

POLICE AND CRIME PANEL
16th December, 2016

Present:-

Barnsley MBC

Councillor D. Griffin

Doncaster MBC

Councillor J. Healy

Councillor C. McGuinness

Rotherham MBC

Councillor S. Sansome (in the Chair)

Sheffield CC

Councillor J. Drayton

Councillor J. Otten

Co-opted Members

Mr. A. Carter

Mr. S. Chu

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor B. Cutts (Rotherham MBC), R. Frost (Barnsley MBC), T. Hussain and M. Rooney (Sheffield CC).

F32. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 28 OCTOBER 2016

The Chair reported that Councillor Brian Cutts (Rotherham MBC) had written to indicate that he did not consider the minutes to be accurate in respect of his statement under Minute F27 and wished for the minutes to be amended to record that he had observed every protest march in Rotherham, rather than attended. The Chair indicated that he had watched the webcast of the previous meeting, where Councillor Cutts had indicated that he had attended every protest march in Rotherham, and could not recommend that the proposed amendment be incorporated within the minutes.

Resolved:-

That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Police and Crime Panel held on 28 October 2016 be approved as a true and correct record of the proceedings.

F33. TO CONSIDER WHETHER THE PRESS AND PUBLIC SHOULD BE EXCLUDED FROM THE MEETING DURING CONSIDERATION OF ANY PART OF THE AGENDA.

The Chair indicated that there were no items for consideration on the agenda that would require the exclusion of the press and public from the meeting.

F34. TO DETERMINE ANY ITEM WHICH THE CHAIRMAN IS OF THE OPINION SHOULD BE CONSIDERED AS A MATTER OF URGENCY.

The Chair indicated that there were no items requiring the urgent consideration of the Panel.

F35. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC TO THE PANEL

It was reported that no public questions had been received.

F36. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PANEL TO THE POLICE & CRIME COMMISSIONER

In accordance with Procedure Rule 11 (General Questions from Members of the Panel), the following questions were put with responses from the Police and Crime Commissioner:

Mr Alan Carter put the following question:

“Is the PCC sufficiently concerned about the issue of human trafficking and modern day slavery to use his influence to ensure that access to adequate funding may be prioritised to ensure that there are resources sufficient to enable the South Yorkshire Police and their various partners to be able to comprehensively address this apparently growing problem in our communities?”

In response, the Police and Crime Commissioner stated:

“Human Trafficking and Modern Slavery is a growing area of concern and all forces in the UK recognise that. I am meeting with the non-governmental organisation (NGO) and Force lead on the 16 December to discuss a multi-agency partnership. At that meeting I want to discuss the deliverables one might reasonably expect from such a partnership including, but not limited to, the development of a Countywide Partnership Strategy.

In addition to which I have provided some funding to a NGO to provide training to partner agencies first responders - for example housing officers or similar. The training will be free to access and will in the first instance address some of the knowledge gaps we are aware exist in terms of spotting the signs, understanding responsibilities around and reporting mechanisms for victims of modern slavery.

You are right to say that this is a multi-agency issue and responsibility and I welcome this opportunity to further raise the profile of this heinous crime.”

Mr Alan Carter had also given notice of a second question:

“As Police and Crime Commissioner, would you please advise the Police and Crime Panel on your personal involvement in and influence to date upon the releasing and directing for community benefit of assets seized or recovered from criminals’ ill-gotten gains, pursuant to the provisions of The Proceeds of Crime Act 2002? In particular, could you report upon the extent to which money returned to the public purse from this source assists in aiding good community causes and engaging ex-offenders in activities to benefit the wider community in South Yorkshire?”

In response, the Police and Crime Commissioner stated:

“The Proceeds of Crime Act 2002 (“POCA”) sets out the legislative scheme for the recovery of criminal assets with criminal confiscation being the most commonly used power. Confiscation occurs after a conviction has taken place. Other means of recovering the proceeds of crime which do not require a conviction are provided for in the Act, namely civil recovery, cash seizure and taxation powers.

If associated with a criminal investigation / prosecution and conviction this is regarded as an asset in the confiscation process for which the police receive only 18.5% back from the incentivisation fund. In cases of cash seizure, detention or forfeiture the police receive 50% of the amount back through the incentivisation fund.

It is complex and difficult to obtain funds through the Proceeds of Crime Act and can take 5 – 6 years to come through. Because of these complexities we do not rely on POCA money to fund any particular activities because it is not a stable or consistent funding source.”

In response, Mr Alan Carter indicated that communities in West Yorkshire were benefiting from funding from a Proceeds of Crime Fund and enquired whether any monies coming into South Yorkshire were being used for the benefit of local communities.

The Police and Crime Commissioner answered that it was unlikely that the funds being distributed were from the proceeds of organised crime, but rather that the local PCC had given a pot of money the name “Proceeds of Crime Fund”. He committed to look further into the issue. .

Councillor Joe Otten asked the following question:

“Who do you understand to be ultimately responsible for taking the decision to go ahead with the 17th November police and Amey operation on Rustlings Road, Sheffield, to fell trees in the early hours?”

In response, the Police and Crime Commissioner stated:

“The decision to go ahead with the 17 November operation on Rustlings Road was a matter for Sheffield City Council. As I understand it, this was part of a larger contract to resurface roads and make good pavements that included the felling of some older trees whose roots were affecting street maintenance. If memory serves me correctly, this policy was welcomed by all parties on Sheffield City Council at the time. They wanted a coherent plan to tackle the city’s potholes and put the streets and pavements into better order so as to minimise future costs in a time of austerity. The Councillor might like to ask the city council how many claims there were for tripping over poorly maintained pavements in the past few years.”

Councillor Joe Otten asked a second question:

“It has been claimed that decision for the early start to tree felling was “on police advice”. Is this correct and what was that advice?”

In response, the Police and Crime Commissioner stated:

“It would not be the role of the police to tell the local council when to undertake its work, but it would be its role to give an assessment of what the impact might be.”

Councillor Joe Otten asked a third question:

“It has been claimed that a vehicle containing police dogs was on Rustlings Road for a time on the 17th November. Can you confirm or deny this?”

In response, the Police and Crime Commissioner stated:

“No police dogs were requested, utilised or present during the tree felling exercise on Rustlings Road.”

Councillor Joe Otten submitted a fourth question:

“A council's powers to close roads and tow vehicles are limited by regulations requiring notification and signage intended to prevent a premeditated ambush of parked cars such as we saw. What are the consequences of police assistance in this aspect of the operation should it be shown to be unlawful?”

In response, the Police and Crime Commissioner stated:

The road closures as outlined above are the responsibility of the Local Authority. The police only have powers to close in respect of emergencies. Whilst the Local Authority need to secure the road closure orders only the police can enforce them if required.

In respect of the operation on the 17th, the police were advised by the Local Authority that road closure orders were in place and would accept this as being the case. Even if it was subsequently discovered that these were not in place or were not lawfully obtained, the fact that the police acted in good faith would negate any liability for the police for any actions taken. The police did not have any involvement in obtaining authorisation for the road closures for the 17th and the removal of vehicles were arranged and undertaken by council contractors.

To speak about 'a premeditated ambush' is not helpful and seems designed to heighten emotions in a quite gratuitous fashion. This emotive language was also employed by the MP for Hallam, Nick Clegg, when he spoke about people being 'dragged from their beds' by the police. This undermines trust in the police service and I hope he will think twice before uttering such nonsense in the future."

Councillor Joe Otten asked a fifth question:

"What changes have been or will be made to SYP policy in regards to tree protests as a result of these events?"

In response, the Police and Crime Commissioner stated:

"I have asked the Chief Constable to keep me informed of any operations that might see a repetition of what happened on Rustlings Road and also to ensure, as far as possible, that officers are not drawn into carrying out any activity that properly is a matter for the city council and the contractors – such as knocking on doors to ask people to move their cars."

As a supplementary question, Councillor Otten enquired whether police dogs were held in reserve. The Police and Crime Commissioner responded to indicate that the information given to him stated that there were no police dogs in the vicinity.

Councillor Joe Otten asked a sixth question:

"What was the cost (not additional cost, but actual cost of police time etc as normally accounted for) of the police operation on Rustlings Rd on the 17th November?"

In response, the Police and Crime Commissioner stated:

"The resources deployed were all in duty time and no additional costs were incurred. Total staffing time was 72 hours. At £15.47 per hour (mid-level constable rate) this was £1,113.84."

As a supplementary question, Councillor Otten enquired whether the Commissioner would confirm that the figure of twelve officers was correct. In response, the Police and Crime Commissioner stated that he could only tell Councillor Otten what he had been told by the force.

Councillor Joe Otten asked a seventh question:

“Do South Yorkshire Police intend to run a 'close pass' initiative to improve the safety of cyclists, similar to the one that West Midlands Police and other forces are now doing?”

In response, the Police and Crime Commissioner stated:

“I am aware of this scheme and only a couple of weeks ago, the Assistant PCC, Sioned-Mair Richards attended a meeting with representatives of Sheffield Cycle groups as well as the city council about this.

Key roads are targeted and police cyclists ride the road. If someone drives too close to them then colleagues, including someone from the local authority waiting ahead are notified and the offending vehicle is stopped and either prosecuted or given education input. A similar scheme is run in Humberside - Operation Achilles applies the same principles except for motorbikes. The educational input is delivered by a local authority representative using an educational mat. The cost of this mat is approximately £900.

Chief Inspector Glen Suttinwood has provided me with the statistics from the Safer Roads Partnership concerning collisions involving cyclists in South Yorkshire:-

	CRA SH	CJ U	CJ U
PEDAL CYCLE	<u>2016</u>	<u>20</u> <u>15</u>	<u>20</u> <u>14</u>
FATAL	1	1	1
SERIOUS	52	45	56
SLIGHT	200	25 8	27 5

Clearly one death per year is one too many, however, deaths involving cyclists in South Yorkshire are no where near the levels that they are in the West Midlands or other parts of the country. Whilst it is clear that the scheme has been well received in the West Midlands and is a good approach to tackling a key priority, this needs to be balanced against priorities that are Force specific. The main cohorts in relation to road deaths or serious injuries in South Yorkshire are centred on pedestrians and car users - drivers or passengers - where SYP have seen a continual rise over the past 2 years. That said, West Midlands Police are hosting a workshop in Birmingham on 13 January and officers from SYP are looking to attend.

In addition to this, given the challenging demand that the police service is currently facing as a result of austerity, resources are carefully deployed to target specific activity. I understand South Yorkshire Police are not aware of any specific location (s) that is prominent for pedal cyclist Road

Traffic Collisions. Neither, have any officers who are trained and equipped in the use of pedal cycles brought any concerns to the attention of Chief Inspector Suttanwood.

Enforcement should probably be used as a last resort to improve road safety, the most sensible solution would be to look at addressing the root causes of the problem – one of which is the layout of the roads. By creating segregated or shared cycle/pedestrian routes, improving lighting, awareness and signage, cyclists can use the roads with the confidence that they are safe to do. Some of this is being progressed in the county already:-

Sheffield

- Next development at Meadowhall, segregated cycle route.
- The new Ikea is to have cycle routes and crossings to it, as is the upcoming Charter Square improvements.
- The Connect 2 route is a fairly recent cycle route between Halfway and Killamarsh mainly segregated from traffic.

Rotherham

- Centenary Way and Canklow roundabout have all recently been upgraded to cater for cyclists. A cycle route has been created on the Waverley development to a Highfield Springs.

Doncaster

- A number of crossings have been converted to Toucan crossings along with a new one on Leger Way to link the Bawtry Rd commuter route to town. Also a new cycle lane on Bennethorpe.

Barnsley

- A cycle to work route has been built to service the large Asos factory at Grimethorpe.
- Also a new route is being built currently from the Trans Pennine Trail at Pontefract Rd into the town centre.

Whilst naturally, all Force areas will see a decline in cyclists on the roads during the winter, I understand Chief Inspector Suttanwood is discussing the prospect of delivering some educational workshops in schools for future drivers and cyclists with local LPTS during Spring 2017 following attendance at West Midlands Police's workshop."

Mr Steve Chu submitted the following question:

"Does the Commissioner know whether South Yorkshire Police has received any reports of current or historic child sexual abuse connected to professional football clubs, or any other sports clubs? Is it appropriate to seek to review current child protection procedures at local sports clubs? If so, who should do this?"

In response, the Police and Crime Commissioner stated:

“SYP has received 3 reports to date of sexual abuse relating to football clubs – all are historic (one from the 1960s and the other 2 from the 1980s), with only one relating to a professional club, the others are local non-professional clubs.

It would not be appropriate to share further details with the Panel at this time about the on-going investigations. The child protection procedures with sports clubs and other organised activities with children are a matter for the relevant Local Authority or the Local Safeguarding Children's Board.”

Mr Steve Chu referred to his disappointment to learn through the media that the same question had been aired at the Public Accountability Board on 15 December 2016 and queried whether the Commissioner had used the Panel's questions to inform discussion at that meeting or whether it was coincidental. In response, the Police and Crime Commissioner confirmed that it was coincidental, but given the prominence of the subject in the national media in the past weeks it was an important issue to be discussed.

F37. PCC'S GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS

Consideration was given to a report detailing the interim governance arrangements of the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner. The report set out the number and role of independent assurance panels that the Police and Crime Commissioner had established, as well as providing information on the role of the Public Accountability Board.

It was noted that the following bodies had been established:-

- Joint Independent Audit Committee – shared between South Yorkshire Police and the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner
- Independent Ethics Panel
- Independent Advisory Panel for Minority Communities
- Independent Policing Protests Advisory Panel
- Independent Custody Visitors

The Panel thanked the Police and Crime Commissioner for sharing the detail of his governance structure. Members raised concerns in respect of the role of a number of the independent panels which they considered to be performing functions that should fall within the remit of the Police and Crime Panel. Having recently attended a national conference for Police and Crime Panels, Members referred to practice in other police force areas whereby Police and Crime Panels performed a more proactive and supportive role in the development of policy in respect of policing and community safety issues. Concern was expressed that the South

Yorkshire Police and Crime Panel had not been given the opportunity to undertake a similar role.

In response, the Police and Crime Commissioner reiterated the statutory provisions in respect of his role in holding the Chief Constable and South Yorkshire Police to account, which he discharged through Public Accountability Board meetings. He also set out the statutory provisions in respect of the role of the Police and Crime Panel in holding him to account.

Discussions focused on the relationship between the Police and Crime Commissioner's governance structure and the role of the Police and Crime Panel. Members made clear their willingness to take on more work to support the work of the Police and Crime Commissioner as a "critical friend".

The Police and Crime Commissioner indicated that Panel Members would be welcome to attend meetings of the Public Accountability Board and he would be happy for officers to make arrangements for Panel Members to observe other panel meetings.

Resolved:-

That the report be noted.

F38. HER MAJESTY'S INSPECTORATE OF CONSTABULARY (HMIC) UPDATE

Consideration was given to a report from the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner which detailed Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) PEEL (Police Effectiveness, Efficiency and Legitimacy) inspection regime.

It was reported that it was the role of HMIC to independently assess police forces and policing across a wide range of policing activity. HMIC decides on the depth, frequency and areas to inspect based upon their judgement about what is in the public interest.

Section 55(5) of the 1996 Police Act requires Police and Crime Commissioners to prepare comments on any of HMIC's published reports that relate to their Force, and then publish these in the manner they see fit. Section 55(6) required Police and Crime Commissioners to send a copy of these comments to the Home Secretary.

Members noted that the Police Efficiency 2016 report was published on 3 November 2016. The inspection considered the extent to which the Force is efficient at keeping people safe and reducing crime. The three questions considered by HMIC were:

1. How well does the Force understand the current and likely future demand?
2. How well does the Force use its resources to manage current demand?
3. How well is the Force planning for demand in the future?

South Yorkshire Police had been assessed as requiring improvement in respect of the efficiency with which it keeps people safe and reduces crime. The Panel noted the Chief Constable's response to the report.

The Effectiveness Inspection took place in South Yorkshire on 17 October 2016. This would seek to give a rating on how effective South Yorkshire Police are at keeping people safe and reducing crime, previously the Force were rated as requiring improvement. The Police Effectiveness Report will be published in Spring 2017.

It was noted that HMIC had published its rating for Leadership for South Yorkshire Police on 8 December 2016 which had indicated that improvement was required.

Panel Members reflected on the Peer Review undertaken earlier in the year following the suspension of the former Chief Constable. The Police and Crime Commissioner indicated that he considered the peer review process to have been more agile and insightful than the approach of HMIC and many of the issues identified by HMIC had long been identified by the Force and plans had been developed and were being implemented to address those issues.

Panel Members identified that reviewing performance was an area where they could add value and support the work of the Police and Crime Commissioner. Whilst Members did not wish to duplicate any existing performance monitoring activity, the Panel should seek assurances in respect of areas where issues had been identified and that measures were implemented to address underperformance.

The Panel reiterated its wish to see the proposals being developed by the Chief Constable in respect of reforming neighbourhood policing in South Yorkshire. The Police and Crime Commissioner acknowledged the significant contribution that local Councillors would have to make to support a new neighbourhood policing model, as part of the drive to strengthen trust and confidence in the police.

In response to a comment, the Police and Crime Commissioner set out his position in respect to the Police and Crime Bill's provisions to enhance collaboration between emergency services, specifically between Fire & Rescue and the Police. There was provision within the bill for the Police and Crime Commissioner to have a role within the Fire Service, but in South Yorkshire there was no intention to merge blue light services, but there would be a need for further collaboration in future.

Resolved:-

1. That the report be noted.
2. That a report be submitted in February 2017 detailing trends and volumes in respect of contact through 999 emergency calls and 101 non-emergency calls.
3. That a report be submitted in February 2017 profiling the police staff numbers by rank, gaps in numbers, the retirement profile of the force and the strategy to backfill or boost those numbers in the future.

F39. BUDGET POSITION FOR 2016/17

Consideration was given to a report submitted by the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner detailing the budgetary position for 2016-17.

It was reported that there was a reduction in funding for the 2016-17 financial year from Government amounting to approximately £1m compared to 2015/16. As part of the Finance Settlement for 2016/17, the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) was given the flexibility to increase the council tax by 3.3%: this generated additional council tax income of £2.4m largely as a result of an increase in the council tax base.

The total level of revenue funding - including Government grant and council tax income - amounted to approximately £242m. The majority of that was allocated to the Chief Constable to finance Force running costs, including employee costs. In order to keep within the amount allocated and to meet the costs of demand and cost pressures, reductions of at least £6m were agreed as part of the budget process.

It was forecast that there would be an overall underspending of £4.2m in the current financial year. It was noted that a projected underspend of £2.7m sat within the Chief Constable's operating budget. It was reported that the Chief Constable had taken steps to reduce expenditure in the current financial year in order to have resources to carry forward for use in meeting expenditure in 2017/18. One of the largest single variations related to Police Staff costs where there was a projected £2m underspend due to vacancies and staff turnover.

The overall position included a spending variation in respect of the costs of Operation Stovewood: this would be conducted by the National Crime Agency into historic allegations of child sexual exploitation. When the budget was agreed it had been assumed that Special Grant funding would be received from Government and that this would involve the application of a "1% rule": the Home Office have in the past expected the Force to meet an amount equivalent to 1% of the budget with the Government

providing the balance. The actual Special Grant award for 2016/17 had put a ceiling of £1m on the costs met by the Force.

It was further reported that one of the assumptions underpinning the 2016/17 budget was that any further costs that may potentially arise from legacy issues would be largely met from special grant allocations from Government. The nature and extent of any liability that may arise and the degree to which it should be set against the 2016/17 budget, had yet to be finalised.

Panel Members sought assurance in respect of the reserves strategy for the Force and noted that the forecast underspend would be used to supplement reserves. General reserves were recommended to be set around a minimum of £12m.

Recognising the difficult decisions that lay ahead, the Panel indicated that it would be willing to informally engage with the Police and Crime Commissioner to discuss the detail behind proposals for setting the budget. Panel Members indicated that they would welcome the opportunity to monitor the financial position throughout the year and to enter into a regular dialogue to better inform their scrutiny of precept proposals on an annual basis.

In response to a question from the Chair, the Police and Crime Commissioner confirmed that the Government had not offered a four year financial settlement the police, unlike that available to local authorities. The PCC also referred to the various approaches made by South Yorkshire to the Government for special grants for legacy issues.

Resolved:-

That the report be noted.

F40. HOME OFFICE GUIDANCE - SCRUTINY OF PRECEPTS

Further to the previous report in respect of the financial position of South Yorkshire Police, consideration was given to the Home Office's guidance in respect of the Panel's role in scrutinising the precept proposal from the Police and Crime Commissioner.

It was noted that the Panel would be required to hold a meeting on a date between 1 February and 8 February 2017, having received notification of the Police and Commissioner's proposal.

Clarification was sought in respect of the provisions for the Panel to exercise a veto and recommend a higher increase in council tax, which would necessitate a local referendum on a proposed increase. As the guidance was not sufficiently clear, it was agreed that a response would be provided outside of the meeting.

It was suggested that it would be helpful for Panel Members to meet in advance of the formal precept proposal discussion and the Police and Crime Commissioner committed to do whatever possible to accommodate the Panel's wishes.

Resolved:-

1. That the guidance be noted.
2. That clarification be provided in respect of the veto process and any potential referendum requirement arising from a veto.
3. That an informal meeting between Panel Members and the Police and Crime Commissioner be arranged to informally discuss the budget and precept proposals ahead of a meeting in the first week of February 2017.

F41. COMPLAINTS UPDATE

Consideration was given to an update report in respect of complaints submitted by the host authority for the Police and Crime Panel.

The Panel recalled that it was reported to the last meeting of the Panel that the two complaints which had been received in respect of the previous Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) had been referred to the Clerk to the Home Affairs Select Committee. The Panel were informed that the matters have now been referred to the Metropolitan Police, by the Home Affairs Select Committee (HASC). After taking legal advice, the HASC concluded that the allegations referred to (deliberately misleading the Committee) would if proved constitute a criminal offence, which is contrary to the conclusion of the IPCC. The progress of the matter will be reported back to a future meeting of the Panel.

It was reported that a complaint had been received whereby the complainant was dissatisfied with how South Yorkshire Police (SYP) had dealt with his complaint. He appealed their decision to the IPCC who upheld SYP's decision. The complainant then wrote to the PCC. The initial complaint related to how a crime is recorded.

It was noted that the PCC was not responsible for complaints against officers and staff of SYP or for operational matters, these were the responsibility of the Chief Constable. The Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner initially wrote to the complainant explaining that there was nothing further that the PCC could do to assist him in the matter, but the complainant was dissatisfied with that response, and as such submitted a complaint. It was noted that a review was carried out by the OPCC as to whether the correct policies and procedures had been followed. The outcome of this review and further information as to the recording of criminal offences had been provided to the complainant. It was reported

that confirmation from the complainant was awaited that this had satisfactorily concluded the matter.

Panel Members sought assurances that the Complaints Procedure that had been agreed earlier in the year had been implemented. It was reported that the new procedure, which involved the initial screening of complaints by the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner with the two independent co-opted members of the Panel, had been implemented on 1 December 2016.

Panel Members indicated that they would wish to review the effectiveness of the procedure in the new municipal year.

Resolved:-

1. That the report be noted.
2. That the Complaints Procedure be reviewed at the first meeting of the 2017-18 municipal year.

F42. FUTURE ACTIVITY AND DATES OF MEETINGS

Consideration was given to a report detailing the emerging work programme for the Police and Crime Panel and outlining prospective dates of meetings for the 2017-18 municipal year.

It was reported that Panel Members had held an informal work planning session on 18 November 2016 where the following had been identified:

- the Governance Arrangements of the Police and Crime Commissioner
- the financial position of South Yorkshire Police and the Office of the PCC
- the implementation of the recommendations arising from the Peer Review of South Yorkshire Police
- Scrutiny of the Police and Crime Plan

Other items on the agenda for the meeting had dealt with the first three items identified and it was noted that the Police and Crime Commissioner had sought the views of Panel Members and other partners and the public in developing themes for the new Police and Crime Plan. It was noted that this would be brought to the Panel Meeting schedule for 24 February 2017.

The report set out a number of dates for meetings to take place in the 2017-18 municipal year and authority was sought to consult on those dates with the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner.

It was noted that work in preparing a Memorandum of Understanding was underway with a view to submitting a draft to the meeting on 24 February 2017, following consultation with the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner. Further to this, it was suggested that regular meetings be arranged between the Police and Crime Commissioner and the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Panel.

Resolved:-

1. That the report be noted.
2. That Panel Members confirm with the host authority their availability for the proposed meeting dates in the 2017-18 municipal year.
3. That the host authority liaise with the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner to arrange dates for the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Panel to meet with the PCC on a regular basis.