



SOUTH YORKSHIRE POLICE AND CRIME PANEL

**OFFICES OF THE SOUTH YORKSHIRE JOINT AUTHORITIES, 18 REGENT STREET,
BARNSELEY, S70 2HG**

15 DECEMBER 2017

PRESENT: Councillor A Khayum (Sheffield City Council) (Chair)

Councillor S Sansome (Rotherham MBC) (Vice-Chair)

Councillors: B Cutts (Rotherham MBC), D Griffin (Barnsley MBC), D Hughes (Doncaster MBC), J Otten (Sheffield City Council) and S Wilkinson (Doncaster MBC)

Independent Co-opted Members: Mr A Carter and Mr S Chu

Dr A Billings (South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner), M Buttery (Office of the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner), M Clements (Office of the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner) and F Topliss (Office of the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner)

Officers: D Cutting, M McCarthy, L Noble and A Shirt (Barnsley MBC)

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor J Dunn, Councillor B Johnson, Councillor R Sixsmith MBE and S Parkin

1 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were noted as above.

2 **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

None.

3 **URGENT ITEMS**

None.

4 **ITEMS TO BE CONSIDERED IN THE ABSENCE OF THE PUBLIC AND PRESS**

None.

5 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS IN RELATION TO ANY ITEM OF BUSINESS ON THE AGENDA**

None.

6 PUBLIC QUESTIONS:-

7 TO THE POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER

There were no written public questions to the Police and Crime Commissioner.

8 TO THE POLICE AND CRIME PANEL

There were no written questions to the Police and Crime Panel.

9 QUESTIONS FROM POLICE AND CRIME PANEL MEMBERS TO THE POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER

In accordance with Procedure Rule 11 (General Questions from Members of the Panel), the following question had been submitted and the response provided from the Police and Crime Commissioner:-

Questions from Councillor Sansome

1. **How will SYP ensure standard practice across the South Yorkshire force when dealing with mental health crisis situations? We have heard there are different responses to similar situations across South Yorkshire in relation to section 136 detentions.**

Response

South Yorkshire has recently appointed Superintendent Dan Thorpe as the Strategic Mental Health Lead, who was the Metropolitan Police Service Mental Health Lead for a number of years, supporting the then National Police Chiefs' Council (NPCC) Lead for Mental Health, Commander Christine Jones, who helped develop the Mental Health Crisis Care Concordat.

Levels of support for people detained under S136 of the Mental Health Act can vary across SY because the three mental health trusts (SWYFT, RDASH, SHSC) offer different support. In some areas, for example, places of safety have been suddenly closed and officers have had to find alternatives, which causes delay. This is despite S140 of the Act placing a duty on Clinical Commissioning Groups/Local Health Boards to give notice to local social services saying what emergency arrangements are in force in cases of emergency.

However, SYP have been working hard with NHS colleagues from across the County to continually improve aspects of mental health care provision, including getting access to the most appropriate service at the right time, which includes a MH crisis response.

South Yorkshire Police introduced a Strategic Mental Health Partnership Board, which has been operating now for nearly two years. The meeting sits bi-monthly to help SYP to work closely with strategic health partners in the interests of those affected by mental ill health. As an example the Board has kept those aged under 18 years, who are detained under S136 Mental Health Act, out of police cells

(mandatory since 11 December 2017). Over the last 2 years, no under 18's have been taken to a police cell. The board has also been working to achieve 24/7 Mental Health Crisis support for police officers through Single Points of Access or Triage services, which are now in place across the County.

Superintendent Thorpe is revising the Strategic Mental Health Partnership Board and has recently met the Chief Executive of RDASH MH Trust – Kathryn Singh - who has agreed to joint chair the Board. This is important when increasing MH demands are placing pressure on both police and a range of NHS services. Kathryn and Dan are currently reviewing the priorities of the Board and how this could link in with existing Countywide NHS work streams. As an example, one of the priorities of the Board is to examine existing Mental Health Crisis pathways, including the pathway for S136 and to create a Countywide Health Based Place of Safety specification that will introduce a consistent service across the County, something Supt Thorpe achieved in London across 10 Mental Health Trusts and 32 Local Authorities.

If preventing a mental health crisis is a central goal of mental health services; preventative services must be in place across the urgent care pathway and within the community to prevent a crisis occurring.

With S136 demand increasing by 33% over the last year, there is a collective need to understand this demand and work collectively on early interventions, identifying those who are high intensity users of service and creating joint management plans to better support these individuals and reduce demand. This will become a priority for the board in 2018.

Supt Thorpe has also introduced a SYP wide Mental Health Escalation Log, which enables police officers to escalate incidents and issues which have not gone well, or which identify areas for improvement concerning mental health crisis incidents. This provides a valuable countywide overview, which can be broken down into District/Trust areas. The log is regularly shared with strategic partners so that collectively SYP and the NHS can identify trends, repeated issues, which may influence how services are commissioned in the future.

- 2. Do you think the changes to the PACA will mean that people with mental health issues receive a poorer response when in crisis? For example we have been informed it sometimes takes a long time to transport someone to a mental health hospital or section 136 suite if the police and ambulance service are reluctant to help?**

Response

A person experiencing a mental health crisis should receive the best possible care at the earliest possible point. The legal changes introduced to S135/S136 Mental Health Act via the Police and Crime Act 2017, are intended to improve immediate service responses to people who need urgent help with their mental health, particularly in cases where police officers are the first to respond. However, it has been acknowledged by SYP, that health partners are under considerable strain and pressure to deliver various crisis services whilst seeing increasing demand with corresponding challenges around budgets.

The changes to the MHA are varied and may present both opportunities and consequences. For example, the application of S136 has now been widened in respect of where the power can be exercised. This will assist officers from the British Transport Police who regularly respond to people in MH crisis attempting to commit suicide on railway tracks. These are private places and prior to 11 December 2017, BTP officers were unable to exercise their powers under S136.

So whilst there are a number of areas where this power can now be utilised, an unintended consequence could be that we see a sharp or continual rise of S136 demand which may have a knock on effect as to the capability of the NHS to cope with this potential increase.

Another example of how this will improve the response, relates to the use of police cells, which can now only be used in exceptional circumstances. As such, it will be unlawful for police cells to be used unless the circumstances are compliant with the stipulated regulations which are very specific. Consequently, this will result in more adults being taken to health-based places of safety rather than a police cell. However, Mental Health Based Places of Safety within the county often experience challenges around resourcing or being able to manage more than one patient at a time, meaning officers and health partners may need to find urgent alternatives, which may just be the nearest Emergency Department.

That said, the overarching aim is to improve the response to those in need of a crisis response and the legislation has been produced with this in mind.

In respect of transport, Yorkshire Ambulance Service (YAS), (as all Ambulance Services within the UK), are commissioned to provide a transportation service for all individuals detained under S136. They are required to transport them to the nearest, suitable and available health based place of safety. As previously alluded to, SYP do recognise the pressures on colleagues from YAS, who are frequently unable to provide an ambulance to support such requests. Recent analysis of S136 transportation methods in Doncaster evidenced that around 60% of cases were transported by ambulance and the remaining 40% were transported by police vehicle.

In all cases in South Yorkshire, if someone is detained under S136 Mental Health Act, they will have to be transported to the nearest place of safety. If an ambulance is unable to support SYP due to a lack of resources, then SYP will transport the patient. The challenge is the availability of resourcing which is often outpaced by demand, rather than a reluctance to support someone in need of help.

3. How will the police force support incidents of aggression or crime within mental health wards?

Response

Whilst working in the Metropolitan Police Service, Superintendent Thorpe helped to introduce the National Mental Health Restraint Expert Reference Group. This was chaired by Lord Carlile of Berriew CBE QC. In January 2017, the first Memorandum of Understanding regarding the Police use of restraint in Mental Health & Learning

Disability Settings was published. Prior to this, there was no clear national position regarding when the police can be asked to attend mental health and learning disability settings and for what reasons

Health providers have a duty to undertake, implement and review risk assessments for all the services they provide. The police do not have specific powers to restrain a patient for the purposes of medical treatment regardless of whether the treatment is in the patient's best interests. In situations where the police are called for emergency assistance, the circumstances should be assessed on its merits.

The risks associated with restraint are significant. SYP officers should not be called to undertake restrictive practices connected to purely clinical interventions (e.g. taking fluid samples, administering injections/medication) unless exceptional factors apply.

SYP will support colleagues in health services with incidents where:

- There is an immediate risk to life and limb;
- There is an immediate risk of harm;
- Serious damage to property;
- Offensive Weapons are involved;
- Hostages

No assumption should be made by the police that any incident involving any patient will always be a matter for healthcare staff alone; or that offences committed by a patient cannot or should not be investigated or prosecuted.

10 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 29 SEPTEMBER 2017

The following matters arising were noted:-

- The Deputy Chief Constable had confirmed that the increase in non-emergency calls back in 2014 related to the 101 service in Sheffield which meant that calls for South Yorkshire Police and Sheffield City Council came through the 101 service.
- The Commissioner confirmed that representatives from his office had been present at all recent meetings of the Sheffield Safer and Sustainable Communities Partnership Board. Mr Carter confirmed that he had not questioned the PCC's or OPCC's commitment to partnership working.
- Following the last meeting, the Panel's Rules of Procedure had been updated and published on the Panel's website.
- Panel Members had been provided with details regarding how many individuals viewed the webcasts of Panel meetings.

Councillor Hughes asked if he could be provided with an update regarding the concerns he had outlined at the September meeting relating to Neighbourhood Policing.

The Commissioner replied that activity had taken place within Councillor Hughes' Ward area; he was of the understanding that information had been sent to Councillor Hughes.

Councillor Hughes commented that he had not received any information from the Commissioner. The Commissioner stated that he would re-issue the information to Councillor Hughes.

Councillor Khayum asked if the Panel could receive a progress update report in the New Year from the Chief Constable in respect of Neighbourhood Policing.

The Commissioner acknowledged Councillor Khayum's request.

RESOLVED –

- i) That the minutes of the Police and Crime Panel held on 29 September 2017 be agreed and signed by the Chair as a correct record.
- ii) That the Commissioner re-issues information to Councillor Hughes regarding Neighbourhood Policing operations taking place within his Ward area.
- iii) That a progress update report on Neighbourhood Policing be presented at a future Panel meeting.

11 MINUTES OF THE CONFIRMATION HEARING HELD ON 9 NOVEMBER 2017

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the Police and Crime Panel Confirmation Hearing held on 9 November 2017 be agreed and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

12 PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITY OF THE POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER

A report was presented to provide Members with information on how the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) had undertaken his engagement activity over the last 12 months and where engagement would be focused in the coming year.

Councillor Sansome noted that the engagement activity of the Force was reported to the OPCC and monitored at the Trust and Confidence Steering Group. He asked who was leading in this area following the departure of the Assistant Police and Crime Commissioner.

F Topliss replied that the engagement activity of the Force was led by Assistant Chief Constable David Hartley, who was assisted by F Topliss from the OPCC.

Councillor Sansome asked if further details could be provided regarding the joint approach taking place across several Forces in relation to Cyber Crime.

The Commissioner informed the Panel that South Yorkshire was in a seven Force collaboration which would have an intensive focus on Cyber Crime. Operations would not only take place regionally, but nationally and internationally. Members of

the public could report Cyber Crimes to the Force via the 101 telephone number or to Action Fraud.

Councillor Griffin commented that he was of the understanding that the Force had recently issued a survey on police confidence. He asked how this survey had been advertised to encourage members of the public to become engaged and respond.

F Topliss replied that the survey had been conducted to obtain a baseline assessment of trust and confidence in South Yorkshire Police. The survey had been undertaken in harder to reach areas, which included rural and minority communities.

The high-level findings of the survey would be presented to the PCC before Christmas and then presented to the Trust and Confidence Steering Group in January 2018. Further details regarding the outcome of the survey would be presented to the Panel in the New Year, following analysis of the results.

Mr Chu asked whether there was any specific consultation taking place regarding the 2018/19 level of Council Tax precept.

The Commissioner replied that he was currently awaiting the Government's announcement regarding the 2018/19 Police Grant and flexibility around the precept. He added that consultation would take place at various levels. The Commissioner had recently visited the four district Council Leaders to inform them of the likely financial position and Council Tax precept. Conversations with the public had previously taken place, and would commence again shortly following the Government's Police Grant announcement.

Councillor Sansome asked how much engagement was carried out with minority communities. Additionally, who was the OPCC engaging with and in which areas?

The Commissioner replied that the Force have a number of ethnic minority Independent Advisory Group (IAGs) established which meet in each district and a countywide LGBT Independent Advisory Group. The Commissioner confirmed that he also had a Countywide Independent Panel, which was currently in the process of being re-constituted.

Councillor Wilkinson asked if engagement work was undertaken with vulnerable people within communities.

The Commissioner replied that he did try to consult widely with individuals with learning difficulties and disabilities, some of whom sat on the IAGs.

RESOLVED – That Members of the Police and Crime Panel:-

- i) Noted the contents of the report and the PCC's commitment to engagement activity and commented upon any matters arising.
- ii) Noted that F Topliss would provide Panel Members with contact details for Action Fraud.

- iii) Noted that the results of the confidence in policing survey would be presented at a future Panel meeting.

13 ATLAS COURT UPDATE

A report was presented to provide Members of the Police and Crime Panel with information on the Review of Atlas Court.

Councillor Sansome asked if the public had been involved or informed of the review of the 101 system, as a way of increasing public confidence around the system.

The Commissioner reported that public confidence around the service was not as good as he would like it to be. He added that there would be a large amount of publicity when SmartContact was implemented by the Force in March 2018.

M Buttery added that the Commissioner had also informed the Force at recent Public Accountability Boards that they needed to involve the public with regards to progressing the review and manage expectations where there were dips in performance because of the implementation of new systems at a particular time.

Furthermore, at the Force Strategic Change Board, the Commissioner had stated that he wished to see public participation in the design of services.

Mr Chu asked how satisfied the Commissioner was with the Force in managing and understanding public demand for police resources, as highlighted in the HMICFRS report.

The Commissioner stated that he was satisfied with the work which was currently being undertaken by the Force to understand demand for police resources. The situation had much improved in twelve months from when the HMICFRS report had been published.

Mr Chu observed that the average 101 response time since 2015 had been around 1 minute 10 seconds. However, from the information provided to Members on contact centre performance, the current average wait time in the last eight weeks had indicated a wait time of much longer than in 2015; indicating that performance was getting much worse, not better. He asked if the Commissioner could provide the Panel with details regarding his arrangements for holding the Chief Constable to account in this area.

The Commissioner replied that he had also noted the average wait time had increased recently. He added that there was currently misconception from the public around call wait times which, he anticipated would be dispelled once SmartContact had been implemented.

In relation to the proposed future visit to Atlas Court, Mr Carter suggested that the timing of the visit be brought forward from May 2018 to allow all Members of the Panel the opportunity to view the new IT equipment in operation, prior to the local municipal elections, and any (potential) changes in the Panel's membership. However, he recognised that the visit had to coincide with the new system being in place and so this may not be possible.

The Commissioner noted Mr Carter's request.

Councillor Sansome asked if information could be provided at the February Panel meeting setting out progress on each objective for the review of Atlas Court / Contact Management and a timescale when each objective would be achieved.

The Commissioner acknowledged Councillor Sansome's request.

Councillor Griffin asked how satisfied the Commissioner was that the new Connect System would be able to accurately record property details for all of the properties where crimes are committed. He added that, from conversations with farmers located in rural areas, South Yorkshire Police seemed to be struggling to find farm properties.

M Buttery agreed to follow-up Councillor Griffin's concerns, adding that improvements in the Gazetter may come with the new systems.

RESOLVED – That Police and Crime Panel Members:-

- i) Noted the contents of the report and commented upon any matters arising.
- ii) Noted that the Commissioner had agreed to provide information at the February 2018 Panel meeting setting out progress on each objective and a timescale when each objective of the Review of Atlas Court / Contact Management would be achieved.
- iii) Noted that M Buttery would follow-up Councillor Griffin's concerns as outlined above.

14 HER MAJESTY'S INSPECTORATE OF CONSTABULARY, FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICES (HMICFRS) UPDATE

A report was presented to provide Members of the Police and Crime Panel with an overview of the statutory responsibilities of the PCC in relation to Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary, Fire and Rescue Services (HMICFRS) inspections and provide an update on the recent inspection activity within South Yorkshire Police.

Members were reminded that, in 2016, HMICFRS assessed the Force as 'requires improvement'. The latest SYP Police PEEL Efficiency report assessed that the Force still needed to focus on the same areas at the time of the 2017 inspection with an overall assessment as 'requires improvement' but made reference to the fact that favourable progress was being made. The Commissioner highlighted that the Force had been assessed as 'good' in the latest PEEL Legitimacy report.

The Commissioner provided the Panel with the assurances that he would be addressing and following-up each of the HMICFRS recommendations in a number of ways. Firstly, the recommendations would be discussed publicly at the Public Accountability Board and secondly, with the Force's Senior Leadership Group.

Councillor Sansome noted that a response to the Efficiency report was being prepared in line with the PCC's statutory responsibility. He asked if Panel Members could be provided with a copy of the response.

The Commissioner acknowledged Councillor Sansome's request. He added that a media statement had been published setting out his response to the HMICFRS Efficiency Inspection Report.

Councillor Sansome asked if the Panel could receive an annual update report in 12 months' time setting out the Force's progress with regards to how the Commissioner is holding the Force to account in respect of its performance in relation to the Mental Health Strategy.

Furthermore, Councillor Sansome noted that North Wales Police Force had been asked to examine how it trains its officers after an incident where a 24 year old individual had harmed himself. He asked how the Commissioner was holding the Chief Constable to account in the area of training required to ensure officers are competent to deal with people suffering from mental health issues.

The Commissioner acknowledged Councillor Sansome's requests. He added that information regarding officer training would also be contained within the report.

The Panel noted that the Chief Constable and Commissioner had previously stated that they would be making arrangements in the New Year to visit each district council to meet with elected Members to provide them with further information on the revised Neighbourhood Policing model. Panel Members asked that they be informed of the dates.

The Commissioner acknowledged the request.

Councillor Hughes asked if he could be provided with details regarding the timescale for bringing neighbourhood policing back into the communities of South Yorkshire. Additionally, when would Neighbourhood Policing Officers be on patrol within communities?

The Commissioner tasked F Topliss to provide Councillor Hughes with the details of his Local Inspector who could then provide him with further details regarding his Local Neighbourhood Policing Team.

RESOLVED – That Members of the Police and Crime Panel:-

- i) Noted the contents of the report and commented upon any matters arising.
- ii) Noted that the Commissioner had agreed to provide Panel Members with a copy of his response to the PEEL Efficiency report which was being prepared in line with his statutory responsibilities.
- iii) Noted that the Commissioner had agreed to provide the Panel with an annual update report in 12 months' time setting out the Force's progress with regards to how the Commissioner is holding the Force to account in respect of its performance with the Mental Health Strategy.

- iv) Noted that Panel Members would be provided with dates etc. when the Chief Constable and Commissioner would be visiting each district council to meet with elected Members to update them on the revised Neighbourhood Policing model.
- v) Noted that the Commissioner had tasked F Topliss to provide Councillor Hughes with the details of his Local Inspector.

15 BUDGET MONITORING REPORT: : 2017/18 SEPTEMBER MONTH END

A report was submitted to inform Members of the Police and Crime Panel of the financial position for 2017/18 as at 30 September 2017.

The year-end position forecast was that revenue expenditure would be £0.02m less than budget. The reasons for the spending variations were noted by Members.

In relation to capital expenditure Members noted that spending was forecast at £12.9m compared to a capital programme of £13.2m.

Councillor Sansome asked what assurances the Commissioner could give the Panel around the impact on performance and morale within the Force, given the amount of overtime being worked by Officers.

The Commissioner replied that he was concerned about the size of the overtime bill, and had discussed this with the Chief Constable. He outlined that some of the overtime related to policing football matches and some related to historic overtime (EDL Marches). Helping the Chief Constable to understand whether problems had been met through the use of overtime, when actually the Force should have been utilising the workforce itself, and whether there should be more officers, rather than making up the difference with overtime, were discussions that were currently taking place with the Chief Constable.

Councillor Sansome noted that the costs of medical retirements were expected to exceed budget by £0.72m. He asked how this budget would be managed and why it was expected to exceed budget.

The Commissioner replied that the Chief Constable had taken a personal interest in this area to understand why it was expected to exceed budget and to try and reduce this cost. He was confident that, moving forward medical retirements would be better managed.

The Commissioner provided the Panel with narrative on the additional legal costs and approved financial assistance costs.

RESOLVED – That Members of the Police and Crime Panel noted the report on the financial position for 2017/18 as at 30 September 2017.

16 RISK MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

A report was presented to provide Members of the Police and Crime Panel with an overview of the Commissioner's risk management arrangements.

Following discussion, Members felt that it would be useful to understand what its role was in relation to scrutinising the Commissioner's risk management arrangements.

L Noble agreed to conduct research to understand what scrutiny role other Police and Crime Panels performed in overseeing their Commissioner's risk management arrangements.

RESOLVED –

- i) That Members of the Police and Crime Panel noted the contents of the report and commented upon any matters arising.
- ii) Noted that L Noble had agreed to conduct research to understand what scrutiny role other Police and Crime Panels performed in overseeing their Commissioner's risk management arrangements.

17 ANNUAL POLICE & CRIME PANELS CONFERENCE, 6 NOVEMBER 2017

A report was presented to provide Members with a summary of the issues considered at the Sixth Annual Police and Crime Panels' Conference held in Coventry on 6th November 2017.

The Conference had generated several issues which the Panel were asked to consider and make recommendations on to further strengthen the Panel's role.

Mr Chu asked if other Panels decided not to participate in the Regional Network and Special Interest Group, would the costs increase for South Yorkshire.

L Noble agreed to investigate and report back to the Panel.

RESOLVED – That Members of the Police and Crime Panel:-

- i) Agreed to utilise £500 (per annum) from the Grant allocation to pay for Frontline Consulting to facilitate the establishment of a Regional Network.
- ii) Agreed to utilise £200 (per annum) from the Grant allocation to pay for the LGA to provide some administrative support around the establishment of a Special Interest Group (National Association of Police and Crime Panels).
- iii) Noted that L Noble had agreed to investigate the issue regarding increasing costs, if not all Panels decided to participate in the Regional Network and Special Interest Group.
- iv) Agreed to give consideration as to how links could be strengthened with the four District Community Safety Partnerships at a political level.

- v) Agreed to give consideration to making a request for the Chair of the Panel to attend one SY Leaders' meeting per annum to provide an update on the Panel's activities.
- vi) Agreed to consider supporting the ongoing work to strengthen the links with the four District Overview and Scrutiny Committees.
- vii) Agreed to consider holding an additional (informal) Panel meeting around April / May (giving a total of 7) for Members to look back over the previous year, and plan for the coming year.
- viii) Agreed to consider the establishment of a Budget Working Group, as set out in paragraph 22.
- ix) Agreed to consider a Lead Member approach as set out in paragraph 23, when time allows.

18 SOUTH YORKSHIRE POLICE AND CRIME PLAN PRIORITIES AND REQUIREMENTS - THEME: PROTECTING VULNERABLE PEOPLE (PVP)

Members considered a Force performance report that was submitted to the PCC's Public Accountability Board (PAB) held on 27 November 2017, which focused on the theme 'Protecting Vulnerable People'.

Councillor Sansome recalled that it had been reported at the recent PAB meeting that Professor Drew intended to re-visit SYP's performance regarding the handling of CSE. He asked how the Panel would be involved and notified of the findings of that review.

The Commissioner commented that he did not feel there was a need for Professor Drew to re-visit at this stage. He was confident that the Force were now addressing those areas identified.

Councillor Sansome referred to the Victim Care Strategy which was reported at the last PAB meeting, where a figure of 1300 offences was mentioned within South Yorkshire. He asked if the Commissioner was able to provide a breakdown of domestic abuse offences by area, by offence, and how many prosecutions had been pursued.

The Commissioner acknowledged Councillor Sansome's request for information.

Furthermore, Councillor Sansome asked if the Commissioner could provide the Panel with information on the number of domestic abuse reports which were outstanding, and how he held the Force to account in terms of progressing these reports in a timely manner.

The Commissioner replied that he held the Chief Constable to account in this area at the PAB to understand how the Force were dealing with domestic abuse and responding to it.

In relation to rape and sexual offences, Councillor Sansome stated that he was pleased to note that the Force were performing above the national average for conviction rates in this area. He asked if the Commissioner could provide information on the convictions by district and how the Commissioner was liaising with the Force on any re-distribution of staffing to deal with the increase in this area.

The Commissioner acknowledged Councillor Sansome's request. The Commissioner assured the Panel that discussions in relation to rape and sexual offences did take place at the PAB, along with debate and discussion with the Force on a regular basis.

Councillor Sansome stated that a number of other issues had arisen at PAB on 27th November. Specifically, there had been reports that had identified the failings in the national helicopter service responding to thousands of incidents. He asked if the Commissioner could provide the Panel with assurances that flying hours had not, and would not, be reduced and replaced by drones.

The Commissioner replied that there were no proposals to replace the helicopter service with drones. Additionally, South Yorkshire was part of the National Police Air Service (NPAS). In a recent HMICFRS report regarding the air service, it had been suggested that, following the move to the national scheme, the capacity of those services had diminished and not increased. HMICFRS were asking questions regarding the number of bases, helicopters and fixed-wing aircraft that are available. The Commissioner was expecting to see a growth bid in this provision moving forward.

Councillor Sansome stated that it had been reported recently that the Police fear scores of convictions may face challenges because of the suspected manipulation of forensic test results at a private laboratory in Manchester. He asked if the Commissioner had been provided with assurances around any cases within South Yorkshire.

The Commissioner replied that discussions had taken place with the Force regarding this issue. Furthermore, South Yorkshire Police along with other Forces were having to prioritise the re-testing of samples and results.

Councillor Wilkinson asked of the 8,209 incidents relating to missing person reports, how many were from children in looked after care, how many were **not** from children in looked after care, how many of those reports were repeat, and how this was split across the four districts in South Yorkshire.

The Commissioner confirmed that in the last year there had been missing person reports relating to 4,700 adults, 5,800 children and 4,200 looked after children. Demand work was currently being undertaken by the Force in relation to missing persons.

Mr Chu suggested that, as part of the Commissioner's small grants programme he could commission charities to undertake some of the missing persons work.

The Commissioner replied that the voluntary sector did undertake some missing persons work and that, the Force may have to consider using them more in the future due to the high levels of demand in this area.

RESOLVED – That Members of the Police and Crime Panel:-

- i) Noted the report.
- ii) Raised issues in respect of the PCC's role in holding the Force to account for delivery of the Police and Crime Plan.
- iii) Noted that the Commissioner had agreed to provide Panel Members with a breakdown of domestic abuse offences by area, by offence and how many prosecutions had been pursued.
- iv) Noted that the Commissioner had agreed to provide Panel Members with information on the number of domestic abuse reports which were outstanding.
- v) Noted that the Commissioner had agreed to provide Panel Members with information on rape and sexual offences convictions by District.

19 COMPLAINTS UPDATE & EXTENSION OF NON-SERIOUS COMPLAINTS PROCESS

A report was presented to provide the Panel with a regular update on complaints made against the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) during the period 1st April 2017 to 15th December 2017. This included any complaints 'inherited' from the previous host Authority which were outstanding at the 1st April 2017.

Secondly, the report referred the Panel's attention to the Government's proposed extension to the Panel's complaints handling powers regarding complaints about the PCC's conduct (i.e. non policy complaints).

RESOLVED – That Members of the Police and Crime Panel:-

- i) Noted the complaints received.
- ii) Agreed to receive a half-yearly report.
- iii) Noted and consider how it would accommodate the revised complaints powers and duties.
- iv) Considered the additional duties being added to the Complaints Panel's Terms of Reference.

20 LEARNING AND DEVELOPMENT 2017/18

A report was submitted to provide Members of the Panel with a progress update on the Learning and Development Schedule for 2017/18.

Members were informed that the PCC's Budget Familiarisation Session would be held on 29 January 2018; further details had been circulated via email.

RESOLVED – That Members of the Police and Crime Panel:-

- i) Noted the outcome of the discussions with Members held to date.
- ii) Provided comments on the priorities for learning and development.

21 PCC DECISIONS

A report was presented to provide Members of the Police and Crime Panel with information on decisions taken by the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC).

RESOLVED – That Members of the Police and Crime Panel noted the contents of the report.

22 WORK PROGRAMME

Members noted that the Work Programme would be updated to reflect the issues raised at today's meeting.

RESOLVED – That Members of the Police and Crime Panel noted that the Work Programme would be updated to reflect the issues raised at today's meeting.

23 DATE AND TIME OF THE NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Panel will be held on Friday 2 February 2018, 10:00 am at the Offices of the Joint Authorities, 18 Regent Street, Barnsley, S70 2HG (unless stated otherwise).

CHAIR