

HAMPSHIRE POLICE AND CRIME PANEL

**Friday, 26th January, 2018 at 10.00 am
Held in Ashburton Hall, Winchester
(Hampshire County Council)**

Councillors:

Chairman

p David Stewart
(*Isle of Wight Council*)

Vice Chairman

p Jan Warwick
(*Hampshire County Council*)

p John Beavis MBE
(*Gosport Borough Council*)
p Simon Bound
(*Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council*)
p Ryan Brent
(*Portsmouth City Council*)
p Ken Carter
(*East Hampshire District Council*)
p Trevor Cartwright MBE
(*Fareham Borough Council*)
p Steve Clarke
(*New Forest District Council*)
p Adrian Collett
(*Hart District Council*)

p Tonia Craig
(*Eastleigh Borough Council*)
p Lisa Griffiths
(*Winchester County Council*)
p Ken Muschamp
(*Rushmoor Borough Council*)
p Ian Richards
(*Test Valley Borough Council*)
p Dave Shields
(*Southampton City Council*)
p Leah Turner
(*Havant Borough Council*)

Substitute Members

p Mike Fairhurst (*Havant Borough Council*)

Co-opted Members:

Independent Members

p Michael Coombes
p Bob Purkiss MBE

Local Authority

p Reg Barry
p Frank Rust
p Lynne Stagg

At the invitation of the Chairman:

Paul Griffith
Michael Lane
James Payne

*Legal Advisor to the Panel
Police and Crime Commissioner for Hampshire
Chief Executive, Office of the Police and Crime
Commissioner*

BROADCASTING ANNOUNCEMENT

The Chairman announced that the press and members of the public were permitted to film and broadcast the meeting. Those remaining at the meeting were consenting to being filmed and recorded, and to the possible use of those images and recordings for broadcasting purposes.

129. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from:

- Councillor Ken Carter, East Hampshire District Council. Councillor Alan Waterhouse was in attendance as his deputy, but did not have a vote, owing to him not being East Hampshire's nominated appointed member for this Police and Crime Panel meeting.
- Councillor Reg Barry, Additional Local Authority Co-opted Member

The Chairman noted that Councillor Jan Warwick, the Vice Chairman, would be late to the meeting, and Councillors Lisa Griffith and Ken Muschamp would need to leave early.

130. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members were able to disclose to the meeting any disclosable pecuniary interest they may have in any matter on the agenda for the meeting, where that interest is not already entered in their appointing authority's register of interests, and any other pecuniary or non-pecuniary interests in any such matter that Members may wish to disclose.

No declarations were made.

131. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes from the 6 October 2017 meeting were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

132. QUESTIONS AND DEPUTATIONS

The Police and Crime Panel ('the Panel') received one written question to the meeting:

'What are the Police and Crime Commissioner's personal initiatives are to [sic] "Enable effective and efficient operational policing which meets the needs of the people it serves"'

The Police and Crime Commissioner ('the Commissioner') provided a response to this question, which would be forwarded to the member of the public, as they were not present at the meeting:

'The Panel will be aware that one of the priorities in my Police and Crime Plan is to enable effective and efficient policing and, importantly, the work I do beyond policing. This includes efforts that enable better policing and greater capacity in

the constabulary from reducing demand and protecting people from risks that they will offend or enter the Criminal Justice System.

Each Quarter you receive an update from me regarding progress against my delivery plan, including those actions that impact on effective and efficient policing. Many of my initiatives are displayed around the room for those present today and outlined on my website.

But to draw attention to just a small number of highlights:

- *Since day one I have been working on the introduction of an improved call management system that will improve the public's experience of 999 and 101, and indeed all engagement and communication with the Constabulary. This is a significant investment that will have a hugely positive impact in both policing and for the public;*
- *I have facilitated the introduction of a network of Hate Crime reporting centres - while hate crime figures show that more people are coming forward to report hate crime, when they previously might not have done so due to fear or lack of confidence, having more independent reporting centres across the Hampshire policing area will help those most vulnerable members of our communities feel more confident to come forward and report these crimes. This will help the constabulary to build a fuller intelligence picture;*
- *My Estate Strategy supports effective delivery of modern policing today and to take into account changing demands to ensure that our estate is fit to support police and the communities they serve into the future. 2017 saw two significant milestones under the Estate Strategy:*
 - *The first was the Northern Police investigation centre which became operational in April and was officially opened in August by the Home Secretary.*
 - *The second was the ground breaking at the site of the Eastern Police investigation Centre, a key need for the people of Portsmouth, to match the facilities in Southampton and at Basingstoke. This new centre, along with the supporting Neighbourhood and Response and Patrol team bases will keep policing in the heart of the city and enhance operational effectiveness for the area.*
 - *And from management of the Estate, I am able to be a net contributor via this effort to the budget.*
- *I am proud to have created a unique service, through the multi-agency stalking clinic which sees psychologists, psychiatrists, Police, Probation, the Crown Prosecution Service and a dedicated victim advocate come together to manage the risks posed by stalking. The clinic has been recognised as best practice by HMICFRS and recently been awarded funding from the National Police Transformation Fund to extend its work through the introduction of rehabilitative treatment for stalkers.*
- *I enable a large number of organisations, reflected behind me and around the room, that provide services locally to support victims and reduce offending. These vital services provide a lifeline for the people they work with and support frontline policing by helping prevent people from taking the wrong path or having increased vulnerability, thus reducing demand on our hard pressed officers. This is an essential part of my role and a*

relatively small but impactful part of my expenditure to support the most vulnerable in our communities.

- *As you will be aware a key personal responsibility is for me to hold the Chief Constable to account over performance. At a series of public meetings I seek to gain reassurance, on behalf of the communities that I represent, that their priorities are being met and that the risks they face and issues they have are being effectively responded to. In addition I regularly challenge the Chief Constable at briefings and through specific challenges as they arise during our routine meetings.*
- *I remind us all that the four pillars of my plan, each of which has significant personal commitment from me are:*
 - *To champion community needs*
 - *To strengthen partnerships*
 - *To enable effective & efficient operational policing; and*
 - *To reduce offending*

These are enriched by the work of my team and a very wide range of valued partners - for none of us are alone in our efforts – but they flow from my plan and my commitment to serve the communities I represent – to keep all of us SAFER’

The Commissioner also noted the mis-reporting in the press around the Hampshire Marine Unit, and noted that this had been a potential saving proposal put forward by the Constabulary, but that this had been personally vetoed by the Commissioner as he felt it a key service to protect for the future.

The Chairman thanked the Commissioner for his full response to the question posed. No further questions or deputations were received.

133. **CHAIRMAN’S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman made one announcement, thanking the Panel’s scrutiny officer, who would be taking up a secondment position elsewhere in Hampshire County Council, and would resultantly no longer support the Panel’s meetings. The wider Panel and Commissioner joined in thanking the officer.

134. **POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER’S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chair invited announcements from the Commissioner, who highlighted the following to the Panel:

On the Policing and Crime Act 2017’s implementation, the Commissioner had continued to review proposals around Fire governance with key partners, and had engaged consultants on the potential business case for a range of options. This work had now been completed, and the Commissioner would be presenting the outcomes to a Governance Board meeting in February. On complaints reform, the Commissioner would be required to take on a more formal role in relation to police complaints, but the further legislation required had been delayed by the Home Office, and would not be introduced until at least early 2019. Once the Commissioner had further information on the Act’s implementation locally he would provide an update to the Panel.

The Commissioner had in the past week met with the Community Safety Alliance, and noted that hearing from this group formed an important contribution

to his work. The Commissioner had also hosted NHS and health practitioners to understand their issues, and how organisations could work better together to provide single points of contact, to mitigate pressure on vulnerable people, and to ensure that partners were not duplicating effort. The Solicitor General had recently visited Hampshire at his request and the Commissioner had hosted him, reviewing measures to add value to criminal justice through partnership working.

The Chairman thanked the Commissioner for his updates and noted that he and his office had also been involved in discussions around 'one public estate' on the Isle of Wight, building on the principle of partnership working.

135. POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER - OUTCOMES FROM THE DEPUTY POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER CONFIRMATION HEARING

The Panel received a verbal update from the Commissioner on events succeeding the Confirmation Hearing for the role of Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner held on 6 October 2017 and next steps.

The Commissioner noted that he was grateful for the Panel's support and thoughts on the Deputy role, and to hear recognition of the broad scope of the Commissioner's role. The Commissioner had also received comments from public who were perhaps less supportive of the need for the role, which he would taken into any future consideration of this position.

Post-Confirmation Hearing, the Deputy, Ms Flick Drummond, had resigned by mutual decision. The Commissioner read the public statement issued at the time, which noted that the relationship between a Commissioner and his deputy has to be close and, unfortunately, it was apparent this could not happen in this case.

The Commissioner thanked Ms Drummond for her work in the role.

In response to questions, Members heard:

- That the Commissioner has been extremely busy since the Deputy Commissioner had stood down, working on the draft precept and budget, and trying to maximise his impact across the policing area.
- There were not immediate plans to appoint another Deputy, as the Commissioner required time to reflect on what model would be best in terms of support.
- The Commissioner was aware that his current working hours were not sustainable, and was reviewing how to manage this best with his Office.

136. POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER - 2018/19 PRECEPT

Members received an overview from the Commissioner of his budget report and supporting presentation on the proposed precept for the 2018/19 financial year (see Item 8 in the Minute Book). Also present to answer technical questions were the Chief Finance Officer to the Commissioner, and the Chief Finance Officer to the Chief Constable.

The Commissioner noted that the precept was a key item in the annual cycle of the Office, and he was pleased to have provided a detailed accompanying

budget report to the Panel. The Commissioner was grateful for the scrutiny of the Finance Working Group (FWG) prior to this meeting, as well as for their report, which had been published prior to the meeting. The Commissioner spoke to the report and presentation, and highlighted salient points to the Panel.

The Commissioner noted that his aim was to keep you, your family, your community safer, and that the Hampshire policing area was in general a very safe area to live and work. The proposal to increase the precept by £12 for the average Band D property, or £1 per month, would enable the Constabulary to continue to protect the public from risk and harm.

The Home Office had confirmed that Hampshire Constabulary would receive the same settlement in 2018/19 as in 2017/18, but that Police and Crime Commissioners would all be given the increased flexibility to set council tax at a maximum of an additional £12 for a Band D property. This flexibility was progress, but funding remained challenging, and the issue of fairer funding had still not been tackled nationally. There remained many key hidden issues requiring innovative approaches to policing, such as modern slavery and trafficking, and Hampshire required the appropriate level of funding to ensure that the force had the technology and resources needed to be a modern and operationally effective Constabulary.

The precept proposal, if agreed, would see Hampshire Constabulary making a number of efficiencies and savings,. Hampshire would remain as having one of the lowest precepts nationally.

The Commissioner produced statistics to demonstrate that in the last year, the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Hampshire had the lowest cost per head of the population nationally, and this year it would be likely to continue to have one of the lowest. The additional funding being transferred into the Office's costs was £440k, which included £280k to fund expenditure which in previous years had been funded through the allocation of funds from the Transformation Reserve. The allocation of the £440k to the revenue budget was proposed for 2 reasons:

- i) Whilst a significant element of the £440k had in previous years been funded from the Transformation Reserve, the current reducing level of reserves meant that a continued draw from reserves is unlikely to be sustainable to support ongoing activity
- ii) to provide transparency of the total costs of the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner, and wanting to be honest about the costs of the Office,.

Most of the precept and national grant funding received by the Commissioner was transferred to the Constabulary, but some needed to be allocated to his Office to support the mandatory services he was required to commission and deliver, and activities around the Police and Crime Plan.

The Constabulary's reduction in headcount related to the removal of vacant posts, or enabling technology which allowed services to be delivered with fewer people. The savings proposed to be made were in the Commissioner's view those that had the lowest impact on the population and services provided.

Without the increase in the precept, the Commissioner would have to work with the Constabulary to identify where to make further cuts. The increase in the precept would provide some breathing space, and would help to enable innovation which was proactive rather than reactive.

The online consultation undertaken on behalf of the Commissioner had shown that 70% of those completing the survey had been supportive of an increase in the precept. The Commissioner showed a short video on the precept consultation events, giving a sense of what those representatives from the community attending had heard at the sessions. The views from these events had helped to inform the final proposals. The Commissioner had noted to these members of the public that the proposal to increase the precept wasn't just to plan for 2018/19, but also to secure longer term funding to sustain policing. After the presentations had been heard, a majority of those present were willing to support the precept, and to contribute a greater amount to the policing budget.

The Chairman of the Panel provided a short summary of what had been heard and raised salient points from the report, noting the overall proposal to increase the precept by £12 for a Band D property. The Chairman noted that he had received correspondence from members of the public in relation to the precept proposal, as he suspected other members of the Panel had, and he would be asking questions that correlated with some of the concerns raised, particularly around the proposal to increase the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner's budget by £0.44m, which the report set out would be used for essential staff within the Office, and for delivery of the Police and Crime Plan,. The Commissioner and his representatives noted that this was spending that already took place within the Office, but that this funding was currently transferred from reserves. The Commissioner needed to ensure that the budget existed to support, for example, the expanded complaints system powers, or salary costs if another Deputy were to be recruited. This additional funding was about greater transparency, which would no longer be taken from reserves as it amounted to a continuing liability, and should be included within the budget.

Councillor Jan Warwick joined the meeting.

The Chairman of the FWG noted that it had met just over a week prior to the Panel in order to review the precept and budget papers, and had been disappointed with the amount of time available between receiving the papers and reviewing them at the meeting. This wasn't a criticism of the officers and staff – as the Chairman of the FWG knew from experience that staff were under pressure to review the budget after the funding allocation was announced – but he would have preferred to have seen the papers for longer in advance of the meeting. The Chairman of the FWG wished to be assured that the Commissioner and Chief Constable had received adequate time to review the budget and draft precept, and were involved in the process of agreeing the budget papers and saving proposals. The Commissioner noted that the Constabulary had seen issues with an underfunded budget since day one of his term of office, and therefore the budget options had been discussed in detail over the previous year, and more intensely over the previous few months. The Commissioner and Chief Constable had reviewed all of the possibilities, including what the timescales would look like for each potential saving work-

stream, and what impact each saving proposal would have. The Constabulary had undertaken months of detailed work on this, looking at the potential options before the government allocations were released, so that a plan was in place for all eventualities. The Commissioner expected the Chief Constable to notify him should she have any concerns about the operational delivery of the Force, and she had not done so in relation to the savings proposed. There had been some short-notice reworking of the budget after the government allocation had been released, but this had been for a positive reason. The Commissioner had also personally intervened in those areas where he felt savings were not appropriate, such as by ensuring that the Hampshire Marine Unit continued to be funded.

The Chairman of the FWG noted the report published for the Panel's consideration from the group. In the most recent meeting, the FWG had discussed the additional funding for the Office of the Commissioner and a number of other issues, such as the savings proposals, the spending on innovation, IT replacement, and the commissioning budget. The overall FWG view was support for the precept in order to maintain policing, agreeing that the case had been made to raise the precept by £12 for a Band D property, which would enable an increase in the funding base for this year and in future. The FWG did however have continuing questions on the detail and choices being made within the budget. For example, the report set out savings of just under £7m, including officer reductions, and the FWG were keen to understand to what extent this information had been shared in the consultation event, questioning whether the public had been told the detail of the savings required. The Chief Financial Officer to the Chief Constable noted that the total number of officer post reductions were shared, as was a total breakdown of cash savings, with pie charts giving an overview of the current spend in order to give an idea of the savings as a proportion of this. The individual officer numbers under each heading in the report had not been shared at that stage.

The Chairman of the FWG spoke to the section of the report detailing investment in IT, and wished to be assured that the money being set aside for this was being well managed and spent on priority areas, and would not be replicating similar projects. The Commissioner noted that the Chief Constable had put forward the areas of suggested spending and efficiencies based on the options that had the most impact (in terms of reduced spend) and the least impact. The Commissioner was satisfied that there were no 'easy' savings options left; future budgets if underfunded would require the Constabulary to consider further cuts.

The Chairman moved to questions from the wider Panel. In response to questions, Members heard:

- That the Commissioner had set out the costs of his Office in the presentation, which showed a historically low cost per head of the population, and was significantly less than the national average. The proposed increase in the cost of the Office to £2.57 per head of the population was still under the national average by £1.57 per person.
- The Commissioner recognised and understood the reasons for the expressed public view that suggested support of the increased precept, but concern about additional funds for his Office. The Commissioner set out that in his opinion, the budget represented how to undertake policing in the best way by the Chief Constable. Secondly, the Commissioner understood

that the public wanted visible policing, and needed the police to be better at showing what modern policing looks like, i.e that not all of it was visible or impacted on the Hampshire population directly. In the Commissioner's view, there needed to be greater realisation that policing expertise was no longer limited to uniformed policing, but was also about specialists and police staff. The Commissioner was advised by the Chief Constable of the budgetary requirements of the Constabulary to be efficient and effective, but it was for her to determine was this looked like operationally, with appropriate challenge from the Commissioner.

- The argument about the police funding settlement formula needing to change nationally had been won, but Hampshire couldn't rely on this changing in the near future. The police funding settlement monies received from the Home Office were the Commissioners to allocate, with the majority forwarded to the Constabulary for operational policing. The Commissioner did however need to fund his Office appropriately, and some of the monies received were for funding the mandatory services the Commissioner must provide.
- The value for money profiles published by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) of Police and Crime Commissioner costs did not previously include those monies spent under the transformation reserves. The 2018/19 figure did include this increased spend, which accounted for the rise in cost per head.
- That the Commissioner was happy for his Office to be value for money, but recognised that the policing settlement and precept were both underfunded in comparison to other Forces, and this wasn't fair. The Commissioner had considered other possible arrangements of his budget, but felt that this was the best one.
- The Chief Constable endorsed the budget report and proposed precept fully.
- That the Commissioner had asked the Chief Constable to protect rural specialist policing, as he understood the importance of this to communities. Hampshire Constabulary was nationally recognised as having a leading rural offer, and it was important to safeguard this.
- The Artemis programme had been grant funded nationally by the Home Office. This project was not obsolete, and was in vehicles and ready to go, but required the roll-out of the emergency services mobile communication programme to for it to go live, which was a delayed nationally-led scheme.
- The delayering of police management had taken place in 2015 through the operational change programme. There had been some restoration of necessary management following monitoring and evaluation, but the Constabulary had less senior roles as a result.
- The Precept proposed would avoid significant cuts to policing in the short term, but it was important to remember that it only made up a third of the overall budget; two-thirds were still made up of the police funding settlement. By making sure that the precept was adequately funded, the Commissioner would have more breathing space to land the right longer-term funding solution by lobbying the Home Office.
- The Commissioner was increasing his Office spend to match the work being undertaken, recognising that he needed to have the expertise to undertake reviews required, such as those for fire and complaints that had arisen from the Policing and Crime Act 2017, which could become very

significant mandated services. The Commissioner understood the public need for rigorousness in relation to his Office spend, but he felt that the role of the Commissioner was added value, and there was a necessary cost and a need to be clear about this.

- That currently the actual budget for the Office of the Commissioner was £1.524m, with some additional spending from reserves
- The funding arrangement of servicing Office activity from the Transformation Reserve had been inherited from the previous Commissioner. The current Commissioner had taken the decision to be more transparent about the true costs of the Office.

Councillor Ken Muschamp left at this point in the meeting.

The Chairman of the FWG noted that it would be helpful for the Panel in future to be able to compare spend against what was budgeted for, in order to understand areas of under and overspend.

The Chairman moved to debate. The following was heard in discussion by the Panel:

- That correspondence had been received by Members of the Panel which suggested that the public were supportive of the precept, but not of the proposal to allocate additional funds to the Office of the Commissioner. There had also been correspondence which queried whether the additional funding for the Office was appropriate in light of the proposal to reduce posts across the Constabulary.
- That there seemed to be a suggestion that the public didn't understand how the budget was organised from the Commissioner, but the feedback received and noted by members of the Panel suggested that they did understand, but didn't agree with it.
- The public saw the policing budget as being for integrated policing services and perhaps weren't aware of, or didn't understand, the mandatory services provided by the Commissioner and how these were funded. There was a potential to do more to communicate this to the public.
- That there were concerns about whether those geographic areas that saw spikes in crime rates were being allocated an appropriate amount of the budget.
- The Panel welcomed the transparency around the costs of the Office but had concerns about the use of the 'value for money' statistics if this didn't previously include and wouldn't include in future all spending from reserves.

The Chairman summed up following debate the concerns that he had heard from Members, and members of the public about the additional Office spending. He noted that the Panel had received correspondence, and individual members had also received feedback, but that it would be for the Panel to determine whether or not they supported the precept. To this end, the Chairman asked the legal advisor to speak to the Panel, who provided an overview of relevant parts of 'The Police and Crime Panels (Precepts and Chief Constable Appointments) Regulations 2012'.

The Chairman moved to recommendations. Before moving to the recommendation in the paper, he invited any alternative recommendations from the Panel. An alternative recommendation was received, proposed by Bob Purkiss and seconded by Councillor Leah Turner. In proposing his recommendation, Mr Purkiss made it clear that the recommendation was not a veto of the precept proposal

'That the Panel do not support the recommendation, as outlined in the paper before us, and ask [that] our concerns and those of the public are taken into account, and that any increase in funding is put directly and only into retaining and enhancing [the services provided by] police officers and staff.'

The Chairman inserted the context clarified by the Panel prior to the vote upon it and a vote was held:

For: 16
Against: 0
Abstained: 0

As the recommendation was passed, the Chairman noted that there was no need to vote on the recommendation within the report. The Chairman proposed a further recommendation based on the feedback received from Members during the meeting, which was seconded by Councillor Dave Shields:

'That the Police and Crime Commissioner clarifies to the public what funding he receives, and what this is spent on, including the mandatory functions of the Police and Crime Commissioner.'

For: 16
Against: 0
Abstained: 0

RESOLVED

That:

- 1. The Panel do not support the recommendation, as outlined in the paper before us, and ask [that] our concerns and those of the public are taken into account, and that any increase in funding is put directly and only into retaining and enhancing [the services provided by] police officers and staff.'**
- 2. The Police and Crime Commissioner clarifies to the public what funding he receives, and what this is spent on, including the mandatory functions of the Police and Crime Commissioner.**

The Panel took a ten minute break before returning to proceedings.

After the break, the Chairman clarified that the recommendations the Panel had agreed were not a veto of the precept, and it would be for the Commissioner to determine how he wished to respond to the recommendations made.

In response to the recommendations, the Commissioner noted that he would take the Panel's feedback on board and understood Members' role to reflect on the range of views that had been made through both the consultation and directly to the Panel. The Commissioner was disappointed that his public service ethos hadn't come across clearly enough to the Panel. The Commissioner promised to reflect on all he had heard and to respond to this. He was pleased that the Panel had not vetoed the precept and he was absolutely certain that the average £12 increase was necessary to keep the people of Hampshire safe.

137. **POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER - REGIONAL COLLABORATION**

The Panel received a report from the Commissioner and his representatives setting out how Commissioners and Constabularies were working in collaboration across the region (see Item 9 in the Minute Book).

The Commissioner noted the content in the report, stating that increasingly national safety is delivered through regional and national work, but that the impact often lands locally. The role of the Commissioner was to be present in these forums in order to ensure that Hampshire is well represented, and is able to lead nationally and regionally as well as locally. The Commissioner's aim through this work was to build on his mandate to help keep people safe.

In response to questions, Members heard:

- Hampshire Constabulary employed excellent people but did not always have access to the right skillsets. The benefit of regional collaboration was the opportunity to access these and to share them across a wider geography, working together to keep people safe.
- That the focus of collaboration was on what keeps people safe. How the resource cake is cut needed to be reviewed by national government in future. Partnership was not just about co-location or being joined by borders, but also about specialism sharing.
- The Commissioner was confident that the contact management programme would land well. There were always risks with innovative projects of this size that there would be the potential to overspend and not meet the original timescales as the scope and needs of the project may change as it progresses.
- The Marine Unit was now a Hampshire-only service.
- That there were ongoing dialogues with Dorset and Wiltshire.

RESOLVED

That:

- 1. The report is noted**
- 2. The report is forwarded for discussion to the regional Police and Crime Panel Collaboration Group, which is next due to meet in March 2018.**

138. POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER - COMMUNITY STRATEGY

The Chairman recommended that this item be adjourned to the Panel's 13 April 2018 meeting, when the Community Strategy would be available to consider alongside the engagement work listed in the report. The Panel agreed to this deferral.

139. POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER - POLICE AND CRIME PLAN DELIVERY

Members received some advance slides and a presentation from the Commissioner and representatives of his Office setting out an update on delivery against the Police and Crime Plan 2016-2021 (see Item 11 in the Minute Book).

Councillor Warwick provided an overview of the most recent Police and Crime Plan Working Group, where a number of topics were considered and highlights requested on the Heartstone schools project, firearm licensing review, and Elders Strategy, which the presentation in the papers had covered.

The Panel heard that the Commissioner and his Office had set out to be ambitious from day one in relation to considering projects which would add value in delivering the Police and Crime Plan. Currently, the number of projects in place exceeded the resource of the Office, so choices were being made in terms of the priorities to focus on.

On the three topics that the Plan working group had requested updates on:

- Schools in the Southampton area had been difficult to engage in relation to the Heartstone project, and the assistance of the local Member would be helpful in trying to improve this.
- The firearms licencing review had been successful in reducing significantly the average time to process grants, licences and certificates, which had moved the project into the 'green' status. The Commissioner noted that the Plan working group had suggested that this improvement be added to the Commissioner's website. Previously, the project had been 'amber' as the Officer had not received timely reports from the firearms team, in order to record the impact of the measures taken. The Commissioner was delighted to note the significant improvement in this area, and that the Plan working group had recognised this.
- The Commissioner felt that in engagement exercises it was often younger voices that tended to be prioritised, and the purpose of the Elders Strategy was to ensure that the Commissioner had access to these voices, who can offer a lifetime of contribution. This would also be picked up through the community strategy, which would be considered by the Panel in April.

The Commissioner noted that the slides provided as part of the pack gave a list of the decisions he had taken, and a detailed overview of the projects ongoing.

Moving to the additional slides presented, the Commissioner noted his success in publishing the latest volume of the 'Little Book of Big Scams', which he had provided copies of to the Panel for passing on to those who they felt would

benefit. Under the topic of youth engagement, the Commissioner had recently visited Itchen College as part of 'Parliament Week' in order to speak to them on his role, and to take questions. From this, applications had been received to the Youth Commission and two students had been successful in gaining places.

On the Victim Care service, which was a service commissioned by the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner, the Commissioner was pleased to share the significant number of victims of crime that had been offered support, received enhanced support and had gone on to receive one to one services to help them cope and recover. With the implementation of the General Data Protection Regulations, it may be that in future the Commissioner would not be able to share the number of individuals assisted by the victim care service, so it was important to highlight this to the Panel whilst able to.

The Commissioner noted his pleasure in helping with the ground breaking for the Eastern Police Investigation Centre in Portsmouth, and played a short video to the Panel on the progress of his Plan.

The Chairman thanked the Commissioner and the Programme Office Lead for their update.

RESOLVED:

That the update on the delivery of the Police and Crime Plan is noted.

Councillors Adrian Collett and Lisa Griffith left at this point in the meeting.

140. POLICE AND CRIME PANEL - QUARTERLY COMPLAINTS

Members received a report from the scrutiny officer to the Panel detailing the activities of the Complaints Sub-Committee in the last quarter (see Item 12 in the Minute Book).

RESOLVED:

That the quarterly complaints report is noted.

141. POLICE AND CRIME PANEL - WORKING GROUP TERMS OF REFERENCE UPDATE

Members received updated Terms of Reference for the Police and Crime Plan Working Group of the Panel from the scrutiny officer (see Item 13 in the Minute Book).

It was heard that the amendments related to the quarterly monitoring of the Plan's progress.

RESOLVED:

That the terms of reference are agreed.

142. **POLICE AND CRIME PANEL - WORK PROGRAMME AND 2018/19 MEETING DATES**

Members received a report from the scrutiny officer to the Panel which sets out the proposed work programme and future dates for 2018/19 (see Item 14 in the Minute Book).

RESOLVED:

That:

- Meeting dates are noted.
- The work programme, subject to any recommendations made at the meeting, is agreed.

Chairman 13 April 2018,

This page is intentionally left blank