



## Dorset Police and Crime Panel

Minutes of the meeting held at County Hall, Colliton Park, Dorchester, DT1 1XJ on Tuesday, 13 November 2018

### Present:

Mike Short (Chairman) (Independent Member)  
John Adams (Vice-Chairman) (Bournemouth Borough Council)  
David Brown (Borough of Poole), Les Burden (Borough of Poole), Bernie Davis (Christchurch Borough Council), Norman Decent (Bournemouth Borough Council), Bobbie Dove (Bournemouth Borough Council), Janet Dover (Dorset County Council), Mohan Iyengar (Borough of Poole), Andrew Kerby (North Dorset District Council), Barbara Manuel (East Dorset District Council), Iain McVie (Independent Member), Bill Pipe (Purbeck District Council), Byron Quayle (Dorset County Council), John Russell (West Dorset District Council) and David Smith (Bournemouth Borough Council)

### Officers Attending:

Martyn Underhill (Police and Crime Commissioner), Simon Bullock (Chief Executive, OPCC), Alexis Garlick (Chief Finance Officer, OPCC), Adam Harrold (Director of Operations, OPCC), Mark Taylor (Group Manager - Governance and Assurance) 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, 1 February 2019.**)

### **Apologies for Absence**

38 An apology for absence was received from Mike Byatt, Weymouth and Portland Borough Council.

### **Code of Conduct**

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

### **Minutes**

40 The minutes of the meeting held on 27 September 2018 were confirmed and signed.

In respect of the Annual Report, the Chief Executive, OPCC advised that it was due to be finalised shortly and would be circulated to Panel members.

### **Public Participation**

#### 41 Public Speaking

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

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.

## **Police and Crime Commissioner updates**

42 The PCC updated members on the following areas of development, (the PCC's speech is attached as an Annexure to these minutes):-

### **Fallout of merger decision**

The economic case had showed the merger to be the most effective way to deliver budgets. The 100 police officers for Dorset that the merger would have provided would now not happen. However, Dorset was not dependent on merger for future stability. The OPCC had budgeted as if it wouldn't happen and was now exploring many other collaborations i.e. the merger savings had not been included in the Medium Term Financial Plan. Dorset Police was now hosting the Regional Forensic Collection across the 5 forces in the south west and the Qlik Sense analytical tool was in the process of being adopted. Talks were ongoing with Hampshire about further collaborations. There had also been various discussions with Dorset and Wiltshire Fire and Rescue on a number of areas of potential collaboration with the aim to continue to try to save public money and achieve efficiencies.

### **Alliance**

The PCC reassured the Panel that, despite the failure of the Merger, the Alliance was strong and that it would be actively continued. As a result of the collapse of the merger though some adjustments have had to be made. The merge team had now been disbanded and a decision had been made to not further align any more business areas for the time being. The Force would still have joint Chief Officer meetings fortnightly and other changes to local governance were also highlighted. There was now a clear need to recruit a permanent Chief Constable as the current Chief Constable had been appointed on a temporary basis pending the outcome of the merger. The post would be advertised shortly, interviews would be held in January 2019 and the Chairman of the Police and Crime Panel had been invited, and had accepted, to take part in the process in an observer capacity.

The PCC highlighted that the Force was now operating with 500 less officers which was the lowest number of officers since 1981. He advised that Policing could no longer do everything, and he was considering which services to stop to keep the Police going. However, he assured members that people would be kept safe.

He was awaiting the government's budget decision in December, but he had lobbied them for more funding. However, there was an expectation that PCCs should raise the precept to accommodate the huge increase in demand especially in relation to knife crime.

Following a question from the Chairman about the Police pensions issue in the national media, the Chief Finance Officer, OPCC advised that the burden which had previously been held centrally by the Treasury was gradually, over several years, being moved to the local employer. The costs were sensitive to the Office for Budget Responsibility (OBR) growth forecast, which had reduced at the last valuation having the impact of increasing the required employer contributions. It was believed that the Treasury would partially offset next year's increase, and it was highlighted by the OPCC that this was a National issue which affected everyone. The Panel noted that the National Police Chiefs Council (NPCC) were in the process of challenging the Government through the courts on this change to Police pension policy.

With regards to the cost of the merger process, the PCC advised that the merger process was not yet completely closed and a full release of information and figures would be made available shortly. He also noted that he was due to release all the paperwork under Freedom of Information (FOI) for the merger and this would be available on the Future Policing website. This information would be shared with the Panel at the point of publication.

Following a discussion about the Fire and Rescue Service attending non-injury accidents instead of the Police, the PCC advised that discussions were still ongoing between Chief Officers of both organisations. This was deemed a heavy demand on Police resources that could be better utilised. There were hundreds of non-injury accidents that Police attended as a matter of course but the Fire and Rescue Service could equally deal with them.

In respect of other work that the Police might not do in the future, the PCC advised that work was reasonably well advanced and the intention was for Dorset Police to report back to him in January 2019. The police were moving to a demand led model but there needed to be a clear understanding of the model in the first instance. Following a question about the Fire and Rescue Service being paid to attend such incidents, the PCC advised that this was part of the ongoing negotiations.

In response to a question from a member about the number of drink/drug related arrests at Road Traffic Incidents (RTI), and the number of police officers required to operate safely, the PCC undertook to provide this information outside of the meeting.

### **Staffing**

The Chief Executive, OPCC advised members that the PCC had set a challenge for him to consider staffing at the OPCC. They had been carrying a number of vacancies for a couple of months, but these were now being addressed. He had looked at staffing in depth and a number of other factors and was now comfortable that the OPCC was staffed at the appropriate level, given the delivery objectives set out in the Police and Crime Plan and the PCC's list of commitments, which the PCC had accepted. He added that he would continue to keep staffing under a watchful review.

One member referred to the reductions in officers and possible further cuts in the future and yet the level of staffing in the OPCC remained the same. The Chief Executive responded that in this instance he was referring to existing budgets and not new budgets. At this precise moment in time with current budgets in a reasonable place it was appropriate. In the future it could be very different. He highlighted that Police budgets and the OPCC budgets were completely separated. He also confirmed that the second review of staffing for this year had been completed and would be reviewed on an ongoing basis.

### **Noted**

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

43 The Panel considered a report informing them of the progress against the Police and Crime Plan and Priorities 2017-21. The report provided information on the financial outturn position for Quarter 2 2018/19.

The PCC highlighted areas of work related to each of the pillar themes. Members of the Panel, who were leading on each of the themes in the Plan, were also invited to provide updates.

#### **Pillar 1 – Protecting People at Risk and Harm – Cllr Andrew Kerby/Cllr Byron Quayle**

Cllr Kerby made reference to his scrutiny review of the Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) which he had launched prior to the last meeting of the Panel in September.

A few volunteers had come forward and preliminary reports were good. He was looking to contact external agencies to see what their experiences were. The PCC welcomed the 'mystery shopper' type approach and invited him to contact the Police for further help with examples of those DBS checks that might have slipped through the net. One member referred to the issue of different organisations wanting separate

DBS checks and the PCC highlighted the need for one system to be in place. However, this had been stopped by the Government as the costs were too high.

Reference was made to the number of recorded hate crime and recorded hate incidents given the report showed that hate crimes had increased by 10% but hate incidents had decreased by 26%. The PCC advised that there had been a focus on hate crimes and that the recording of incidents had improved. He added that this was one of the areas that the Government wanted to see an increase in reporting and it was encouraging that people were talking about it more and therefore reporting it more. One member felt it was positive to see an increase in the reporting of hate crime. The PCC expressed concern that disability hate crime was still under-reported and felt that this area needed to be investigated further.

Following some confusion over the rag ratings in the report, the Chief Executive, OPCC highlighted the importance of scrutiny and that this report focussed on the PCC's objectives as set out in his Plan, rather than the Chief Constable's performance in this particular area. The report aimed to give the Panel a flavour of where things were and in Dorset they were thankfully talking about relatively low numbers as Dorset remained a safe place to live and work. It was suggested that a deeper dive into hate crime could be undertaken to provide a better understanding.

Following a comment about knife crime, the PCC confirmed that at present Dorset did not have a charity focusing on knife crime.

Members discussed the stop and search practice and asked the PCC for his view. He made reference to the 3 different messages to the Police that had been received from 3 different Home Secretaries on stop and search and supported the current view as this did need to be done to keep people safe. He referred to the high number of black people that had been subject to stop and search in Dorset and advised that a report on this was due to be completed in January 2019.

One member asked for an indication if any of the searches had been unlawful in the recent review that had taken place. The PCC advised that there was a large report which had been drafted but he needed to get the Police to respond before circulating it further. He made reference to the Stop and Search scrutiny panel which had been reshaped considerably this year and was content for Panel leads to attend and observe.

Following a comment about the partnership working in the Multi Area Safeguarding Hub (MASH) being criticised, the PCC advised that all agencies had been criticised, apart from the Police. He had recently been talking to colleagues in local authorities and that in respect of Local Government Reorganisation (LGR) the focus was on being safe and legal by April 2019 but to look to improve safety and vulnerability in August 2019.

With regard to the effectiveness of the PCC's blog on county lines, the PCC advised that thousands had read it and he had received a good number of responses. The purpose of the blog was to raise awareness with partners.

## **Pillar 2 – Working with our Communities – Cllr Bernie Davis/Cllr Mohan Iyengar**

Cllr Iyengar was concerned that the articulation shown in the rag ratings might not give the whole picture. The Group Manager, Governance and Assurance noted that the Panel had been working closely with the OPCC on the format of the quarterly reports and it was about getting the balance right to support effective scrutiny. As there was an ongoing and active role for the Panel in getting this right, more detail, understanding and reflections on this could be included at the Training day on 7 December 2018.

Cllr Iyengar made reference to the summer Drink Drive campaign and felt that the name and shame effect had been a positive deterrent. The PCC advised that this was a Police operational campaign and that he had challenged them about this. The challenge was initiated by reports to the OPCC that public exposure of Drink Drive offenders could lead to difficulties for those involved, particularly if those individuals were already managing poor mental health. There had to be a robust risk assessment around this as there was a very delicate balance to be sought. One member was pleased to hear that people were risk assessed before their name was made public and the PCC undertook to take this back to the Police and his Head of Media. As some members were in favour of the name and shame process and others expressed caution, Cllr Iyengar welcomed a Panel discussion on this in order to come to a collective view.

The PCC confirmed that the national guidance stated that if someone had been charged they could be named.

In respect of Neighbourhood Policing engagement contract timings, the Director of Operations, OPCC advised that a self-assessment was being produced and was due to be signed off by the end of the year, the OPCC would have sight of this in January 2019.

Cllr Iyengar felt that with regards to his Pillar 'working with our communities', in order to keep the idea of the pillars going there was a need to look to sharpen them up to ensure clear segmentation of the issues. It was agreed to look at this as part of the training session in December.

Following a question about the Business Crime Strategy, the Chief Executive, OPCC advised that work had been ongoing to try to align this with Devon and Cornwall, but it had now been decided that this objective would no longer be pursued.

**Pillar 3- Supporting Victims, Witnesses and Reducing Reoffending** – Cllr Barbara Manuel/Cllr Bill Pipe

Cllr Pipe made reference to the staff recruited for the Complainant Advocate Project and highlighted the problem of the double/triple booking of court rooms, especially in Weymouth. The PCC advised that there had been a significant improvement in this area and undertook to report back to members about performance in Bournemouth as Weymouth had now improved.

Following a comment about victim satisfaction and whether there were any particular issues in this area, the PCC advised that the data came from surveys carried out with a number of victims. This was an ongoing challenge but with a constant focus there had been some improvement.

In response to a question about tagging of criminals, the PCC advised that there were 2 types of tagging and that Government tagging been contentious for several years. This commitment was red in the report as he wanted to expand the tagging of offenders in Dorset and as yet the new tags had not yet been procured.

In respect of the Restorative Dorset event scheduled for 22 November 2018, the Director of Operations, OPCC confirmed this event was to celebrate the hub and there would be speakers from the Police and several other agencies. Further details would be circulated to Cllr Pipe outside of the meeting.

**Pillar 4 – Transforming for the Future** – Iain McVie

Iain McVie advised members he was due to attend a meeting in January which would be looking at spotlight scrutiny on court schemes and he also highlighted the PCC's

funding of £263k for the Weymouth CCTV regeneration programme. Mr McVie felt the contact he had with Jason Mumford at the OPCC alerted him to any significant changes to the ratings within his pillar.

Cllr Russell made reference to a 101 meeting (Customer Service Improvement Panel) he had attended in October where a good presentation had been received along with a useful update on neighbourhood engagement.

Members asked the following questions and received the attached responses:-

1. Can the Chief Finance Officer for the OPCC set out the detail of the disposals (capital receipts) that have taken longer than assumed and the reasons for the delay? and also outline the impact of these delays on the capital programme?

*The delay related to 2 disposals: The former Christchurch Police station and Wimborne Police station. Both are complex in terms of working with multiple parties and subject to the planning process which has added to the time taken to achieve completion of sales. Christchurch has required a supplemental agreement (to be signed by 5 parties) to allow a replacement planning application. In the case of Wimborne the sale is being progressed jointly with Dorset County Council who are the freeholder (Dorset Police are the leaseholder) and the sale is subject to planning with the potential purchasers seeking pre-application discussions with the Council prior to entering into the contract for sale.*

*The impact of the delays has had the effect of reducing the forecast year-end balance on the Capital Receipts reserve (although it should be remembered that the assets are still held on the Balance Sheet i.e. there is no loss value as a consequence of delay – liquidity is affected which in turn impacts on the ability to spend the receipt for other capital spend). Offsetting the impact of delayed receipts is a forecast that capital expenditure in 2018/19 will be lower than budgeted.*

*In summary the slippage in the timing of receipts is partially offset by slippage in expenditure.*

2. From the analysis of the revenue budget it can be established that the Chief Constable is forecasting to spend £1.1m more than budgeted on overheads in 2018/19.
  - Is it possible to obtain a more complete understanding as to the nature of these costs and why they are predicted to be 17.6% (£5M) higher than the original budget?

*Taking the question on the change from the Original Budget first – there has been an adjustment of £4m increase to the Overhead expenditure budget which is equally matched by an increase to the income budget. This relates to an alignment of the Private Finance Initiative (PFI) budget to the financial accounting format which requires the grant to be shown as income as opposed to being netted off expenditure. This has arisen because both the annual accounts and the budget is now prepared by the Alliance Finance Team.*

*In relation to the £1.1m variance this is spread across a number of areas and in part is a reflection of some of the underspending in staffing costs. For example there is an increased use of the IT managed service contract as a result of difficulty to fill vacancies in the IT department, and there are high regional collaboration costs as we continue to develop working in partnership. The Resource Control Board is monitoring the detailed variations in overheads.*

3. Recognising that the Chief Constable has briefed the Panel on police overtime before, can the Police and Crime Commissioner provide an update on the changes that have been implemented in-year to reduce Police Officer overtime?

*The changes are, of course, all operational and therefore not necessarily a matter for me. From a governance perspective there are two boards where police use of overtime is scrutinised – firstly the People Board, attended by my Chief Executive, receives quarterly performance data on the workforce that highlights any exceptions. More importantly though the Resource Control Board, chaired by the Chief and attended by my Treasurer and I, receive a more detailed overview of overtime, with respect to the use of allocated budgets.*

*Following on from my recent PCC challenge into overtime, and the ongoing pressures on budgets, both the Chief and I continue to keep a close watch to ensure the changes implemented throughout the force have embedded and are having the desired effect. The Chair also requested that Occupational Health be taken into consideration across the Force by the PCC due to the overtime burden.*

### **Resolved**

1. That the rag ratings in the report be explored further at the Panel's training day scheduled for 7 December 2018.
2. That the PCC would look again at the hate crime/incidents figures.
3. That the Panel would have a discussion on naming and shaming, in respect of drink driving offences, in order to come to a collective view.
4. That the PCC would report to members about the booking of court rooms in Bournemouth as Weymouth had significantly improved.
5. That further details of the Restorative Dorset event on 22 November 2018 be sent to Cllr Pipe.

### **Precept 2018/19 - Update on the use of monies identified for targeted activity**

- 44 The Panel considered a report by the Chief Finance Officer, OPCC which provided an update in relation to the Panel's endorsement of the 2018/19 council tax increase of £12 per annum for a Band D property in order for members to assess the impact and effect achieved through the application of these funds.

Members asked the following questions:-

1. (Para 2.2) - Whilst acknowledging that these events maybe being co-ordinated at the national level:
  - o What action is being taken at the local level in order to assure the Dorset tax payer that the raise in precept 18/19, and the proposed 19/20 rise, meets the 2018 Central Govt directive on:
    - i. Improved efficiency and increased productivity, making better use of the money held?
    - ii. Smarter Procurement?
    - iii. Improving productivity?

*The PCC advised that he had tried to address all 3 areas and was working hard to secure smarter procurement. There was a move to a demand model locally in policing.*

2. (Para 2.3) - What changes are being proposed for the Reserves Strategy?

*The draft Reserves Strategy has been updated with only minor presentational changes plus the inclusion of an additional table to show the analysis of reserves as required by the Home Office guidance. No significant changes are being proposed and the Policy Statement is unchanged from 2018. The*

*final Reserves Strategy and an updated budget risk assessment will be part of the budget papers presented in February 2019.*

3. In terms of the other bullet points contained in the '2018/19 precept letter' from the Panel to the PCC:

- What specific action has been taken on:
  - a. Continuing a specific focus on securing the Strategic Alliance savings in order to deliver the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP); with contingency plans in place should these not materialise?
  - b. Developing the support work to demonstrate value for money through investment on key areas in the Police and Crime Plan (e.g. visibility of metrics, benchmarking, return on investment etc.)?
  - c. Developing the cost of the "police demand model" in order to inform the future budget debate?

- a. *Alliance savings continue to be under considerable scrutiny. However, it is fair to acknowledge that we are in limbo between decisions having been made on the basis of progressing with a merger, and waiting for the next Alliance Exec Board where those decisions can be reviewed in light of the current position. For example, members received a presentation at the June meeting that highlighted the interaction between the alliance and merger programmes – and noted that the four corporations sole had determined which elements of the Alliance programme should continue as planned, which should be paused, and which should be moved into the merger programme (pending future decisions). Post merger decision, those have yet to be formally reviewed.*

*At the same time, Dorset has taken the decision to remove some alliance savings from the current MTFS – namely criminal justice, victims/witnesses, estates and contact management and communications, given the likelihood of those savings being realised within the current MTFS are minimal. This is prudent, and will allow the business better visibility of the challenge ahead.*

*The contingency plans are straightforward, albeit sub-optimal, in that they largely involve the removal of some discretionary growth areas from the current MTFS, a further pressure on establishment numbers (particularly continuing to hold over a number of police staff vacancies) or relying on a precept increase.*

- b. *Notwithstanding the discussion here today, the visibility of delivery against the police and crime plan has improved significantly over the past 12 months, and of course we will continue to work with the Panel to further improve the product.*

*With the FMS also being piloted this year, opportunities have been taken to ensure better alignment of the forces and OPCC's reporting procedures – in this case through the auspices of the SPB. This dual focus on both force and OPCC delivery will enable a shared approach to PCC and Chief Constable aims and objectives right across both organisations, and ensure as efficient and effective a process as possible.*

*Similarly, with respect to the OPCC commissioning budget, steps are now being taken to ensure the stronger alignment of commissioning objectives the THR matrix that policing uses to assess priorities. This will enable OPCC to prioritise against demand areas, hopefully providing support to policing in those most critical delivery areas – such as missing people, and wider vulnerabilities such as mental health, drugs and alcohol. This will also include a focus on areas such as county lines and violent crime, particularly through a prevention and early intervention focus – again delivering a better return on investment than would be*



achievable by spending against crisis care.

- c. *Members have heard from Supt Lyne about the demand work the force is undertaking, this will cost demand – albeit in terms of police officer time spent, rather than financially.*

*Nationally, work has been undertaken as part of the spending review and the HO-led frontline review to set out the current levels of police demand, with a view to putting the case for further funding to HMT. Given the outcome of the recent budget, members will appreciate that work was unsuccessful in its endeavours.*

*Therefore, the Policing Minister and the Home Sec are now taking a different stance, and want to make a ‘more for more’ argument – i.e. if there is more investment in policing, then we can invest more in preventative and early intervention capability and try and turn off the demand.*

*Therefore, there is both work underway at the local and the national level to consider and cost demand, both of which will be reporting shortly. It is also worthwhile mentioning a couple of factors:*

- *HMICFRS has set out broad areas for forces to consider as part of the FMS process – this is less about quantifying demand, and more about assess the force’s ability to meet the demand – so called security of supply*
- *HO has majored on productivity and efficiency as its key factors. Whilst we are yet to receive clear advice about how we should assess our productivity or efficiency - we continue to tackle this issue locally, but this does mean that we still do not have an easy way to compare or contrast our demand with that of other forces.*

Following the Chief Executive’s response members offered the following comments:-

- With regards to Prevention, it was highlighted there should be more regard from partners who withdrew services; i.e. Local Authorities, that resulted in the Police having to step in;
  - With reference to any Home Office bid to the Treasury, could the Panel lend any support to confirm that prevention was better than any cure;
  - The cost of the demand model in order to measure the demand cost in relation to the funding meeting the requirements;
  - In respect of the national pictures of what good looks like could this be replicated, the PCC noted that they could have initiatives that could apply to anyone which could be a nationally led process;
  - Following a raft of press releases, a member asked if they could be alerted in advance in order to advise their residents. The PCC noted that he had advised the Panel earlier in the meeting prior to the releases going out to the public.
4. Is it possible for the PCC to include the key headlines, learning and actions included in the latest HMICFRS Value for Money profiles to the Dorset Police and Crime Panel for their informal Finance Briefing on 10<sup>th</sup> January 2019?

*The PCC undertook to provide members with this information at their training day on 7 December 2018.*

### **Noted**

#### **Complaints Management - OPCC update**

45 The Panel considered a report by the Chief Executive, OPCC which provided an

update on complaints management following the Home Office's recent confirmation that anticipated reforms to the complaints system would be delayed.

One member highlighted that in respect of Model A – Mandatory, the Panel needed to be aware that this was highly likely to result in more complaints against the PCC.

To date the draft regulations had been sent to the Chief Constable's but as yet no guidance had been given.

Following a question about super complaints, the Director of Operations, OPCC noted that the Chief Constable and PCC would be informed if one was received. Although the PCP would not be part of this process members would be updated on the process. The PCC suggested the Panel could appoint a Pillar Lead for complaints.

#### **Resolved**

1. That the OPCC would provide a further update for members when a final decision was made about the local implementation of the Alliance Customer Service Team.
2. That the Panel would consider a formal Panel Lead for complaints.

#### **Work Programme**

- 46 The Panel considered its Work Programme and noted the items to be considered for their next meeting on Friday 1 February 2019.

The Group Manager, Governance and Assurance advised members that work was ongoing to try to realign some of the dates for meetings next year to be more in line with quarterly reporting.

Members were reminded of the Training Day scheduled for 7 December 2018 and noted that a draft agenda would be available shortly.

#### **Resolved**

That the work programme be updated accordingly.

#### **Complaints Update**

- 47 The Group Manager – Governance and Assurance advised members that no new complaints about the PCC had been received. However, one further complaint relating to a previous topic, the 'Lush: paid to lie campaign' had been received, which was being dealt with by the Monitoring Officer, OPCC.

#### **Noted**

#### **Questions from Panel Members**

- 48 There were no questions by members of the Panel.

Meeting Duration: 10.00 am - 1.10 pm