

# **NOTTINGHAMSHIRE POLICE AND CRIME PANEL**

1

## **MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON MONDAY 7<sup>th</sup> December 2015 AT 2.00 PM AT COUNTY HALL**

### **MEMBERS PRESENT**

(A denotes absent)

Chairman - Christine Goldstraw OBE – Independent Member  
Vice-Chairman Councillor Debbie Mason – Rushcliffe Borough Council

Executive Mayor Kate Allsop – Mansfield District Council  
Rizwan Araf – Independent Member  
Councillor Andrew Brown – Nottinghamshire County Council  
Councillor Cheryl Butler – Ashfield District Council  
Councillor Eunice Campbell – Nottingham City Council  
Councillor David Challinor – Bassetlaw District Council  
Councillor David Ellis – Gedling Borough Council  
Councillor Glynn Gilfoyle – Nottinghamshire County Council  
Councillor John Handley – Nottinghamshire County Council - **A**  
Suma Harding – Independent Member  
Councillor Tony Harper – Broxtowe Borough Council  
Councillor Nicola Heaton – Nottingham City Council  
Councillor Neghat Khan – Nottingham City Council  
Councillor Keith Longdon – Nottinghamshire County Council - **A**  
Councillor Tony Roberts – Newark and Sherwood District Council - **A**  
Bob Vaughan-Newton – Independent Member  
Councillor Linda Woodings – Nottingham City Council

### **OFFICERS PRESENT**

Keith Ford – Team Manager, Democratic Services ) Nottinghamshire  
Pete Barker – Democratic Services Officer ) County Council  
(Host Authority)

### **OTHERS PRESENT**

Paddy Tipping – Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC)  
Chris Cutland – Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner (DPCC)  
Kevin Dennis – Chief Executive, Office of PCC (OPCC)  
Chris Eyre – Chief Constable, Nottinghamshire Police  
Charlotte Radford – Chief Finance Officer (OPCC)  
Tim Young – Frontline Consultancy

## **1. MINUTES OF LAST MEETING**

The minutes of the meeting held on 2 November 2015, having been previously circulated, were agreed as a true and correct record and were confirmed and signed by the Chair of the meeting.

## **2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Handley, Councillor Longdon and Councillor Roberts.

## **3. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS**

Councillor Ellis declared a private and non-pecuniary interest as his daughter now works for the Nottinghamshire Police Force. This did not preclude him from speaking or voting on any of the agenda items.

## **4. WORK PROGRAMME**

Keith Ford introduced the report and informed Panel Members that the Work Programme had been updated following both the last panel meeting and the pre agenda meeting and also in discussion with the Chair, Vice-Chair and Kevin Dennis.

Keith informed the Panel that a theme needed to be identified for the April meeting and requested that members e-mail him with their preference.

### **RESOLVED 2015/36**

**That the work programme be noted and updated in line with Members' suggestions as appropriate.**

## **5. POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER'S UPDATE REPORT**

The Commissioner introduced the report and informed the panel that the reporting of Hate Crime had increased, which had been a priority for himself and the Chief Constable. There had been concern from the Jewish and Muslim populations about the possible repercussions for them of the recent terrorist attacks. The Commissioner had met imams and chairs of mosques and the Chief Constable had spoken to representatives of all faiths in the wake of the Paris attacks. There have been a number of islamophobic incidents, which would always be taken seriously by the Force, but they have been relatively few and the Commissioner emphasised that it was important to keep the threat in perspective.

The Commissioner spoke of the ongoing investigations into historic child sexual abuse (CSE). Operation Daybreak was dealing with 167 allegations involving 255 offenders, both named and unnamed, and the files were now with the Director for Public Prosecutions. Operation Xerxes involved a similar number of allegations and offenders. The Commissioner informed the Panel that he discussed the issue regularly with the Force and was satisfied the Chief was making some carefully considered decisions regarding the use of resources.

The Commissioner spoke about the Victims' Code, a case study of which was included as an appendix to the report. It was a priority of the Force to devote extra resources to this area, though the Commissioner was still waiting to hear from the Ministry of Justice about the amount of extra funding that would be made available. The Commissioner was not confident that the increased level of funding would be sustained.

The meeting was adjourned at this point (2.10pm) for ten minutes owing to disruption from the public gallery.

Following the adjournment, the Deputy Commissioner informed the Panel that the Victims' Code had been introduced by the Force in 2013 and it was important that all concerned parties adhered to the Code. Progress had been made by the Force in the past 2 years though improvements could still be made, in the area of recording requirements for example. The Deputy Commissioner emphasised the importance of the use of the Victim Personal Statement (VPS) and the need for the Force to refocus its attentions on its use. The Code had recently been revised and now all victims, irrespective of the type of crime committed, would be offered a service.

During discussions the Panel raised the following points:

- The Panel welcomed the revised version of the report and considered it an improvement on the previous format.
- The Panel expressed concern at the levels of sickness, which appeared to be increasing across the board. The Commissioner explained that the target was 3.7% for staff and officers and that the figures for staff were above target and the figures for officers were below target. The Commissioner offered to write to members with more detail if required, but with the new system it would take time for accurate information to become available.
- The Panel expressed concern at the incidence of islamophobic behaviour and gave examples where the police officers involved had to be persuaded to report the incidents concerned. The Chief Constable was only aware of one incident and the offender had been charged. If there was another case he asked to be informed of the details. The Commissioner reiterated that he had met religious leaders and that the matter was being taken seriously. The Chief Constable informed the Panel that there had been no statistically significant increase in crime against those of faith following the Paris attacks.
- In terms of the information regarding domestic violence repeat victims, the Panel welcomed the inclusion of the table as it allowed trends to be identified but felt that the information provided was difficult to follow. The Deputy Commissioner agreed with the observations and undertook to ensure that the figures would be clearer when presented to the next meeting.
- The Panel raised the subject of malicious communications offences and the Commissioner agreed that this was an area of growing concern and that the recent change in the law would mean an increase in such offences. It was a problem for society, not just the police, but people were posting comments on Facebook, for example, which they would never say face to face. The Panel felt that such offences should be easy to detect but the Chief Constable drew the

distinction between resolution and detection at a time of reducing resources where the Force adopted a threat, harm and risk approach to help focus on the most important priorities.

- The Panel asked the Commissioner what constituted 'Other' expenditure referred to on page 46 of Appendix C to the report, as this accounted for a third of the relevant budget. The Commissioner replied that he would provide the detail in writing.
- The subject of the apparent overspend on overtime was brought up by the Panel. The Commissioner confirmed that the budget had been reduced and expenditure was now controlled tightly. The expenditure detailed was as a result of mutual aid, ie the Force supporting neighbouring Forces who would be recharged for the expenditure. There was a time lag between the expenditure incurred and receiving the reimbursement by the relevant Force so the figures gave the impression that the budget was being exceeded. The Commissioner was confident that there would be no overspend in this area.
- The Panel raised the problem of overspending in other areas as detailed on page 48 of Appendix C to the report. The Commissioner responded by saying that it was getting increasingly difficult to make the savings planned, with the areas of property disposal and the transport PFI contract being especially problematic. The Commissioner was aware that the Chief Constable had been working on those areas where it was clear that the proposed savings were unlikely to be achieved and a number of initiatives were underway in order to attempt to balance the budget, though the Commissioner was aware they were nearly two-thirds of the way through the financial year. The Commissioner agreed with the Panel that some of the proposed savings were highly unlikely to have been achieved from the outset and that the making of savings became increasingly difficult with the passage of time. The Chief Constable informed the Panel that the intention was to maintain, and if possible strengthen, operational levels. This had led to more partnership working which in some cases had delayed the realisation of some savings. For example, the Leicestershire Force made a late decision to join the single shared service initiative and though a decision could have been made to progress without their participation, this would have meant missing out on even greater savings. Unfortunately, this did mean that in the short term some planned savings had to be foregone. The need to drive out the structural budget deficit remained.
- In response to questions from the Panel, the Commissioner confirmed that in the case of the discharged firearm during an event at Police HQ, the Chief Constable had informed him within half an hour of the incident occurring and that if anything similar were to happen in the future he would be contactable at any time. Furthermore the Commissioner's and his Deputy's holidays never clashed. The event in question had been risk assessed but the incident resulting in the firearm discharge was not. The officer involved had now received advice and the Commissioner was confident that this type of incident would not happen again. The Chief Constable added that the officer involved was well motivated but misguided. Any similar occurrence was now highly unlikely given that clear advice had been issued and in future all aspects of such events would be risk assessed.

- The Panel highlighted the fact that despite the measure for the production and supply of drugs offences being contained in the blue rated section of the report, that is those measures which exceed their target by 5% or more, there were areas, The Meadows for example, where drugs continued to be a problem. The Panel felt also that a switch to 'legal' highs was taking place. The Commissioner replied that he appreciated that there remained a problem with drugs in certain areas having been made aware by local councillors but that on the whole the Commissioner felt that it was a problem that was under control. The Chief Constable said that in terms of 'legal' highs, legislation had just been brought in that would have a significant effect in this area. The Force's approach, as in other areas, was one of threat/risk/harm and in this case it meant there had been a focus on violent crime and burglaries, which was what the community had indicated the Force should be prioritising. In terms of drugs the Force had prioritised the supply of drugs over the possession of drugs as this was the area that generated crime, and in that respect the Force had been successful.

Councillor Challinor queried why the Commissioner was not willing to meet the survivors of historical CSE. The Commissioner replied that on the contrary he had an exemplary record of meeting survivors and would provide details of dates in writing following the meeting as well as transcripts of those meetings also if required (Confirmation of the meeting dates was subsequently sent to all members of the Panel by the Commissioner). Councillor Challinor apologised to the Commissioner for any misunderstanding.

#### **RESOLVED 2015/037**

1. That the contents of the update report be noted.
2. That the revised format of the report be welcomed.

#### **6a. UPDATE ON STRATEGIC THEME 7C2 – ENSURE THE FORCE ACHIEVES A BALANCED BUDGET AND DELIVERS THE REQUIRED EFFICIENCY SAVINGS**

#### **6b. FOLLOW UP ON THE BASE BUDGET REVIEW 2013**

The Commissioner introduced the reports and welcomed earlier discussions with Members. He confirmed that work on the Budget remained a priority but pointed out that it was becoming harder to identify and deliver the level of savings required. Deloitte had been invited to work on the Base Budget Review and the vast majority of their recommendations were being taken forward.

The Chair stated that questions relating to these reports had already been covered earlier in the meeting.

#### **RESOLVED 2015/038**

**That the contents of both reports be noted.**

## **7. EAST MIDLANDS REGIONAL COLLABORATION UPDATE**

The Commissioner introduced the report, which contained details of the work being undertaken across the East Midlands. Nottinghamshire was the only Force participating in all collaborations and this gave the Force an increased resilience. The Commissioner informed the Panel that the next area of work would focus on back office costs. This process had proved to be difficult and painful but the Commissioner felt that the Force was now ready to make real progress. Savings could already have been made collaborating with the Northants force but the Commissioner felt that the right decision had been made to delay the process and involve Leicestershire as well in order to maximise the cost savings. Notwithstanding this, significant progress had been made in other areas, with the Aurora II initiative being acclaimed internationally. A new policing bill is due in the New Year and collaboration will feature, especially with regard to the fire and rescue service.

During discussions the Panel raised the following points:

- The Panel asked the Commissioner whether the savings made through collaboration could be quantified and the Commissioner agreed to provide the figures, though he was not entirely confident that the savings cited would be achieved. However, the Commissioner stated that a good proportion of the budget was now spent on collaboration and that he did demand that savings be made. The Commissioner felt that as more of the budget was being spent regionally he was not sure that the correct governance arrangements were in place. The Commissioner felt that this would be an issue for the Panel to consider over the coming year.
- The Panel queried why the collaboration budget was being overspent and asked the Commissioner whether this was being caused by other authorities. In reply the Commissioner stated that the cost of the work was partly funded by applying to the police collaboration fund which, although a lengthy process, did mean the Force would be able to claim back the money spent. All those collaborating received a share from this fund but at present not all of those involved had passed on their contribution, though the Commissioner reassured the Panel that all those involved would make the required payment. The Panel asked how others were accounting for any overspends and the Commissioner explained that these would only be present during the financial year and that by year end everything would be reconciled and no overspends would occur. The issue of double-counting was raised by the Panel and the Commissioner replied that it was an issue with which Notts was very familiar and were aware that some expenditure was for Notts and some occurred regionally. Nothing was counted twice. The Panel felt that the regional work being undertaken was an exemplar, that it was better if this work could continue and that it was important that something that was working well was not dismantled. The Commissioner said that the work being undertaken in the East Midlands came out well in the relevant HMIC (Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary) report but that it would be unfair to expect the Force to continue to make cost savings without considering savings that could be made at a regional level.

**RESOLVED 2015/039**

**That the contents of the report and the attached appendix be noted.**

The meeting closed at 3.30pm

**CHAIRMAN**

Mins 7 December 2015