

HAMPSHIRE POLICE AND CRIME PANEL

10.00am – 27 January 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)
a Trevor Cartwright MBE
(Fareham Borough Council)
p Steve Clarke
(New Forest District Council)
a Tonia Craig
(Eastleigh Borough Council)
p Alison Johnston
(Test Valley Borough Council)

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

Co-opted Members (after Minute 27):

Independent Members

p Michael Coombes
p Bob Purkiss MBE

Local Authority

a Reg Barry
p 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
Acting Chief Executive, Office of the Police and
Crime Commissioner*

39. **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.

40. **WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

The Chairman welcomed all to the meeting.

41. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received from:

- Councillor Trevor Cartwright (Fareham Borough Council)
- Councillor Ian Lyon (Portsmouth City Council)
- Councillor Jacqui Rayment (Southampton City Council) – Councillor Dave Shields was in attendance as the Deputy Member
- Councillor Leah Turner (Havant Borough Council)

42. **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.

43. **MINUTES**

The Minutes from the 7 October 2016 meeting were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

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

No questions or deputations were received by the Panel on this occasion.

45. **CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman gave one announcement, noting that he was now the Leader of the Isle of Wight Council, with responsibility as part of his portfolio for public protection.

46. **COMMISSIONER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chair invited announcements from the Police and Crime Commissioner for Hampshire (hereafter referred to as 'the Commissioner'). The Commissioner did not make any specific

announcements, other than to note the fullness of the agenda to be considered, and to highlight the proposal for the precept to be of strategic importance and a key milestone in the delivery of the Commissioner's responsibilities.

47. **POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER FOR HAMPSHIRE – 2017/18 PRECEPT**

Members received an overview from the Commissioner of his budget report and supporting presentation on the proposed precept for the 2017/18 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 Constabulary.

The Commissioner spoke to the report and presentation, and highlighted salient points to the Panel. It was noted that Hampshire was one of the ten areas with the lowest policing precepts, and therefore the Commissioner would be entitled to raise the precept by a higher amount for 2017/18, by a maximum of £5 for an average Band D property. The surrounding financial context of the precept was described to the Panel, including the Commissioner's visible role nationally in highlighting the unfairness of the current funding formula, and the need to review and implement changes to this as soon as possible.

A consultation had been held on the budget with the public, who were mostly supportive of the proposal. An event had been held in Hampshire, with a satellite event on the Isle of Wight, which saw a demographically-balanced audience receive information on the budget. It was noted that support for a £5 rise in precept increased after contextual information was provided.

The expectation of the Home Secretary that Commissioners raise precept income had not changed for the 2017/18 financial year. Hampshire remained one of the best value for money Forces in England and Wales, with the HMIC profile showing Hampshire Constabulary as having the second lowest cost per head of population nationally, and was rated in the 'PEEL' efficiency assessment as being 'Good', with some elements of the financial approach being 'outstanding'.

The Commissioner wished to propose a precept increase of 3.12%, or £5 for an average Band D property, for 2017/18. This followed the strategy set out in the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS), although this approach would still see a funding shortfall of approximately £13m in 2019/20. The Commissioner noted his view that he would not seek to increase taxation on the local population without testing the evidence for this, especially in times of austerity. For 2017/18, the Commissioner felt it appropriate to increase the precept, for the reasons set out in the report.

The Panel received an additional report from the Finance working group (see Appendix 8A, Item 8 in the Minute Book) setting out the views of those Members who had considered the budget report, MTFS and related financial information in detail prior to the Panel meeting. After

reviewing and challenging additional information from the Commissioner, including a joint letter from the Commissioner and Chief Constable to the Policing and Fire Minister on the national funding formula, the Finance working group were content to support the Commissioner's proposal.

In response to questions, the Panel heard:

- That the Commissioner praised the efforts of the finance officers in delivering robust financial planning and stability in the face of difficult circumstances. There were areas that required further attention, such as the £13m identified deficit for 2019/20, the need to further modernise technology, and the issues around the national funding formula.
- The Commissioner had adopted a reserves approach whereby confidence could be given to funding major change programmes because the investment could be identified and allocated at an early stage. Additionally, it was important to plan for the unexpected nature of policing, where the Constabulary may be asked to respond to a new threat or experience additional slicing to the budget. The Commissioner was personally resistant to saving too much in reserves, but was content with the current strategy.
- In the current year, it was expected that there would be a 1.5-2% underspend, mostly relating to employee expenses due to holding open vacancies after police officers and staff leave or retire. In 2017/18, it was expected that the Constabulary would open a recruitment round for police officers, as attrition rates were higher than the Force model required. Therefore there was a better chance of aligning budget to spend in future.
- The Commissioner had taken advice from the Chief Constable on the budget required to deliver operationally effective policing.
- As noted by the Finance working group, both the Commissioner and Chief Constable had been visible nationally in public, advocating for an urgent review of the national funding formula, setting out the continued pressures faced by the Constabulary despite the robust management of its budget and amount of efficiencies saved.
- The increase in precept would enable the Commissioner to sustain the current policing model, and to support programmes which would see a more innovative and modern approach to policing, e.g. through the review of the 101 process.
- If the precept was not agreed, the budget would be reassessed to ensure that policing remained operationally effective. It would however result in the Commissioner not being able to invest in the tools required to modernise the service, or may require thought being given to further efficiencies.
- That transformation projects are robustly challenged and it would no longer be acceptable to the Commissioner for him to agree greater investment into programmes because detailed planning had not been executed at the scoping and planning stages. All projects needed to demonstrate evidence of added value or how they will make the population safer.
- The Commissioner had been clear that he wished to proactively

identify and reach out to community groups and individuals who are sometimes under-represented in consultations. Materials used in the consultation were available in other languages and prints in order to improve accessibility, and good connections had been made through the Officer of the Commissioner with community leaders and representatives. Additionally, both the 'young' and 'elder' hard to reach groups had been considered, and future engagement with these groups were outlined in the Delivery Plan to be considered later.

- It was the role of the Commissioner to argue for the right level of policing and commissioning of other services locally, and to propose to raise the precept accordingly if it was felt that resource didn't match the demands on services.

Following questions, the Chairman moved to debate. The majority of Members discussed their support for the increase in precept, noting that this would continue to provide a sustained policing service across the geography.

There was some debate about Council Tax being increased across the public sector, and the impact this has on the population's purse.

A vote took place on the endorsement of the 3.12% increase to the policing precept, which was carried by 13 votes, with two abstentions.

RESOLVED:

That the Police and Crime Commissioner for Hampshire's proposed precept level increase for 2017/18 of 3.12% is supported.

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

48. **POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER – POLICE AND CRIME PLAN DELIVERY**

Members received a report and presentation from the Acting Chief Executive setting out the process followed by the Commissioner to develop his Delivery Plan for the Police and Crime Plan 2016-2021 (see Item 9 in the Minute Book).

Members heard that the Delivery Plan responded to the request from the Panel at their October meeting to provide a structure for delivery and implementation of the Commissioner's Police and Crime Plan. The Delivery Plan would set out the key headings under which success could be measured, and would provide the Commissioner and Panel with the tools required to scrutinise and support the Plan.

The Commissioner had reviewed the Police and Crime Plans of Commissioner colleagues nationally and felt that his Plan provided the best base on which to build delivery around community needs, stronger partnerships, reduced offending and ensure effective and efficient operational policing.

The vision of the Delivery Plan was to have a priority-based focus, but through a structure which enabled the evolution and development of these. The Delivery Plan had been build based on the 'agile' approach to project management, with the Office of the Commissioner refocused to ensure that project skills can be built and delivery and activity applied appropriately. There were five key strands of the Delivery Plan:

- 'Big Conversations' – the Commissioner and his team will lead on [big conversations] to create opportunities and drivers for change.
- 'Big Issues' – this will be the most fluid of the strands adopting the issues of the moment.
- 'Partnerships and Commissioning' – finding ways to make us safer through the work with partners and providers.
- 'Communities' – listening and responding to the concerns of the wider community.
- 'Policing' – the Commissioner has a statutory duty to hold the Chief Constable and her team to account.

It would be important for evidence to be produced which measured the success priorities and the projects underneath them. The Delivery Plan would be outcome and benefit focused, and examples were provided to show how this would work in practice.

Some discussion was held by the Panel on the expectations of the Delivery Plan and the need to ensure that achievements could be measured both in terms of quantity and quality, and progress considered by the Panel. In response, Members received a second presentation from the Commissioner (see Item 9 in the Minute Book) setting out the activities undertaken and progress made against the key headings of the Delivery Plan for the previous quarter.

In response to questions, the Panel heard:

- That the appendices to the Delivery Plan had not been provided as they were very large, but the Commissioner was content to provide these to the Plan working group for their consideration at a future meeting.
- The ability of the Delivery Plan to evolve shouldn't mean that there will be mission creep, and this was something the Commissioner would check for in his challenge and scrutiny of delivery. As the Police and Crime Plan was over a period of five years this would require the ability to be agile, and to triage and assess what makes the biggest impact, tweaking the delivery of the Plan to match what resulted in the best outcomes,
- The Panel had highlighted the importance of regularly engaging and consulting with the public, and this formed an important part of both the 'big conversations' and 'communities' work-streams. The Commissioner felt the consultation undertaken on the precept, and inclusion of hard to reach groups, evidenced his commitment to this. It would also be of significant importance to listen and challenge the Chief Constable on the delivery of the Police and Crime Plan, and to ensure that the Constabulary collected and shared evidence contributing to the Plan.

Appendices to be considered by Plan WG

Members noted their satisfaction with the delivery details provided

Reporting of

through the second presentation, and agreed that the Plan working group should consider whether this was the most appropriate method of presenting progress to future Panel meetings.

progress against Delivery Plan to be considered by Plan WG

RESOLVED:

That

- **The delivery plan is noted.**
- **The implementation of the Police and Crime Plan be added to the work programme to be considered at each Panel meeting.**
- **The PCP's Police and Crime Plan Working Group receive the appendices as detailed in the delivery plan.**

49. **POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER – ESTATES STRATEGY – UPDATE ON DELIVERY**

Members received a report setting out the progress made against the Estates Strategy (see Item 10 in the Minute Book).

In response to questions, the Panel heard:

- That during the timeframe of the Estates Strategy the market had changed and it was an appropriate time to review its aims in order to ensure that it was what is required to ensure operational effectiveness.
- Inflation in future at this time was unknown due to outside issues such as Brexit, American politics and instability in the markets. It was hoped that better detail of inflation estimates would begin to emerge in 2018.

Members heard that the Commissioner was reviewing the Estates Strategy in order to understand the requirements of the Constabulary in the current economic climate, and to reassess the resources and capacity available to shape the future of the estate. This would be brought to the next Panel meeting for consideration.

RESOLVED:

That the Panel receive a further update on the estates strategy at their 7 April 2017 meeting.

50. **POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER FOR HAMPSHIRE – ANNUAL REPORT**

The Panel received the draft Annual Report of the previous Police and Crime Commissioner for Hampshire for 2015/16 (see Item 11 in the Minute Book).

The Panel were aware of their ability to make a report or recommendation to the Commissioner in line with Section 28(4) of the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act, but chose not to do so for the 2015/16 year.

RESOLVED:

That the Panel notes the draft Annual Report of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Hampshire.

51. **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 12 in the Minute Book).

The Chairman of the Sub-Committee note that the complaint referred to in the report as still to be considered had now been closed.

RESOLVED:

That the quarterly complaints report is noted.

52. **POLICE AND CRIME PANEL –TERMS OF REFERENCE**

Members received a report from the scrutiny officer to the Panel which updated the Terms of Reference for the Panel's working groups following their initial meetings (see Item 13 in the Minute Book).

The Chairman of the Complaints Sub-Committee and Legal Advisor set out recent issues that had arisen in the course of considering a complaint, specifically relating to whether the Panel is able to 'investigate' a complaint, and that these would be tested with the Home Office. Additionally, the Panel were still awaiting the outcomes of the consultation on Police and Crime Panel powers in relation to complaints, and the Terms of Reference would need to be reconsidered once the proposals of the Home Office were known.

RESOLVED:

That the updated Terms of Reference are agreed.

53. **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 together with the future meeting dates for 2017/18 (see Item 14 in the Minute Book).

RESOLVED:

That:

- **The meetings dates are noted.**
- **The work programme is agreed.**

Chairman, 7 April 2017