

# Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel

Tue 7 Sep  
2010  
7.00 pm

Committee Room 2  
Town Hall  
Redditch

**REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**



[www.redditchbc.gov.uk](http://www.redditchbc.gov.uk)

# Access to Information - Your Rights

---

The Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 widened the rights of press and public to attend Local Authority meetings and to see certain documents. Recently the Freedom of Information Act 2000, has further broadened these rights, and limited exemptions under the 1985 Act.

Your main rights are set out below:-

- Automatic right to attend all Council and Committee meetings unless the business would disclose confidential or “exempt” information.
- Automatic right to inspect agenda and public reports at least five days before the date of the meeting.
- Automatic right to inspect minutes of the Council and its Committees (or summaries of business undertaken in private) for up to six years following a meeting.
- Automatic right to inspect lists of background papers used in the preparation of public reports.
- Access, upon request, to the background papers on which reports are based for a period of up to four years from the date of the meeting.
- Access to a public register stating the names and addresses and electoral areas of all Councillors with details of the membership of all Committees etc.
- A reasonable number of copies of agenda and reports relating to items to be considered in public must be made available to the public attending meetings of the Council and its Committees etc.
- Access to a list specifying those powers which the Council has delegated to its Officers indicating also the titles of the Officers concerned.
- Access to a summary of the rights of the public to attend meetings of the Council and its Committees etc. and to inspect and copy documents.
- In addition, the public now has a right to be present when the Council determines “Key Decisions” unless the business would disclose confidential or “exempt” information.
- Unless otherwise stated, all items of business before the Executive Committee are Key Decisions.
- (Copies of Agenda Lists are published in advance of the meetings on the Council’s Website:  
**[www.redditchbc.gov.uk](http://www.redditchbc.gov.uk)**

---

**If you have any queries on this Agenda or any of the decisions taken or wish to exercise any of the above rights of access to information, please contact**

**Jess Bayley  
Committee Support Services**

**Town Hall, Walter Stranz Square, Redditch, B98 8AH**

**Tel: Fax: (01527) 65216**

**e.mail: [committee@redditchbc.gov.uk](mailto:committee@redditchbc.gov.uk)**

**Minicom: 595528**

# Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel

Tuesday, 7 September 2010

7.00 pm

Committee Room 2 Town Hall

## Agenda

### Membership:

Cllrs:

Bill Hartnett (Chair)  
Simon Chalk

Anita Clayton  
Wanda King

<b>1. Apologies and named substitutes</b>	To receive apologies for absence and details of any Councillor (or co-optee substitute) nominated to attend this meeting in place of a member of this panel.
<b>2. Declarations of Interest and of Party Whip</b>	To invite Councillors to declare any interest they may have in items on the agenda and any Party Whip.
<b>3. Minutes</b> (Pages 1 - 8)	To confirm as a correct record the minutes of the meeting of the Executive Committee held on 8th March 2010.  (Minutes attached).  <b>(No Specific Ward Relevance)</b>
<b>4. Actions List</b> (Pages 9 - 10)	To note the contents of the Panel's Actions List.  (Report attached).  <b>(No Specific Ward Relevance)</b>
<b>5. Sexual Assault Referral Centre (SARC)</b>	To receive a presentation on the subject of Sexual Assault Referral Centres (SARCs)  (Verbal presentation to follow).  <b>(No Specific Ward Relevance)</b>
<b>6. Questions for Worcestershire PCT</b>	Subject to the outcome of discussions under item 5, to propose questions for the consideration of representatives from Worcestershire PCT on the subject of Sexual Assault Referral Centres (SARC).  (Oral report).  <b>(No Specific Ward Relevance)</b>

# Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel

Committee

Tuesday, 7 September 2010

<p><b>7. Policing White Paper - Policing in the 21st Century: Reconnecting Police and the People</b> (Pages 11 - 62)</p>	<p>To consider the contents of the policing White Paper - Policing in the 21st Century: Reconnecting Police and the People – and to determine whether any feedback should be provided by the Panel as part of the White Paper consultation process.</p> <p>(Report attached).</p> <p><b>All Wards</b></p>
<p><b>8. Referrals</b></p>	<p>To consider any referrals to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee direct, or arising from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Executive Committee;</li><li>• The Overview and Scrutiny Committee; or</li><li>• Other Sources.</li></ul> <p>(No report).</p> <p><b>(No Specific Ward Relevance)</b></p>
<p><b>9. Work Programme</b> (Pages 63 - 64)</p>	<p>To consider the contents of the Panel’s Work Programme.</p> <p>(Report attached).</p> <p><b>(No Specific Ward Relevance)</b></p>
<p><b>10. Exclusion of the Public</b></p>	<p>It may be necessary, in the opinion of the Chief Executive, to consider excluding the public from the meeting in relation to the following items of business on the grounds that exempt information is likely to be divulged. It may be necessary, therefore, to move the following resolution:</p> <p><b>“that, under S.100 I of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following matter(s) on the grounds that it/they involve(s) the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in the relevant paragraphs (to be specified) of Part 1 of Schedule 12 (A) of the said Act, as amended.”</b></p> <p><b>(No Specific Ward Relevance)</b></p>



www.redditchbc.gov.uk

# Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel

15th July 2010

## MINUTES

### Present:

Councillor Bill Hartnett (Chair), and Councillors Simon Chalk and Anita Clayton

### Also Present:

Councillor Shiela Blagg (West Mercia Police Authority), Michael Collins (Standards Committee) and Councillor Brenda Quinney

### Officers:

B Houghton and S Hanley

### Committee Officers:

J Bayley, D Sunman

## 1. APOLOGIES AND NAMED SUBSTITUTES

Apologies for absence were received on behalf of Councillor Wanda King.

There were no named substitutes.

Apologies for absence were also received on behalf of the following partners and interested parties;

J Bridge (Magistrates Court), K Hazeldine (Redditch Anti-Harrassment Partnership) and Insp I Joseph (West Mercia Police).

## 2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND OF PARTY WHIP

There were no declarations of interest of any Party Whip.

.....

Chair

# **Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel**

---

15th July 2010

## **3. MINUTES**

**RESOLVED that**

**the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 8th March 2010 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.**

## **4. ACTIONS LIST**

Members considered the Panel's Action List and noted that all of the actions that had been requested at the previous meeting of the Panel had been completed.

**RESOLVED that**

**the report be noted.**

## **5. PROTOCOL**

The Committee considered the amended draft protocol for the Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel.

Members noted that further amendments might be required once the future of the Government Office for the West Midlands (GOWM) was known.

**RESOLVED that**

**the protocol be approved.**

## **6. COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP - INTRODUCTORY QUESTIONS**

Officers provided answers to a number of questions as follows:

- 1) What are the current "hot issues" for community safety in Redditch?

The current issues for Redditch identified by the annual Strategic Assessment were alcohol related crime and disorder, anti social behaviour and environmental issues such as graffiti, litter and dog fouling. These issues were also raised at PACT (Partners and Communities Together)

# Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel

---

15th July 2010

meetings and the Council's Roadshows. The Place Survey and the Worcestershire Viewpoint Survey had highlighted that there were negative perceptions of the levels of crime and anti social behaviour in Redditch.

- 2) To what extent has the Redditch Community Safety Partnership prioritised these "hot issues"?

All the issues highlighted in answer to question 1) above had been identified and prioritised through the Strategic Assessment and Action Planning process. Monthly Tasking meetings had taken place and had identified ways to address the issues in partnership with other agencies. Funding criteria for the Tasking Grant Scheme were directly linked to the partnership's priority areas.

- 3) How successfully has and / or is the Redditch Community Safety Partnership addressing these "hot issues"?

The previous Local Area Agreement (LAA) had included specific funding for the reduction of crime. Stretched targets of 17.5% had been achieved and Worcestershire County Council had received £1.2 million additional funding. Redditch Community Safety Partnership's share had amounted to £500,000. The Partnership had also led on tasking and the employment of a Community Safety Analyst, which had later come to be recognised nationally as best practice.

- 4) Are the major issues facing Redditch and prioritised by the Redditch Community Safety Partnership different to other areas?

It had been found that the majority of the "hot issues" were the same countywide with only slight differences linked to the make up of the population. However, it had been found that sexual offending was a particular issue for Redditch.

- 5) Please could you provide an overview of the work that is currently being delivered by the Redditch Community Safety Partnership?

As well as overseeing ongoing projects the Partnership is making progress with a programme of partnership development beginning with a review of the Tasking Group. Work was ongoing with Worcestershire Safer Communities

# **Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel**

---

15th July 2010

Board and other district Community Safety Partnerships to develop a countywide Communications and Marketing Strategy and Year Planner. It was hoped that this would keep residents better informed and counteract their feelings of being unsafe.

It was noted that over time the Redditch Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel could help to communicate the positive work and achievements of the partnership to the public and other local stakeholders. Officers were asked to report back to the Partnership that the Panel could potentially provide this type of assistance.

**RESOLVED that**

- 1) **Officers report back to the Community Safety Partnership the potential for the Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel to help communicate the positive achievements of the Partnership to the public; and**
- 2) **the report be noted.**

**7. COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP - STRATEGIC BOARD MINUTES**

Members received, for information, the minutes of a number of meetings of the Strategic Board of the Redditch Community Safety Partnership.

**RESOLVED that**

**the minutes be noted.**

(During consideration of this item, Members discussed matters that might necessitate the disclosure of exempt information. It was, therefore, agreed to exclude the press and public prior to any debate on the grounds that it included information relating to any action taken, or to be taken, in connection with the prevention, investigation or prosecution of crime.)

(There is nothing exempt, however, in this record of the proceedings.)



# Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel

15th July 2010

---

## 8. REDDITCH COMMUNITY SAFETY PLAN

(During consideration of this item, Members discussed matters that might necessitate the disclosure of exempt information. It was, therefore, agreed to exclude the press and public prior to any debate on the grounds that it included information relating to any action taken, or to be taken, in connection with the prevention, investigation or prosecution of crime.)

## 9. REFERRALS

Following a referral from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, Officers delivered a presentation on the causes and consequences of violence against women and girls. Members expressed confidence that the Police and Redditch Community Safety Partnership were taking appropriate action on the issues highlighted in the presentation.

Officers reported that a referral had been received some time ago from Councillor Juliet Brunner, Portfolio Holder for Community Safety, asking members to consider a review of the fear and perceptions of crime and anti social behaviour.

### **RESOLVED that**

- 1) no further action be taken on the referral from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee; and**
- 2) Councillor Brunner be asked to confirm whether her referral is still an issue.**

(During consideration of the first part of this item, Members discussed matters that might necessitate the disclosure of exempt information. It was, therefore, agreed to exclude the press and public prior to any debate on the grounds that it included information relating to any action taken, or to be taken, in connection with the prevention, investigation or prosecution of crime.)

(There is nothing exempt, however, in this record of the proceedings.)

(Officers to circulate a copy of the Community Safety Manager's presentation to all members of the Panel.)

# **Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel**

15th July 2010

---

## **10. WORK PROGRAMME**

Members considered the Panel's current Work Programme and suggested potential items for inclusion on the list. This included the following matters:

- 1) Community Safety Partnership – assessment of funding streams; and
- 2) Policing White Paper – 21st October 2010 Panel meeting.

## **11. EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

**RESOLVED that**

**Under S.100 I of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following matters on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12 (A) of the said Act, as amended.**

**Community Safety Partnership – Strategic Board Minutes**

**Redditch Community Safety Plan**

The Meeting commenced at 18:32  
and closed at 20:50

.....  
Chair

By virtue of paragraph(s) 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted



**Actions requested by the Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel**

<b>Date Action Requested</b>	<b>Action to be Taken</b>	<b>Response</b>
15th July 2010	Officers were asked to report back to the Community Safety Partnership on the potential for the Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel to help communicate the positive achievements of the Partnership to date.	The next meeting of the Community Safety Partnership's Strategic Board will take place on Wednesday 8th September when this update could be provided. Lead Officer, Community Safety Manager, estimated completion date, not specified. TO BE COMPLETED?
15th July 2010	Members requested that a report be delivered on the subject of alcohol related admissions of Redditch residents to the Queen Alexandra Hospital at the following meeting in October.	The item has been added to the Panel's Work Programme for the meeting in October accordingly. ACTION COMPLETED.
15th July 2010	Members requested that background information be provided with regards to Sexual Assault Referral Centres (SARCs).	A presentation on this subject is due to be delivered during the course of this meeting. WILL BE COMPLETED DURING THIS MEETING.
15th July 2010	Members agreed that the Joint Director of Public Health for the Worcestershire Primary Care Trust should be invited to attend a future meeting to discuss SARCs.	Contact has been made with the Joint Director. An arrangement has been made for a representative of Worcestershire PCT to attend on his behalf during the October meeting. ACTION COMPLETED.
15th July 2010	Members requested that Councillor Brunner be contacted to find out whether she still felt that a review of ways to tackle perceptions of crime and disorder, as suggested in October 2009, was still an appropriate subject for the Panel.	Councillor Brunner has confirmed that she is satisfied with the work that the Community Safety Partnership is undertaking to address perceptions of crime and disorder. She therefore feels that no action is required from the Panel to address this issue. ACTION COMPLETED.





**Policing in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century:  
Reconnecting police and the people**

**Policing in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: Re-connecting the police  
and the people**

Ministerial foreword

Chapter 1: The challenge

Chapter 2: Increasing democratic accountability

Chapter 3: Removing bureaucratic accountability

Chapter 4: A national framework for efficient local policing

Chapter 5: Tackling crime together

**© Crown Copyright 2010**

The text in this document (excluding the Royal Arms and other departmental or agency logos) may be reproduced free of charge in any format or medium providing it is reproduced accurately and not used in a misleading context. The material must be acknowledged as Crown copyright and the title of the document specified.

Where we have identified any third party copyright material you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned

ISBN: 9780101792523

Printed in the UK by The Stationery Office Limited  
on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office

P002381616 07/10 19585 4861

Printed on paper containing 75% recycled fibre content minimum.



## Ministerial foreword



This Government's vision is for a free, fair and responsible society. At the heart of that vision is a radical shift in power and control away from government back to people and communities. Nowhere is that more true than in our plans for policing reform. Reform is critical. Increasing Government interference in recent years has changed the focus of the police. They have become responsive to government targets and bureaucracy rather than to people. They have become disconnected from the public they serve. Crime is still too high; too many individuals and neighbourhoods suffer anti-social behaviour; and only just over half the public have confidence that the issues that matter locally are being dealt with. At the same time the challenges we face have changed. Terrorism, a growth in serious organised crime and cyber-crime all require approaches which cross not just police force boundaries but international borders.

The mission of the police which was established by Sir Robert Peel as preventing crime and disorder has not fundamentally changed. Nor has the dedication of the officers and staff that have served since. But over time the model for policing initiated by Peel has slowly been eroded. His revolutionary model for policing in London was so successful, Parliament legislated for similar bodies across the country but subject to local accountability by people who knew the locality and what was wanted – initially magistrates and councillors in early forms of what would become police authorities. Over time however the role of central Government grew. As the number of police forces fell, police authorities took on bigger areas. They have since become remote and invisible, without the capability and the mandate to insist on the priorities of local people. Instead, central government sought to fill the vacuum in determining local priorities and performance.

So to achieve Peel's mission of preventing crime and disorder (which we now call anti-social behaviour), we need to once again reform policing in the country; restoring once more the connection between the police and the people, putting the public back in the driving seat and enabling the police to meet the new crime and anti-social behaviour challenges.

This paper signals the most radical change to policing in 50 years. We will transfer power in policing – replacing bureaucratic accountability with democratic accountability.

First we will transfer power back to the people – by introducing directly elected Police and Crime Commissioners, representing their communities, understanding their crime and anti-social behaviour priorities and holding the Chief Constable to account for achieving them, and being able to fire her or him if they do not. Chief Constables will be responsible for the day to day operations of their police force but accountable to the public via these individuals and not Whitehall. Together, they will lead the fight against crime and anti-social behaviour. Our plans will make the police more accountable, accessible and transparent to the public and therefore make our communities safer. Regular beat meetings will allow people to challenge the police's performance and accessible 'street level' crime data will shine a light on local crime trends and concerns.

Secondly, we will transfer power away from government – trusting police professionals. We will do away with central targets. Frontline staff will no longer be form writers but crime fighters: freed up from bureaucracy and central guidance and trusted to use their professionalism to get on with their jobs.

Thirdly, we will shift the focus of government. The previous government tried to micro manage local policing but did not support forces effectively on national issues. We will change this. We will create a new National Crime Agency to lead the fight against organised crime, protect our borders and provide services best delivered at national level.

We want to ensure that the 'golden thread' that runs from local policing across force boundaries and internationally is not broken. The large scale devolution in power to local forces will be matched by a stronger, more streamlined approach on those issues that do require national coordination.

These changes will have to be made at a time of serious and difficult budget cuts. I have already been clear that the police will have to bear their fair share of the burden. That is why value for money will have to drive everything the police do.

The police are charged with keeping people safe; cutting crime and anti-social behaviour. I am confident that they will do all within their power to meet that responsibility, and preserve the frontline of the police service for local communities.

This document sets out our plans for police reform including elements that will be part of the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Bill that we will introduce in the Autumn. They represent exciting new opportunities for individuals, communities and police officers at all levels to shape the future of policing. I want to hear your views about how we can best make the reforms work.

I believe these radical reforms will build a strong new bridge between the police and the public. In short they will ensure policing for the people.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'T. May', with a long horizontal stroke extending to the left.

**RT HON. THERESA MAY MP  
HOME SECRETARY**

## Chapter 1: The challenge

1.1 Despite spending more on criminal justice than any other comparable country the UK is still a relatively high crime country compared with its neighbours.<sup>1</sup> Too many of us fear crime and anti-social behaviour (ASB)<sup>2</sup> and we turn a blind eye when we see it – often because we are fearful of the consequences of doing so, not because we don't care or can't be bothered.<sup>3</sup> In Germany, two thirds of people said they would intervene to stop ASB, in the UK two thirds would not.<sup>4</sup> After years of rising budgets and police numbers crime is still too high, people still feel unsafe and ASB blights too many communities.

1.2 Sir Robert Peel's first principle of policing stated: "The basic mission for which the police exist is to prevent crime and disorder". This remains the case, but the challenges facing communities and the police have changed over time. Since the 1960s, new technologies have helped police to keep up with advances in the way that crime is committed. The increased mobility of criminals has been matched by the patrol car and radio communication; analysis of crime and ASB hot spots allows response teams to see where they should be targeted.

1.3 But whilst technology has enabled the police to keep up with new types of crime and criminal, the ongoing centralisation of the police has left the service disconnected from the communities they are there to serve. The gap we need to fill today is one of accountability, not technology.

1.4 The approach of the last decade has been for central government to intervene more and more in local policing in an attempt to make it more accountable. There has been an ever increasing list of legislation with the specific aim of centralising policing. The Home Secretary has been given stronger and stronger powers to intervene; to set national objectives; publish data relating to performance; issue codes of practice and guidance; and direct police authorities. In 2001 this process of centralisation continued through the creation of the Home Office Police Standards Unit. Its aim was to strengthen the performance of local police command units and, in time, it would end up intervening in forces that were failing. Nowhere in this long list of reforms does the public appear as the natural democratic check and balance that Peel referred to in 1829 as the bedrock of police activity.

---

<sup>1</sup> Criminal Victimization in International Perspective

[http://rechten.uvt.nl/icvs/pdf/files/ICVS2004\\_05.pdf](http://rechten.uvt.nl/icvs/pdf/files/ICVS2004_05.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> 53% of people in the UK find 'crime and violence' one of the three most worrying things, compared to 40% in Italy, 33% in France and 20% in Spain, Ipsos-MORI, May 2009

<sup>3</sup> Casey, L, Engaging Communities in Fighting Crime, Cabinet Office (2008)

[http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/media/cabinetoffice/corp/assets/publications/crime/cc\\_summary.pdf](http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/media/cabinetoffice/corp/assets/publications/crime/cc_summary.pdf)

<sup>4</sup> When asked if they would challenge a group of 14 year old boys vandalising a bus shelter, 64% of German respondents said they probably or definitely would, compared to 62% of British respondents said they probably or definitely would not. Anti-Social Behaviour Across Europe, ADT, 2006

1.5 The service has taken strides to make better connections with its community and its partners. In particular at a local level they are important partners in local Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) and the service has rolled out dedicated Neighbourhood Policing Teams (NPTs) which are valued by their communities. These are all worthy reforms, spurred by the right ambition. They have gone some way to decentralise the service. But we need to go further to make it more accountable to local people.

1.6 The previous Government's approach failed to recognise problems that were more fundamental. They failed to recognise that those who should be in the driving seat, those who suffer when things don't work, are the public, not Government. And they undermined the professional discretion of the police – driving a wedge between the police and the public they are meant to serve.

1.7 Their approach and specific initiatives distorted the tripartite relationship that underpins policing – the relationship at a national level between central government, the professional leadership of the service and those responsible for its local accountability. Central government interfered too much in local issues, and failed to provide the right challenge and support for policing issues that went beyond force boundaries. Professionals saw their judgement undermined, leading them to take refuge in bureaucracy, looking upwards to Whitehall, rather than outwards to the public they joined to serve. Partnerships made strong steps in trying to work together to prevent crime, but were pulled in opposing directions by different Government departments.

1.8 The challenges the police service now face require a new approach.

#### Challenges of a service accountable to Whitehall not the public

1.9 To cut crime, policing relies not just on the consent of the people but their active cooperation. But the bond between the police and local people is not strong enough. The police have been encouraged to focus on the issues that national politicians have told them are important rather than the concerns of their local communities. Reports to Ministers and civil servants in Whitehall have taken precedence over information to help the public judge how well the police service is doing.

1.10 Targets and standards in policing were driven by Whitehall rather than the public. At best, national targets and standards have not taken account of local needs, and at worst eroded Chief Constables' professional responsibility for taking decisions to meet the particular needs of their local communities. All too often targets have driven perverse incentives. For example the 'Offences Brought to Justice' target incentivised officers to pursue easy to achieve low-level detections rather than focusing on more serious offences.

1.11 Many individual members of police authorities have made great efforts in recent years to improve police responsiveness and represent local communities. But despite these efforts the public are often unaware of police authorities themselves. A Cabinet Office review in 2007 highlighted that only

7% of the public would know to go to their Police Authority if they had a problem with policing in their local area. The public do not know how to influence local policing, let alone get actively involved. There is no direct way for the public to change or challenge those who govern policing on their behalf.

#### Challenges of disempowered professionals

1.12 Whitehall has not only caused a growing disconnect between the police and the people; it has disempowered the police themselves.

1.13 The police have been tied up in bureaucracy following central guidance setting out how they should do their work rather than using their professional judgement to get on with their jobs serving their communities. Police have become form writers rather than crime fighters, taken away from the public by bureaucracy and overly prescriptive central guidance. Despite record numbers of police officers and staff, the police are spending less time on the street.

1.14 Bureaucracy has not just been created by central Government. There are some inefficient and bureaucratic processes within the police itself that need to be addressed, for example forms or guidance created by forces themselves to cover their backs in a culture that is too 'risk averse'. Police officers and staff are being overwhelmed by the sheer volume of central policing guidance being issued. In the last year alone some 52 documents were issued and a further 60 were found to be in planning. The average length of such documents was just under 100 pages. These manuals contained over 4000 new promises, covering duties such as policing international cricket matches and data collection for missing persons.

1.15 National targets, multiple funding streams and restrictive guidance have also pulled community safety and criminal justice partners in different directions, creating elaborate and bureaucratic formal relationships rather than a practical focus on the outcomes that matter to their communities. Too much regulation and an increasingly intrusive state have crowded out the instinct of local people and voluntary organisations. We need to move beyond the era of bureaucratic accountability to one of democratic accountability.

#### Challenges of visibility and availability

1.16 A report published this month by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) called *Valuing the Police* shows that the result of this bureaucratic form-filling, over prescription and central guidance is that only 11% of police officers are available to the public at any time.<sup>5</sup> This is not the service that the public should expect. The public should expect them to be on their streets, visible and available to serve and keep them safe.

1.17 But over the last decade the police service at all levels, from Chief Constables to front line professionals, has been expected to deal with an

---

<sup>5</sup> Valuing the Police, HMIC, 2010, [http://www.hmic.gov.uk/SiteCollectionDocuments/Value%20for%20Money/VTP\\_NFS\\_20100720.pdf](http://www.hmic.gov.uk/SiteCollectionDocuments/Value%20for%20Money/VTP_NFS_20100720.pdf)

increasingly complex set of expectations. New challenges – most obviously work to counter terrorism, but also the growth in serious and organised crime, cyber crime, economic crime, child protection and domestic violence – have become central to the business of policing. The need for much more effective work with local authorities, the wider criminal justice system and many other partners, though never easy, is increasingly taken for granted. These challenges must be met while at the same time maintaining the public's continuing expectation – rightly – of greater visibility and availability on their streets.

#### Challenges of tightening resources

1.18 Spending on the police has increased by 24% in real terms since 2000/01 and stands at £13 billion a year today. Over the past decade the focus on public spending has been on money rather than value for money; inputs and officer and staff numbers rather than outcomes. Government and police forces have wasted money, such as the £6m spent advertising the Policing Pledge, telling people what the police ought to do, rather than ensuring money is used to fight crime.

1.19 In the Budget on 22 June 2010, the Chancellor announced that 'unprotected' Departments – including the Home Office – will face real cuts over the next four years. Police funding will have to take its fair share of this challenge. In its Comprehensive Spending Review, the Government will announce departmental spending limits on 20 October, with proposals for individual police force budgets following later in the year.

#### A new approach

1.20 The Government intends to rebalance the tripartite relationship to address these fundamental issues. Clear roles and relationships; with the 'golden thread' of British policing – from the national and international to the very local – renewed and strengthened, are at the heart of the Government's strategy for policing in the years ahead. This document provides more detail on the priorities and next steps.

1.21 It sets out a new deal for the public and a new deal for the police service. A deal where the public are in control and where the police can focus on cutting crime and making people feel safe.

- We will empower the public: introducing directly elected Police and Crime Commissioners who will give the public a voice and strengthen the bond between the public and the police through greater accountability and transparency so that people have more confidence in the police to fight crime and ASB. (Chapter 2)
- We will empower the police: removing bureaucratic accountability, returning professional responsibility and freeing up officers' time to get on with their jobs, out and about in local communities and not tied up in paperwork or meetings. (Chapter 3)

- We will shift the focus of national Government: ensuring the police are effective in dealing with serious crimes and threats that cross force boundaries or national borders, but in the end impact on local communities. And we will make the police at force, regional and national levels more efficient so that frontline local policing can be sustained. (Chapter 4)
- We will empower the Big Society; reforming our wider approach to cutting crime, making sure everyone plays their full part in cutting crime in a Big Society - wider criminal justice and community safety partners, the voluntary and community sector and individuals themselves. (Chapter 5)

1.22 The key priority for the police is to cut crime – keeping people safe from the harm caused by everything from ASB to serious crime and terrorism. Our vision for reform is based on outcomes achieved through a strengthened bond between the police and local people. We want the public to be safe and feel safe, have a real say in how their streets are policed and be able to hold the police to account locally, having more opportunity to shape their own lives. We want them to trust the police and know that they will be there for them when they need them and to have confidence that the criminal justice system has ethics and integrity, is working in their interests and making the best use of their money.

1.23 The Government will not centrally mandate priorities in each local area – we expect Police and Crime Commissioners to work with their local communities to establish the crime and ASB priorities that matter most locally, and for the public to hold them to account for the performance of their force. We also expect Police and Crime Commissioners to collaborate effectively on matters of regional and national importance.

#### Impact Assessment

1.24 To assist us in complying with the Coalition Government’s regulation requirements this document is intended to stimulate discussion and elicit views both from those likely to be affected and any interested partners. Any legislative provisions brought forward following this consultation will be accompanied by a fully developed and robust Impact Assessment measuring the impact on the public, private and third sectors.



## Chapter 2: Increasing Democratic Accountability

2.1 We want to empower the public - increasing local accountability and giving the public a direct say on how their streets are policed. By 2012, the Government will have put in place the most radical change in policing for half a century. The public will have elected Police and Crime Commissioners and will be holding them to account for how policing is delivered through their force.

2.2 This will be achieved by:

- The abolition of Police Authorities and their replacement by directly elected Police and Crime Commissioners – ensuring the police respond to local priorities and are directly accountable to the public for delivering safer communities and cutting crime and ASB;
- Providing information to help the public know what is happening in their area and hold the police to account with accurate and timely information about crime, ASB and value for money in their neighbourhood;
- A more independent Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) that will shine a light on local performance and help communities hold their Police and Crime Commissioners and police forces to account.

### Police and Crime Commissioners

2.3 The police are currently held to account locally by Police Authorities, which were established as part of the major reform of policing in 1964, to ensure that the governance (the appointment of the Chief Constable and holding him or her to account) was independent of local politics by requiring a third of the members to be Magistrates. This independence was further augmented by the reforms in 1994, requiring a proportion of police authority members ('independent members') to be drawn from local communities.

2.4 Individual police authority members have worked hard to engage their communities, but Police Authorities remain too invisible to the public. The public do not know how to influence the way policing is delivered in their community, let alone get involved. There is no direct way for the public to choose the people that represent them - only 8% of wards elect councillors who are police authority members. We will abolish Police Authorities and put power directly in the hands of the public. For the first time ever the public will be able to directly vote for an individual to represent their community's policing needs.

2.5 Police and Crime Commissioners will be powerful representatives of the public leading the fight against crime and ASB. They will ensure that:

- The public can better hold police forces and senior officers to account;
- There is greater public engagement in policing both in terms of priority setting and active citizenship;
- There is greater public – rather than Whitehall – ownership of force performance; and,
- The public have someone 'on their side' in the fight against crime and ASB.

2.6 Police and Crime Commissioners will ensure that the police are held to account democratically, not bureaucratically by Whitehall. This is part of the deal for the police: removing micro-management by central government in local policing, in return for much greater responsiveness to and engagement with the public.

2.7 These reforms are too pressing for a lengthy Royal Commission on increasing policing accountability. The coalition agreement set out our intention to introduce Police and Crime Commissioners. We are keen to hear your views about how we can make this work most effectively. We will introduce legislation in the autumn and the public will be able to vote for their Commissioners for the first time in May 2012.

#### Scope and Remit of the Police and Crime Commissioner

2.8 We are determined to embed this reform into the existing force boundaries that people already understand. A single Commissioner will be directly elected at the level of each force in England and Wales with the exception of the Metropolitan Police (where local accountability is already strong) and the City of London Police. The British Transport Police, the Civil Nuclear Constabulary and the Ministry of Defence Police will not have Commissioners.

2.9 The Commissioner will hold the Chief Constable to account for the full range of his or her current responsibilities. Police and Crime Commissioners will have five key roles as part of their mission to fight crime and ASB:

- Representing and engaging with all those who live and work in the communities in their force area and identifying their policing needs;
- Setting priorities that meet those needs by agreeing a local strategic plan for the force;
- Holding the Chief Constable to account for achieving these priorities as efficiently and effectively as possible, and playing a role in wider questions of community safety;
- Setting the force budget and setting the precept. Our intention is to make precept raising subject to referendum. Further detail will be set out by the Department for Communities and Local Government (in England) and the Welsh Assembly Government (in Wales); and,
- Appointing - and, where necessary, removing - the Chief Constable.

2.10 Commissioners will need to appoint and lead a team to support them in their important responsibilities. The Government does not intend to prescribe these support arrangements in detail. It will be for individual Commissioners to decide how to ensure they have an effective support team with the right expertise and knowledge of the area – although the Government will, for example, require the appointment of an individual with appropriate financial skills, and establish process safeguards to ensure that appointments are made with propriety. Commissioners will need to demonstrate value for money to the electorate on any money spent on overheads rather than frontline policing.

2.11 The Government will work closely with the Welsh Assembly Government to ensure that the framework within which the directly elected Commissioners for the four forces in Wales operate reflects and respects devolved responsibilities.

#### *Elections*

2.12 The Government wants candidates for Commissioners to come from a wide range of backgrounds, including both representatives of political parties and independents. Commissioners will have a set four year term of office and term limits of two terms. The Government intends to apply the existing framework for the conduct of local government and Parliamentary elections including the recognised eligibility criteria for standing for public office, in preparing for the first set of elections in May 2012. We are considering the appropriate voting system, and believe that a preferential voting system is the right option. We will work closely with local government representatives and the Electoral Commission to ensure that these elections are coordinated effectively and represent good value for money.

#### *Role of the Chief Constable*

2.13 The operational independence of the police is a fundamental principle of British policing. We will protect absolutely that operational independence. Giving Chief Constables a clear line of accountability to directly elected Police and Crime Commissioners will not cut across their operational independence and duty to act without fear or favour. In fact Chief Constables will have greater professional freedom to take operational decisions to meet the priorities set for them by their local community – via their Commissioner. This will include being able to appoint all of their top management team.

#### Specific responsibilities of Commissioners

2.14 We do not want to shackle Commissioners with reams of guidance and prescription on their role. Their local focus will be largely determined by the public. Set out below are some of the key responsibilities we intend all Commissioners to have and we welcome your views on these.

#### *Local Policing*

2.15 Commissioners will have a clear responsibility for holding the Chief Constable to account to make sure that policing is available and responsive to communities. The work of neighbourhood policing teams to identify and meet the most local priorities in every community is a fundamental element of local policing, but local policing goes beyond that work; it is also the full service of response, investigation and problem solving across all communities. Effective local policing which provides the police with legitimacy and the confidence of their communities is essential for supporting the wider police mission of protecting the public from serious harms and threats.

2.16 The public need to see their police on their streets as much as they need to know their emergency call will be dealt with quickly. There is no 'one size fits all' model. Policing must vary according to the characteristics of different neighbourhoods. But neighbourhood teams need to be closely linked to other parts of local policing and other police functions, be part of

neighbourhood partnerships and neighbourhood management arrangements and engage with the community.

*Serious crime, protective services*

2.17 Crimes and criminals are not confined within force boundaries. Commissioners will be responsible for the full range of policing activity in which their Chief Constable and force engage and will need to look beyond their own force borders. They will need to balance local priorities and pressures with the cross boundary action, at national and regional level, also needed to secure operational efficiency. Chapter 4 sets out our approach to active cross-border collaboration. Commissioners will be under a strong duty to collaborate, in the interests of value for money and to tackle cross border, national and international crimes (such as fighting serious organised crime and terrorism).

*Wider community safety and criminal justice*

2.18 Policing cannot be effective if it is working in isolation. Chapter 5 sets out how policing needs to be delivered in partnership with the public, but also with key agencies at the local level and across the criminal justice system (CJS). Effective joint working with partners will be key to the success of Commissioners. Long-term strategies aimed at discouraging offenders from re-offending and preventing others from embarking on a life of crime rely on the work of other partners, providing access to justice, effective sentencing, punishment and rehabilitation of offenders, good education and activities for young people, drug and alcohol treatment, and action taken by local council and housing officers.

2.19 Commissioners will be enabled to play a considerable role in wider questions of community safety. We are considering creating enabling powers to bring together CSPs at the force level to deal with force wide community safety issues and giving Commissioners a role in commissioning community safety work.

2.20 The ability to deliver swift justice and reduce re-offending whilst delivering value for money for the CJS as a whole will be affected by the ability of the Commissioner and the rest of the CJS to work together effectively. The Government sees a potential future role for Commissioners in respect of the wider CJS as further reforms develop, but immediately we will look to place a reciprocal duty, albeit one that does not compromise the necessary independence of partners, on Commissioners and other criminal justice services to cooperate with each other. This will help ensure that the decisions each CJS partner takes on priorities and investment will take full account of the implications for colleagues. We will also explore how they can best work with Local Criminal Justice Boards.

*Value for money*

2.21 Commissioners will hold their police force to account for the money it spends and ensure that it delivers value for money for the public. A key responsibility of the Commissioner will be to:

- Report to the public in a transparent and open way how funding is being used;
- Hold forces to account for their local use of resources, including the use of any national arrangements for buying goods and services and making good use of nationally provided services; and
- Hold forces to account for their contribution to and use of collaboratively provided services within their region.

### *Diversity*

2.22 Engaging with the community requires a diverse workforce. Commissioners will be responsible for holding the Chief Constable to account for ensuring that their police force reflects the diversity of the population it serves. This is important in getting communities more involved in policing, ensuring the police can understand local communities' needs and to build trust and break down cultural barriers. This is essential for the public to report and help solve crimes. More than 25% of police officers are now female and BME representation stands at 4.4%, up from 2% in 1999. These figures are higher for PCSOs, standing at 44% and 11.5%.<sup>6</sup> We must ensure that much more progress is made with these changes – across the whole police service as well as local policing.

### *Devolved Government*

2.23 Responsibility for local government is devolved in Wales and we will be working closely with partners in Wales, including the Welsh Assembly Government, to ensure that there are checks and balances which make effective links to the different local government landscape in Wales. We want to ensure Commissioners and local government are empowered to make the decisions that work best for their local area.

### *London*

2.24 In London, the Metropolitan Police Authority will be abolished and the Greater London Authority will fulfil the scrutiny role discussed below. We are discussing with the Mayor of London and the Metropolitan Police Commissioner what further changes, if any, are needed in London to complement these reforms. In particular we need to ensure that any new arrangements reflect the Metropolitan Police Commissioner's wider national policing responsibilities.

### Checks and Balances

2.25 The public at the ballot box will be the ultimate judge of the success or failure of each Commissioner and how well they are serving their community. But the public need to have the right information to judge the Commissioner's performance and they need to know the Commissioner can be called to account with effective scrutiny and appropriate checks and balances, in particular at the local level.

### *Local Government and independent scrutiny*

---

<sup>6</sup> R. Mulchandani and J. Sigurdsson Police Service Strength England and Wales, 31st March 2009, Home Office (2009) <http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs09/hosb1309.pdf>

2.26 At the core of our proposals for appropriate checks and balances to the power of the new Police and Crime Commissioners is the establishment of a new Police and Crime Panel. This will ensure there is a robust overview role at force level and that decisions of the Police and Crime Commissioners are tested on behalf of the public on a regular basis. We will create Police and Crime Panels in each force area drawn from locally elected councillors from constituent wards and independent and lay members who will bring additional skills, experience and diversity to the discussions. We are clear that these relate to the Commissioner and not the force itself.

2.27 This Panel will be able to advise the Commissioner on their proposed policing plans and budget and consider progress at the end of each year outlined in a 'state of the force' report. If the Panel objects to the Commissioner's plans or budget they will be free, in the interests of transparency, to make their concerns public, or in cases of misconduct, to ask the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC) to investigate the Commissioner. They will be able to summon the Commissioner to public hearings, take evidence from others on the work of the Commissioner, and see papers sent to the Commissioner as a matter of course except where they are operationally sensitive. They will hold confirmation hearings for the post of Chief Constable and be able to hold confirmation hearings for other appointments made by the Commissioner to his staff, but without having the power of veto. However, they will have a power to trigger a referendum on the policing precept recommended by the Commissioner.

*Scrutiny at neighbourhood beat meetings*

2.28 Neighbourhoods are the key level at which communities engage and are the building blocks of a Big Society. Police and Crime Commissioners will provide greater local accountability than ever before, but communities need a way of holding the police to account at the neighbourhood level. As set out in the coalition agreement we will require police forces to hold regular 'beat meetings' so that residents can hold them to account.

2.29 The term "beat meetings" conjures up an image of the same few people sitting around in a local hall. Police and Crime Commissioners will want to ensure that neighbourhood level engagement is inclusive and representative of the whole community. So they will be responsible for requiring that their forces' neighbourhood policing teams are having regular beat meetings at times and in places that are widely advertised, but also that they are taking an innovative approach to making the most of these meetings and other ways of engaging the full range of members of the public in diverse communities. For example, local police teams are already being encouraged to meet residents in supermarkets, old people's homes and schools – or online, via virtual beat meetings, Facebook or Twitter. And they are linking up with other services or prominent people in trusted voluntary or community groups such as neighbourhood managers - who are also engaging the public, to maximise the range of people they speak to.

2.30 Front line professionals need to be visible and available at times and in places where their communities can make their views known and assess

progress on their priorities, and Commissioners will provide a powerful new impetus and public voice in making this happen.

2.31 Local councillors, who are elected by every neighbourhood to represent their interests, will take a close interest in ensuring that Commissioners are securing effective policing for every neighbourhood in their area.

#### *Transparency*

2.32 For democratic accountability to be effective the public need independent transparent information on the performance of their Commissioner. When the public go to the ballot box to vote for their Commissioner, we want to ensure they have the full range of information available, so they can make their decision based on facts rather than anecdote and rumour. And we want to ensure that communities are able to engage properly with their Commissioner during their terms of office, so local policing plans will have a consultation phase with responses published.

2.33 The public must be able to see the performance of their police on crime, on antisocial behaviour and on how they spend the public's money. They must be able to compare this performance with how the police have performed in the past and how they are performing in relation to other neighbourhoods and forces.

2.34 From January 2011, we will ensure that crime data is published at a level which allows the public to see what is happening on their streets and neighbourhoods. We will require police forces to release this data in an open and standardised format that would enable third parties to create crime maps and other applications that help communities to engage and interact with their local police in a meaningful way. We will build on this over time to ensure that communities always have access to the most up to date and accurate picture of crime in their neighbourhoods. We will build on this over the next year by ensuring that the police are in a position to publish data more frequently than this, to bring the UK in line with best practice from other countries - some do so every week.

2.35 Across the public sector we are making changes to ensure that Government, and especially public spending, is transparent to the public, communities and businesses. As part of this we will make sure that police forces are providing information about how much of the taxpayer's money they receive and what they are doing with it.

2.36 We will also ensure that Police and Crime Commissioners – and their support teams - are subject to similar transparency arrangements. They will be subject to Freedom of Information requests, publish as default all papers and notifications of meetings, and all payments they make over £500 (in line with wider transparency arrangements for local government). They will also publish organograms and salaries of appointees of their small teams and establish a code of conduct (including gifts and hospitality). Policing Plans will need to be compliant with the Human Rights Act.

2.37 The Government will publish estimates of the cost of the elections and other aspects of the Commissioners policy in due course.

2.38 The Government will make proposals for the pay of Police and Crime Commissioners later in the year. These will reflect our focus on value for money and transparency, and take account of variation in force size and responsibilities.

#### *HMIC*

2.39 Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) will become a stronger advocate in the public interest, independent from the Government and the police service. We will ensure that HMIC has the powers to be able to undertake this critical role and strengthen the public's trust and confidence by providing them with objective and robust information on forces.

2.40 HMIC's role will be to work for the public to shine a light on policing outcomes and value for money locally and help them make informed judgements on how well Police and Crime Commissioners and their forces are performing in relation to local priorities and national obligations. It will do this through a light touch inspection regime and production of publicly accessible information and the publication of Value for Money Profiles providing comparative information on costs and outcomes. A more robust Inspectorate will not mean a return to unnecessary and burdensome regulation. Any inspection activity will need to be proportionate and add value.

#### *Checks and balances at the national level*

2.41 There are some issues of sufficient risk or national importance to warrant national oversight and requirement, and the Home Secretary intends to retain powers to ensure that these are dealt with effectively. These will include powers to ensure that events of national importance such as the Olympics are policed adequately and that the police service can provide an appropriate response to threats to national security or crisis. They will also include powers to ensure that our national policing capabilities and structures are used effectively to provide a proportionate response to future regional and national threats (both discussed in Chapter 4).

#### *Complaints and recall*

2.42 Police and Crime Panels and the IPCC will have a critical role in dealing with formal complaints against Commissioners. In the event of allegations of misconduct, we envisage that the Police and Crime Panels will receive complaints and will be able to refer them to the IPCC to investigate.

2.43 We will also introduce the power of recall in relation to Police and Crime Commissioners. Police and Crime Panels and the public may have a role in triggering the recall of Police and Crime Commissioners, but recall will only be used where the IPCC has ruled that serious misconduct has taken place.



2.44 If a Commissioner should resign or be unable to do their job, the Police and Crime Panels will be able to appoint an interim Commissioner until a by-election can be arranged or the Commissioner can return to the post.

**Consultation Questions:**

1. Will the proposed checks and balances set out in this Chapter provide effective but un-bureaucratic safeguards for the work of Commissioners, and are there further safeguards that should be considered?

2. What could be done to ensure that candidates for Commissioner come from a wide range of backgrounds, including from party political and independent standpoints?

3. How should Commissioners best work with the wider criminal justice and community safety partners who deliver the broad range of services that keep communities safe?

4. How might Commissioners best engage with their communities – individuals, businesses and voluntary organisations - at the neighbourhood level?

5. How can the Commissioner and the greater transparency of local information drive improvements in the most deprived and least safe neighbourhoods in their areas?

6. What information would help the public make judgements about their force and Commissioner, including the level of detail and comparability with other areas?

## Chapter 3: Removing Bureaucratic Accountability

3.1 Police officers should be crime fighters, not form writers. We have set out how we intend to replace bureaucratic accountability with democratic accountability. Police and Crime Commissioners are a crucial element of this but other changes are needed too. We need to move the responsibility for telling the police how they should do their jobs out of Whitehall and return it to Chief Constables, their staff and the communities they serve.

3.2 This second radical shift in power is already underway - from Whitehall to the police. Frontline officers and Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs) will be subject to less central bureaucracy so they can get on with the job of keeping the public safe. Currently, according to HMIC, only 11% of the police are visibly available to the public at any one time.<sup>7</sup> We need far more of them out on the streets, in communities, visible and available. We will stop officers filling in unnecessary forms, from 'stop' forms to data requests from central government. We want officers to focus on police work not paperwork and processes.

3.3 This will be achieved by:

- Ending Whitehall interference in policing – freeing the police from central control by removing Government targets, excessive centralised performance management and reviewing the data burden that is placed on forces – but ensuring that data is still available to local people;
- Reducing bureaucracy and promoting judgement – supporting professional responsibility and cutting red-tape;
- Ensuring that the leaders of the service take responsibility for keeping bureaucracy to a minimum at force level.

### Cutting the bureaucracy imposed by Whitehall on police forces

3.4 The Government will continue to have a role in setting the national strategic direction for the police, but it will have no role in telling the police how to do their job – that is for the police; or in holding them to account for how well they have done it – that is for the public and their Police and Crime Commissioner.

3.5 We have already removed the remaining Government-set target on police forces to improve public confidence. From now on it will be for communities to decide how well their force is doing. We have also removed the Government imposed Policing Pledge, which was often viewed as ten targets in disguise.

3.6 The increased provision of accurate and timely locally focused information to the public will be critical in empowering them to effect real change in their communities. We do not want to end up with a system where

---

<sup>7</sup> Valuing the Police, HMIC, 2010, [http://www.hmic.gov.uk/SiteCollectionDocuments/Value%20for%20Money/VTP\\_NFS\\_20100720.pdf](http://www.hmic.gov.uk/SiteCollectionDocuments/Value%20for%20Money/VTP_NFS_20100720.pdf)

forces put out the minimum amount of data. Commissioners need to lead the way in ensuring that this is about showing the public the real figures; figures about what the public think matters locally, not what the force considers is important. HMIC will consider how to adapt their approach to shine a light on police performance on behalf of the public.

3.7 The previous Government not only adopted a centralist and top down approach to the police, but equally to partners across the criminal justice system and community safety world. Partnerships have focused on following prescriptive processes and targets set by Whitehall which have pulled them in different directions and prevented them from focusing on what matters locally. Chapter 5 sets out how we will remove some of this prescription so that public outcomes can be better achieved.

3.8 Over the years the amount of data central Government has collected to assess the police has piled up to the extent that it is getting in the way of common sense policing. It is important that crime data is recorded in a consistent way across the country so that the public can have trust in statistics and compare the performance of different forces. However, it does not all need to be reported on centrally. We will review the use of data for performance management, police assessment and public information so as to reduce bureaucracy and remove targets in disguise.

3.9 The public need to know that when they report crime to the police they will be taken seriously and that any information produced by the force, Commissioner or anyone else can be trusted. Objective information about forces on a standardised basis will be necessary as the public value comparable information, including as we set out earlier in relation to local crime data. We also want to explore how justice information can be made more transparent so the public can hold wider justice agencies to account.

3.10 This needs to be balanced with the need to reduce excessive recording and reporting arrangements that keep officers away from the front line. We will look again at the National Crime Recording Standard (NCRS) and how crime is recorded.

#### Reducing bureaucracy and promoting professional judgement

3.11 Too much police time is spent filling out forms and following procedures that are unnecessary and have come as a result of an overly risk averse culture. We want officers out on the streets fighting crime, but analysis shows the amount of time being spent on paperwork creeping up to 22% in 2007/08 with almost half of that not related to reported incidents. We want to restore professional judgement and discretion to the police. Whole shopping trolleys' worth of guidance is loaded onto the police during the course of a year. Whether this is guidance for officers on how to dress or 92 pages on how to ride a bike – this has to be reduced. Local police forces often think of better ways to do things but are prevented from making changes by strict guidelines. We will be ruthless in identifying those processes that are unnecessarily time-consuming for police officers and support staff. The police need to work with

partners across the criminal justice system to reform those CJS processes that generate bureaucracy for the police and vice versa.

3.12 By September, HMIC will have completed its analysis of how working practices and processes across the criminal justice system can be improved to reduce duplication and bureaucracy. We will look to its findings to identify specific measures to improve the efficiency of the processes necessary to get cases into and through the system and to deliver better outcomes for the public.

3.13 By the end of this year, we will scrap the national requirement for the 'stop' form in its entirety and reduce dramatically the burden of the stop and search procedures. We will also maximise the use of available technology to further reduce the paperwork in policing so that, for example, an officer will only need to record manually three pieces of information on a stop and search record.

3.14 We will take a close look at processes under the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act (RIPA) and the Police and Criminal Evidence Act (PACE) to minimise the paperwork involved for police officers, balancing the importance of reducing unnecessary bureaucracy with the need for appropriate safeguards to protect the public from the improper use of some of these powers.

3.15 We will return decision making to police officers, which is why we are taking action to return charging decisions to officers for a broader range of summary offences and will roll this out from November 2010.

3.16 We will also remove barriers to a common sense approach to policing. This involves reforming those health and safety practices that underpin a risk aversion culture that can sometimes prevent police officers from intervening and protecting the public. Lord Young will publish his review of health and safety law and practice across the public sector, including policing, in September. Following on from this, we will work with our partners to ensure that police officers are able to get on and do their job unhindered by unnecessary regulation or practices. As a first step we will support the Health and Safety Executive to embed the approach taken by their guidance, *Striking The Balance*, which sets out a common sense approach to applying health and safety policy to policing, central to which is that police officers that do the right thing and put themselves in harm's way to keep the public safe should be properly recognised and supported.

3.17 These changes are the start of freeing the police to do their job - cutting crime and building confidence with the community they serve. We are keen to hear views on what else gets in the way of this.

#### Ensuring the leadership of the service takes responsibility

3.18 Not all bureaucracy is Government imposed. Much has been generated locally, sometimes as a result of the tendency to collect information and monitor it, even when no longer required to do so nationally or locally. Some

of it has been generated by national policing organisations, for example, ACPO and NPIA guidance. The service itself needs to examine its internal processes and doctrine which can lead to unnecessary bureaucracy. Action needs to be taken to challenge the culture of risk aversion that has developed in policing. Officers all too often collect information just in case it is needed rather than applying a common sense approach. This culture change will need to be supported and embedded by chief officers giving consistent messages to their forces about the information they need to collect and what is not needed. The police must be able to decide how incidents are dealt with and resolved and we will look to ACPO to show strong leadership in promoting and supporting the greater use of professional judgement by police officers and staff.

3.19 Police and Crime Commissioners will clearly have a role to play in getting the balance right between preserving the information and processes needed to focus on the public's priorities and removing anything that is inefficient or unnecessary.

3.20 Work will continue with Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) and IPCC to ensure that the revised misconduct and unsatisfactory performance procedures (introduced in December 2008) are used effectively. Those procedures enable local police managers to deal with public complaints, misconduct and poor performance in a less bureaucratic and adversarial way. They have helped shorten the timetable for dealing with cases and have placed more responsibility on local managers as part of their engagement with their neighbourhoods. In most serious misconduct cases, for example those which may lead to dismissal, they have reduced the time taken to hold officers to account.

**Consultation questions:**

7. Locally, what are examples of unnecessary bureaucracy within police forces and how can the service get rid of this?

8. How should forces ensure that information that local people feel is important is made available without creating a burdensome data recording process?

9. What information should HMIC use to support a more proportionate approach to their 'public facing performance role', while reducing burdens and avoiding de-facto targets?

10. How can ACPO change the culture of the police service to move away from compliance with detailed guidance to the use of professional judgement within a clear framework based around outcomes?

11. How can we share knowledge about policing techniques that cut crime without creating endless guidance?

## 4. A National Framework for Efficient Local Policing

4.1 Criminals do not stop at police force boundaries. The crime and ASB that play out in our communities and affect our businesses are often related to criminality and threats that start in another part of the country, or even another part of the world. So we need to ensure that we have the right resources in the right place to tackle this. For too long Government has tried to control nationally what is best done locally – but it has not done enough to support forces on issues that go beyond their area or to ensure that the right national capabilities are in place.

4.2 Police and Crime Commissioners will be focusing on holding their local police force to account for tackling crime and protecting the public. We need to ensure that local policing and Commissioners are supported by effective national arrangements. These arrangements need to support Commissioners to ensure their budgets are used to deliver the best possible outcomes and ensure that their local communities are kept safe from criminals who may operate across force or national boundaries.

4.3 Forces will need to find new ways of working that get the best possible value from their resources. By collaborating with other forces, they can make savings from back-office and support functions, and protect the public from serious and organised crime more effectively. And there are some things that need to be done just once, nationally.

4.4 This will be achieved by:

- Better **value for money in local policing** – ensuring sufficient officers and staff are available to the public at the times when they are needed most; and through a review of remuneration and conditions of service for police officers and staff.
- Better **collaboration between forces** to save money on back-office and operational support functions, and tackle serious and cross-boundary criminality more effectively.
- Simplifying national arrangements, including creating a **new National Crime Agency** that will lead the fight against organised crime, protect our borders and provide services best delivered at national level.

4.5 In all of this we want to secure the so-called “golden thread” of policing in this country - the connectivity from local, neighbourhood policing through protective services to international policing. Neighbourhood and local policing informs and supports operational activity to protect the public from serious threats, harms and risks. For example street drug dealing might be a neighbourhood policing priority, but it also provides intelligence about organised crime groups involved in drugs importation and supply. In recent years, community information has proven to be crucial in the countering of a number of terrorist plots and in assisting the police and its partner agencies in their investigations.



4.6 We are not going to create a much smaller number of “strategic forces” operating at regional level through compulsory mergers. The Government has considered and rejected this. Big is not necessarily beautiful or better value for money. British policing at its best is strongly grounded in local communities. The Government does not support the imposition of structural changes on local forces which will be seen by the public as creating vast and distant conglomerations, weakening their capacity to influence and hold to account those who keep them safe. Scarce resources in challenging times need to be focused on strengthening front line policing, not bankrolling controversial mergers with little public or political support. Any such changes would in any case take years to come to fruition, and in the meantime provide huge distraction for police leaders from their central mission of cutting crime and maximising value for money.

4.7 So we are not dramatically altering the force structure. But we are making clear that Chief Constables will be responsible for the totality of policing in their area, working with each other in collaboration and with the National Crime Agency, and held directly to account by the public through Police and Crime Commissioners.

#### Supporting better value for money in local policing

4.8 In order to maintain the service the public receives, we will make significant cuts to central Government and non-departmental public bodies. But the police will have to bear their fair share of the burden. The whole police service will need to show leadership about how to act professionally in more challenging economic circumstances. We need to make the most of every pound spent on policing to maintain and improve the quality of frontline service that the public receives.

4.9 The public want to know that crime and ASB is being dealt with in their neighbourhoods and that the police will be there for them when they need them.

4.10 Commissioners will be responsible for ensuring value for money at the local level and will want to ensure that their force is maximising all opportunities to drive effectiveness. We have for too long been focused on how many officers there are rather than looking at what they are being asked to do. Chief Officers have a clear role to ensure that the entire police workforce is more available than currently and more productive. Local communities will not accept a situation where only around a tenth of police officers are available on the streets at any one time. The police service will need to focus hard on improving this through better workforce management and organisation, and by looking critically at the roles being undertaken by officers in operational and business support functions and removing them from unnecessary administrative duties and routine tasks where their skills and powers are not properly used.

4.11 We should be using police staff for time-consuming functions previously performed by officers. For example, maintaining databases is not a good use of a sworn officer’s time. The job could be done by a specialist more

effectively and for considerably less money and will free the officer to spend more time on frontline policing. Forces could also consider using the private sector to provide certain services.

4.12 Evidence from the 14 forces engaged in the QUEST programme shows that the removal of wasteful elements of processes and resources across all areas of operational policing (including volume crime, neighbourhood policing and the CJS) as well as the back office business support function, can achieve significant productivity improvements and better outcomes for the public.

4.13 Forces will need to have a sophisticated understanding of local demand to ensure resources are deployed flexibly and effectively to match that demand, with shift patterns designed to maximise availability. This will reduce the need for spending on overtime across all areas of policing, which will be vital in reducing costs and maintaining service levels. And by maximising the use of available technology forces will be able to increase the time that officers spend on the streets, while saving taxpayers' money.

4.14 Individual forces can also play a role in reducing costs by encouraging greater involvement of the public and voluntary sector. Chapter 5 sets out how the police, and neighbourhood policing teams in particular, have a role in encouraging volunteering opportunities as police staff or special constables, taking part in joint patrols or in neighbourhood watch schemes which aim to deter crime.

4.15 HMIC will play a key role in highlighting for the public and Police and Crime Commissioners how local forces are making best use of their resources to meet local policing needs. It will produce publicly accessible information reflecting the priorities of the community, and Value for Money Profiles that provide rich comparative data enabling the public, Police and Crime Commissioners and chief officers to make detailed comparisons across force areas. HMIC will conduct Value for Money Inspections. These inspections will consider the value for money achieved by local activity; by the use of nationally provided contracts or services; and by collaborative work. Police and Crime Commissioners will be able to call upon HMIC to inspect their force or aspects of its work if they believe that the Chief Constable is unable to make sufficient progress on value for money.

4.16 We also want to spread information on which policing techniques are the most effective at cutting crime across the CJS. We would welcome your views on which agency is best placed to do this.

*Review of remuneration and conditions of service for officers and staff*

4.17 Expenditure on the workforce accounts for around 80% of police spending. It is therefore important to look carefully at these arrangements. We want to ensure that the remuneration and conditions of service for those that work in policing can support the delivery of an excellent service and provide the public with value for money. As part of the Coalition Programme, we have launched a full review of remuneration and conditions of service for

police officers and staff. We have made clear that the review will cover the arrangements for both officers and staff because it is important to look at the police workforce in the round. We will publish the terms of reference and membership of the review shortly.

4.18 The review will complement John Hutton's work on the Independent Public Service Pensions Commission, which will undertake a fundamental structural review of public service pension provision, including police officer and staff pensions. The Commission will make recommendations on how public service pensions can be made sustainable and affordable in the long-term, fair to both the workforce and the taxpayer, and ensure that they are consistent with the fiscal challenges ahead. The Commission will produce an interim report in September 2010, considering the case for short-term savings within the Spending Review 2010 period, consistent with the Government's commitment to protect those on low incomes. The Commission will produce a final report in time for Budget 2011.

#### A new approach to collaboration between forces

4.19 For policing functions that are not specifically local in nature, we need to strengthen the approach to how forces can collaborate together and with other partners in order to deliver these more efficiently and effectively. Police and Crime Commissioners will need to play a key role in making this happen across:

- a range of operational and back office support functions for which it is neither sensible nor affordable to adopt 43 different approaches; and
- frontline policing functions to protect the public from serious and cross boundary 'level 2' criminality<sup>8</sup> – these acute protective services (for example the investigation of major crimes such as homicides or dealing with organised crime gangs) can be delivered more efficiently and effectively.

4.20 This is not the same as mergers of forces – having police forces that are local, that the public can identify with and are responsive to their needs is an important principle of policing in England and Wales and one that we ought not to change. So, as stated above, we will not impose mergers on forces. We will consider requests for mergers only where they are voluntary, are supported by a robust business case and have community consent. Forces need to be looking at other options of enhanced collaboration as set out in this Chapter.

4.21 There are some areas where the current collaboration arrangements work well, for example around counter terrorism policing where we have regional and national structures which have enhanced the police service's capability. We think there are lessons to be learned here for other areas of

---

<sup>8</sup> The National Intelligence Model (NIM) describes criminality as follows: Level 1 (local criminality that can be managed within a Basic Command Unit (BCU)), Level 2 (cross border issues, usually of organised criminals, major incident affecting more than one BCU), Level 3 (Serious crime, terrorism operating at a national or international level). Closing the Gap, HMIC (2005)

policing – specifically our response to organised crime, as recently highlighted by the Metropolitan Police Commissioner. For the most part though, the current collaboration arrangements can be extremely variable in demonstrating improved services or lower costs. In many areas, the governance and accountability arrangements are too weak and decisions over whether or not to collaborate are only reached after protracted debate and negotiation in which self-interest has been allowed to override the greater good.

4.22 Police and Crime Commissioners will cut through this bureaucracy and drive forward the collaborative effort in support of their Chief Officers. We will support them by introducing a strong duty to collaborate that will ensure that forces do this across the widest possible range of policing functions. This will support the police, both to reduce costs and to improve the protection of the public from serious and organised crime. It will enable decisions on collaborative ventures to be reached much more quickly than is currently the case, and will give greater democratic accountability to the delivery of collaborative policing functions. These functions are often less visible to the public, but no less important to their protection from harm locally.

4.23 In driving collaboration activity, we will expect Police and Crime Commissioners to hold their Chief Constables to account for:

- **meeting the professional standards for providing protective services set by ACPO**, including through collaboration, so that there is a minimum level of service on which the public can depend across the country, and sufficient consistency between forces so that, in times of crisis and emergency, they can still come together and operate effectively alongside each other;
- **determining the right group of forces to collaborate with**, taking account of existing collaborative infrastructures (for example those for counter-terrorism and for organised crime), providing greater consistency of approach and greater scale of opportunity;
- **identifying the elements of operational and business support services to collaborate on** in order to protect the public and deliver value for money. We would expect ACPO to provide a professional view on what these functions will be.

4.24 HMIC will assess decisions by individual forces and their Commissioners about where to collaborate with others and on the effectiveness of that collaboration in maintaining or improving services at a lower cost. We would expect HMIC to advise Government on the instances where forces and Commissioners have chosen not to collaborate where there are clear benefits for the wider police service. We will take steps to strengthen the current duty to collaborate in order that the Home Secretary can, when advised and it is in the national interest, direct forces to collaborate.

4.25 Within local areas and where it fits with the collaboration needed between forces, there may be opportunities to team up with other partners to provide some services. Collaboration at the neighbourhood level is already happening in some areas through neighbourhood management/partnership

approaches. Local collaboration could have the twin benefits of improving efficiency and partnership working. The private sector has the potential to play a key role in the provision of back office transactional services such as HR. We will also want to consider what other functions could be delivered through the private sector on behalf of groups of forces – such as custody facilities.

4.26 We will work with the police service to ensure that legislative opportunities are taken as soon as parliamentary time allows to reduce the bureaucracy relating to collaboration - by removing unnecessary regulations if necessary.

#### Simplifying the national arrangements

4.27 We want to support Police and Crime Commissioners with effective, clear and co-ordinated national arrangements. We want to improve, rationalise and bring coherence to the way things are done on what can be termed national level policing issues – encompassing both operational and operational support functions.

4.28 Our approach will involve ending the practice of procuring things in 43 different ways when it makes no sense to do so either operationally or financially; and introducing much stronger national coordination in respect of some cross-boundary operational policing challenges. We will also establish a new National Crime Agency to improve, in particular, our response to organised crime and enhance the security of our borders. As part of the streamlining of the national landscape, we will phase out the NPIA, reviewing how this is best achieved.

#### *An improved law enforcement response to organised crime*

4.29 Organised crime<sup>9</sup> causes significant harm to the UK and its interests, with social and economic costs to the country estimated at between £20 billion and £40 billion per year. Today's organised criminals are nimble, entrepreneurial and no respecters of local, regional or national boundaries. Some have a global reach. But the effects of their criminality are played out on our streets and in our communities on a daily basis.

4.30 Despite some improvements, and genuine successes against some criminal groups, our law enforcement response has lagged behind this threat. There are assessed to be around 38,000 individuals engaged in organised crime impacting on the UK, involving around 6,000 organised criminal groups. The harsh reality is that law enforcement is impacting on far too few of these criminals.

4.31 We will publish, later this year, a new overarching strategy for tackling organised crime from the very local to trans-national levels, which drives joined-up action by law enforcement and across Government, and raises public and private sector awareness. Ahead of that strategy, but in a move we see as being central to it, we are proposing an important change to the

---

<sup>9</sup> Organised criminals are defined as “those involved, normally working with others, in continuing serious criminal activities for substantial profit, whether based in the UK or elsewhere”.

operational law enforcement landscape. We believe that we can have a more rational, better coordinated approach to organised crime than at present, providing a more effective and efficient response, and which can address the perceived lack of clarity and accountability in the current governance arrangements. Learning the lessons from our response to international terrorism, the intention is to link the responsibilities of local Chief Constables, and their Police and Crime Commissioners, with regional policing capabilities – under stronger national coordination and strategic direction.

*A National Crime Agency*

4.32 We will create a powerful new body of operational crime-fighters in the shape of a National Crime Agency. This should harness and build on the intelligence, analytical and enforcement capabilities of the existing Serious Organised Crime Agency (SOCA) and the Child Exploitation and Online Protection Centre. But the new Agency should better connect these capabilities to those within the police service, HM Revenue and Customs, the UK Border Agency and a range of other criminal justice partners.

4.33 We propose that the National Crime Agency will be led by a senior Chief Constable. It should be responsible for:

- **improving what we know about the threat from organised crime.** Building on existing work, we see the Agency having responsibility for mapping details of the individuals and organised crime groups operating in and against the UK. Its job will be to build a more comprehensive picture of actionable intelligence – the lifeblood of our response to the threat – subject to robust safeguards;
- **providing effective national tasking and coordination** of police assets. We see this as a logical extension of proposals already being developed by the UK’s law enforcement agencies to better coordinate the response to organised crime. In particular, we see the Agency bringing coherence to the activities of the range of what are presently uncoordinated regional policing capabilities.<sup>10</sup> The Agency will depend for its success on the effectiveness of these capabilities, but also on those within local police forces, with local identities, who have the trust and confidence of the local communities they serve. We are clear that our national safety and security begins with having safe and secure neighbourhoods. We see these new tasking and coordination arrangements being subject to an agreed, transparent operational protocol between chief constables and the new Agency;
- **ensuring more law enforcement activity takes place against more organised criminals, at reduced cost.** This means prioritising available resources in a more efficient and effective manner: targeting the most serious criminals for hard-edged enforcement but ensuring more lawful interventions take place to disrupt the activities of a much larger number of other criminals involved in organised crime groups – along the lines of the High Volume Operating Model devised by SOCA;

---

<sup>10</sup> Made up of Regional Asset Recovery Teams; Regional Intelligence Units; and Regional Organised Crime Units.

- **strengthening our border policing arrangements**, to enhance our national security, improve immigration controls and improve our response to organised crime – most forms of which involve commodities, assets or people crossing the UK border at some point, in many cases illegally.

4.34 We envisage the new Agency being made up of a number of operational ‘commands’ under the leadership of the Chief Constable in charge – comprising, for example, an organised crime command; a border policing command; and (potentially) an operational support command. As explored below, there may also be other national issues for which responsibility could logically sit with the new Agency.

4.35 There will need to be clear, revised robust governance and accountability arrangements for the new National Crime Agency, recognising its intelligence-led operational focus. These will need to be more public facing than existing arrangements and must link to the important role which Police and Crime Commissioners will play in relation to individual police forces and collaborative ventures. We envisage, for example, Commissioners being under a duty to collaborate, not just with each other, but also with other bodies such as the new Agency. We recognise that it will be important for the public to have a clear line of sight in terms of the accountability of the new Agency, including its progress in achieving specific outcomes.

4.36 The establishment of a National Crime Agency and collaborative approaches would align with the work being led by ACPO to improve what is referred to as the ‘interoperability’ of the police service. In essence, this is about ensuring that different police units and personnel can work together seamlessly when required (such as in response to a terrorist incident; organised crime investigation; or large scale public event). For some distinct aspects of policing, this requires, for example, common standards of professional practice and equipment; compatible communications systems; and clarity about who is in charge of what.

4.37 Our starting proposition is that the focus of the new National Crime Agency should be on improving the operational response to organised crime and improving the security of our borders, since we judge these areas to be the most pressing in public protection terms.

4.38 But there are other cross-boundary crime challenges in which the new Agency might play an important role. For example, the Government has set out a commitment to strengthen the work of tackling serious economic crime, and we will consider how this would relate to a National Crime Agency. This will depend on the outcome of work on how to tackle economic crime. We will consider any possible implications for counter terrorist policing in due course and after full consultation. Counter terrorist policing already has effective national structures.

4.39 A large number of ‘national’ policing units have also emerged, over time, with a variety of responsibilities. The overall picture is now confusing and cluttered. And the public accountability for the activities of some of these

units is, at best, opaque. Some of these national units reside in individual forces (such as the Police Central e-Crime Unit within the Metropolitan Police Service). But a number of others come under the banner of ACPO – such as the Police National Information and Coordination Centre (PNICC), which is responsible for coordinating, when necessary, the national mobilisation of police resources. As ACPO repositions itself in a re-balanced tripartite, it may be that responsibility for some of the functions presently being carried out by these national units could be brought under the ambit of the National Crime Agency.

4.40 It is possible that – as we review the NPIA’s functions - some of them could also come under the ambit of the National Crime Agency, through establishing a distinct support command. But we would want to ensure that this did not detract from the new Agency’s operational focus. Over time, further additional responsibilities could be added.

4.41 The Strategic Defence and Security Review is currently considering organised crime within the context of the overall national security prioritisation process. The proposals outlined above will be developed in line with the Strategic Defence and Security Review and its consideration by the National Security Council consideration.

#### *Strengthening our borders*

4.42 The Coalition Programme for Government includes a commitment to establish a Border Police Force to enhance national security, improve immigration controls and crack down on the trafficking of people, wildlife, weapons and drugs. Currently, there are too many agencies working disjointedly on border controls and security which has led to gaps in process and communications, different lines of reporting and accountability, and no streamlined process, oversight or strategy about how goods and people move through checks and controls.

4.43 We propose that the Chief Constable who leads the National Crime Agency should be responsible for a Border Police Command. This new Command will work to a national strategy, including an assessment of risk and priorities and a programme of multi-agency operational activity. As part of these arrangements the new Command will have responsibility for co-ordinating and tasking those border enforcement operational staff who together will form the new Border Police capability. Legislative requirements will be taken as soon as parliamentary time allows. Steps to introduce the new arrangements on an incremental basis will commence immediately.

#### *The National Policing Improvement Agency*

4.44 The NPIA has done much to bring about welcome changes to policing. In particular it has acted as a catalyst for identifying areas for efficiency gains within forces, encouraging greater collaboration and identifying where economies of scale can be realised through national procurement frameworks. It has succeeded in the first stage of rationalising a number of different agencies responsible for supporting police forces. But now is the



right time to phase out the NPIA, reviewing its role and how this translates into a streamlined national landscape.

4.45 We will look at what aspects of the NPIA's functions are still needed and if so, how they might best be delivered in a new landscape, including alternative funding models. Some of its support functions are clearly critical to successful policing such as the provision of essential national police infrastructure, like central databases. We will look at options for how the NPIA's critical national infrastructure and value for money support functions are best taken forward. There might be an enhanced role for the Home Office in terms of the latter functions. Responsibility for the former could move to a distinct support command within the new National Crime Agency – provided that it did not detract from its operational focus.

4.46 We will work with the NPIA, wider police service and other partners and reach decisions about which of its functions should be delivered where, by the autumn this year. We envisage the NPIA being fully phased out by spring 2012.

4.47 We will seek to make the legislative changes to enable the creation of the new National Crime Agency as soon as parliamentary time allows. In doing so, we will work with the devolved administrations to establish the appropriate jurisdiction for the Agency. Our ambition is for the Agency to come fully into being by 2013, with key elements of its functions being operational before then as part of a transitional period.

*Driving a new national approach where it is needed*

4.48 As well as rationalising and strengthening some of our existing national assets through the establishment of the National Crime Agency, we need to develop new national approaches in a small number of instances where it is in the national interest to do so. This is not about fettering the judgement of Police and Crime Commissioners and Chief Constables locally in how they allocate resources to tackle local priorities – but instead about supporting them to get the best value for every pound spent.

4.49 The Government will therefore specify the contractual arrangements to be used by the police service to procure equipment and other goods and services. In many cases these will be arrangements put in place by central government, local government or other public bodies. In some cases where there is a need specific to the police service, where it will often be important to ensure the capability for inter-operability between forces, or no suitable contractual arrangements exist, new ones will be put in place.

4.50 A national approach is under way (the Information Systems Improvement Strategy) to ensure that the IT systems in all 43 forces can come together and 'talk to each other', that there are national arrangements for buying hardware and software and that there is a rationalised approach to IT support staff.

4.51 We will legislate at an early opportunity to ensure a coherent basis for the Home Secretary to specify procurement arrangements to be used by the police service, and to drive the convergence of IT systems. In the meantime, in order to ensure that savings are made as soon as possible, we will take forward proposals for regulations under existing legislation to specify certain contractual arrangements to be used by the Police Service. We are publishing a more detailed consultation alongside this one on the regulations for the mandation of goods and services.

4.52 In addition some policing functions can most sensibly be organised nationally. For example the police service is working to put in place a National Police Air Service. We will consider the case for further nationally organised services taking into account business planning being led by the police service.

*The Association of Chief Police Officers*

4.53 We want to professionalise the police at all levels. ACPO needs to play its role in this by repositioning itself as the national organisation responsible for providing the professional leadership for the police service, by taking the lead role on setting standards and sharing best practice across the range of police activities. ACPO's focus on professional standards means they should also play a leading role in leadership development, including some training programmes, while ensuring effective support and challenge from other providers. ACPO will continue to play a key role in advising Government, Police and Crime Commissioners and the Police Service on strategy, best practice and operational matters. Strategic policy will be set locally by Police and Crime Commissioners and nationally by the Government.

4.54 We will expect ACPO to play a leading role in ensuring that Chief Constables drive value for money, and have the capability to drive out costs in their forces. We will revoke the previous Government's planned creation of a Police Senior Appointments Panel.

4.55 ACPO itself recognises the need to increase its accountability for what it does and for the public funding it receives. It will need to have a governance structure which makes it accountable to those who fund it and have an elected mandate – both directly and indirectly – for policing; in short, the rebalanced Tripartite which will, in future, include a key role for Police and Crime Commissioners. We are working with ACPO to agree the most appropriate structure for achieving this, with accountability and transparency the key conditions.

**Consultation questions:**

12. What policing functions should be delivered between forces acting collaboratively?

13. What are the principal obstacles to collaboration between forces or with other partners and how they can they be addressed?

14. Are there functions which need greater national co-ordination or which would make sense to organise and run nationally (while still being delivered locally)?

15. How can the police service take advantage of private sector expertise to improve value for money, for example in operational support, or back office functions shared between several forces, or with other public sector providers?

16. Alongside its focus on organised crime and border security, what functions might a new National Crime Agency deliver on behalf of police forces, and how should it be held to account?

17. What arrangements should be in place in future to ensure that there is a sufficient pool of chief officers available, in particular for the most challenging leadership roles in the police service? Is there a role for other providers to provide training?

18. How can we rapidly increase the capability within the police service to become more business-like, with police leaders taking on a more prominent role to help drive necessary cultural change in delivering sustainable business process improvement?

## Chapter 5. Tackling crime together

5.1 Replacing bureaucratic accountability with democratic accountability and strengthening national arrangements will help the police to cut crime. But it is not just the police who cut crime. The whole criminal justice system (CJS) needs to work together effectively to reduce crime – bringing offenders to justice, ensuring fair and proportionate justice, supporting victims and witnesses and preventing offending and re-offending. Even more than this it is not just the state that can cut crime. The role of the public has been clear since Sir Robert Peel stated ‘the police are the public and the public are the police’. Individuals and neighbourhoods with active citizens can help prevent crime and ASB and help the police to keep their area safe. But for too long Government has tried to impose services on communities, stifling local action and activism.

5.2 Public cooperation – not just passive consent - is essential for the police to do their job. We want to restore confidence in policing so more people get involved. More people providing information, ready to act as witnesses and confident that they will be supported when they stand up against ASB will help police cut crime.

5.3 Over the coming years we will have forged a partnership between people and police - on the one hand freeing up the police from the bureaucracy and targets that choke real localism, and on the other hand providing the incentives, training and encouragement for people from all walks of life to help to police their own communities. In partnership with criminal justice partners, we will have implemented radical reforms across the criminal justice system which - as with policing – will be focused more on the needs of local communities rather than on Whitehall. We will enable organisations to work together on rehabilitation to cut re-offending rather than being pulled apart by conflicting national targets and initiatives. We will have helped partners to work together with a focus on outcomes not processes. These reforms will have rebuilt public confidence in the criminal justice system, with people more able and willing to play an active role themselves as part of a Big Society.

5.4 We will achieve this by:

- enabling and encouraging people to get involved and mobilising neighbourhood activists;
- developing and implementing a radical CJS reform strategy;
- stripping away unnecessary prescription and bureaucracy in the partnership landscape.

### Enabling and encouraging people to get involved and mobilising neighbourhood activists

5.5 A key part of these reforms is increasing community involvement and promoting greater individual responsibility for keeping neighbourhoods safe.

Many of the services which will be involved in developing this new approach are devolved. We will need to work closely with the Welsh Assembly Government to see how our plans and theirs can come together.

5.6 Our focus will be on empowering individuals and communities not simply to be able to hold agencies to account, but also to underline that crime prevention is a shared responsibility. Solutions to local problems are often best found within communities, and drawing back the state will allow neighbourhood activists and groups to come forward and play their full role. We will provide greater opportunities for community activism and involvement through:

- Giving communities more power;
- Encouraging people to take an active role in their communities;
- Transferring power from central to local government;
- Supporting co-ops, mutuals and social enterprises; and
- Publishing Government data.

5.7 Doing these things, focusing more on what local people say they want rather than what Whitehall decides, will increase people's confidence in the criminal justice system. And this in turn is important if more people are to get involved and to support positive social norms in their communities. People need to trust the police and have confidence that action will be taken by the courts if they are going to play their part and report crime or give evidence. People need to feel safe in their streets and know that the police, housing associations and local councils will be there for them, if they are to come together as communities to solve problems such as youth crime or ASB.

5.8 Neighbourhoods are the key building block for the Big Society; they are where people engage and where frontline services are delivered. Neighbourhood policing teams have a crucial role to play in mobilising community involvement. Through being available, asking people what their concerns are, resolving them and telling people what they have done, neighbourhood policing has been important in increasing the confidence of their communities. And by being dedicated to neighbourhoods, officers and PCSOs can build the trust of communities so they can come forward and help the police detect and enforce crimes, often very serious ones.

5.9 We will promote the range of ways that citizens can get involved in keeping their neighbourhoods safe and encourage them to do so. A key step will be making it easier to access the police and report crime and ASB. We will look for a cost effective way of establishing the number '101' as a single national police non-emergency number for reporting crime and ASB. Over time, this would enable local partners to join up with the police to provide even more streamlined access and efficient services for the public according to local needs and local priorities.

5.10 Across the country, we want to support more active citizens: taking part in joint patrols with the police, looking out for their neighbours and passing on safety tips as part of Neighbourhood Watch groups or as Community Crime Fighters. More people will be advising the police as members of youth independent advisory groups, coming together as communities to sign

neighbourhood agreements which set out the local commitments of services and communities to tackle crime and ASB, having more of a say in how money is spent (participatory budgeting) and in how offenders make amends (community restorative justice). And people are volunteering more formally across the whole criminal justice and community safety spectrum – as special constables, magistrates, police cadets and victim support volunteers to name but a few.

5.11 By volunteering their free time, special constables and other police volunteers provide a tangible way for citizens to make a difference in their communities. They have a long history within the police. The number peaked at over 67,000 in the 1950s, but fell to around 24,000 in 1974 and 11,000 in 2004, although it has climbed to 15,000 today.

5.12 We want to see more special constables and explore new ideas to help unlock the potential of police volunteers in the workforce, for example as police ‘reservists’. They are a clear manifestation of the Big Society in action, demonstrating the role which individuals and communities have in helping to fight and prevent crime. As well as adding resilience, greater involvement of specials and volunteers will help open up the police service to a more diverse group of people with different skills and life experience.

5.13 We also want to support organisations that can and do make a difference to communities and not just rely on Government as the sole provider. We will work with the Office for Civil Society (in England) to develop a way forward with the voluntary and community sector, including mutuals, co-operatives, charities and social enterprises. We will encourage English forces to sign up to local compacts between themselves and the voluntary sector, which set out some key principles about how they work with each other.

5.14 Later this year, we will publish a new crime strategy, which will set out in greater detail how the approach to preventing and reducing crime will be reshaped in the Big Society.

#### Developing and implementing a radical CJS reform strategy

5.15 The Government is committed to devolving responsibility across the criminal justice partners as a whole. The CJS is currently too remote from communities, lacks transparency, and is not accountable to the public or sufficiently focused on the needs of victims. There is also work needed across the system to reduce waste and free professionals from central guidance and targets so they can focus on cutting crime and rebuilding confidence in the system. We will provide incentives, paying by results and ensuring that value for money and an understanding of the best evidence available underpins everything we do. This will include:

- A new approach to cutting crime, including a new approach to youth crime, tackling ASB – including more active citizenship and voluntary sector involvement - and effectively addressing the link between drugs, alcohol and crime;

- Police reform, as set out in this document, moving from bureaucratic to democratic accountability and passing power and judgement to the local level;
- Sentencing reform to ensure that it is effective in deterring crime, protecting the public, punishing offenders and particularly cutting re-offending;
- Developing a new approach to the rehabilitation of offenders, so that the public are protected, victims receive restitution and offenders are punished whilst being given the opportunity to turn their lives around. We want to create the right incentives for agencies to rehabilitate offenders and stimulate innovation by opening up the market to the private and not-for-profit sectors. Our vision is that all sentences, whether in prison or in the community, should not only punish, but also involve education, hard work and change, so that offenders can integrate into their communities more effectively than when they entered the criminal justice system;
- Reviewing the prison estate's contribution to rehabilitation and reducing reoffending and developing a sustainable and cost effective prison capacity strategy as part of the Spending Review.

5.16 Working closely with criminal justice agencies, we will ensure that the system is more coherent, accessible and transparent to the public. The CJS must reinforce responsibility and ensure that offending always has consequences that are visible to the law-abiding majority.

5.17 This cannot go on being a system where half of the police, the first (and often the only) representatives of the system most people will encounter, say they would speak critically of it. It needs to be a system in which communities and professionals alike take pride, where we are united with a common cause and shared values. We need to make sure we are making the most out of everyone who can help cut crime; with partners across the criminal justice and community safety world working together to focus on local communities and with those local communities playing an important role themselves.

#### Removing unnecessary central prescription around local partnerships

5.18 The police have a long history of partnership working. A range of statutory and non-statutory partnerships covering community safety and criminal justice which involve the police have developed over the last 13 years. These operate at different geographical levels but have some overlap in roles and remits, causing confusion about respective roles and bureaucracy that restricts their ability to work together effectively.

5.19 Effective partnership working will be particularly important as agencies work to offer a better service within tightening resources. The criminal justice system will be more effective if those that work within it are free to develop their own structures which will enable them to respond to different local circumstances, expectations and priorities.

5.20 CSPs and other local partnerships have played a strong role in preventing crime, and we want them to continue to do so. But we intend to



free local partners up as much as possible. We do not intend to simply re-draw the landscape in a different, yet still prescriptive way, but we will make the most of what works well, and leave as much local freedom as possible. Local people should have more say over the way that services are provided. We want local solutions to local problems. We will strip away unnecessary prescription and bureaucracy by repealing some of the regulations for CSPs, whilst retaining the helpful core statutory duty on those key partners to work together. We want your views on how best to achieve this. The Government has already stripped away the myriad of targets on Local Criminal Justice Boards thereby allowing them to focus on local issues.

5.21 Whilst policing and crime are non-devolved matters, many of the factors that can influence levels of offending and criminality – health, substance misuse, education and housing – are matters for which responsibility in Wales is devolved to the Welsh Assembly Government. In addition, three of the six CSP statutory partners – Local Authorities, Local Health Boards and Fire and Rescue – are devolved in Wales. We will work closely with the Welsh Assembly Government and partners in Wales to free partners from bureaucracy and enable locally determined partnership arrangements.

**Consultations questions:**

19. What more can the Government do to support the public to take a more active role in keeping neighbourhoods safe?

20. How can the Government encourage more people to volunteer (including as special constables) and provide necessary incentives to encourage them to stay?

21. What more can central Government do to make the criminal justice system more efficient?

22. What prescriptions from Government get in the way of effective local partnership working?

23. What else needs to be done to simplify and improve community safety and criminal justice work locally?

**Table 1: New roles for key individuals and organisations**

<b>Police and Crime Commissioners</b>	Will be powerful representatives of the public in policing with a clear mandate. They will represent and engage with the public, set local policing priorities, agree a local strategic plan, hold the Chief Constable to account set the force budget and precept, appoint the Chief Constable and where necessary dismiss the Chief Constable.
<b>Police and Crime Panels</b>	<p>Will, ensure there is a robust overview role at force level and that decisions of the Police and Crime Commissioners are tested on behalf of the public on a regular basis. They will be made up of locally elected councillors from constituent wards and independent and lay members who will bring additional skills, experience and diversity to the discussions</p> <p>They will hold confirmation hearings for the post of Chief Constable and be able to hold confirmation hearings for other appointments made by the Commissioner to his staff, but without having the power of veto. However, they will have a power to trigger a referendum on the policing precept recommended by the Commissioner.</p>
<b>Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs)</b>	These partnerships bring together the various agencies with responsibility for community safety. By repealing some of the regulations for CSPs, and leaving the helpful core statutory duty on those key partners to work together, CSPs will have the flexibility to decide how best to deliver for their communities. We are considering creating enabling powers to bring together CSPs at the force level to deal with force wide community safety issues and giving Commissioners a role in commissioning community safety work. In Wales, we will work with the Welsh Assembly Government to agree what changes are needed.
<b>Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO)</b>	Will become the national organisation responsible for providing the professional leadership for the police service, by taking the lead role on setting standards and sharing best practice across the range of police activities. It will also play a leading role in ensuring that Chief Constables drive value for money. It will be expected to show strong leadership in promoting and supporting the greater use of professional judgement by police officers and staff. It will have a governance structure which will include a key role for Police and Crime Commissioners.
<b>National Crime Agency</b>	<p>Will lead the fight against organised crime and the protection of our borders. It will harness and exploit the intelligence, analytical and enforcement capabilities of the existing Serious Organised Crime Agency (SOCA), but better connect these capabilities to those within the police service, HM Revenue and Customs, the UK Border Agency and a range of other criminal justice partners.</p> <p>The Agency will be led by a senior Chief Constable and encompass a number of 'commands', including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Organised crime - responsible for improving what we know</li> </ul>

	<p>about the threat from organised crime; providing effective national tasking and coordination; and ensuring more law enforcement activity takes place against more organised criminals at reduced cost.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Border Policing – responsible for coordinating and tasking border enforcement operational staff, working to a national strategy, including an assessment of risks and priorities</li> </ul> <p>The Agency may also take responsibility for other national policing functions, including some of those presently carried out by the National Policing Improvement Agency, which will be phased out.</p> <p>The Agency will be subject to robust governance arrangements, which will link to the role played by Police and Crime Commissioners.</p>
<p><b>Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC)</b></p>	<p>Will be a strong independent Inspectorate, which through light touch inspection regimes will provide the public with objective and robust information on policing outcomes and value for money locally to help them make informed judgements on how well Police and Crime Commissioners and their forces are performing. They will advise the Home Secretary where it is in the national interest to direct forces to collaborate.</p>
<p><b>Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC)</b></p>	<p>Will investigate complaints about the misconduct of Commissioners and be able to trigger recall. Will support the police to learn lessons and deliver a better service to the public.</p>

**Diagram 1: What the policing landscape looks like now**





Diagram 2: What the policing landscape will look like in the future



**Consultation text**

Scope of the consultation

- Topic of this consultation:** This document sets the Government's vision for policing; how it will cut crime and protect the public, be more directly accountable to the public, offer value for money – all through greater collaboration, the introduction of Police and Crime Commissioners, less Government intervention and bureaucracy and more professional responsibility and judgement and a new policing and partnership landscape.
- Scope of this consultation:** The elements of this consultation can broadly be divided into two parts. The first are specific commitments already made in the Coalition Agreement where the Government is not consulting on whether they should happen, but how best they can be implemented. The second are broader areas where the Government is asking for views on whether and how to achieve its aims. Where possible this consultation follows the Code of Practice on Consultation.
- Geographical scope:** Policy on policing and criminal justice partners covers both England and Wales. Other important partners in preventing crime, such as local authorities, health and education, are devolved in Wales. We will work with the other devolved administrations to establish the appropriate jurisdiction for the National Crime Agency.
- Impact assessment (IA):** To assist us in complying with the Coalition Government's regulation requirements this document is intended to stimulate discussion and elicit views both from those likely to be affected and any interested stakeholders. Any legislative provisions brought forward following this consultation will be accompanied by a fully developed and robust Impact Assessment measuring the impact on the public, private and third sectors.

Basic Information

- To:** We would like to hear from anyone who has an interest in policing and community safety.
- Duration:** The consultation starts on 26 July 2010 and ends on 20 September 2010 (8 weeks).
- Enquiries:** Home Office  
Police and Crime Communications  
6<sup>th</sup> Floor, Fry Building  
2 Marsham Street  
London  
SW1P 4DF  
[CPGcommunications@Homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:CPGcommunications@Homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk).

**How to respond:  
Additional ways to become involved:**

You can respond online at:  
<http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/policingconsultation>  
This will be an online consultation exercise. A PDF consultation document will also be available to download online.  
Please contact the Home Office (as above) if you require information in any other format, such as Braille, large font or audio.

**After the consultation:**

The first step is for the consultation responses that are relevant to the legislation in the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Bill to be considered before the Bill's introduction in autumn 2010. The second step is that the responses to the wider elements of consultation will be summarised, and considered as part of further policy development.



Responses: Confidentiality and Disclaimer

The information you send us may be passed to colleagues within the Home Office, the Government or related agencies.

Information provided in response to this consultation, including personal information, may be subject to publication or disclosure in accordance with the access to information regimes (these are primarily the Freedom of Information Act 2000 [FOIA], the Data Protection Act 1998 [DPA] and the Environmental Information Regulations 2004).

If you want other information that you provide to be treated as confidential, please be aware that, under the FOIA, there is a statutory Code of Practice with which public authorities must comply and which deals, amongst other things, with obligations of confidence.

In view of this it would be helpful if you could explain to us why you regard the information you have provided as confidential. If we receive a request for disclosure of the information we will take full account of your explanation, but we cannot give an assurance that confidentiality can be maintained in all circumstances. An automatic confidentiality disclaimer generated by your IT system will not, of itself, be regarded as binding on the Department.

The Department will process your personal data in accordance with the DPA and in the majority of circumstances this will mean that your personal data will not be disclosed to third parties.

Alternative formats

We will both offer, and provide on request, these formats under the Disability Act.

Consultation criteria

Where possible the Consultation follows the Code of Practice on Consultation – the criteria for which are set out below.

***Criterion 1 – When to consult – Formal consultation should take place at a stage when there is scope to influence the policy outcome.***

***Criterion 2 – Duration of consultation exercises – Consultations should normally last for at least 12 weeks with consideration given to longer timescales where feasible and sensible.***

***Criterion 3 – Clarity of scope and impact – Consultation documents should be clear about the consultation process, what is being proposed, the scope to influence and the expected costs and benefits of the proposals.***

***Criterion 4 – Accessibility of consultation exercises – Consultation exercises should be designed to be accessible to, and clearly targeted at, those people the exercise is intended to reach.***

***Criterion 5 – The burden of consultation – Keeping the burden of consultation to a minimum is essential if consultations are to be effective and if consultees’ buy-in to the process is to be obtained.***

***Criterion 6 – Responsiveness of consultation exercises – Consultation responses should be analysed carefully and clear feedback should be provided to participants following the consultation.***

***Criterion 7 – Capacity to consult – Officials running consultations should seek guidance in how to run an effective consultation exercise and share what they have learned from the experience.***

The full Code of Practice on Consultation is available at:

<http://www.berr.gov.uk/whatwedo/bre/consultation-guidance/page44420.html>

### Consultation Co-ordinator

If you have a complaint or comment about the Home Office’s approach to consultation, you should contact the Home Office Consultation Co-ordinator, Nigel Lawrence. Please DO NOT send your response to this consultation to Nigel Lawrence. The Co-ordinator works to promote best practice standards set by the Code of Practice, advises policy teams on how to conduct consultations and investigates complaints made against the Home Office. He does not process your response to this consultation.

The Co-ordinator can be emailed at: [Nigel.Lawrence@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:Nigel.Lawrence@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk) or alternatively write to him at:

Nigel Lawrence, Consultation Co-ordinator  
Home Office  
Performance and Delivery Unit  
Better Regulation Team  
3<sup>rd</sup> Floor Seacole  
2 Marsham Street  
London  
SW1P 4DF



# Crime and disorder Scrutiny

No Direct Ward Relevance

Panel

7th September 2010

## WORK PROGRAMME

(Report of the Chief Executive)

Date of Meeting	Subject Matter	Officer(s) Responsible for report
<b>ALL MEETINGS</b>	<b>REGULAR ITEMS</b>	<b>(CHIEF EXECUTIVE)</b>
	Minutes of previous meeting  Minutes from recent meeting of the Redditch Community Safety Partnership's Strategic Board  Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel Action List  Referrals from Council or Executive Committee, etc. (if any)  Task & Finish Groups - feedback  Committee Work Programme	Chief Executive  Relevant Partnership representative(s)  Chief Executive  Chief Executive  Chief Executive  Chief Executive
	<b>REGULAR ITEMS</b>  Redditch Community Safety Plan  Annual Strategic Assessment – Executive Summary  Annual Report – Chair of the Redditch Community Safety Partnership	Relevant Partnership representative(s)  Relevant Partnership representative(s)  Relevant Partnership representative(s)

# Crime & Disorder Scrutiny

Panel

7th September 2010

<b>OTHER ITEMS - DATE FIXED</b>		
7th September 2010	Sexual Assault Referral Centres (SARCs) – Presentation	Relevant Partnership representative
7th September 2010	Questions for Worcestershire PCT - Brainstorm	Relevant Partnership representative
7th September 2010	Policing in the 21st Century: Reconnecting Police and the People	Relevant Partnership representative
21st October 2010	Alcohol Related Admissions to Hospital - report	Relevant Partnership representative
21st October 2010	Worcestershire PCT Representative – Interview regarding SARCs	Relevant Partnership representative
<b>OTHER ITEMS – DATE NOT FIXED</b>		