

## AGENDA

### KENT AND MEDWAY POLICE AND CRIME PANEL

Dear Councillor

Notice is hereby given that a meeting of the **KENT AND MEDWAY POLICE AND CRIME PANEL** will be held in the **Council Chamber, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone** on **Tuesday, 17th November, 2015, at 10.00 am** when the following business will be transacted

Members of the public who require further information are asked to contact Joel Cook/Anna Taylor on 03000 416892/03000 416478

*Tea/Coffee will be available 15 minutes before the start of the meeting in the meeting room*

#### Membership

Councillor Paul Clokie	Ashford Borough Council
Councillor Pat Todd	Canterbury City Council
Councillor Chris Shippam	Dartford Borough Council
Councillor Keith Morris	Dover District Council
Councillor John Cubitt	Gravesham Borough Council
Mr Mike Hill (Chairman)	Kent County Council
Councillor Fran Wilson	Maidstone Borough Council
Councillor Michael Franklin	Medway Council
Councillor Peter Fleming	Sevenoaks District Council
Councillor Malcolm Dearden	Shepway District Council
Councillor Andrew Bowles	Swale Borough Council
Councillor Lin Fairbrass	Thanet District Council
Councillor Brian Luker	Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council
Councillor Don Sloan	Tunbridge Wells Borough Council
Mr Roger Latchford	Co-opted member
Dr Mike Eddy	Co-opted member
Councillor Habib Tejan	Co-opted member
Councillor John Burden	Co-opted member
Mrs Elaine Bolton	Independent Member
Mr Gurvinder Sandher (Vice-Chairman)	Independent Member

## **UNRESTRICTED ITEMS**

*(During these items the meeting is likely to be open to the public)*

- 1 Introduction/Webcast Announcement
- 2 Apologies and Substitutes
- 3 Declarations of Interests by Members in Items on the Agenda for this Meeting
- 4 Minutes of the Police and Crime Panel held on 22 September 2015 (Pages 3 - 8)
- 5 Minutes of the Police and Crime Panel held on 26 October 2015 (Pages 9 - 10)

### **B - Commissioner's reports requested by the Panel/offered by the Commissioner**

- B1 Update on Victim Centre and Victim Support Work (Pages 11 - 12)
- B2 Protecting the Public from Harm (Pages 13 - 14)
- B3 Financial Planning for 2016/17 Onwards (Pages 15 - 18)

### **C - Commissioner's Decisions**

- C1 Commissioner's Decisions (Pages 19 - 20)

### **D - Panel Matters**

- D1 Future work programme (Pages 21 - 22)

## **MOTION TO EXCLUDE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

That under Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraphs 1 & 3 of part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

- E1 Exempt minute of Independent Police Complaints Commission discussion held on 26 October at Kent and Medway Police and Crime Panel (Pages 23 - 26)

Peter Sass  
Head of Democratic Services  
03000 416647

**Monday, 9 November 2015**

## KENT COUNTY COUNCIL

---

### KENT AND MEDWAY POLICE AND CRIME PANEL

MINUTES of a meeting of the Kent and Medway Police and Crime Panel held in the Council Chamber, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone on Tuesday, 22 September 2015.

PRESENT: Mr P M Hill, OBE (Chairman), Mr Gurvinder Sandher (Vice-Chairman), Cllr A Horton (Substitute for Mr A H T Bowles), Cllr J Burden, Cllr P Clokie, Cllr J Cubitt, Dr M R Eddy, Cllr L Fairbrass, Mr R A Latchford, OBE, Cllr Sloan, Cllr H Tejan and Cllr P Todd

ALSO PRESENT: Mrs A Barnes, Mr A Harper, Mr S Nolan and Mr N Wickens

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr M Campbell (Policy Officer) and Mrs A Taylor (Scrutiny Research Officer)

#### UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

**136. Minutes of the Police and Crime Panel held on 2nd June 2015**  
(Item 4)

1. The Chairman referred to para 127 (2) of the minutes, the Panel resolved to delegate authority to the Head of Democratic Services to take steps to achieve political balance via appropriate co-optees. The Scrutiny Research Officer explained that the Panel had a full complement of Members with the exception of one Independent Member - a process was underway to fill that post. The Panel comprised 14 Leader appointments, (one from each local authority in Kent) an additional seat for Medway Council in recognition of geographical balance, and 2 additional Labour seats and one UKIP in recognition of political balance across Kent. Councillor Tejan had joined the panel representing Medway, and Dr Eddy and Cllr Burden joined the panel representing the Labour group as co-optees.
2. The Chairman then referred members to para 131 of the minutes, the Panel resolved that the Commissioner be asked to provide an update on the Youth Advisory Group in early 2016, this had been included in the work programme for February 2016.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 2 June 2015 were an accurate record and that they be signed by the Chairman.

**137. Dates of 2016 Panel Meetings**  
(Item 5)

RESOLVED that the Panel note the meeting dates for 2016.

**138. Overall crime performance - July 2014 to June 2015**  
(Item B1)

1. The Chairman stated that this was an important issue, one which the Panel had had much discussion over in the past.
2. The Commissioner introduced the report. She said she had spent the past two years explaining the increase in the Force's performance figures up to July 2014 as a result of the improved accuracy of crime recording. The report showed that the Force had continued to maintain a very high level of recording accuracy and the Commissioner was pleased to report that, comparing 12 months data at the same high level of accuracy, recorded crime had fallen by 1.5% which equalled 1500 fewer victims of crime. The only target set by the Home Secretary was to reduce crime, but for Kent it was also about reducing the number of victims of crime. The Commissioner explained the history of crime recording in Kent, that she had commissioned HMIC to independently review crime recording accuracy and this found a 90% accuracy rate which was not acceptable. Subsequently, the Force had worked hard to improve the accuracy of crime recording and the Commissioner's Chief of Staff was previously the Crime Registrar, playing a key role in facilitating this work. All numerical targets had been removed, officers had to provide a quality service and crime recording was now at 96-97% accuracy. When HMIC inspected police forces nationally, they found that levels of crime recording accuracy ranged from 60 – 80%.
3. The Commissioner explained that July 2014 was the new baseline and provided a like for like comparison with the subsequent year's data. Members were referred to the graphs at page 19 of their meeting pack. Kent's crime levels initially increased due to the improved accuracy of crime recording, but Kent now had one of the lowest increases in recorded crime. Kent had been praised nationally for its improvement in crime recording accuracy.
4. The most recent data from September 2014 - August 2015 showed that the reduction in crime had been maintained. Whilst some offences had increased, the Commissioner said this reflected victims being more confident to report crimes, most notably domestic abuse and historic sexual offences. The Commissioner confirmed that she was pleased with the progress but not complacent, stating that this issue was discussed at every Governance Board meeting. The Commissioner explained the role of Compass House in supporting victims of crime, and said that a number of Panel members were due to visit Compass House in November to see the facilities first hand.
5. The Chairman confirmed that there was confidence in Kent's crime recording figures, recognising that it was extremely difficult to compare forces unless they had similar reporting accuracy rates, and this was putting HMIC in a difficult position when publishing comparative national data.
6. The Commissioner was congratulated on the report and the improvement in crime recording accuracy. A Member asked whether fraud and internet crime was included in the crime figures. The Commissioner explained that the City of London Police had responsibility for fraud and cyber-crime, and that the National Crime survey conducted by the Office of National Statistics (ONS) had not asked the public whether they had been victims of fraud or cyber-crime until 2015. The ONS estimated that there were 3 million victims of fraud or cyber-crime last year. The Commissioner offered to provide a report to the Panel on fraud and cyber-crime at a future meeting.

7. One Member commented that the focus should be on reducing crime rather than comparing with other forces; the Commissioner agreed and explained that the graphs showed a comparison of year on year data for Kent Police.
8. In response to a question about crime being properly investigated and detected, the Commissioner explained that this was the responsibility of the Chief Constable. The Commissioner stated that this was regularly monitored through the Governance Board to which all Members were welcome.
9. A concern was raised about members of the public not reporting crime because they did not feel it would be investigated. The Commissioner was asked how she was encouraging the public to report crime. The Commissioner said she reinforced the message that crime should always be reported at all public events. Rural crime in Kent was reducing, and the Commissioner offered to report back to the Panel on this and the Rural Task Force.
10. In response to a question about the breakdown of violent crime and sexual offences the Commissioner referred to domestic abuse. The recording of domestic abuse had increased and the Commissioner said this was positive because it meant the public had greater confidence to report to the police. Within the domestic abuse figures, first-time recording had increased and recording of repeat abuse had reduced due to victims getting the support they needed. There was on-going work with partners to promote the reporting of domestic abuse, an awareness campaign was run during the previous football World Cup and would likely be run again next year.
11. In response to a question about the 101 and 999 service the Commissioner explained that she had recently spent time in the Force Control Room as there had been concerns about the 101 service. 999 calls were the top priority and if there was a spike in demand for the 101 service then there may be a delay in calls being answered. Cuts to the Force budget had resulted in fewer staff yet the demand had not reduced. The majority of calls to 101 were not reporting crime, sometimes as low as 20% related to crime. During July 2015 there were 4000 extra calls to the Force Control Room regarding Operation Stack and whether roads were open.
12. A Member requested that the crime clear up rate be included in future crime performance reports.

RESOLVED that the Panel welcome the reduction in victims of crime, particularly burglaries and congratulate the Force on the high level of crime recording accuracy. Where there were increases, the Panel wishes to keep a watchful eye. The Panel welcomes the Commissioner's offer to report back on fraud, cyber-crime and also rural crime in Kent including the Rural Task Force at a future meeting.

**139. Accounts 2014/15**  
*(Item B2)*

1. The Commissioner offered her congratulations to Mr Nolan, Chief Finance Officer, who had just been appointed president of the Police and Crime Commissioners' Treasurers Society.

2. The Panel was reminded that the Force had already made savings of £50million in the period 2011-2015. There were planned savings of £14.5million this year and further significant savings would have to be found up to 2020. The Chancellor had announced another year of austerity up to 2020 and the Government was consulting on a new system for allocating funding between forces. The Commissioner's response to the Government's consultation was attached at Appendix B of the report.
3. Mr Nolan introduced the report which comprised the draft accounts and the strategy in response to the comprehensive spending review. Members were reminded that the Accounts were currently draft and a number of queries were being worked through, but an unqualified opinion by the deadline was expected. The Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC) had been working on a four year plan, to the end of 2018/19 in line with the previous governments spending review period. The Chancellor had expanded this period to 2019/20 adding approximately £14million to the 'already planned for' savings. The Chancellor was due to announce the national spending review on 25 November, but the impact for Kent would not be known until approximately 18/19 December 2015. Mr Nolan said that the current formula was not fit for purpose and the review was welcome, however the lack of certainty was unsatisfactory and further clarification would not be available until nearer Christmas.
4. The Commissioner said that the Force and OPCC had assumed cuts of 28% (cuts would be between 25-40%) but this caused difficulties with the timing of OPCC engagement around the precept as clarity on the financial position would not be available until nearer Christmas. Consultation could be carried out before Christmas without further detail but allowing more time for consultation or after Christmas with more detail but allowing less time for consultation. The Commissioner said she would welcome the Panel's view on the best approach.
5. The Force was congratulated on improving its performance whilst absorbing the cuts they had faced in recent years.
6. The Commissioner said that the funding formula had to be fair to urban and rural forces; there had been very little work with partners on the issue to date.
7. A Member queried the level of reserves held by the Force. The Commissioner said that Kent had a prudent approach to reserves, inherited from the Police Authority and these were built up for capital investment as well as covering insurance risk and providing a buffer in case cuts were greater than planned. The Commissioner referred members to the final paragraph of her letter in response to the Government's consultation and the reference to reserves.
8. A Member asked that the Panel be involved in discussions around the budget proposals for 2016-17 and the Commissioner confirmed that she would welcome engagement with the Panel.

RESOLVED that Members congratulate the Force on its performance in managing the financial challenges and the Panel looks forward to engagement with the Commissioner around her budget proposals and expressed their support for securing a fair deal for Kent under the new funding formula.

**140. Working with the Business Community**  
*(Item B3)*

1. The Commissioner introduced the report, saying it was vital that the Force worked closely with the business community because being a victim could be devastating to some businesses. The OPCC and the Force had a long history of working in partnership with the business community. Business crime was absolutely not a victimless crime and the Business Crime Advisory Group had done some excellent work shaping the Force's Business Crime Strategy, looking at crime reduction measures and providing tailored crime prevention advice. The scope and nature of business crime was changing, for example, organised criminals from London were coming to Kent and committing large scale fraud and theft. Tackling issues such as this was a priority and in November 2015 the Chairman of the Business Crime Advisory Group and the Commissioner were hosting a joint business crime conference to look at crime prevention techniques, emerging threats and best practice with an emphasis on fraud and cyber-crime, the date would be confirmed to Members.
2. The Chairman queried what impact the work the Commissioner had outlined had had on business crime. The Commissioner's Chief Finance Officer explained that the value of this work included encouraging reporting of business crime and moving away from the retail industry solely, to raising awareness of other serious threats to businesses. The Serious Crime Directorate had presented to the Business Crime Advisory Group about cyber-crime, opening up opportunities for local businesses to share information. The Commissioner set out the figures for business crime, in 2012-13 there had been 25,065 offences, 2013-14 25,297 offences, 2014-15 25,774 offences. There had been an increase in shoplifting and improved crime recording accuracy had also had an impact, however the figures excluded all fraud offences which were reported directly to Action Fraud. The Commissioner advised the Panel that there was a new national definition of business crime: 'Any criminal offence that is committed against a person or property which is associated by the connection of that person or property to a business'.
3. In response to a query about the emerging issues being identified by the Business Crime Advisory Group, Mr Nolan explained that these included the impact of organised criminals and cyber-crime.

RESOLVED that the Panel thank the Commissioner for the report and request a further report on business crime in September 2016.

**141. Body Worn Cameras - Verbal update**  
*(Item B4)*

1. Mr Nolan explained that funding from the Innovation Fund had been received for 400 body worn cameras, but unfortunately a second bid for funding was unsuccessful so the cameras were not rolled out across the Force. The 400 cameras were used in a pilot scheme which led the Chief Constable and the Commissioner to again discuss the impact of cameras being rolled out more widely. Following the Commissioner's approval of a business case, the Chief

Constable has purchased another 1600 cameras, at a cost of £1.8million over three years out of the capital programme (£1.4million in the current year). The business case included a reduction in complaints, with the Force estimating productivity savings of £900,000 per year as well as 2,600 less absences from work as a result of police officers being hurt on duty. The cameras would be rolled out over the next year.

2. Panel Members were shown video footage of a stop and search captured on a camera worn by a Kent police officer. The Commissioner said that the Police Federation supports the use of cameras as it stops malicious complaints and officers being injured. The Commissioner also said that they will have a knock on effect for the wider criminal justice system with improved evidence gathering, a reduction in bureaucracy and an increase in early guilty pleas as people can't argue with what they see.
3. The Vice-Chairman welcomed the use of the cameras. In answer to a question from the Vice-Chairman the Commissioner said that the cameras would be available to all frontline officers, and would become part of their daily kit in most cases. Mr Harper said data would be stored in line with guidance, 7 years as minimum but if the data was linked to a serious crime it would be held for longer and then when no longer required would be destroyed in the correct manner.
4. The Commissioner said that whilst savings achieved through the use of cameras was important, the cameras would also improve the safety of officers.

RESOLVED that the Panel note the update on body worn cameras.

**142. Commissioner's Decisions - July, August & September 2015**  
*(Item C1)*

RESOLVED that the Panel note the decision of the Commissioner to endorse the wide scale roll out of body worn cameras for frontline police officers.

**143. Future work programme**  
*(Item D1)*

1. The Panel asked that a general discussion around the Commissioner's budget proposals take place at the November meeting.

RESOLVED that the Panel note the work programme with the inclusion of a general discussion around the Commissioner's budget proposals at the November meeting.

**144. Minutes of the Commissioner's Governance Board meeting held on 11th August 2015**  
*(Item E1)*

RESOLVED that the Panel note the Meeting Notes of the Commissioner's Governance Board held on 11 August 2015.

**KENT COUNTY COUNCIL**

---

**KENT AND MEDWAY POLICE AND CRIME PANEL**

MINUTES of a meeting of the Kent and Medway Police and Crime Panel held in the Council Chamber, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone on Monday, 26 October 2015.

PRESENT: Mr P M Hill, OBE (Chairman), Mr Gurvinder Sandher (Vice-Chairman), Mr A H T Bowles, Cllr P Clokie, Cllr J Cubitt, Cllr M Dearden, Cllr M Franklin, Cllr B Luker, Cllr K Morris, Cllr L Weatherly (Substitute for Cllr Sloan), Cllr P Todd, Cllr F Wilson, Mr L Burgess (Substitute for Mr R A Latchford, OBE) and Cllr H Tejan

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr M Campbell (Policy Officer) and Mr J Cook (Scrutiny Research Officer)

**145. SUMMARY OF EXEMPT ITEM (Where Access to Minutes Remains Restricted)**  
*(Item 4)*

The Committee resolved that under Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraphs 1 & 3 of part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

**146. IPCC Investigation of the Kent Police and Crime Commissioner**  
*(Item 5)*

1. The Chairman thanked Members for attending the additional meeting at short notice and stated that he hoped there would be a consensus on how the Panel should respond to the Independent Police Complaints Commission report.
2. Mr Campbell (Policy Officer) provided the Panel with an explanation of the process for dealing with a conduct matter of this type. A conduct matter in relation to a Police and Crime Commissioner is defined in the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 as a matter where a criminal offence may have been committed. The Panel has a duty, under the Elected Local Policing Bodies (Complaints and Misconduct) Regulations 2011, to refer any conduct matter to the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC). Mr Campbell reminded the Panel that the Crown Prosecution Service decision not to charge the Commissioner and the IPCC's report were not subject to review and that it was not the role of the Panel to re-investigate the matter
3. The Chairman advised the Panel that he had been made aware of the conduct matter by Kent Police after initial enquiries. The Chairman instructed the Commissioner's Monitoring Officer (the PCC's Chief of Staff, who holds delegated

authority for initial complaint handling), to refer the matter to the IPCC on behalf of the Panel. This took place on 26 September 2014.

4. The Panel discussed the IPCC report.
5. RESOLVED that the Panel agreed the following conclusions on the report:
  - i. The Panel notes that, having considered the evidence in the IPCC investigation, the CPS decided not to prosecute Mrs Barnes.
  - ii. The Panel is very distressed that the report has taken so long to complete. In the Panel's view 13 months is an inordinate length of time to take on what ought to have been a simple matter.
  - iii. The Panel is particularly disappointed that the IPCC did not interview Mrs Barnes until almost 5 months after the Panel referral.
  - iv. The Panel is very concerned that the objective of open and transparent justice may have been defeated by:
    - (a) the lengthy time taken to investigate, which meant that the CPS had to take a decision on prosecution without further investigation; and
    - (b) the decision, without any explanation in the report, that a prosecution would not be in the public interest.
  - v. The Panel considers that the whole process has caused damage to the Police and Crime Commissioner herself, to her Office and to the administration of justice.
  - vi. The Panel requests an assurance from the Commissioner that she has established a system in her Office to ensure that she, and her staff, are all required regularly to produce evidence that they are fully insured when driving on business, such that a repeat of this regrettable incident cannot occur in future.

**From:** Ann Barnes, Kent Police and Crime Commissioner  
**To:** Kent and Medway Police and Crime Panel  
**Subject:** Update on Compass House and Victim Support Work  
**Item & Date:** Item B1 17 November 2015

**Introduction:**

1. This paper follows on from the report the Panel received on victim services on 9 September 2014. As noted in that paper Police and Crime Commissioners were given responsibility for the commissioning of victim support services in October 2014. This required Commissioners to ensure that a core support service was in place for victims of crime regardless of whether their crime had been reported to the police. In addition, specialist services also needed to be made available for victims with more complex needs.
2. The commissioning approach for victim services in Kent has, and continues to be supported by key groups, such as:
  - *The Victims' Panel – which consists of residents who have had a range of victim experiences in Kent. They have been pivotal in the development of Compass House and supporting the commissioning approach.*
  - *The Victim Services Co-Design Group – which is a group of professionals from criminal justice and support organisations who are tasked with making improvements to services that support victims in Kent.*
3. In addition to the above, Portsmouth University undertook a Needs Assessment of victim services in Kent and this has been pivotal in the development of our approach. The needs assessment included an audit of existing victim services, gaps in service provision and mapping of the victim's journey.
4. The Commissioner is committed to providing services to victims and witnesses that are the best that can be offered and tailored to individual needs. The help that victims seek can be simple or sometimes very complex, so a tailored approach which recognises individual needs is fundamental to Kent's approach.
5. The Kent victims services commissioning approach consists of the following:
  - Compass House;
  - Core Victim Service; and
  - Specialist Victim Services.

**Compass House:**

6. Compass House was launched in June 2015 and is the co-located hub for victim services in Kent. It aims to provide a central point through which victims can access support services and also supports those services to work more collaboratively. The name Compass House was chosen by the Victims' Panel, who were also involved in deciding on the decoration of the public access areas.
7. Currently, Victim Support, as the commissioned service provider and Kent Police's Witness Care Unit (WCU) are co-located within Compass House. This co-location took place in April 2015 and has resulted in greater information sharing and joint working, which is of direct benefit to services that victims receive.
8. In addition to the co-location of Victim Support and WCU, Compass House provides other facilities including:
  - A staffed reception / welcome desk.
  - Support / Counselling rooms.
  - Two Live Link suites, for vulnerable witnesses to provide evidence at court remotely.
  - Private waiting room.
  - Training room.
  - Hot desk facilities.

9. The support rooms, training room and hot desk facilities are available for other support organisations to utilise, free of charge, to meet with clients, undertake training and hold meetings, or hot desk, taking advantage of the co-location opportunities. Some of the organisations who are utilising the facilities at Compass House include:
- Rubicon Cares;
  - Citizens Advice Witness Service;
  - Court Independent Domestic Violence Advisers;
  - Family Matters;
  - MCCH; and
  - Mediation Services.
10. Compass House will continue to be developed over the coming 12 months, including the identification of further opportunities for co-location and use of facilities by other support organisations. It should be noted that victims are not required to visit Compass House to access support services as the services are delivered within Kent's communities. However, we will also be considering options for supporting service delivery in communities to ensure support is as accessible as possible.

### **Core Victim Service:**

11. In April 2015 Victim Support were awarded a 12 month single tender contract to deliver the core victim support service from Compass House. This was to enable a greater understanding of the needs of Kent victims to be obtained to fully inform the specification of the longer term contract.
12. The new service moved away from the 'one size fits all' model delivered by the Ministry of Justice (MOJ) and focuses on providing a tailored and individual response for victims reporting a crime to Kent Police, British Transport Police or Action Fraud. The service is also accessible for victims who do not wish to report a crime to the police.
13. The service will reach an estimated 14,000 more victims than the previous MOJ model and will provide free and confidential support through initial telephone led support and then within communities. This service is delivered in its entirety from Compass House.
14. The types of support available are
- Emotional support.
  - Signposting and onward referral.
  - Information and advice, including practical advice.
  - Advocacy.

### **Specialist Victim Services:**

15. Whilst Victim Support provides the core support service in Kent, there is also a need to ensure appropriate specialist support services are in place, such as trauma counselling and support for sexual assault victims. These specialist services need to work in collaboration with the core support service to ensure there are effective referral pathways for victims to support access to the right services.
16. The Portsmouth University Needs Assessment has been key to supporting the commissioning of specialist services as it mapped existing provision and gaps in these services. As a result two bidding rounds, in 2014 and 2015 were run to deliver the following specialist services:
- Trauma counselling.
  - Support for hate crime.
  - Support for children and young people.
  - Support for rape and sexual assault victims.
  - Specialist domestic abuse support.
17. Details of those organisations awarded funding can be found at <https://www.kent-pcc.gov.uk/victims-funds.html>.

**From:** Ann Barnes, Kent Police and Crime Commissioner  
**To:** Kent and Medway Police and Crime Panel  
**Subject:** Protecting the Public from Harm  
**Item & Date:** Item B2 17 November 2015

**Background:**

1. As members will be aware there are seven priorities in the Police and Crime Plan, including to 'Protect the public from harm'. Due to the nature of some of the threats, operational activity relating to this priority is often unseen by the public. This paper provides an overview of activity in relation to some elements.
2. The governance for policing is set out in the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011. Police and Crime Commissioners are required to hold their Chief Constable to account for the effectiveness and efficiency of their force, including performance against the Police and Crime Plan. The Commissioner has developed proportionate and balanced structures to achieve this, including one to one meetings, bespoke briefings and external assessments (i.e. by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary). In addition, the public Governance Board enables Police and Crime Plan delivery to be probed and success acknowledged; recent examples relating to this priority include Organised Crime Groups (11 August 2015) and Child Sexual Exploitation (11 November 2015).

**Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE):**

3. This is a national strategic policing priority and area of business the Force identified as a threat which requires a specialist response. As a result, the Commissioner has committed to providing £200k funding recurring for three years to boost Force capacity to fight CSE and enhance multi-agency working. The Chief Constable is supporting the establishment of a multi-agency co-located team with dedicated officers and staff to promote awareness, improve intelligence and investigate CSE. Work is also underway to secure partnership investment from Kent County Council, Medway Council and NHS England.
4. As well as 9 officers and 6 police staff, the team includes the following, some of whom have started:
  - Kent County Council – 1 Social Care Manager, with another awaiting Force vetting clearance. 1 Education Co-ordinator (Early Years Help) currently awaiting Force vetting clearance.
  - Medway – 2 Specialist Social Workers currently awaiting Force vetting clearance.
  - Health – Negotiations underway to secure an investment.
5. Importantly, robust processes with partners have been developed to ensure the CSE Team are able to readily receive early notification of CSE concerns, gather intelligence and effectively respond. In addition, a training and communication strategy is being developed for staff, as well as community engagement.
6. The establishment of Multi Agency Sexual Exploitation (MASE) Board's for Kent and Medway will provide strategic oversight of the combined CSE Team and wider arrangements. In turn, by reporting to the respective Safeguarding Children Boards they will provide robust accountability of service delivery. Work is underway to ensure Community Safety Partnerships are effectively incorporated into the governance arrangements.
7. Within Kent Police, the CSE Team reports into the Protecting Vulnerable Persons Board, which is chaired by an Assistant Chief Constable who is also the vice chair of the Kent Safeguarding Children's Board. The Head of the Public Protection Unit also sits on the Protecting Vulnerable Persons Board and is vice chair of the Medway Safeguarding Children's Board. This representation ensures appropriate accountability.

**Organised Crime Groups (OCGs):**

8. The Force uses 'National Intelligence Model' principles, particularly collation and dissemination of intelligence to tackle organised crime, from neighbourhood level through to national and international.
9. In 2011, the Government published 'Local to Global: reducing the risk from organised crime'. This summarised the impact of organised crime and promoted the Integrated Operating Model which brings all partners together to work collaboratively in order to maximise impact. The Kent & Essex Serious Crime Directorate, through Serious Organised Crime Unit investigations have adopted this principle by working with divisional command teams to tackle those groups that present the greatest risk. Commissioned and proposed operations are judged and prioritised on threat, risk and harm.

10. A key component is also the identification of 'vulnerability' and this runs through all wider activity. As the key to local delivery, a 'Violence and Vulnerability Board' has been created to work with Community Safety Partnerships to ensure responsibilities are appropriately discharged. Whilst there's recognition that in some areas (i.e. domestic abuse, child abuse) there are county-wide mechanisms, in relation to organised crime there is an assessed need to ensure an appropriate focus with local partners.
11. The Force have always been at the forefront of tackling organised crime and has established systems and processes to effectively disrupt and dismantle OCGs. Jointly, the Kent and Essex Commissioner's regularly receive presentations on operational activity to tackle organised crime groups.

### **Prevent Programme:**

12. To tackle violent extremism and radicalisation, the Force has a dedicated Prevent Team who work with strategic partners to achieve three objectives:
  - Respond to the ideological challenge of terrorism and the threat faced from those who promote it.
  - Prevent People being drawn into terrorism and ensure they are given appropriate advice and support.
  - Work with sectors and institutions where there are risks of radicalisation which need to be addressed.
13. This year saw the implementation of the Counter Terrorism and Security Act which places a duty on 'specified authorities' to have due regard to the need to prevent people from being drawn into terrorism. The main focus of the Prevent Team is to manage referrals where individuals are considered to be vulnerable to radicalisation or suspected of becoming extremists. The Force has seen an increase in referrals year on year as awareness and understanding of Prevent increases. The Force also contributes towards briefing and advising a range of organisations, in addition to faith and community groups. The Government recently launched 'The Counter-Extremism Strategy' with the aim of defeating all forms of extremism: violent and non-violent, Islamist and neo-Nazi. Appropriate legislation is likely to follow.
14. On 3/4 November 2015, as part of the Home Office National Counter Terrorism Exercise Programme a 'live play' exercise took place at Ramsgate Port. In addition to Kent Police, partner agencies involved included SECamb, KFRS, Kent County Council, the armed forces and Local Authorities.
15. The Kent Prevent Delivery Board is co-chaired by Kent Police and Kent County Council ensuring a consistent and structured Prevent programme across the county. The board includes representation from Health, Education and Local Authorities.

### **Cyber Crime:**

16. The Kent & Essex Serious Crime Directorate leads the Force response to this threat, whether that's cyber-attacks, or conventional computer offences. A joint Cybercrime Unit is being created and will be in place by March 2016, enabling a bespoke response. Regular crime prevention advice is circulated through media releases and social media. This will be enhanced through a Cyber Protect Officer within the Cybercrime Unit who will provide advice and complete cyber security assessments for small/medium enterprises.
17. Op Action is seeking to protect the public by visiting potential victims whose details were identified through warrants conducted by Trading Standards. The individuals are on a so called 'scammers list' being circulated between criminal groups as susceptible to fraud offences. This joint initiative with Trading Standards seeks to ensure they are aware of the risk and given appropriate crime prevention advice.

### **Hate Crime:**

18. The Force has an established Hate Crime Forum with an active membership including the CPS Hate Crime Coordinator, Victim Support, the Independent Police Advisory Group (IPAG) and local charities.
19. The IPAG has recently restructured and there are now 12 District IPAGs feeding into a County IPAG. The District IPAGs are establishing their membership and holding inaugural meetings. Hate crime is an area of particular focus and disability hate crime will be the first theme at the January 2016 County IPAG.
20. The Force works with a charity (MCCH) to deliver the Jigsaw project which aims to raise awareness and reporting of hate crime against those with a learning disability or autism. To date, 287 officers and staff have received awareness training as well as Victim Support court staff, the CPS and local Magistrates. The Office of the Commissioner has recently provided funding to the Jigsaw project enabling the roll-out of up to 40 third-party reporting hubs across Kent – the aim is to have ten hubs in place by Christmas 2015.

**From:** Ann Barnes, Kent Police and Crime Commissioner  
**To:** Kent and Medway Police and Crime Panel  
**Subject:** Financial Planning for 2016/17 Onwards  
**Item & Date:** Item B3 17 November 2015

**Financial Context:**

1. Kent Police is already an efficient Force, graded as 'good' by HMIC for its financial management overall, including 'outstanding' for financial planning in particular. The current year budget is £306.5m with some two thirds of funding coming in the form of government grant and around one quarter from the police element of the Council Tax; with each 1% increase raising £800,000 (the remainder is local fees and charges). On the spend side some 80% is pay related.
2. There is considerable uncertainty about the scale of the financial challenge, but conceivably this could see a range of grant cuts between 25% to 40% over the next four years plus possible new formula distribution changes which could make our position more or less worse than the average. In the midst of the uncertainty we are currently assuming real cuts of around 28% over the 4 year period, equating to further savings of £62.2m between 2016/17 and 2019/20, with an assumed £15.4m required for 2016/17. All of this is on top of the £61.4m savings the Force has already made since the Spending Review 2010.
3. As part of the strategy, the Commissioner intends to allow the Force to smooth the impact of the savings by using £5.5m of earmarked reserves over the period. This permits the Force more time to design and implement the changes necessary to achieve the savings requirement and deals specifically with a particular hike in savings required next year due to changes in employer National Insurance costs.
4. On that basis, this report outlines the current plans for next year and identifies the key themes being adopted to develop medium term saving plans. In the latter case, these will be familiar from the 'Delivering value for money' paper presented at the June Panel meeting. Overall, the lack of planning certainty makes it very difficult to confirm specific plans at this stage; especially for the medium term. The guiding principle remains minimising front line impact as far as possible, including taking front line savings last, but based on certainty as to the precise grant available over the next four years.
5. The savings above assume the continuation of a 2% increase in the police element of the Council Tax in line with the published Police and Crime Plan. Without this, the savings required would increase by some £1.6m per year, or £6.4m over the period. That current planning assumption remains my intent in line with the published plan, but also reflects the fact that current regulations make it effectively impossible to have a meaningful discussion with residents about a greater increase to help mitigate even further savings. The current police precept element for an average band D property in Kent is £147.15. This is one of the lowest in the country and a 2% increase equates to an extra 6p per week on a Band D home.
6. The details of the Spending Review are due to be announced on the 25 November 2015. This announcement will specify the total funding available to the police service nationally, but will not break it down to force level, nor show the extent of any prior top slicing by the Home Office or the local impact of any formula changes. The actual level of grant funding will remain unknown by all forces until Friday 18 December.
7. The Commissioner will be holding a 'Policing in Austerity' conference on 9 December and Panel members are very welcome to attend.

**Outline Savings Plans for 2016/17:**

8. At this stage, the Force plans to achieve the year 1 target of £15.4m through the following savings:
  - £2.4m - Non Pay efficiencies.
  - £3.2m - Restructuring and layering local policing.
  - £2.0m - Restructuring and further efficiency measures in the joint Serious Crime Directorate.
  - £2.9m - Further efficiency and collaboration in Support Services.
  - £1.2m - Restructuring and other efficiency initiatives in the Force Control Room.
  - £2.5m - Further assumed staff turnover.
  - £1.3m - Other miscellaneous.

9. It would be wrong to trivialise the above, as any potential savings in support services or from restructuring/layering will inevitably have consequences for the individuals concerned. Although in outline, as can be seen, the aim at least for next year is to absolutely minimise the impact of savings on front line policing. However, it will be impossible to avoid these over the medium term given the likely scale of the challenge.

### **Medium Term Planning:**

10. The 'Delivering value for money' paper presented at the June Panel meeting summarised the key strategies that the Chief Constable was pursuing to develop his medium term savings plan options. They remain valid and are the corner stone of internal re-modelling, but as mentioned, in the absence of grant certainty for the medium term it is extremely difficult to publish specific meaningful plans for the as yet unconfirmed financial gap. This would neither be fair to staff or the communities they serve; however it will be obvious that possible savings of over £60m in the next four years will inevitably have a major impact on Kent Police's structure, organisation and services. The Chief Constable's operational requirement to deliver services based on threat, risk and harm, allied to his and the Commissioner's shared vision of protecting neighbourhood policing and putting victims at the heart of processes are the three over-arching priorities.
11. For this reason, in developing options for the medium term, the Chief Constable is pursuing a number of strategies that the Commissioner fully endorses. These can be broadly summarised as follows:
- Demand management. The intention is to better understand demand on police time to free up as much as possible for front line policing. This includes the development of a new website to shift appropriate demand online.
  - Effective partnerships. Both the Commissioner and Chief Constable are actively engaging with key partners across the county to ensure demand is managed by the appropriate agency.
  - Technology and innovation. As well as a new website, major initiatives such as body worn video, tablets, new core systems like Athena, and digitalisation generally, are all designed to make more effective use of officer time and help minimise the impact of savings on front line policing.
  - Efficiency and effectiveness challenges. This is across all activities from best use of estate and transport to the best approach for responding to new threats and risks in an efficient and effective way.
  - Collaboration. A key aspect of planned savings options going forward, particularly in relation to the now established Support Services Directorate and Serious Crime Directorate with Essex, but also with potential other partners.
  - Staffing. Crucially, as much in terms of supporting the right culture and skills, as in the challenges of responding to potential new ways of working with reduced budgets.

### **Latest Funding Formula Position:**

12. Since the Panel last met, the Home Office have published a further round of consultation on proposals for a simplified new formula for distributing the national police grant. To an extent, it provided exemplifications of impact which was one of the major criticisms of the first round. Whilst this is to be commended, it still lacks clarity on the proposals for London, which because of scale, means the position for all forces could change significantly.
13. At this stage, the impact of the new formula for Kent would be a marginal gain. However, the major caveat remains that it is the absolute impact of the 25% to 40% cut from the Spending Review which is the major threat to police funding. Any new formula has the effect of making that average grant position more or less worse in each local area. Please find attached the commissioner's response to the second round of consultation.
14. Very latest position - on Friday 6 November, the Home Office advised all Commissioners that they had made an error in the exemplification of the formula for each Force area. The impact of the error appears to result in significant shifts in possible 'winners and losers'. On Monday 9 November, the Minister announced there would be no new formula for 2016/17 and instead, working with the sector, the intention is to introduce a new formula probably for 2017/18.

Rt Hon Mike Penning MP  
Minster of State for Policing, Crime, Criminal  
Justice and Victims  
Home Office  
2 Marsham Street  
London  
SW1P 4DF

27 October 2015  
Ref: OPCC/GC/274/15  
*Please quote reference on all replies*

*Dear Mike,*

### **Consultation on reform of police funding arrangements in England and Wales**

I write in relation to your letter of 8<sup>th</sup> October. I refer you to my response to your first consultation and my comments below draw on that.

I welcome the fact you have now released exemplifications. As you know, that was a key concern about the first round of consultation. In the interest of Force areas like Kent, I am also pleased that you have decided to remove completely the crude Band D tax base indicator from the model. As you know I was most concerned that would be a double penalty to areas like Kent with above average tax base but below average precept.

I note the two other changes you now propose, namely, inclusion of a new Area Cost Adjustment factor and the change to the bars indicator. The impact for Kent is not completely clear, because of the changes in factor weights and lack of detail. On the surface it appears the former (i.e. ACA) is a modest positive for Kent and the later ('bars squared') is a modest negative. It is clear however that the large Metropolitan Forces are significant beneficiaries as a result of the bars indicator adjustment. This to me seems unjustified and further work around this indicator is urgently required. However, more fundamentally it raises the question on how such significant changes came about using 'Principal Component Analysis' in the second consultation but were not brought to the fore by the technique the first time round.

Looking forward it would be most concerning if the hoped for stability in the formula was undermined by additions or changes in the model each year depending upon ministerial discretion and/or the particular lobbying of the moment. What policing needs is certainty to plan accurately for the future. While I do commend the release of exemplifications, I remain deeply concerned about the lack of clarity around the position for MOPAC. If the revised approach to the "NICC" process has the effect of largely compensating MOPAC for its apparent loss in the formula exemplifications you show, that will be very disappointing in the context of the transparency and expectation of relative formula gain and loss that your letter appears to wish to promote. In short, given its

scale, a significant NICC top-slice significantly reduces the relative gain and increases the relative loss for all other forces.

More generally, I regret your letter has not dealt with the broader concerns I set out in my first response. In particular:

- It remains difficult to comment on transition except to observe that some transition will be needed. However, it must relate to the total cash effect of the Spending Review, reallocations (i.e. top-slice) and formula changes. In addition, local reserves held for valid local risks and transformational investment cannot be spent twice to support formula transition.
- As well as the lack of clarity on NICCs, I remain concerned about other possible but not yet detailed “re-allocations” which affects the level of top-slice and thus increase financial pressure locally.
- The hoped for prospect of a fundamental and wide ranging review of police funding seems to be fading. The current review is narrowly focused on the formula only.
- There remains a lack of clarity in how possible, if not likely, changes in the national, regional and local policing offer are allowed for in the new formula arrangements.

In conclusion, on a separate but related matter, I would like to commend the Home Secretary's opening up the debate within Government, of greater council tax flexibility for policing, in her recent letter to Nick Allston. From this I know the APCC (Finance Group) will be responding direct. I merely wish to emphasise that from my perspective as the Police and Crime Commissioner for Kent, with one of the lowest precepts in the country, localism is best served by allowing local residents a more meaningful choice between council tax rises and service impacts, than is currently the case. If nothing else those Force areas with well below average precepts like Kent should be allowed more flexibility because of that fact. I would be more than happy for these sentiments to be shared with Treasury.

*Best wishes,*

*Ann*

**Ann Barnes**  
**Kent Police & Crime Commissioner**

**From:** Ann Barnes, Kent Police and Crime Commissioner  
**To:** Kent and Medway Police and Crime Panel  
**Subject:** Commissioner's Key Decisions – October 2015  
**Item & Date:** Item C1 17 November 2015

**Decision:** Approval for Kent Police to evaluate unmanned aircraft (commonly referred to as drones) to support policing activity.

**Justification:** Recognising the financial challenge and also developments in technology, the use of drones may enable the expansion of air operations in a safe and cost effective way, helping to further protect communities from harm. In particular, there may be benefits in using drones to assist officers in searching large areas quickly (e.g. locating vulnerable missing persons) using aerial photography and thermal imaging equipment.

**Decision:** To commence the procurement of a new Integrated Communications Control System (ICCS) for emergency call handling within the Force Control Room and allocate funding in the 2016/17 Capital Programme.

**Justification:** The Emergency Services Mobile Communications Project (ESMCP) is a national Home Office project which will replace the current Airwave technology with a new Emergency Services network combining voice and data functionality. One implication is the requirement for every force to upgrade their ICCS for emergency call handling to be ESMCP compliant.

**Decision:** To submit a response to the second round of consultation on proposed changes to the Home Office Funding Formula.

**Justification:** To challenge some technical aspects of the formula and on behalf of residents, promote their interests and seek to influence the funding Kent receives to ensure the best outcome for the future of policing in the county.

**This page is intentionally left blank**

**Police and Crime Panel Forward work programme (as at 17<sup>th</sup> November)****2<sup>nd</sup> February 2016**

Draft Police and Crime plan 2016/17	Statutory requirement
Precept proposal 2016/17	Statutory requirement
HMIC PEEL report on Force performance and Force finance	Requested by Chairman
Panel Annual report	Requested by Chairman
Youth engagement work – progress report	Agreed by Panel 2/6/15

**12<sup>th</sup> April 2016**

Review of PCC term of office	Requested by Chairman
------------------------------	-----------------------

**14<sup>th</sup> June 2016**

Election of Chairman and Vice-Chairman	Annual requirement
Complaints against the PCC and policy review	Report by Panel officers
PCC's Annual report 2015/16	Statutory requirement
Agree procedure for selecting Independent Members by Nov. 2016	Statutory requirement

**8<sup>th</sup> September 2016**

Accounts 2015/16	Statutory requirement
Review of Panel Communications Protocol	Review agreed by Panel (report by Panel officers)
Impact of PCC's work with the business community	Requested by Panel Sept 2015

**15<sup>th</sup> November 2016**

Budget planning for 2017/18	Requested by Panel
-----------------------------	--------------------

Items to note at each meeting

Commissioner's decisions

Commissioner's forward plan of decisions

Governance Board minutes

On a date to be determined

Update on rural crime (offered by PCC Sept 2015)

Update on cyber-crime (offered by PCC Sept 2015)

Document is Restricted

**This page is intentionally left blank**