response to a question about what action the PCC would be taking in relation to this service, the Acting PCC advised the key improvement would be communication. He explained that, following the next meeting of the 101 Panel in January, he would report back to this Panel at their meeting on 3 February 2017.

Members were keen to see information for how long people were actually on the telephone. The Acting PCC advised that the calls were analysed very carefully but noted that the percentage figures were skewed by a relatively small number of calls that took a long time. He undertook to circulate this information to members outside of the meeting.

Following a question about how issues being reported by email was progressing, the Acting PCC advised that it was suffering with certain teething troubles and officers were working to get the forms right. One issue that was highlighted was a frustration that some people were emailing in the middle of the night when they had nothing better to do which was taking up call handlers time to then phone them back.

In response to a comment about residents' concerns for the 101 Service the Acting PCC felt that there was a lot of historical experience in regard to this service and people had got accustomed to complaining about the system but he stressed this was not a failing service. In reality there were around 8 or 9 formal complaints received monthly which represented a complaint rate of 0.2%. One member, from personal experience, felt that 80% of his calls were not a good experience and he had waited a long time on numerous occasions.

Following a discussion on a number of questions that a member from Bournemouth Borough Council wished to submit on behalf of his ward, the Chairman felt that in the first instance these should be sent to the Police to be addressed.

One member felt it would be helpful to have some comparable information from other areas to see if the service in Dorset is good or otherwise. The Panel reflected on the current timings of the 101 Service Panel and suggested there may be merit in holding more frequent meetings.

### **Resolved**

1. That Bill Pipe, Purbeck District Council, join the 101 Service Improvement Panel as the third Dorset Police and Crime Panel representative.
2. That the current approach to hold quarterly meetings for the 101 Service Improvement Panel be discussed and reviewed at the next meeting of the Panel in

January 2017.

## **Police and Crime Plan - Quarter 2**

46 The Panel considered a report by the Acting PCC which informed members of the progress against the Police and Crime Plan and Priorities 2013-17 for Quarter 2. The Acting PCC highlighted elements of performance against the Plan during this quarter. He also provided commentary for members on a few key areas of activity and highlighted the priorities in the Plan.

He updated members on the current Establishment numbers which stood at 158 Special Constables and 176 volunteers which was a reduction from the last quarter. Exit interviews continued to be held. In total 7,163 hours worked by Special Constables and volunteers, were recorded which was higher than the same period last year.

Following a comment from a member about the value of Special Constables and volunteers, the Acting PCC advised they were both very valuable to the Police and were very valued. Members of the Panel noted their appreciation of the hard work and commitment of all of the volunteers also.

In response to a question about 'victim code compliance', the Interim Chief Executive advised this was a national code of guidance for victims and undertook to share this with members outside of the meeting.

Following a discussion about the increase in total crime, the Interim Chief Executive advised that clearly there were areas of concern but an increase in figures reflected the increase in reporting which was not necessarily a negative sign.

In response to a question about a continuity plan for recruitment, the Interim Chief Executive advised they were trying to level out the peaks and troughs. They recruited at 110% to try and allow for this. The Force had a long term strategic workforce plan which the PCC had sight of. All forces were actively trying to ensure the diversity of the Force represented the local population.

Following a question about Project Genesis and with perhaps a lack of PCSOs one member queried how this would move forward. The Interim Chief Executive advised that whilst PCSOs were still recruited it was a balance which had to be decided by the Chief Constable as this was an operational issue.

In response to a question about the Home Office Police Transformation Fund and what scrutiny of Dorset Police was being undertaken by the OPCC should these awards be rejected, the Acting PCC advised that a number of projects would not go ahead if the funding was not successful, some would still go ahead but funds would have to be allocated from elsewhere.

The Treasurer noted that a small overspend was predicted for the end of the year.

Finance Questions, submitted in advance of the meeting, to the Acting PCC / Treasurer to the PCC were responded to below:

1. The Panel would like to record its disappointment in the continual inconsistencies in the presentation of financial information which impedes its ability to carry out effective scrutiny. *Examples would be the differences in the original plan revenue budgets for 2016/17, the overfunding of the revised 16/17 capital budget and a reserves statement which does not tie up to the capital programme.* Could the Acting Commissioner confirm that he would welcome the opportunity for financial representatives of this panel to meet with the Treasurer of the OPCC and the Assistant Chief Officer responsible for

Finance from Dorset Police to resolve these matters moving forward?

*We have worked very closely with the panel over the past year or so to get the financial monitoring into an agreed format. There were some presentational issues in the Q1 figures and the classification of a number of the budgets has subsequently been changed to align better with the budget holders e.g. South West Forensics costs are now shown under "regional collaboration" and uniform costs moved to being centrally managed. These are just presentational changes - meaning that some of the mapping of the budget lines has changed rather than being virements. These will be consistent going forwards, in line with the Q2 figures in the report today. If there are any presentational changes in the future, we will add a footnote to explain it. The carry forward figure in the capital funding should read 6,287 not 6,376. This was an error in the table provided. We will also give some further consideration as to how we can report the reserves position during the year. These are set as part of the budget and are not normally amended until the year end. The Treasurer confirmed he was content to meet with financial representatives from the Panel.*

2. Can the Acting Commissioner provide the panel with reassurance of the financial management arrangements within the OPCC and Dorset Police as the concern would be that if the expenditure being shown as spent in the period to the end of September 2016 is doubled it would indicate a potential £7m overspend for the 2016/17 financial year and not a relatively balanced position as shown?

*We are very happy to provide that assurance. At present there are several budgets where a significant proportion of the expenditure has been made in the first half of the financial year such as Premises costs and Communications and Computing. Despite this, the outturn position will show only a small variance. Third Party Payments would also appear to be fully spent already but the reality is that a significant proportion of this will be recovered from other forces later in the year. We are therefore content that the reported position is accurate and reflects all known issues at this point of the year.*

3. Section 3.12 of the report highlights that almost £6m of an approximate revised capital budget of £11m (56%) is being slipped into future financial years. Can the Acting Commissioner provide the Members of this panel with assurance as the process of determining capital need and the timing of that need?

*The capital programme was reviewed periodically and any new capital bids went through a prioritisation process. Once in the capital programme, it was quite common for the schemes to move between financial years. Some of the ICT programme had been delayed until 2017-18 whilst national initiatives such as those being undertaken by the Police ICT company were fully understood and strategic alliance considerations were also taken in to account. The need for the capital projects still remained but the timing and method of delivery may be amended. The Vice Chairman also asked that slippage in this area be looked and examined as a specific element in the PCC's scheduled efficiency review of procurement.*

4. Section 3.20 of the report references the Bear Scotland legal case. Can the Acting Commissioner provide a brief outline of this case and the impact it has had on the finances of Dorset Police?

*Following legal action (Fulton vs Bear Scotland), it was now necessary to make payment to reflect the additional entitlement to holiday that accrued on additional hours worked, primarily overtime. The financial impact on Dorset*

*Police was £200k which was included in the current year and future year's budget.*

**Noted**

**Police Overtime**

47 The Panel considered a report by the Acting PCC which explored in detail the use of Police Overtime. The report set out the current uses of overtime and provided some context to current spending levels. It was highlighted that the difference in overtime spend between 2014/15 and 2015/16 was around £600k.

This was one of the priority areas specifically identified for efficiency review by the PCC following his re-election in May 2016. Members asked if the Acting PCC could confirm whether, at the conclusion of the review, they were satisfied with the current approach and/or whether specific areas for improvement were identified. The Acting PCC advised that there was a whole list of points that were made and discussed, but he confirmed that the Chief Constable was happy with the arrangements. There was a robust debate and the PCC was very satisfied with how the Police were dealing with it.

Following a question from a member about unplanned operations the Treasurer advised that there had not been any so far this year. In respect of overtime, this was one of the tools that was used with staffing and was part of a national policy. It was partly funded from the revenue budget and money had also been set aside in the reserves.

One member highlighted a reduction in the amount spent on football. The Treasurer explained that this referred to football policing which was recovered from the football clubs.

**Noted**

**Work Programme**

48 The Panel considered and agreed its Work Programme for the remainder of 2016.

Members noted that both the spotlight scrutiny work on Firearms Licencing and the format and content of future Police and Crime Plan Monitoring Reports had been deferred due to the PCC's emergency issues. The Acting PCC and Interim Chief Executive agreed to ensure that revised dates, together with any supporting preparation documents were produced, to allow this work to move forward.

The Panel was reminded of the training session scheduled for Thursday on 8 December 2016 in Dorchester. This would be a facilitated session and a self-assessment questionnaire would be sent to members in advance of the session for completion prior to the 8 December. This would be used to capture strengths and weaknesses for discussion and help to compile a development plan for the Panel to aid its continuous improvement. Members were encouraged to actively participate to maximise the outcomes from the session.

Members were advised that the PCC would be unavailable for the meeting scheduled for 20 June 2017 so an alternative date would be secured shortly.

With regard to the holding of meetings at different venues, one member felt it would be better to return to the original arrangements of holding them in Dorchester. The Chairman agreed to review this early in the New Year with all members.

**Noted**

### Questions from Panel Members

49 No questions were asked by members of the Panel.

### Exempt Business

50 **Resolved**

That in accordance with Section 100 A (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 to exclude the public from the meeting in relation to the business specified in minute 51 as it was likely that if members of the public were present, there would be disclosure to them of exempt information as defined in paragraph 2 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act and the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information to the public.

### The OPCC Restructure

51 The Interim Chief Executive updated members of the Panel on the current restructure at the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner. He explained that a major review of the OPCC had been ongoing since May 2016. Work was underway to recruit a part-time Chief Executive, a full-time Deputy Chief Executive and a part-time Chief Financial Officer. The interview date for the Chief Executive's post was 18 November 2016.

As part of the restructure there had been a lot of staff consultation and the organisational structure was predominantly based on the current structure. Benchmarking of structures and processes had also been looked at. The Interim Chief Executive undertook to share the confidential document with members to provide further assurance of the rationale for the changes.

Whilst members were pleased to hear about the inclusion of apprenticeships they felt the structure appeared to be a bit top heavy. The Interim Chief Executive advised that the organisation needed to be reactive to a range of responsibilities set by Government which were expected to continue to grow, particularly noting the expected passage of the Police and Crime Bill next year. The changes were made in order to allow flexibility as and when appropriate, but remained conscious of the importance of public justification and scrutiny for any such changes.

Members asked the following questions, to which the Interim Chief Executive responded:-

1. How does the new structure compare with the current arrangements in terms of cost and staff numbers?

*There were still a few posts to go through the grading system but it was estimated there was about £1k per year, between the old structure and the new structure. The costing as it stood was therefore cost neutral, but would give a better service.*

2. How confident are you that the new structure can be staffed within in a timely period?

*Plans along with contingencies were now in place in order to progress.*

3. How do the changes impact and reflect continuing discussions in respect of the Strategic Alliance?

*The opportunities for a shared Chief Executive had been explored but it was felt this this was not the right time for such a change. Officers were still looking at opportunities to share and align functions across where appropriate to do so.*

The Interim Chief Executive, OPCC was aware that an update on the previous Chief Executive was still outstanding. He advised this was an ongoing process with independent support and input. The Panel recognised the details remained confidential.

The Acting PCC updated members on the PCC's personal situation and advised that he was taking the opportunity of his time away from the office to draft his next Police and Crime Plan as this was one area of work, under statute, could not be delegated to the Deputy or Acting PCC. The PCC was very grateful for all the goodwill and support he had received from members of the Panel.

**Noted**

Meeting Duration: 10.00 am - 1.10 pm