

Minutes

Minutes of the Thames Valley Police and Crime Panel held on Friday 25 September 2015, in Council Chamber Wokingham Borough Council Civic Offices Shute End Wokingham Berkshire RG40 1BN, commencing at 11.00 am and concluding at 1.52 pm.

Members Present

Julia Adey (Councillor, Wycombe District Council), Margaret Burke (Councillor, Milton Keynes Council), Emily Culverhouse (Councillor, Chiltern District Council), Trevor Egleton (Councillor, South Bucks District Council), Ms Julia Girling (Co-opted Member), Jesse Grey (Councillor, Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead), Mr Curtis-James Marshall (Co-opted Member), Bob Pitts (Councillor, Wokingham Borough Council), George Reynolds (Councillor, Cherwell District Council), Dee Sinclair (Councillor, Oxford City Council) and Quentin Webb (Councillor, West Berkshire Council)

Officers Present

Helen Fincher and Clare Gray

Others Present

David Carroll (Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner), Francis Habgood (Chief Constable), Paul Hammond (Chief Executive of the Office of the PCC), Dr Shona Morrison (Office of the PCC) and Ian Thompson (CFO and Deputy Chief Executive, Office of the PCC)

Apologies

Patricia Birchley (Councillor, Buckinghamshire County Council), Robert Courts (Councillor, West Oxfordshire District Council), Angela Macpherson (Councillor, Aylesbury Vale District Council), Kieron Mallon (Councillor, Oxfordshire County Council), Chris McCarthy (Councillor, Vale of White Horse District Council), Iain McCracken (Councillor, Bracknell Forest Council), Tony Page (Councillor, Reading Borough Council), Anthony Stansfeld (Thames Valley Police and Crime Commissioner) and Ian White (Councillor, South Oxfordshire District Council)

1. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

2. Minutes

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 17 July 2015 were agreed as a correct record subject to the following changes:-

- Julia Adey was present at the meeting
- In relation to the item on taxi licensing Dee Sinclair had expressed concern about taxis entering the city from another area and trading when they were not licensed to do so.

3. Public Question Time

There were no public questions.

4. Victims Commissioning Update

A presentation was given by the Policy Manager Dr Shona Morrison from the OPCC. During the presentation the following points were made:-

Introduction

- The Government consultation, *'Getting it Right for Victims and Witnesses'*, concluded that victims should experience high quality support tailored according to need and that this would be best achieved through a mixed economy of local and national commissioning. Within this new landscape for victims' services commissioning, the MoJ will remain responsible for providing some services at a national level, while PCCs will become responsible for commissioning the majority of emotional and practical support services for victims of crime in their local areas from October 2014.
- In December 2013, the Ministry of Justice began issuing grants to PCCs under the **Domestic Violence, Crime and Victims Act 2004** to support the development of local commissioning of victims services, including Restorative Justice (RJ). The initial tranche of funding received in December 2013 (2013/14 Victims Funding) was followed by further funding in 2014 (2014/15 Victims Funding).
- The **Ministry of Justice** (MoJ) will continue to commission a witness service, a homicide service, support for victims of human trafficking, support for victims of rape through rape support centres, some national telephone help-lines for victims, and some locally-based services through competitive grant funding arrangements, for example, to support male victims of rape and serious sexual assault.
- The **Victims Code** stipulates what each criminal justice agency must do for victims, and the timeframe in which they must do it. It tells victims exactly what they can expect from the criminal justice system, and allows them to hold the system to account if they don't get the service to which they are entitled.
- The **Victims Commissioning Framework** is guidance provided to support PCCs commissioning activity in relation to the victims funding.
- The **Victims' Directive** (2012/29) of the European Parliament establishes minimum standards on the rights, support and protection of victims of crime. This is regardless of whether they report the crime to the police.

2013/14 Funding

The conditions of funding expressed to PCCs by the MoJ in relation to the 2013/14 Victims Funding were to:-

- Build Restorative Justice (RJ) capacity in the PCC area and, where capacity is sufficient, fund RJ activity.
- Build the capacity and capability of wider Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise (VCSE) support providers in advance of local commissioning, and
- Prepare the Office of the PCC for local commissioning.

2014/15 Funding

Conditions of the 2014/15 Victims Funding require the PCC to provide or commission:-

- services for victims of crime and particularly victims in the priority categories outlined in the Victims' Code to help them cope with the immediate impacts of crime and, as far as possible, recover from the harm they have experienced,
- services for victims of sexual and/or domestic violence,
- support services for family members, and
- any associated costs that arise in the process of commissioning/provision of victims' services.

Total Funding Available

Funding does not include areas such as Anti Social Behaviour and victims of road traffic accidents.

- 2013/14 Victims Grant - £844,092 (of which approx £600k was available for the first phase grants for victims services and RJ).
- 2014/15 Victims Grant - £793,365 (this excludes the funding top sliced by MoJ to extend grant funding for the organisation 'Victim Support' until SE PCCs commissioned the 'non-specialist' service from April 2015).
- 2015/16 Victims Grant - £2,467,000 (to cover full costs of the regional 'referral mechanism', local 'non-specialist' support, victim-centred/pre-sentence RJ services, and local specialist services).
- In addition there was some unexpected funding from the MoJ relating to bids being submitted to supplement the 2014/15 grant; two of the four bids were successful. This gave an extra £750,000 but created a pressure as the funding had to be spent by the end of March 2015.

PCC Commissioning Intentions

The PCC has agreed to six broad Commissioning Principles which are outlined below:-

- The PCC will work towards introducing fully commissioned services by April 2015, informed through the 'cycle of commissioning' advocated by the MoJ Framework which includes the four-stage process (i) Understand (ii) Plan (iii) Do, and (iv) Review.
- Using a range of methodologies, the PCC will seek to comprehensively understand the needs of victims in Thames Valley.
- The commissioning approach will be consultative to ensure the views of potential provider organisations, particularly those from the third sector, help to inform the PCC's priorities well in advance of the commissioning process.
- Prior to commissioning, the PCC will commit to investing in the capability of the provider base, particularly those working with victims of the most serious crime, those persistently targeted or vulnerable and intimidated victims.
- The PCC will carry out outcome-focussed commissioning, providing services to achieve two high level outcomes
 - to help victims **cope** with the initial impact of crime, and
 - to subsequently **recover** from the harm experienced.
- Good governance arrangements will be established to ensure the commissioning process and funding decisions are accountable, transparent and well-informed.

In looking at commissioning the following areas supported the process:-

- MoJ advice and guidance
- Public contract principles
- A fair and transparent process
- Open to the market
- Identifying gaps in services
- Research including interviews being held with local stakeholders, providers and focus groups with victims of crime such as business crime, under 16's, parents, victims of burglary, Berkshire Women's Aid
- Work was undertaken with the Local Criminal Justice Victims and Witnesses Group to provide a forum for a Commissioning Reference Group and to help support good decision making.

Needs Assessment

The following activities supported the Needs Assessment process:-

- A mapping exercise was undertaken of what services already existed. Advice was also sought from external authorities.
- Market engagement events
- Seeking comments from groups of providers – this was quite unusual and had not been carried out in other areas but had been included as good practice in the EU Regulations.
- Opportunities were sought to join forces and consider bidding for contracts on a Thames Valley wide basis
- There is a statutory requirement of the Victims Code to provide automatic referrals with police data being transferred to relevant organisations. The PCC commissioned an overarching victim referral mechanism and onward support (replacing the existing national, MoJ funded, service provided by Victim Support). This was required under the EU Directive and the MoJ conditions of funding for 2015/16. This service is co-commissioned with two other PCCs in the SE Region (Surrey and Sussex) and the contract specification will take into account advice issued by the MoJ and the National Victims Commissioning Reference Group (made up of a small number of PCCs from across England and Wales).

Commissioning specialist services

Local commissioning of specialist services for victims in the Thames Valley by the PCC, including RJ services, involved a 3 step process:-

- (1) First Phase - Victims and RJ Grants competition (May 2014),
- (2) Second Phase - Victims and RJ Grants competition (Sept 2014), and
- (3) Contract tendering for commissioned services (Oct 2014 to Mar 2015)

The criteria for the second round of grant funding closely reflected the emerging priorities of the PCC, highlighted through the Victims Needs Assessment and other consultation activity undertaken by the PCC. The services funded through the second phase of grant funding was expected to develop and align delivery in preparation for bidding and delivering commissioned services from April 2015.

All grant funding has to be regarded as one-off funding without any guarantee that further funding will be available.

In November 2014 Victim Support were given a three year contract with the opportunity to extend two years.

In terms of the EU tender exercise evaluation criteria were used with an Evaluation Panel with internal and external panellists including a subject matter expert, Youth Offending Team Manager, a representative from the NHS and Thames Valley Police. All services are now in place with the final contract commencing on 1 October 2015.

Referral and Reporting

- Hate Crime – the contract with MK Equality Council provides an excellent, proactive service, including linking in with the Hate Crime Network and aims to increase the reporting of Hate Crime by promoting and working with organisations who may be presented with victims of hate crime and may not be aware of its definition. They will provide training and education of professionals and carers to improve their knowledge and understanding to help improve ‘third party’ reporting.
- Coping and Recovery (MoJ terminology) – need to provide high level outcomes in order for victims to cope with the experience and to recover and move forwards.
- Local support services ‘Victim Support’ to provide emotional and practical support. This area relies on volunteer support who require specialist training in a number of areas.
- Specialist services are required for young victims where there are currently long waiting lists and high thresholds. Three focus groups were held with young victims and some young people who have experienced serious crimes such as sexual and domestic violence and need to be able to feel safe.

- There are two organisations which can help young people with sexual violence – the Independent Sexual Violence Advisory Service (16 +) or the Young Victims Service (8-17 years) but this depends on what service the victim would like to access. The ISVAS would co-locate with the police eventually (Sexual Assault Referral Centre) where there are specially trained officers. There will be more outreach work including liaison with sexual health clinics.
- Domestic Violence and Complex Needs – there is a bespoke piece of work being carried out to map out and identify gaps in the Thames Valley also looking at young victims. Buckinghamshire County Council has conducted some good research into this area looking at the links between substance misuse, mental health and domestic violence which has been included in national research. There were also links with children on Child Protection Plans and domestic violence. Some of these victims are passed from one organisation to another and are sent to refuges but because of their chaotic lives are not able to fit in with other residents and become disruptive, are then refused access and return home to an abusive situation. A pilot project has been commissioned to support complex victims by keeping them in refuges with additional services provided and this pilot would last for 18 months and then be evaluated and if successful, commissioned for a longer period.
- Restorative Justice - there is a requirement that funding would be allocated to PCCs to commission victim-initiated RJ and pre-sentence RJ services. Judges can defer sentences to let RJ intervention take place if both parties agree. The organisation used by Thames Valley has international recognition and has also been able to obtain some significant grant funding. RJ is used for neighbourhood disputes but its original intention was to deal with a wide spectrum of offences including serious crimes such as murder. RJ also includes the perpetrators and victims family.
- Independent Trauma Advisory Service for Exploitation/Slavery – two new areas have been piloted in Reading and Oxford. There is an ongoing piece of work with the Counselling Hub to improve counselling provision in the Thames Valley. There is a referral mechanism to an appropriate counsellor which is unique to Thames Valley.

The Chairman thanked Dr Shona Morrison for an extremely informative presentation and the following points were made through questioning :-

- Quentin Webb asked about the governance for ensuring that the **quality** of the service was good? There are contract management procedures and each of the contracts has a dedicated contracts manager. There is a **Performance Management Framework** that derives outcomes with an outcome focussed approach. The Performance data is agreed with providers and there is an audit each year with some areas looked at in depth such as good practice or areas of concern. A Peer Review could also be used to provide expertise and advice on improvements.
- Jesse Grey referred to what **external subject matter experts** were used to help the commissioning process. Dr Morrison had been on a contract management course and was part of the Cabinet Office Commissioning Academy. A commissioning network had also been set up and there were regular meetings where good practice was shared on a regional basis.
- In response to a question from Bob Pitts on **hard to reach groups** Members noted that officers had agreed to focus on some specific groups such as victims and young people. There were strategies for each of those groups and officers would attend events to reach out to those groups. They were also working on a Victims Website which would be linked to the PCC website and this would advise people how to make referrals and to obtain feedback from victims on services. Surrey and Thames Valley would be undertaking a satisfaction survey. Local authorities are also asked to inform the OPCC of issues in relation to victims of crime and the commissioning of services. They were also looking specifically at people with Learning Disabilities.
- There was a red RAG rating showing in the PCC's Strategic Delivery Plan in relation to **engagement with the public** and this was being addressed through the website mentioned above and also working with new providers. It was important to engage with the public to understand their concerns in order to improve future services.
- Curtis James Marshall asked whether Dr Morrison would be able to speak to a local charity about the commissioning of services in relation to domestic violence. However, because the OPCC was

Thames Valley wide there was a capacity issue in dealing with individual organisations as they were a small office with a limited amount of resources.

- In terms of **statistics on victims** Margaret Burke was informed that this information was available including cluster patterns.
- Dee Sinclair expressed concern about **grant funding** and the ability for small organisations to remain viable with no future certainty. She made reference to the Making Changes Programme which was a voluntary community programme for men who perpetrate violence and abuse towards women and to learn appropriate ways to manage their emotions; this Programme was struggling with funding. A number of organisations were grant funded with fixed term contracts and if they provided successful services they could obtain future funding. Services would need to expand and contract according to need. The Independent Trauma Advisory Service had undertaken pilots in Reading and Oxford and had obtained further funding from the Police Innovation Fund. The Commissioning Process was to understand, plan, do and review. Services should not continue if their evaluation was not positive. In response to the Making Changes Programme the PCC supports projects which involve perpetrators and help crime reduction. However, funding streams were limited and other areas of funding could be used such as the Local Authority Community Safety Fund. There was also a Police Property Act Fund and bids could be submitted to reduce reoffending.
- Dee Sinclair informed Members that 10th – 17th October was **National Hate Crime Awareness Week** and it was important to actively raising awareness of hate crime and promote the Thames Valley service throughout the week. #WeStandTogether is a national hashtag used for hate crime. There was also a conference on **Exploring Restorative Justice in Domestic Abuse and Sexual Violence Cases** on 18 November 2015 which was being run by Oxford City Council.
- Julia Girling reported that she provided **witness support** and expressed concern that some victims were advised not to seek counselling until their case had been heard which could take up to two years or more. She emphasised the importance of having a key relationship with the police. Dr Morrison reported that victims are given numerous contacts through different agencies and there was a national problem about having a seamless journey through the process and it was important for all relevant agencies to liaise closely and to ensure that the process was streamlined. Another issue was the take up of support offered. A more holistic way of working needed to be identified. Julia Girling commented that if strong support was given by the police this made a huge difference to the quality of evidence given at court.

The Deputy PCC reported that it would be helpful for a letter to be written on this area by the Panel which he could then discuss at his next meeting with the Local Criminal Justice System.

Action: JG/TE/Committee Advisor

- Julia Adey asked about the **consistency and priorities of services** across the Thames Valley. Dr Morrison reported that opportunities had been sought to join forces and bid for contracts on a Thames valley wide basis to ensure consistency. All victims were vulnerable but priorities such as child sexual exploitation and sexual violence had been addressed. The needs assessment had also ensured consistency of service. There were bespoke pieces of work being undertaken and the website was being developed to gain feedback from victims on any concerns about services or gaps in the market. There was also an outreach capacity. The audit and performance data would also provide good information on service provision and also where victims are presenting from and who chooses to take up services and who doesn't. Some people may not take up a service straight away but years later. There were currently no waiting lists as many of the services were new and they would promote services once they were fully in place. They would utilise national promotions such as Hate Crime Awareness Week to advertise services.
- Julia Girling asked about the number of **Restorative Justice Conferences**. Dr Morrison reported that this was the first service that had been commissioned but was still relatively new and the numbers so far were not high (they were in double figures). Restorative Justice was more about a qualitative rather than a quantitative service and a number of cases referred had not proceeded to a full conference. This may be because the offender was not willing to take part. Approximately 350 cases were identified per year.

- Jesse Grey asked about **training for police officers**, including on the Victims Code and also whether they were given a Victims Pack. The Chief Constable reported that they were given a lot of training and complied with the Code. In the pack there was a 'tear-off' sheet which gave victims key information and also information on the Witness Charter.

Dr Morrison was thanked for her excellent presentation and for the professional approach that she had undertaken to commissioning and monitoring outcomes.

5. Police and Crime Commissioner Annual Report

The Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner presented the PCC Annual Report and highlighted the following areas:-

- Multi agency Safeguarding Hubs had been put in place in Reading and Slough.
- Victims Commissioning was progressing well as evidenced by the earlier agenda item.
- Community Safety Fund was being spent on local priorities across the Thames Valley as shown by the graphs in the Annual Report.
- The Force had saved £58 million through efficiency savings and had further financial challenges ahead.
- The Thames Valley had the lowest spend on the OPCC, per head of population in the country.
- In terms of fighting crime, crime was at its lowest level in the last 25 years.
- A Complaints, Integrity and Ethics Panel had been set up to help improve public confidence in the professional standards, integrity and accountability of local policing.

The Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner paid tribute to the work of officers who supported him and the PCC. The following points and questions were put by Members:-

- Jesse Grey asked that whilst the Office of the PCC had the lowest spend did that have any implications for the PCC's increased responsibilities. The Deputy PCC reported that the current office establishment was fit for purpose to undertake the PCC's current range and level of service responsibilities.
- George Reynolds referred to the visibility of the police and emphasised the importance of reducing rural crime. He was concerned about police visibility in rural areas. The Deputy PCC commented that community policing was a priority although there were financial challenges ahead. The Chief Constable reported that a number of Special Constables had been recruited into the police force but that recruitment of Special Constables was picking up. There was also a review of Neighbourhood Policing which was focusing on protecting frontline services and was looking at different ways of helping visibility with a reducing budget. Technology had improved which meant that police officers did not have to travel back to police stations and used tablets so that they could maintain their presence on the street. Curtis James Marshall expressed concern about the Metropolitan Police Service who had reduced the number of Police Community Support Officers.
- Dee Sinclair commented that she felt that police officers should not attend lots of meetings but should be visible on the street instead and also in relation to rural crime that farmers should ensure that their farms were secure through using CESAR construction equipment security and registration rather than relying on the police. Most police officers now send written reports to local meetings to provide information to residents.
- Jesse Grey asked a question on whether the targets were challenging enough. Many of the national targets related to traditional crimes such as burglaries and a comment made by the previous Chief Constable had related to the need to concentrate on modern day crimes such as child sexual exploitation and terrorism rather than burglary where the offender had often left the scene by the time the police arrived. The Chief Constable reported that a proportionate response was required depending on the severity of the crime and the vulnerability of the victim.
- The Chairman reported that some of the graphs were difficult to read because of the shading used but otherwise welcomed the report and emphasised the need to keep the costs down in terms of its production and for promotion on the website. It was important for all Members to publicise this report.

Members welcomed the report.

6. OPCC Strategic Delivery Plan and Thames Valley Police Delivery Plan

The Panel received the OPCC Strategic Delivery Plan 2015/16 and the Force Performance Summary. There is no statutory requirement to produce and monitor delivery of the Plan during the year but it was helpful for Panel Members to receive these two reports to understand progress of delivery against the Police and Crime Plan objectives. Reports on performance were considered at the PCC Policy Planning and Performance Meeting (last meeting was on 30 July) and these agendas are available on the website. The Chief Constable presents his Force Performance summary to the PCC and targets are aligned to the Police and Crime Plan.

The following points were made during questioning:-

OPCC Strategic Delivery Plan

- There was a red rating in relation to the OPCC Strategic Delivery Plan in relation to developing options and recommendations for improving OPCC consultation and engagement with victims. The Chief Executive reported that further discussion was needed to tie in with new services now being trailed and commissioned. This would also be undertaken in relation to contract monitoring and performance management and the ability to look in depth at examples. There was also the development of the website for victims and the formalisation of the consultation strategy. The Chief Executive paid tribute to the work undertaken by Dr Morrison on Victims Commissioning who had built up these new services and developed a good commissioning process undertaking academic research and a full needs assessment. A number of workshops had also been held looking at the best models for the Thames Valley.
- The second red rating related to identifying hard to reach/less visible groups and undertaking targeted engagement activities which needed further investigation. The OPCC had identified priority groups to target in the first instance.
- The third red rating was to develop joint Community Safety Partnership working with partners to identify recommendations on Cyber Crime and PREVENT. The OPCC would work with the Force to help develop serious organised crime profiles. This target was now moving from red to amber. The Chief Constable reported that cyber crime was dealt with at a regional level so that officers were specially equipped to investigate crimes. There had been an inspection by HMIC which had been positive. Work was in place with other partners to help prevent exploitation.

Force Performance Summary

- Julia Adey commented on the volume of rape investigations which result in prosecution. From April to 13 July, 12 of the 357 rapes had resulted in offenders being charged or summonsed for the offence. The Chief Constable reported that rape cases were often complex with time delays and also depended on the quality of investigative files. The Crown Prosecution Service support victims through the process. The longer the case takes the more disengaged the victims become. There has been a significant increase in reporting since the Jimmy Savill case with some historic cases (one rape was recently reported dating back to 1946) and also increased confidence with reporting on domestic sexual abuse. This was a key priority where resources needed to be allocated, particularly officers with the right skills.
- Julia Girling made reference to a previous meeting where there had been a discussion about hiding apps on tablets to help vulnerable people, who were suffering from exploitation or abuse. The PCC himself had not developed any apps but they had been discussed at the Victims Commissioning Conference and at a previous meeting. The apps were designed for confidentiality.

Members welcomed the report.

7. Review of Complaints Ethics and Integrity Panel

The Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner presented his report on the Complaints Integrity and Ethics Panel. The report referred to the recent review on the structure and effectiveness of the Complaints Integrity and Ethics Panel. The purpose of the Panel was to provide a transparent forum that monitors and encourages constructive challenge over the way complaints and integrity, ethics and professional standards issues, are handled by the Force and overseen by the PCC. It was important to have independent people on board who could be seen as the voice of residents within the Thames Valley. The Chief Constable reported that he was pleased that this had been set up which influenced changes internally and provided constructive challenge to the way things are done.

Quentin Webb asked about the transparency of the meeting. The Deputy PCC reported that the minutes of the Panel meetings are reported to the PCC's Policy Planning and Performance meetings and are available on the PCC website. Members of the Joint Independent Audit Committee attend meetings of the Panel to observe proceedings in order to inform its assurance assessment of this area of governance. The meeting is not held in public as it deals with confidential information about individuals.

Members welcomed the report.

8. Committee of Standards of Public Life 'Tone from the Top'

At the last meeting there was an action to compare the current arrangements of the PCC and the Panel to look at ways in which further good practice could be implemented to promote high ethical standards, good leadership and accountability in policing following the recent report from the Committee on Standards in Public Life. A report was attached to the agenda from the Scrutiny Officer.

As a response was not required by the Chairman of the Committee on Standards in Public Life until 29 November Members agreed that this item should be considered at the November meeting once a formal response from the PCC had been made.

9. General Issues

Quentin Webb referred to the Proposal on the provision of court and tribunal estate in England and Wales which was out to consultation. One of the courts listed in the document was the West Berkshire (Newbury) Magistrates' Court which was being considered because closure is proposed and integration is planned. The OPCC will be responding to the consultation.

Dee Sinclair referred to the financial sustainability of police forces in England (National Audit Office report) and expressed concern about frontline policing. She also referred to inadequate information being presented to Court which would have an impact on prosecutions. Reference was also made to the Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 which will enable the police, local councils, social landlords and other agencies to better tackle anti-social behaviour, and enable victims and communities to feel safe in their own homes and neighbourhoods. The Chairman reported that this could be a future Work Programme Item.

Action: Committee Adviser

The Chief Executive reported that local policing was critical and that the PCC was concerned about future funding and was meeting with MPs shortly to discuss this and what impact changes in funding would have on the Thames Valley. The Office would hear in December what their reduced level of Police Grant allocation for 2016/17 would be and whether there were any changes to the Police Grant Funding Formula. They were currently having a dialogue with the Home Office. The new formula would commence in April 2016. There was a concern that the Government was not aware of the ramifications of funding cuts on sustainable local policing.

Margaret Burke referred to the delays for adopters and foster carers relating to the Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS). In addition she expressed concern about the increase in rough sleeping and the consultation in relation to integrating the police and fire station in Bletchley. The Chief Constable reported that rough sleeping

was a Local Authority responsibility. In terms of the Disclosure and Barring Service he reported that there had been an unexpected increase in the request for checks combined with losing staff in this area. They were looking at additional resources. In terms of the consultation on the station at Bletchley they were moving the position of the station but not removing the service. A memorandum of understanding had been signed by the Force and Fire and Rescue to look at co-locating services. Margaret Burke commented that her concern was the position of the station in relation to traffic management issues.

The Chairman referred to an example in his area where a child had gone missing a number of times and had incurred costs to the police of £150,000 and the lack of response of his neighbouring authority. The Chief Constable reported that it was important to work in partnership to address these issues.

In answer to a question on CCTV there had been a long consultation. Meetings were being held across Buckinghamshire, Berkshire and Oxfordshire to progress this.

10. Work Programme

The Work Programme was noted. An additional item was added to the November meeting to hold a Confirmation Hearing for the Deputy PCC to extend his contract for five months, to the end of the PCC's current tenure of office.

Members were informed that from the beginning of November the Host Authority for the Police and Crime Panel would be South Bucks District Council.

11. Date and Time of Next Meeting

27 November 2015 at 11am.

CHAIRMAN