

Minutes

Minutes of the Thames Valley Police and Crime Panel held on Friday 17 June 2016, in Diamond Room, Aylesbury Vale District Council, The Gateway, Gatehouse Road, Aylesbury Bucks HP19 8FF, commencing at 11.00 am and concluding at 1.30 pm.

Members Present

Councillor Julia Adey (Wycombe District Council), Councillor Patricia Birchley (Buckinghamshire County Council), Councillor Margaret Burke (Milton Keynes Council), Councillor Sandy Lovatt (Vale of White Horse District Council), Councillor Tony Ilott (Cherwell District Council), Councillor Emily Culverhouse (Chiltern District Council), Councillor Trevor Egleton (South Bucks District Council), Julia Girling (Independent Member), Councillor Angela Macpherson (Aylesbury Vale District Council), Councillor Kieron Mallon (Oxfordshire County Council), Curtis-James Marshall (Independent Member), Councillor Iain McCracken (Bracknell Forest Council), Councillor Barrie Patman (Wokingham Borough Council), Councillor Dee Sinclair (Oxford City Council), Councillor Paul Sohal (Slough Borough Council), Councillor Quentin Webb (West Berkshire Council) and Councillor Ian White (South Oxfordshire District Council)

Officers Present

Clare Gray

Others Present

Andy Boyd (Thames Valley Police), Anthony Brain (Reading Borough Council), Phil Dart (Buckinghamshire County Council), Francis Habgood (Thames Valley Police), Paul Hammond (Office of the PCC), Susan Powell (West Berks Council), Anthony Stansfeld (PCC), Garry Tallett (Slough Borough Council), Ian Thompson (Office of the PCC) and Richard Webb (Oxfordshire County Council Fire and Rescue Service)

Apologies

Councillor Derek Sharp (Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead), Councillor Robert Courts (West Oxfordshire District Council) and Councillor Tony Page (Reading Borough Council)

41. Election of Chairman

RESOLVED

That Mr T Egleton be elected Chairman of the Thames Valley Police and Crime Panel for the ensuing year.

42. Appointment of Vice-Chairman

RESOLVED

That Mr K Mallon be appointed Vice-Chairman of the Thames Valley Police and Crime Panel for the ensuing year.

43. Changes in Membership

The following changes in Membership were reported:-

Cllr Tony Ilott replaced Cllr George Reynolds representing Cherwell District Council
Cllr Sandy Lovatt replaced Cllr Chris McCarthy representing Vale of White Horse District Council
Cllr Derek Sharp replaced Cllr Jesse Grey representing Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead
Cllr Paul Sohal replaced Cllr Sabia Hussain representing Slough Borough Council
Cllr Barrie Patman replaced Cllr Bob Pitts representing Wokingham Borough Council

44. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

45. Minutes

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 11 March 2016 were agreed as a correct record subject to the following changes:-

Julia Adey gave her apologies for the meeting

Minute 33 – Domestic Violence

Cllr Dee Sinclair asked for an amendment to the minutes regarding funding for and benefits of perpetrator programmes. The recommendation related to whether there should be a Thames Valley Perpetrator Programme Co-ordinator and Cllr Sinclair emphasised the need to break the cycle of reoffending in Domestic Abuse cases so offender programmes should be given equal consideration in funding bids.

46. Public Question Time

There were no public questions.

47. Themed Item - Community Safety Partnerships and Neighbourhood Policing

The aim of this item was to look at the relationship of Community Safety Partnerships with the Panel and to specifically look at one area of CSP's which is Neighbourhood Policing. The Chairman welcomed three external witnesses to the meeting:-

Phil Dart Director for Communities Buckinghamshire County Council (BCC)

Richard Webb Head of Trading Standards and Community Safety Oxfordshire County Council Fire and Rescue Service (OCC)

Garry Tallett Community Safety Partnership Manager Slough Borough Council

Phil Dart, Director of Communities BCC provided Members with an update:-

- Community Safety Partnerships were introduced in the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 to be made up of 'responsible authorities' and some who sit as a result of local agreement. The

Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 made no significant amendments to the role and remit of CSPs, however it meant changes to their working context as funding for crime and disorder reduction would be funnelled through the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC).

- Buckinghamshire benefits from a clear partnership structure with long standing governance arrangements that complement the two-tier (County and District) authority environment. There is a Safer & Stronger Bucks Partnership Board, a Safer and Stronger Bucks Co-ordinating Group, three District Community Safety Partnerships and some thematic groups covering key priority areas. The Community Safety Partnership contains a number of statutory partners, and there is a commitment between them all to continue to work together to achieve better outcomes for the community.
- At a County level, there are roles that seek to ensure that there is a co-ordinated and complete response to the issues across the County where that is appropriate. There is also responsibility to deal with the issues that have been identified across the County with the statutory partners and also to provide support and add value to the resource and experience of partners in local District areas.
- The Safer and Stronger Bucks Partnership Board and the Community Safety Partnerships in Bucks continue to work together with colleagues from across Thames Valley to ensure that the Community Safety Partnership priorities are understood and help to shape the future Police and Crime Plan which the Police and Crime Commissioner will produce.
- A protocol has been produced to help define the distinct roles, responsibilities and governance arrangements for each of the Strategic Boards and Partnerships and how they work together to safeguard and promote the welfare of people living in Buckinghamshire.
- He was confident that that emerging themes in crime were covered by the strategic landscape and that the current Police and Crime Plan generally reflected priorities in the Thames Valley.

Richard Webb Head of Trading Standards and Community Safety OCC provided Members with an update:-

- The Oxfordshire Safer Communities Partnership elected-Member-led Board and Business Group are central to the framework of the partnership. The role of the Board is to identify and agree strategic community safety priorities that partners will address across Oxfordshire. This is a statutory function. Members of the Oxfordshire Safer Communities Partnership Board include strategic-level representatives of groups with a statutory responsibility for community safety, and groups key to shaping and delivering the community safety agenda.
- The role of the business group is non-statutory. It provides the Board with advice and guidance to assist it to fulfil its role and support delivery of the countywide priorities. This includes producing the strategic intelligence assessment; managing the business planning process; ensuring an information sharing protocol is in place and monitoring performance. This is an OSCP operational group made up of community safety managers from each district council area, senior police officers, senior officers from the fire service, probation, NHS and Public Health, prison service, and voluntary sector. There is continuing dialogue between the Member and Officer Group.
- The Partnership has recently undergone a review to ensure that it is in a strong position to meet the challenges ahead and to be more responsive to local communities. It also links in closely with Strategic Partnership Boards.

Garry Tallett, Community Safety Partnership Manager, Slough Borough Council reported that there was a different structure in Berkshire as they were all Unitary Authorities. Their planning and process

frameworks had a close link with all Strategic and Safeguarding Boards to ensure that they fulfilled all their statutory requirements.

During discussion the following questions were asked:-

Relationship between the Panel and Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs)

- Cllr Quentin Webb asked about how Community Safety Partnerships should engage with the Panel. Many Panel Members sit on CSP's so there is an effective mechanism for intelligence and data to be shared between the Panel, CSPs and Scrutiny Committees. Phil Dart reported that Buckinghamshire has an Officer Strategy Group which is regularly attended by a representative from the OPCC and the Deputy PCC. The Panel Chairman has also been recently invited to attend to ensure there is a stronger link between the CSPs and the Panel.
- Cllr Kieron Mallon referred to the report which included a link to West Yorkshire Police and Crime Panel rules of engagement with CSPs. He commented that Oxfordshire had an excellent relationship structure between partnerships therefore there was no need for rules of engagement as the Chairman of the CSPs and the Chairman of the Board all attended the Safer Oxfordshire Partnership and the Panel and communicated any areas of concern. He suggested that this relationship structure should be mirrored in the Thames Valley. Richard Webb reported that the elected Member-Led Oversight Committee not only included Panel representatives but also representatives from the PCC and the officer led Co-ordinating Group which they felt was the right structure to achieve good liaison. Garry Tallett reported that Berkshire did not have a Berkshire wide meeting but there was good liaison between Community Safety Partnership Managers across the County and the OPCC and Panel Members attended Community Safety Partnerships. However, the unitary system was more complicated with no overarching system.
- Phil Dart commented that whilst it was important to understand any gaps in oversight it was also important to ensure that there was no duplication between the partner organisations. He gave an example of the Prevent Duty which the Safer and Stronger Bucks Board were taking a lead on. Whilst it was important to keep other Partnership Boards informed on this area they needed to be clear on roles and responsibilities. He referred to the protocol which he had mentioned at the start of this item which mapped out arrangements to ensure that all gaps were plugged and any overlap identified.
- Cllr Barrie Patman reported that Panel Members had a good relationship with CSP partners and could feed any issues through the Panel Meeting in order to question the PCC. He gave an example of when the Panel looked at Female Genital Mutilation where local issues were discussed and action was taken by the Panel to write to Health and Wellbeing Boards.
- Cllr McCracken reported that in addition to many Cabinet Members sitting on the Panel they were also scrutinised by their own Council to ensure that they were being held to account for their own portfolio area.
- Cllr Margaret Burke reported that she did not sit on the Safer MK Partnership Board and that she would raise this issue with the Leader. The PCC also commented that it was important to have those links so that they could monitor how resources were being utilised.
Action: Cllr Burke
- Regular briefings were given to CSP Members and Chairman before the Panel meeting to ensure that any relevant issues were raised at the meeting.

Community Safety Funding

The PCC reported that in previous years he had provided funding to local authorities in the Thames Valley for community safety purposes. All Community Safety funded activities are aligned to relevant objectives within his Police and Crime Plan. However, the OPCC is exploring options for alternative distribution of the community safety fund in 2017/18 and later years. At present he was one of two PCCs that allocated their entire community safety budget to local authorities. He gave flexibility to how the funds are spent and managed with monitoring in place. In West Yorkshire the PCC chairs a force-wide CSP Forum, which collectively agrees how the grant monies will be spent for the benefit of local communities. He reported that he would be conducting a review and there will be a consultation on this in the Summer. Cllr Kieron Mallon reported that having a Forum would be easier to do in West Yorkshire as it was not as big as the Thames Valley. The PCC referred to Avon and Somerset who used a formula to ensure an equitable distribution of funding. Some areas had put a bidding process in place with pre determined criteria.

General Issues relating to CSPs

- Cllr Dee Sinclair referred to the Oxford City Annual Review which highlighted the challenges facing the city including children's safeguarding, the Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub and looking after younger vulnerable people. She asked what actions were being taken to address these issues? Richard Webb reported that each individual partnership organisation contributed and took a lead on issues such as extremism, hate crime, modern slavery etc and information is then shared with the Co-ordinating Group and the Board. In these Forums an assessment is then made by the Managers who attend on whether there were any gaps, ensuring there was good liaison with Safeguarding Boards, ensuring the right policies and procedures were in place and the right capacity to ensure that they were implemented effectively. Cllr Dee Sinclair commented that she was worried about children in care. Richard Webb commented that there were adult and children social care representatives on Community Safety Partnerships who had a good local knowledge and understanding. Local CSPs analysed local patterns and trends and voiced any concerns to the county-wide partnership. The Local Community Safety Partnerships supported good working relationships between relevant managers which included Local Police Area Commanders and Social Care Locality Managers.
- Cllr Patricia Birchley asked a similar question relating to vulnerable adults particularly with the pressure on resources. Phil Dart reported that vulnerable adults were a high priority within the Safer Bucks Plan. If resources are cut back they are prioritised to look after the most vulnerable. He referred to the work being carried out by the Local Police Area Commander in Chiltern and South Bucks on missing persons which affected a high proportion of adults. She was looking at the underlying cause of why people went missing in order to find a way to reduce repeat incidents which should free up further resources for other areas.
- Cllr Angela Macpherson asked how CSPs regularly engage and consult with the community about their priorities. Phil Dart reported that Buckinghamshire undertook extensive consultation across the County and community priorities had been reflected in the Safer Bucks Plan. They were now using modern technology to communicate with communities. Cllr Angela Macpherson emphasised the importance of robust engagement and that this should be reflected in their Plans.
- Cllr Paul Sohal asked a question about neighbourhood policing and whether there were any concerns about this. Garry Tallett reported that there was good partnership working on neighbourhood policing and that key priorities were being tackled and fed back at a strategic level particularly through the Strategic Assessment. Phil Dart reported that Buckinghamshire had strong links with Neighbourhood Policing Teams and they also had 19 Local Area Forums across the County which consisted of County, District, Town and Parish Councillors and

representatives from the police and fire service. Richard Webb reported that Oxfordshire had strong relationships with Local Police Area Commanders and key officers looking at any risks or issues relating to crime and community safety.

Neighbourhood Policing

Members noted that in 2014-15 Thames Valley Police Delivery Plan set an action to review the approach to Neighbourhood Policing in light of best practice nationally and emerging College of Policing evidence. The PCC reported that a strong emphasis within the review was that policing services should be designed to meet, and better manage demand but that neighbourhood policing still remained a priority.

Chief Superintendent Andy Boyd, Head of Neighbourhood Policing and Partnerships reported that this Strategy had been presented at a College of Policing Conference on Local Policing and was also used as part of a central input to the International Police Leadership Course as this work was being viewed as being at the forefront of national thinking as to how to sustain Neighbourhood Policing within the current policing landscape. They had reorganised the governance structure centrally and reviewed their performance and processes. In terms of outcomes that this review should achieve they were using qualitative and quantitative measures. Weekly meetings are being undertaken with LPA Commanders and their Management Teams to develop and embed the new neighbourhood policing principles. An LPA self assessment checklist has been developed to support implementation setting out how the strategy can be 'operationalised' with activities that will embed the 'four pillars' approach incorporating evidence based practice.

During discussion the following points were noted:-

- Cllr Patricia Birchley referred to research carried out by Cambridge University where the results of a major criminology experiment suggest that investing in proactive PCSO foot patrols targeting crime hot spots could yield more than five to one return: with every £10 spent there was a saving of £56 in prison costs. The PCC commented that he would look at this research.

<http://www.cam.ac.uk/research/news/policing-two-officers-on-the-beat-prevent-86-assaults-and-save-thousands-in-prison-costs>

Action: PCC

- Cllr Kieron Mallon welcomed the strategy for the delivery of neighbourhood policing which would help improve visibility, engagement with communities, problem solving and community resilience.
- Cllr Dee Sinclair reported that she was pleased with the approach being taken on neighbourhood policing, particularly problem solving but commented that it was important not to lose a lot of the good work that had been built up with communities over the past years.
- Cllr Quentin Webb referred to the good work of Community Wardens which had been part of his Council's reduction in spending. This would have an impact on the quality of life for those living in housing estates as Community Wardens helped support the work of Police Community Support Officers.
- Cllr Trevor Egleton asked how crime would be analysed. Chief Superintendent Andy Boyd referred to a Demand and Vulnerability Module which has been launched which is an intranet based resource which allows officers direct and immediate access to detailed demand data. Vulnerability data has not been received from the HMIC and is in the process of being incorporated into the module to further inform local decision making and priority setting. Use of this will enable Commanders and neighbourhood staff to prioritise problem solving activity appropriately based on vulnerability and the reduction of demand.

- Cllr Sandy Lovatt referred to local government scrutiny and the need to be more informed about community safety and policing. He also referred to Communication Strategies on policing issues and using Town and Parish Councils as statutory consultees. The PCC reported that most consultation was done through Councils. Cllr Kieron Mallon referred to the Neighbourhood Action Groups which varied across the Thames Valley. The PCC suggested that the Local Police Area Commander and the PCSO should attend the NAG. Cllr Dee Sinclair commented that it was more important for the police to be out on the street and not attending meetings. The Chief Constable reported that they were happy to support successful NAGs where public engagement was good. However, where NAGs were not flourishing they were looking at using social media. Chief Superintendent Andy Boyd reported that some NAGs were good at problem solving local issues and other areas had stronger resident groups. He referred to the World Café event which took place in Reading and was attended by a large number of people from a wide range of local communities who explored specific themes of local vulnerability and potential issues of local concern.
- Cllr Kieron Mallon commented that in the Police Foundation report it states that current performance frameworks do not adequately capture the impact or outcomes of neighbourhood policing. He asked the Force how they will measure the changes/impact of this review and be able to understand whether it is the review or external factors impacting on crime ? The Chief Superintendent reported that this had always been a concern. However, the self assessment checklist would help build the performance framework for neighbourhood policing and the Local Police Area Commander could satisfy themselves that they have delivered outcomes on behalf of the Force.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. **That an Annual Meeting be held looking at Community Safety Partnerships where Panel Members would feed back on their own local areas to ensure that the Community Safety Partnership priorities are understood and help to shape the future Police and Crime Plan and to identify any questions which need to be raised with the PCC.**
2. **That an update be given on the review of the Community Safety Fund at the September Panel meeting.**
3. **That any work carried out in the Thames Valley relating to scrutiny of crime and disorder be feed through in the general issues report.**

48. Post Election outline of PCC manifesto and challenges for the future

The PCC, Anthony Stansfeld, was congratulated by the Panel for being re-elected following the elections in May. In his election statement he commented that his priorities were to:-

- Reduce crime and drive up detection rates
- Maintain the balance between urban and rural policing
- Ensure that the Police budget is targeted effectively
- Protect vulnerable people
- Ensure that the police act firmly and fairly, using good judgement to deal with the public politely, gaining their respect and acting with integrity.

The PCC reported that in his previous term he was pleased that he had achieved his objectives by reducing burglary, reducing rural crime and prioritising Child Sexual Exploitation, Domestic Abuse, Fraud and Cyber Crime. He particularly mentioned the work that had been undertaken on Preventing

Female Genital Mutilation and that there was now a legal requirement for the NHS and Schools to report this crime. However this was still widely un-reported and no cases had been recorded in the Thames Valley.

The PCC reported that there were challenges ahead with budgetary pressures on police and partner organisations resulting in services being cut. There were also challenges with increasing population, immigration, housing issues and increasing budgets required to support the vulnerable.

The Force in the past few years has had to make huge budget cuts and there was also a concern about any possible changes to the national police formula grant. However, the tax payer's alliance had congratulated the OPCC on being one of the offices with the lowest cost per head of population even though it had increasing responsibilities being added with Government changes such as Victims Commissioning. There was also the new Policing and Crime Bill which was looking at giving the PCC responsibility for the Fire and Rescue Service, police complaints and also more responsibility in relation to the Local Criminal Justice System. He was also considering whether to make any changes to his office as the Thames Valley was a large area and he was thinking about having local offices in certain areas to help representation at partners' meetings as he was also being given increasing responsibility at a national level. He was currently considering having a full time Deputy PCC.

During discussion the following questions were asked:-

- Cllr Iain McCracken made reference to the Fire Service and the Memorandum of Understanding that had been signed the purpose of which is to commit each fire and rescue service to look at collaboration within the Thames Valley as a first option, to reduce cost, improve quality and improve resilience. He also referred to the Emergency Services Mobile Communication Project and asked the PCC whether a number of masts would need to be erected across the Thames Valley. The PCC referred to the legislation going through Parliament which was looking at combining Fire Services under the remit of the PCC. Legislation also referred to Ambulance Services however there were fewer similarities with this Service so this would take longer to look into. The Chief Constable reported on ESMCP which was a Communication Programme for the three emergency services – this would provide a network with extensive coverage, high resilience, appropriate security and public safety functionality. There was a National Reference Group that considered Force issues and the Programme Board were confident about the delivery of this Project. The main contract had been awarded in December 2015. The Chief Constable reported that not all masts would be needed but coverage would be better on 4G network. Cllr Iain McCracken asked what Plan B would be if they missed the implementation timetable of September 2017? The Chief Constable reported that there was some flexibility around these dates.
- Cllr Angela Macpherson referred to the huge pressures with housing growth for example Aylesbury Vale was expected to have a population increase of 20,000. She asked how the Force was linking in with Local Plans to ensure that appropriate resources are being deployed for neighbourhood policing. The PCC reported that it was critical that distribution of resources was equitable and extra funding would be available through the precept with additional housing. The Chief Constable reported that the police would help support new housing estates with neighbourhood teams and would engage at an early planning stage. They could also make bids through the Community Infrastructure Levy. The Chief Constable would ask the Local Area Commander to contact Cllr Angela Macpherson to ensure that they had engagement with the Local Plan.

Action: Chief Constable

- Cllr Paul Sohal asked about the proposal to have localised offices and whether there would be one in Slough. The PCC commented that he would like to have a local office in Slough, particularly to have closer contact with the Council and the Trust on safeguarding issues.

The PCC was thanked for his report.

49. General Issues

The general issues report was discussed and the following questions were raised:-

- Cllr Margaret Burke reported that dog theft had increased by 46% in Milton Keynes. She asked for a written answer on figures across the Thames Valley and how this was being addressed. The PCC reported that dog fighting was a serious issue including the setting up of Puppy Farms, one of which had been passed at the Planning Committee of his local Council. Cllr Burke also asked for information on the incidence of breast ironing, which was sometimes linked with Female Genital Mutilation. The PCC reported that he had spoken to the Chief Constable about this but no cases had been reported. However, he would not be surprised if there were some cases in the Thames Valley. This was an issue that could be raised at the Preventing CSE Sub-Committee.

Action: Agenda item for Preventing CSE Sub-Committee

- Cllr Kieron Mallon asked the PCC whether he had any concerns that the Force being not yet prepared in relation to the HMIC report on Honour Based Abuse. The PCC commented that there was low reporting in this area as well. The Chief Constable reported that the Force had already addressed a lot of concerns raised, assigned responsibility to a Chief Officer, developed an Action Plan and raised awareness with partners. There would be a further inspection later on in the year by HMIC. Cllr Kieron Mallon reported that it would be good for Panel Members to raise awareness of this crime similar to the action they took with Female Genital Mutilation.

Action: Panel Members

- Cllr Dee Sinclair asked about the impact of legislation in relation to legal highs. The Chief Constable reported that they had previously targeted suppliers of legal highs rather than users. Previously it was an education issue now the law could be enforced.
- Cllr Dee Sinclair then expressed concern about safeguarding in relation to language schools and Home Stay Students. There was no formal licensing of language schools and the Oxford Forum she had recently attended wanted to put pressure on Government to make changes. The PCC commented that he had previously expressed concern about the fact that there was no legal framework and he asked to see a copy of the letter that had been written to the MP from the Forum. This was an issue that could be discussed further at the Preventing CSE Sub Committee.

Action: Letter to be discussed at Preventing CSE Sub Committee

- Cllr Dee Sinclair referred to the upcoming EU Referendum and the impact on policing. The PCC expressed concern about border control and the need for good security. In relation to border control he commented that about 20 different agencies were involved and there needed to be better co-ordination. He also expressed concern about serious organised crime and links abroad.

50. PCP Annual Report

Members received the draft Annual Report of the Panel.

RESOLVED

That the draft Annual Report be circulated and published.

51. Verbal update on proposed changes to national funding formula

The PCC informed Members that he had received anecdotal information that the review of the national funding formula for policing would probably not be completed and implemented for another two years.

52. Annual Review of Police and Crime Panel Rules of Procedure, Panel Membership and Police and Crime Panel Budget

Members received a report on the review of the Rules of Procedure, changes in Panel Membership and the Panel budget.

No amendments have been received by the Panel Secretariat to the rules of procedure. Cllr Paul Sohal raised the issue of having nominated deputies. A number of Members commented that they did not want to have nominated deputies because they were not as accountable and that one of the strengths of the Panel was continuity of membership and bringing knowledge and skills to the Panel. Cllr Kieron Mallon referred to the previous item on Community Safety Partnerships and referred to the need to have the right links and membership between the two Groups. Cllr Barrie Patman referred to the Government guidance on the set up of the Panel and the expertise and knowledge required to sit on the Panel. Members agreed that that there should be no change.

In terms of membership Members agreed that the existing Sub-Committees and Working Group should continue as agreed with the same Chairman:-

Cllr Iain McCracken – Chairman of Preventing Child Sexual Exploitation Sub-Committee
Cllr Kieron Mallon – Vice Chairman

Cllr Emily Culverhouse – Chairman of Complaints Handling Sub Committee
Curtis James Marshall – Vice Chairman

Cllr Iain McCracken – Chairman of Budget Task and Finish Group

Members were asked to write to the Chairman if they wanted to be part of/no longer wanted to be part of the Groups above.

RESOLVED

That the Panel budget be agreed and that the Sub Committees and Task and Finish Groups should continue with no changes to their Terms of Reference for the following year.

53. Work Programme

The Work Programme was noted.

Panel Members considered whether to include the scrutiny of the PCC's approach to publishing a road safety speed camera scheme deployment strategy in its Work Programme. A report was submitted and

considered as part of the Panel agenda including the previous topic scoring criteria and a copy of the letter to the Chairman dated 14 March 2016.

In discussing whether the item should be included in the Work Programme the PCC was questioned about his approach. In answering he responded that his priority was that the Force deploy speed cameras in appropriate places where there is a clear identified risk of traffic accidents, as opposed to deploying cameras in low-risk areas where the public may perceived the objective as being simply to generate revenue income from fines rather than to reduce the number of accidents. He also commented that he was in active discussions with the Chief Constable on day-to-day deployment decisions re mobile cameras but he is not promoting the need for the Force to develop a Deployment Strategy per se, just the application of common sense by relevant responsible senior officers to deployment decisions.

The Chief Constable also commented that there is data on the Force's website which shows information on collisions and casualties in speed camera areas. The figures for 2015 had not yet been published. The process for speed camera enforcement was strictly adhered to so that there was balanced enforcement.

<http://www.thamesvalley.police.uk/rdsafe/rdsafe-roadpol/rdsafe-roadpol-speedenforcement/rdsafe-roadpol-speedenforcement-cameras.htm>

Members were also informed that fines arising from convictions for speeding offences were collected by Government and that the Force received income from speed awareness courses which was reinvested into road safety initiatives and the Safe Drive Stay Alive Campaign.

Panel Members were happy with the response from the PCC and the Chief Constable and a proposal was put that the issue would not be added to the Work Programme which was agreed.

RESOLVED

That the request on adding an item to the Work Programme on whether the Chief Constable should have a Deployment Strategy for speed cameras be not agreed.

54. Date and Time of Next Meeting

9 September at 11am at Aylesbury Vale District Council

CHAIRMAN