

ACCOUNTABILITY AND PERFORMANCE PANEL

A meeting of the Accountability and Performance Panel was held at Police Headquarters Martlesham, and via Microsoft Teams at 09:30 on Friday 9 May 2025.

PRESENT:

Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner

Tim Passmore (Police and Crime Commissioner)

Darren Horsman (Chief Executive Officer)

Colette Batson (Chief Finance Officer)

Sandra Graffham (Head of Communications and Engagement – attended for the public questions)

Fraser Cooper (Head of Policy and Performance)

James Sheridan (Policy and Commissioning Officer)

Kate Boswell (Executive Assistant to the PCC and Chief Executive)

Suffolk Constabulary

Rob Jones (Deputy Chief Constable)

Eamonn Bridger (Assistant Chief Constable)

Julie Dean (Assistant Chief Constable)

Kenneth Kilpatrick (Assistant Chief Officer)

In attendance for the Public Agenda via Teams

Adriana Stapleton (Police & Crime Panel Support Officer – via teams)

1 x member of the public in person

3 x members of the public via teams

Apologies

Rachel Kearton (Chief Constable)

PUBLIC AGENDA

1 Public Question Time

- 1.1 The Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) welcomed everyone to the meeting.
- 1.2 The PCC advised that four questions had been received from members of the public in advance of the meeting.
- 1.3 A question was received from Mr Gibbs, submitted on 21 April 25, and summarised as follows: “With detailed figures included, what is the cost of the PCC and the staffing in the PCC office? What is the full cost of a Police Constable per annum?”
- 1.4 The PCC gave the following answer: “All information is available on the [PCC website](#) . The PCCs basic pay is £73,000, with the pay rate set nationally. The total expenditure including pay, travel and employment costs in 2024/25 was £102k. The pay and employment budget

for the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner in 2024/25 was £663k and the total expenditure was £580k. The underspend was due to vacancies within the year.”

- 1.5 The Deputy Chief Constable (DCC) referred to the following response provided by the Constabulary: “Police officer pay scales are published publicly each year as a result of the police renumeration review. These are available online through [Constable pay scales](#). However, the overall cost of an operational officer varies as a number of factors will change the total amount, including length of service. Specialist constables such as authorised firearms officers, dog handlers and specialist response officers to name a few will require a large amount of additional training and accreditation in order to remain operationally competent. Furthermore, in order for an officer to be effective they must be correctly equipped in terms of protective equipment, IT, vehicles and uniform items. The combination of training and equipment will increase the cost of individual officers and is subject to change based upon national requirements, role changes and supplier contract charges.”
- 1.6 Mr Hughes submitted the following questions on 22 April 25: “Why is there a police station in Felixstowe when it does not accept queries or reports of crime from the public, and does not deal with local crime? Why do Suffolk Police and Suffolk County Council not take information from the public on traffic and parking offences? Why do parking offences in Felixstowe have to be reported by a traffic warden?”
- 1.7 DCC Jones referred to the following response provided by the Constabulary: “The Police station at Felixstowe provides a base for the Response and Community teams dramatically reducing the response times to incidents in the Felixstowe area. If not for this location the nearest response base would be at Martlesham which significantly increases the travel time for urgent response. The need for maintaining a station clerk at each station is carefully considered. The current reporting trends indicate that most members of the public prefer to report to police online or via the telephone. It is simply not cost effective to continue staffing a public enquiries office when the demand would consist of very few public visits. The yellow-coloured telephone positioned outside the main entrance will link any member of the public to the Contact and Control room directly and should police be required they will be able to rapidly despatch a unit. Crime reports can be submitted rapidly using the constabulary website and queries can be submitted to the local community team via e-mail to their central inbox. This is available through [Home | Suffolk Constabulary](#). Additionally, if anonymity is desired, [Independent UK charity taking crime information anonymously | Crimestoppers](#) offers a telephone or online reporting service which is free to all members of the public.
- 1.8 For parking offences, under the Civil Parking Contraventions Designation order 2020 all parking enforcement is now handled by the district and borough councils. To report parking issues in Felixstowe the public may visit [Civil parking enforcement » East Suffolk Council](#). Any member of the public may report parking contraventions, and this is not limited to traffic wardens.”
- 1.9 Mr Hughes asked the following supplementary questions, “If there are people already on site at Felixstowe Police station, then there would be no increased costs for them to speak to members of the public at a Front Desk. There is a distinct feeling of isolation in the town between members of the public and the police, and that they are only there for their own purposes. The people of Felixstowe feel frustration at paying for these services and not getting a police service. He raised a further issue regarding witnessing a 20 tonne HGV using a car park that had signage saying not for use for vehicles over 3.5 tonne, delivery vehicles

being parked on pedestrian crossings, and despite reporting these incidents nothing further happened. If low level crime such as parking offences are allowed, it doesn't take long before further crimes then escalate. In an age where everyone has a smart phone, if location settings are on with time and date stamp, surely this can be submitted as online evidence for the police to respond to". The PCC thanked Mr Hughes for his points and advised that his comments would be taken away and responded to directly. DCC Jones added Mr Hughes would be put in touch with the local inspector for the area.

ACTION – DCC Jones to put the local inspector in touch with Mr Hughes.

- 1.10 The following questions were received from a Ms E Bryant on 25 April 25: "In relation to Neighbourhood Crime, can you explain how Suffolk Constabulary help victims of crime that experience financial loss? What happens with online reports of crime or is this just used to gather data? 2. With limited resources, do Suffolk Police only respond to crimes involving violence or physical injury?"
- 1.11 DCC Jones referred to the following response provided by the Constabulary: "All reported crime in Suffolk is subject to robust evidential review and assessment of available lines of enquiry. This process enables the best team within the constabulary to be allocated each investigation. With each case, officers must assess whether there are sufficient viable lines of enquiry which will produce a reasonable prospect of conviction in court. This forms part of the full code test which is a foundation pillar of the UK justice system. The decision and scale of investigation will be a mixture of these factors. Where the identification of a suspect for any crime will always be prioritised and a proportionate outcome sought. In relation to financial recompense, it is simply not feasible for the constabulary to provide any financial support to victims of crime. The criminal injuries compensation scheme operates nationally and may be accessed via [Criminal Injuries Compensation Authority - GOV.UK](https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/criminal-injuries-compensation-authority). Although this is focused on injuries sustained as a result of criminal activity. Personal insurance policies are the primary method or recouping financial loss of this nature and crime numbers are provided by the constabulary as a matter of process. Victim support is available and should be offered to all victims in addition to details on how to claim compensation. All criminal offences are subject to investigation and there is no aspect of reporting which is used purely for data gathering. One of the key metrics to measure our constabulary performance is based around positive outcomes for victims' and public confidence and satisfaction."
- 1.12 Ms Bryant responded that she made an online report of a crime on 8 February this year, and she had yet to receive a response. Realistically the response to this is now too late. The PCC advised that this would be followed up.

ACTION – DCC Jones to organise for the case raised by Ms Bryant to be re-looked at.

- 1.13 The final question was received from a Mr Newlands on 7 May 25: "What support is in place to members of the public when they report ASB online? What notification should be provided if the system fails?"
- 1.14 DCC Jones referred to the following response provided by the Constabulary: "It may have been that the ASB reporting tool had a fault within it which did not generate the report, or it may have been that Mr Newlands did not submit it correctly, either way this has been highlighted to the digital team to be looked at. In terms of his question around the follow-up call, when a report is made to Suffolk police you should always receive a reference number, depending how a report is submitted the ref may be in a different format. If a reference is not received a follow-up call may be necessary. However, as a first-time user, unfamiliar with the system this may not be immediately apparent. Whether Police are deployed will

depend on a number of factors. Every report received into the Police is carefully assessed using THRIVE principles (Threat, Harm, Risk, Investigation, Vulnerability and Engagement) for the decision of deployment and report grading to be made. We advise all members of the public reporting incidents to report factually the circumstances being observed and experienced which allows Police to make accurate assessments on urgency and deployment criteria. The ASB report would be sufficient to warrant deployment if the circumstances called for it." The PCC added that addressing ASB is a responsibility that sits across other local authority areas and not just the police.

2 Open minutes of the meeting held on 7 March 2025 (Paper AP25/19)

- 2.1 The minutes of the meeting held on 7 March 2025 were agreed as an accurate record and approved by the PCC.
- 2.2 All actions were noted as complete or in hand and were being followed up outside of the meeting.

3 Financial Monitoring (Verbal Update)

- 3.1 The Assistant Chief Officer (ACO) confirmed that there was no Financial Monitoring report to be presented at the meeting. The Outturn Report for 2024/25, which covers the full 12 months was at draft stage and would be issued to the PCC for comment once finalised. It would be brought to July's APP meeting for fuller discussion.

4 Supporting Children and Young People (Paper AP25/21)

- 4.1 ACC Bridger raised two key areas within the report, firstly the well-established Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH), was seeing referrals and demand grow year on year. He also referred to the Home Office directive around the development and delivery of an Integrated Front Door, which should result in a reduction in demand later in the year.
- 4.2 The second key issue related to a large increase in referrals from the National Crime Agency for online child sexual abuse cases, which was showing an increase of 130% in Suffolk, meaning more complex cases and investigation. The force had flexed its approach to deal with the increased investigative demand, but it would result in more registered sex offenders, creating additional pressure on the Sexual Offender Management Team.
- 4.3 The PCC asked if the Integrated Front Door approach would help to reduce the increase shown in "per child per contact" in the bar graph on page 3. ACC Bridger stated that there were several factors that had resulted in the increase. Relationships with schools were becoming more established leading to schools reporting more issues, increasing the contact figures. There was also internal demand created by people already in the system being reported at each stage. The hope for the Integrated Front Door is that it would reduce this unnecessary internal demand.
- 4.4 The PCC asked what the timeframe was for the Integrated Front Door. ACC Bridger replied that it would hopefully be later in the year, but the Constabulary was not the lead agency developing it. He would update the PCC once further details were known.
ACTION – ACC Bridger to provide an update on the Integrated Front Door timelines to the PCC once known.

4.5 The Head of Policy and Performance asked at point 2.8 of the report, what the forces success rate was for delivering the Domestic Violence Disclosure Scheme (DVDS) within the designated 28-days. ACC Bridger stated that when compared nationally Suffolk was a good users of the scheme, but the link to the Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub contributed to demand pressure. Good progress had been made, and surges in requests managed, however further increases could result in a review of the current approach. The rates were being closely monitored.

4.6 The PCC queried the cause of increased referrals to Multi Agency Risk Assessment Conferences (MARAC) while the number of cases progressing remaining the same. Had there been any change to the level of participation from the partnerships. ACC Bridger responded that there would always be referrals that didn't meet the criteria for the scheme, and that the number of referrals was not a concern as there were methods in place for screening them. From a Constabulary perspective partnerships continue to work well. All partners have their own set of pressures and statutory responsibilities, which is indicative of a system under strain.

4.7 The PCC asked how work was progressing at point 2.13 (Missing Children). ACC Bridger advised that it was ongoing, lots had been achieved, however there was more to do including training, and an update to the Philomena protocol implemented. Plans were in place for a self-inspection later in the year using the same framework as HMICFRS. Once the internal audit had been completed, feedback would be provided.

4.8 The PCC asked for an update on Operation Hydrant. ACC Bridger advised he would invite the Head of Policy & Performance to the relevant meetings.
ACTION – ACC Bridger to invite the OPCC's Head of Policy & Performance to the relevant Op Hydrant meetings.

4.9 The Policy & Commissioning Officer referred to point 2.28 (Referrals to the Internet Child Abuse Investigation Team), and the increase in ICAIT referrals. What impact was being seen on the arrest and charge rates in the ICAIT. ACC Bridger advised that there was sufficient resourcing in place and current levels were sustainable, however further increases would require a review.

4.10 The PCC asked at point 2.45 how did a 3-month deferred prosecution process for children build confidence in policing. ACC Bridger responded that there was a strong evidence base behind the decision, with it being a successful approach for children by diverting them away from criminal justice and into proper support. The scheme was a pilot, so would be evaluated before full implementation. It had worked well in other counties, enabling Suffolk to learn from them prior to implementation. ACC Bridger provided reassurance the voice of the victim gets heard throughout the process, with the decision-making panel acting as an advocate for the victim. The scheme has a time bound approach and is dependent on the participation of both the child and guardian. Without full participation the child will move back into the traditional criminal justice system. If successful, it could help to reduce pressure on the criminal justice system. The PCC commented that he was looking forward to seeing the results of the pilot.

4.11 The Chief Finance Officer (CFO) asked if the notice given at point 4.1 around funding by Suffolk Youth Justice Service would impact the Constabulary's baseline PCSO figures. ACC Bridger confirmed it would not affect the base line figure.

4.12 The Chief Executive requested the PCC be kept updated on the potential impact to the Suffolk Youth Justice Service as per changes at point 4.1. ACC Bridger confirmed he would provide updates.

ACTION – ACC Bridger to provide the PCC with updates on the impact of the team changes as referenced at point 4.1.

5 Neighbourhood Crime and ASB (Paper AP25/22)

5.1 ACC Bridger highlighted the exceptional progress made on ASB, resulting in an overall decrease, as a result of the good work being delivered by the community policing teams. The funding received for Operation Spotlight has been used to good effect.

5.2 He mentioned that there had been a reduction in solve rates for burglary, and a reduction in using the Op Converter team who would usually investigate it. Last year was an exceptional year with several major cases, so the Op Converter team did not run as it would. However, the team were back in place and were starting to return to normal. Nationally Suffolk's robbery rate is one of the lowest in the country, plus the overall solve rate within the county remains high.

5.3 There was an increase of 8% for retail crime and shoplifting, although nationally it was reported to be 23%. The solve rates were strong but the force continued to encourage further reporting to the police by retailers. In more than 80% of cases where there was an offender, they were arrested within 48hrs. This would continue to be a focus for the Neighbourhood Policing Team, and the Neighbourhood Policing Guarantee.

5.4 The PCC asked if there was a way the force could work with the business community to help make the process of reporting for smaller shops with fewer staff easier. ACC Bridger responded that the Neighbourhood Policing team continue to build relationships with local retailers, and whilst it was frustrating for people to have to complete the reporting forms, it was necessary information. Where there is a spate of thefts or hotspots identified, the community team communicate the information to retailers and share problem-solving plans.

5.5 The Policy & Commissioning Officer asked if the government's idea of Respect Orders would require officer training and a new way of thinking. ACC Bridger responded that the availability of various orders can be a challenge for front line staff to ensure they are used correctly, but there is continued professional development available. Guidance around the use of Respect Orders is still being developed by the government.

5.6 The Chief Executive asked, at point 6.2, if the force were getting any indication from the BID (Business Improvement Districts) of an appetite to contribute to prevention activities. ACC Bridger replied that the Constabulary would welcome initiatives from other partners to help address shoplifting as there is still much work to be done.

5.7 The PCC asked what was being done to improve the solve rate for motor vehicle theft. ACC Bridger advised that firstly a deeper analysis of the data needed to be undertaken, followed by subsequent preventative work to deliver targeted patrols within identified hotspot areas. Officers were equipped digitally to deal with the recording of crime and the investigation, and the tools to overlay information to link in with the Neighbourhood Policing team to deliver focussed and targeted controls.

5.8 The Chief Executive asked if the Criminal Behaviour Orders referenced at point 6.10 were being used. ACC Bridger replied that they were used when appropriate and were one of a range of civil orders available to the constabulary.

5.9 The PCC congratulated the force for the recent ONS data with Suffolk having the third lowest rate of crime in the country.

6 Tackling Serious Violence (Paper AP25/23)

6.1 ACC Bridger highlighted the key points within the report, showing a 3.6% reduction for violence with injury on the previous year, which was below the national average. Suffolk had the third lowest figures for knife crime nationally, and figures locally remained stable and at a low level. This data was corroborated against hospital admissions for knife incidents data. The force is also an early adopter of the Clear Hold Build initiative, with the third site now live in Ipswich.

6.2 The PCC asked with reference to point 4.3, if the 10% increase for Knife Crime in the Southern Area was the beginning of a trend. ACC Bridger advised that the data would show fluctuations when the overall crime numbers were low. The Clear Hold Build initiative would focus on specific areas and target this.

6.3 The PCC asked for clarity at point 4.13 where it stated that Clear Hold Build in Ipswich was an adaptive model. ACC Bridger stated that findings were taken from the previous locations, and the force needed to be responsive and receptive to feedback from partners. The force has therefore ensured the approach to Clear Hold Build is tailored to the needs in that location and partnership. It was believed overall, the needs in the Ipswich ward were different to the other areas already tackled.

6.4 The PCC asked how the data would be used from Clear Hold Build in Ipswich. ACC Bridger responded that the relevant data set for the site prior to the launch of Clear Hold Build, would be revisited later in the process to gauge results. The PCC commented that he would be interested to see the data once complete.

6.5 The Chief Executive asked if there would be any metrics used to measure public perspective and public confidence within the Ipswich Clear Hold Build area. ACC Bridger advised that there wouldn't be as an existing data set would be needed as a baseline in order to measure success. The force would be working on feedback from partners and the communities, which would still provide a valuable perspective.

6.6 The PCC requested an update on County Lines. ACC Bridger responded that the County Lines business model was still used by serious and organised crime groups, but with many years of concerted effort and focus the issue had reduced within Suffolk. County Lines would also be addressed by Clear Hold Build. Overall, it was stable, it still existed but the force still had the right level of focus on it.

7 Any Other Business

7.1 The PCC requested that for the next Workforce Report (scheduled for 11 July 25), a high-level summary of officer positions as paid for by the uplift was included. Approximately 4 years ago a leaflet was produced showing the results of the previous uplift.

ACTION – DCC Jones to include a high-level summary of officer positions / locations as paid for by the uplift for the July 25 APP Workforce report.

The open part of the meeting closed at 10:58.

PRIVATE AGENDA

[A detailed account of the discussions and decisions on the following items is contained in the confidential minutes]

8 Closed minutes of the meeting held on 7 March 2025 (Paper AP25/24)

8.1 The confidential minutes of the meeting held on 7 March 2025 were agreed as an accurate record and approved by the Police and Crime Commissioner.

9 Protective Services Command Update (Paper AP25/25)

9.1 Suffolk Constabulary gave a summary of this report and invited questions.

10 Strategic Policing Requirement (Paper AP25/26)

10.1 Suffolk Constabulary invited questions on this report.

The meeting closed at 11:22.

Summary of Actions

Item / Paper	Action	Owner
1.8 Public Questions	DCC Jones to put the local inspector in touch with Mr Hughes.	DCC Jones
1.12 Public Questions	DCC Jones to organise for the case raised by Ms Bryant to be re-looked at.	DCC Jones
4.4 Supporting Children & Young People	ACC Bridger to provide an update on the Integrated Front Door timelines to the PCC once known.	ACC Bridger
4.8 Supporting Children & Young People	ACC Bridger to invite the OPCC's Head of Policy & Performance to the relevant Op Hydrant meetings.	ACC Bridger
4.1 Supporting Children & Young People	ACC Bridger to provide the PCC with updates on the impact of the team changes as referenced at point 4.1.	ACC Bridger
7.1 AOB	DCC Jones to include a high-level summary of officer positions / locations as paid for by the uplift for the July 25 APP Workforce report.	DCC Jones