

Cleveland Police and Crime Panel

A meeting of Cleveland Police and Crime Panel was held on Monday, 21st September, 2015.

Present: Cllr Norma Stephenson(Chairman),

Cllr Neil Bendelow, Cllr David Coupe, Gwen Duncan, Cllr Chris Jones, Cllr Jim Lindridge, Cllr Bob Norton, Cllr Charles Rooney, Cllr Bernie Taylor, Cllr Matthew Vickers, Cllr David Wilburn

Officers: Graham Birtle, Michael Henderson, Steve Hume and Margaret Waggott (SBC)

Also in attendance: Barry Coppinger (Commissioner), Michael Porter, Simon Dennis (Commissioner's Office), Iain Spittal (Cleveland Police)

Apologies: Cllr Jonathan Brash, Cllr Ken Dixon, Chu-Chu Nwajobi

PCP 19/15 Evacuation Procedure/Mobile Phones

The Chair highlighted the Evacuation Procedure.

PCP 20/15 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

PCP 21/15 Minutes of meeting held on 30th July 2015.

The minutes of the meeting held on 30th July 2015 were confirmed as a correct record.

PCP 22/15 Members' Questions to the Commissioner

There were no Members' Questions submitted, however, there was a request that a report on the estates strategy be presented to a future meeting. The Commissioner explained that he would arrange this.

RESOLVED that a report of the estates strategy be presented to a future meeting.

PCP 23/15 Performance Monitoring - Quarter 1 2015/2016

Members considered a report that provided an update of performance scrutiny undertaken by the Police and Crime Commissioner for Cleveland to support the delivery of the priorities of the Police and Crime Plan for Q1 2015/16 (April – June 2015).

The following summarises the Panel's consideration:

- there was discussion about the increased rates of crime, detailed in the report. Members were reminded that, in 2014, a National HMIC inspection had highlighted that some crime recording processes had not been robust enough and the Force had undertaken a thorough review of procedures. There was a recognition that improvements in crime recording processes, following the review, had likely had an influence on increases in recorded crimes. It was noted that the Force was committed to the accurate recording of crime going

forward, as it relied on the accuracy of these figures to help it determine the deployment of its resources. It was envisaged that, after October, rates of crime would be more comparable because the significant changes to processes had been undertaken in October last year. Members noted that actual reported incidents showed a 3% increase and it was felt that this was a closer reflection of any increase in crime. There was a request that a briefing be organised for Panel members to discuss the crime figures in further detail. The Force and Commissioner agreed that this would be arranged.

- it was noted that Stockton had not seen as high a level of increase, in incidents of Anti Social Behaviour, as other local policing areas. It was noted that Stockton Borough Council had put substantial resources into dealing with ASB. Members were informed that Durham University had been reviewing ASB across the force area and had identified a range of good practice, which would be shared. It was agreed that the closer agencies worked together, the more impact could be achieved.

- it was queried what effect the Restorative Justice Programme was having on ASB and crime? The Commissioner explained that there had been over 1000 RJ interventions, over the last year. All activity was being monitored and an update report would be presented to a future Panel meeting.

- The Commissioner was asked how successful the victims' support directory had been in raising awareness? It was noted that the directory had been promoted widely and over 30 agencies were involved. A tendering process would begin shortly and an update would come to the Panel in due course.

- There was a request that the layout of the meeting room be reconsidered.

RESOLVED that:

1. the report be noted.

2. a briefing for members be arranged when issues relating to crime figures could be discussed.

3. the following reports be provided to future meetings of the Panel:

- progress on the restorative justice programme.

- an update about victims' support services.

4. consideration be given to the meeting room's layout, for future meetings.

PCP 24/15 Programme of Engagement

Members considered a report that provided a brief update in relation to meetings attended by the PCC, from July to September 2015.

The Chair explained that there was an open invitation for Panel members to attend and observe meetings of the Commissioner's Audit Committee and its next meeting was 24 September 2015. Panel members were requested to

contact the Commissioner's Office if they intended being present.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

**PCP
25/15** **Decisions of the Police and Crime Commissioner**

Members considered a report that provided an update in relation to the decisions made by the Police and Crime Commissioner, between 1 July 2015 and 31 August 2015.

It was explained that an additional decision, relating to funding formula consultation had been deferred.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

**PCP
26/15** **Commissioner's Update**

Members received information from the Commissioner on a number of issues:-

Special Constabulary, Cadets and Volunteers

Members received a brief update regarding the Special Constabulary, Police Volunteer Programme and Police Cadet Programme. It was explained that the Commissioner was holding a volunteer's fair on 2nd November. The fair had been very successful, in previous years, and had led people to be involved in volunteering activities of various kinds. Work was ongoing to better support volunteers and a progress report, on this, would be presented to the Panel.

There was a query about independent custody visitors and how their findings were reported back to the commissioner and how they were handled by the force. The Panel was informed that the Commissioner had a member of staff who worked with custody visitors and spent a lot of time supporting their role, including assisting production of reports. The Police considered the independent custody feedback to be very important and used it when reviewing and updating custody areas. It was agreed that the Commissioner's office would direct panel members to further information about the role of custody visitors.

National Police Air Service - NPAS

The Panel was provided with the NPAS Board's Annual report.

The Commissioner explained that six police and crime commissioners, six police chief constables, together with representatives from the home office, metropolitan police and other bodies sat on the NPAS Board. The Commissioner was the representative of the North East and Yorkshire. The total cost of air support prior to the establishment of NPAS was £71 million. Since its establishment the cost had reduced to £36 million in 2014/15, of which Cleveland paid £1.2 million. Cleveland had paid a disproportionate amount, as it had previously had a helicopter, so initial charges to the force were higher than others because it was carrying higher overheads and higher costs. It had been successfully argued that this should not remain the case and Cleveland's

contribution was likely to reduce. It was envisaged that overall costs for the service would continue to reduce.

The national service provided 24 hour coverage, with an assured 20 minute response time target, which was being met. The Force did not previously have a 24 hour, 7 days a week service. It was indicated that Cleveland Police could not, currently, operate an air support service unilaterally.

The Chair requested that Panel members be advised of any occasions when the Force requested the use of air support, but was refused, as this may be the subject of queries by the public.

The main reasons air cover would be deployed in the area would be if lives were at risk.

The Panel asked for some local operations and performance figures, with a comparison between pre and post NPAS. The Commissioner explained that he would provide such information, subject to its availability.

It was noted that fixed wing aircraft were being used, which were entirely suitable for some needs and cheaper and quieter than helicopters. Obviously some situations needed the unique features of a helicopter.

Members noted the age profile of pilots and the Commissioner indicated that he had intended raising issues related to this at the next Board meeting. Feedback would be provided to the Panel.

Consultation on funding formula and Commissioner's response

The Commissioner explained that he had submitted a response to the Government's consultation on reform of Police Funding arrangements in England and Wales. The Commissioner's response had been published on his website and the Panel had been signposted to it. The Commissioner provided a brief overview of its content. In the response he had highlighted concerns about the funding restraints and the impact on delivery of his Police and Crime Plan and particularly Neighbourhood Policing.

RESOLVED that:

1. the Commissioner provide more information about custody visitors.
2. the Commissioner provide information about NPAS call outs.
3. the Commissioner to provide localised, operational figures, subject to any reporting restrictions.
4. the Commissioner to provide feedback from the NPAS Board, following further consideration of pilot age profiles.

**PCP
27/15**

Scrutiny Work Programme 2015/2016

The Panel considered its work programme for 2015/16. The following topic areas were suggested:

Overall Budget
Victims' Support
Shared Services

RESOLVED that the above topics form the Panel's scrutiny work programme for 2015/16, with each review being undertaken by a task and finish group. Each group to comprise 1 elected member of the full Panel, from each of the constituent authorities and 1 non-political independent member (5 members in total).

**PCP
28/15**

Forward Plan

The Panel considered the current Forward Plan.

RESOLVED that the Forward Plan be agreed.

**PCP
29/15**

Public Questions

There were no public questions.