

HAMPSHIRE POLICE AND CRIME PANEL

10.05am – 7 April 2017

Held in Ashburton Hall, Winchester
(Hampshire County Council)

Councillors:

Chairman

p David Stewart
(Isle of Wight Council)

Vice Chairman

p Jan Warwick
(Winchester City Council)

p John Beavis MBE
(Gosport Borough Council)
p Simon Bound
(Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council)
p Ken Carter
(East Hampshire District Council)
p Trevor Cartwright MBE
(Fareham Borough Council)
p Steve Clarke
(New Forest District Council)
a Tonia Craig
(Eastleigh Borough Council)
a Alison Johnston
(Test Valley Borough Council)

p John Kennett
(Hart District Council)
p Peter Latham
(Hampshire County Council)
p Ian Lyon
(Portsmouth City Council)
p Ken Muschamp
(Rushmoor Borough Council)
p Jacqui Rayment
(Southampton City Council)
p Leah Turner
(Havant Borough Council)

Co-opted Members:

Independent Members

p Michael Coombes
p Bob Purkiss MBE

Local Authority

a Reg Barry
a Frank Rust
p Lynne Stagg

At the invitation of the Chairman:

Michael Lane
Robert Parkin
James Payne

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

60. **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.

61. **WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

The Chairman welcomed all to the meeting.

62. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received from:

- Councillor Reg Barry, Additional Local Authority Co-opted Member
- Councillor Alison Johnston, Test Valley Borough Council
- Councillor Frank Rust, Additional Local Authority Co-opted Member

63. **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.

64. **MINUTES**

The Minutes from the 27 January 2017 meeting were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

Members heard that under Minute 48, the Plan working group had considered what format future updates to the Panel would take, and further information on this would be reported under Item 9 (Minute 69).

65. **QUESTIONS AND DEPUTATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC**

Two questions from the public were received on this occasion. Members heard the following questions and the responses provided:

Question One

Following the report in the Lymington Times and New Milton Advertiser on the 3rd March 2017: Would the Police and Crime Panel request that the PCC acknowledge that it is not the Community Speed Watch Volunteers that are overloading the system, but the number of motorists speeding? Some Community Speed Watch Volunteers felt rebuffed and disheartened by the comment.

Response to Question One from the Police and Crime Commissioner

The Commissioner noted that he did not recognise the article's reflection of his views nor the quotes in it. The view of the Commissioner was provided at the end of the article; being that he is a supporter of Community Speedwatch and believes it represents community value, which had been stated in public before.

The safety of Community Speedwatch volunteers was an important factor that the Commissioner felt needed to be taken into account, and there are issues with the volume of data that needed to be processed. However, the Commissioner did not believe that this detracted from the scheme's value. It would be up to the local Police Commander as to how the scheme was managed locally, but the Commissioner made it clear that he was not critical of Community Speedwatch.

Question Two

Would the Police and Crime Panel seek views from the Police and Crime Commissioner on how members of Community Speed Watch, with relevant security clearance, can better assist the Police in processing the data?

Response to Question Two

The Commissioner explained that Community Speedwatch was a Force-led initiative and is delivered by local neighbourhood teams, and whilst he was supportive of the scheme any decisions around its direction or the role of volunteers was an operational one, and was therefore within the responsibility of the Chief Constable. The Commissioner would therefore pass this feedback on to Chief Constable Pinkney.

The Panel asked supplementary questions of the Commissioner, requesting his assurance that he took the topic of speeding and traffic crime seriously, and what his intentions were to assist and support residents to take action against motorists not respecting road laws. In response, the Commissioner highlighted a variety of newspaper articles where he had been quoted on traffic crime, and reassured Members that speeding in particular was a priority for him. The Commissioner noted that it was important to listen to local people and to encourage feedback which could be passed on to experts. The Commissioner felt that he had encouraged the input of local people and technical responses to speeding across the policing area.

The Panel agreed that traffic crime had been highlighted as an area of interest to local people, as well as through the Commissioner's Police and Crime Plan, and therefore it was intended that this issue be added to the proactive scrutiny work programme, due to be considered at the Panel's afternoon meeting on 7 April.

66. **CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman gave two announcements:

Minister Approval for Co-opted Members

The Chairman had received authorisation from the Minister for Policing and Fire, on behalf of the Secretary of State, for the Panel to formally co-opt three additional local authority members.

Complaints Annual Review Meeting

The Chairman had met with the Chair of the Complaints Sub-Committee to review the complaints protocol and complaints received over the previous year. Further discussion on this is noted under Minute 70.

67. **COMMISSIONER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

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

London Terrorist Incident

Specialist resources from Hampshire Constabulary had been deployed to the incident, following well prepared and rehearsed plans for such an event. Hampshire Constabulary regularly prepared, planned and trained for a range of incidents to help keep the public safe. It was also important that the Commissioner and Chief Constable regularly contributed to regional and national debate on the approach to terrorism and emergency planning, and the Commissioner regularly challenged the Chief Constable to ensure appropriate resource was available, both for national incidents and at home.

Condolences were expressed by the Commissioner and the Panel to the friends and families of the victims of the attacks in London, and to those affected.

Other Announcements

The Commissioner also gave an overview of his week, providing details of key meetings relating to criminal justice, road traffic, finances, Chief Constable accountability, community safety, cyber crime and victim support. The Panel asked the Commissioner to detail what had been learned at these meetings, and how this would benefit the people of Hampshire and the Isle of Wight, to which responses were provided on trends in traffic accidents, collaboration and national policy.

68. **POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER FOR HAMPSHIRE – ESTATES STRATEGY**

Members received an overview from the Commissioner and Interim Chief Executive of the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner on progress made against the Estates Strategy since the Panel's previous update in January 2017 (see Item 8 in the Minute Book)..

A summary of the report was provided, including an overview of the progress of the Police Investigation Centres in Basingstoke and Portsmouth, and the Interim Chief Executive's contributions to national estates workstreams. In terms of the Estates Strategy review, a first draft of a revised document was with the Commissioner for

Estates review
to be added to

consideration, and would be available for scrutiny at the Panel's July meeting.

July agenda

In response to questions, the Panel heard:

- When the Estates Strategy was originally agreed, a scheme of delegation was approved which gave the Estates Strategy and Delivery Director the power to take most decisions, which is why there had been no recently published estate-related decisions taken by the Commissioner.
- The estates team within the Office of the Commissioner were aware of the vacant public sector estate across the two Counties and had made offers for some of these, but negotiations between public sector bodies were often protracted, especially if the ownership or boundaries were complex. The view of the Commissioner was that all public sector organisations should strive to make better use of public assets without the need for large sums of money to exchange hands for their use.
- Investment had been agreed for the 101 response system to make it more flexible and responsive to the public's needs, which was meant there was less need to travel to front desks across the two Counties.
- Front desk times in public sector buildings required balance as police stations were expected to be open at times when, for example, Council buildings were not. Additionally, the safety of shared office workers needed to be kept in consideration.

Discussion was held about a number of front desks in the Hampshire area where Members questioned if they were open at the times when the public were most likely to use them. The Commissioner noted that front desk opening times were an ongoing topic of discussion with the Chief Constable, and data on their use would be brought back to the July meeting of the Panel, to accompany the revised Estates Strategy.

Estates item in July to include data on police front desk use

A number of questions relating to Panel Member areas were raised, to which the following responses were heard:

- That the Commissioner aspired to deliver a positive solution for Aldershot, but progress was being held up by negotiations with the Courts who owned the land due to be redeveloped. The Interim Chief Executive was due to meet with the Chief Executive of Rushmoor Borough Council to discuss progress and a shared estates vision for the town.
- That timelines had slipped in Fareham, although there was some disagreement about where the hold up was, with all organisations given the impression that they were waiting for another to take a decision. Further talks would be held outside of the Panel meeting to resolve confusion.
- The police station in Alton would be closing and the OPCC and Constabulary were working together to publicise how the public could access the police whilst the nearest police station was in Aldershot.
- The Police Investigation Centre (PIC) building in Portsmouth was expected to take between 24 – 30 months from planning permission to operational use, from the experience of project managing the Basingstoke site. The same contractors had won the procurement exercise, which would make the build easier as

lessons had been learnt by those who worked on the Basingstoke PIC. The current delay to gaining planning permission was feedback from the Council's traffic consultancy; usually this was a 12 week determination but this was likely to be extended. Any measures that could be taken by the Portsmouth Panel members to hasten this exercise would be welcomed.

It was agreed that further queries relating to divisions be raised with the Commissioner or Interim Chief Executive directly.

RESOLVED:

That the update is noted.

That the Panel receive the outcomes of the review of the Estates Strategy at the July 2017 meeting.

69. POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER – POLICE AND CRIME PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

Members received two presentations from the Interim Chief Executive setting out an update on delivery against the Police and Crime Plan 2016-2021 (see Item 9A in the Minute Book).

Before hearing the presentation, the Chair of the Police and Crime Plan Working Group gave a summary of the most recent meeting held, where Members discussed the current approach to proactive scrutiny, and how the implementation of the Panel's recommendations could be better monitored, and outcomes assessed.

Following Member suggestions and discussion with the OPCC, a revised approach had been agreed. Recommendations made through proactive scrutiny work will now be allocated to specific projects under the Commissioner's delivery plan for action, allowing the Panel to better see how the recommendations made have directly contributed to the delivery of the Police and Crime Plan.

Also discussed at the meeting was the level of detail being provided by the Commissioner to the Panel at each quarterly meeting, relating to progress against delivery of his Police and Crime Plan. As the Plan Working Group had lead responsibility for supporting the Panel in their statutory responsibilities in relation to the Plan, a detailed breakdown of progress and activities against each of the strands of the delivery plan would in future be brought by the OPCC to each of the Group's meetings. The Group can then pre-scrutinise the information provided ahead of formal meetings.

The OPCC would continue to provide a quarterly update report to each full Panel meeting.

The Commissioner welcomed the scrutiny and engagement by the Plan working group and echoed the comments made by the Chair of the Working Group.

The Commissioner and Interim Chief Executive presented an update on

progress made against the Police and Crime Plan (see Item 9B in the Minute Book).

In response to questions, the Panel heard:

- That the Commissioner was disappointed with the PEEL inspection rating of 'requires improvement' for effectiveness. The report had been drafted by HMIC in October and shared as a draft with the Commissioner and Constabulary then, and ongoing discussion had been held since that time about the issues raised. Those areas where HMIC had presented concerns had been immediately paused and reviewed. One of the specific issues highlighted by HMIC related to how the Constabulary dealt with domestic abuse, and the Commissioner felt that innovative practices being led by Hampshire Constabulary were victim-centred and not completely understood by HMIC. In response, a body of evidence would be built to ensure that this method of triage and solution was appropriate, but until this time these practices would cease.
- The Chief Constable had been challenged by the Commissioner in relation to the report, and she had been clear that the needs of the victim should always drive action by the police. This topic had been raised at the most recent 'COMPASS' meeting, where the Chief Constable had been challenged to reassure the Commissioner, victims and the public that steps would be taken to improve this rating. The dignity and respect of victims remained paramount, and the Commissioner believed that the Constabulary were good at identifying vulnerability.
- Overall, Hampshire Constabulary remained a 'good' force.

Further discussion was held between the Panel and the Commissioner on the level of context to be provided in the delivery update. Some members requested further detail and it was agreed that this would be provided to the Plan working group.

The Commissioner noted his interpretation, in response to requests for additional information that the Panel should only be privy to information relating to the decisions that he had taken. In response, the Chairman agreed that at the next meeting of the Panel, a refresher would be given to all Members and attendees from the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner on the powers of the Police and Crime Panel.

The Chairman noted concerns relating to the recent outcome of the PEEL inspection, and requested that an additional item be heard on this topic at the next Panel meeting.

RESOLVED:

That:

- **The updates on the delivery of the Police and Crime Plan are noted.**
- **The topic of 'PEEL inspections' be added to the PCP's work programme for consideration at the 7 July 2017 meeting.**
- **Through the PCC, the Chief Constable is invited to attend the next meeting of the PCP, in order that new Panel Members**

Plan working group to consider information requested.

Briefing note on Panel powers to be considered in July.

PEEL inspections to be added to the work programme.

are able to meet Ms Pinkney, and for the Constabulary's perspective to be heard on issues due to be considered on the agenda.

70. **POLICE AND CRIME PANEL – QUARTERLY COMPLAINTS REPORT**

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 10 in the Minute Book).

A correction was made to the report, noting that there was one complaint 'informally resolved without action' rather than 'with action'; this had been corrected in the minute book.

The Chairman, Chair of the Complaints Sub-Committee, Legal Officer and Democratic Support Officer to the Panel had recently met to hold an annual complaints review meeting. The Chairman was satisfied that complaints reviewed in the previous year had followed the Panel's processes, and as a result of an evaluation of the year it was agreed that some small tweaks be made to the Complaints Protocol of the Panel.

Complaint protocol to be considered at the July meeting.

RESOLVED:

That the quarterly complaints report is noted.

71. **POLICE AND CRIME PANEL – WORK PROGRAMME**

Members received a report from the scrutiny officer to the Panel which sets out the proposed work programme for the Panel (see Item 11 in the Minute Book).

The Chairman noted that he intended to add the following items to the Panel's work programme, for consideration at the July meeting:

- Local interpretation of the Policing and Crime Act 2017, to include consideration of Fire and Rescue Authorities
- Those items agreed during the 7 April meeting.

RESOLVED:

That the work programme is agreed.

Chairman, 7 July 2017