



**SOUTH YORKSHIRE POLICE AND CRIME PANEL**

**IN MEETING ROOM 11, SECOND FLOOR, TOWN HALL, CHURCH STREET,  
BARNSELY, S70 2TA**

**2 JULY 2018**

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

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

Councillors: B Cutts (Rotherham MBC), M Dyson (Barnsley MBC), R Frost (Barnsley MBC), D Nevett (Doncaster MBC), B Johnson (Sheffield City Council), 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 (OPCC), M Carroll (OPCC), M Clements (OPCC) and F Topliss (OPCC)

Officers: D Cutting, M McCarthy, L Noble and C Tyler (Barnsley MBC)

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor M O'Rourke (Sheffield CC), Councillor C McGuinness (Doncaster MBC) and A Frosdick (Barnsley MBC)

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 public questions to the Police and Crime Commissioner.

Cllr Sansome referred to an 'Abuse of position' statement on HMICFRS website in respect of South Yorkshire Police in a letter to the Chief Constable dated 5<sup>th</sup> October 2017). The letter stated that '... no information was provided that allowed us to assess your progress'.

Cllr Sansome had raised this issue several meetings prior and the HMICFRS document had not been mentioned by the PCC. Additionally, given the high profile CSE in Rotherham, Cllr Sansome felt it odd that the letter should have been sent to the Chief Constable given the number of South Yorkshire officers involved in the CSE cases; is this a potential conflict of interest?

Cllr Sansome asked the PCC if all information had now been made available to the HMICFRS.

Given the recent incidences across South Yorkshire, Cllr Sansome asked the Commissioner for information regarding what is being done to tackle knife crime in the county.

The Commissioner informed the Panel that knife crime is a matter regularly discussed at his regular meetings with the Chief Constable.

The Commissioner informed the Panel of the various initiatives underway to try and address knife crime and to help try to understand what the underlying reasons might be for the increase in knife crime related incidents, noting this isn't unique to South Yorkshire and appears to be an increasing issue nationally and internationally.

The Commissioner cited the potential statistical relationship between 'Stop and Search' policies and the reduction of instances of knife crime, and noted the reintroduction of proportionate and fair 'Stop and Search' activities will hopefully have a positive effect in this area.

Cllr Sansome asked whether current plans and policies were appropriate to address the return to the community of those convicted of knife and gun crimes.

The Commissioner provided the Panel with examples of the current policies in place, noting where these policies are designed to avoid the prevalence of further issues, such as proactive measures to avoid the further criminalisation of young people.

Cllr Sansome asked whether the Panel might receive an update paper on Neighbourhood Policing at a future meeting.

It was noted this is already included on the Panel's work programme and would be received in the autumn.

Cllr Sansome noted there was a request at the previous meeting for an update briefing in relation to the delays in implementing the replacement for the 101 system and asked when this would be made available. A note had been provided to Members, but this had not been circulated to the four local authorities as the Panel had requested.

The Commissioner summarised the significant amount of work and sensitivities involved in this project and noted one strand of work was looking at the best way to provide appropriate updates to the various stakeholders.

Cllr Sansome suggested that the people of South Yorkshire had already made a judgement that 101 'isn't for them', and this is evidenced by the high proportion of calls that are received by the 999 number instead of 101.

The Commissioner suggested demand for support from both numbers has risen exponentially and questioned whether more needed to be done to understand whether this is a consequence of a reduction in opportunities to contact other public services by telephone.

The Commissioner confirmed the new 101 system would be 'state of the art' and would help the call handlers continue to deliver the best service possible.

It was confirmed that no date for the introduction of the new system had been fixed due to the ongoing determination of complex legal and sensitive issues. The Commissioner stressed the importance of getting the new system right prior to its introduction.

The Commissioner thanked Cllr Sansome for his recent morale boosting visit to Atlas Court, and noted that a date was being sought for a wider Panel visit during July / August.

Cllr Sansome asked whether HMICFRS should be asked to help scrutinise the new IT system to assure its capability. The Commissioner confirmed this was something that could be looked at.

Cllr Sansome asked whether the OPCC governance structure and further information regarding the role and remit of the Public Accountability Board (PAB) could be provided. Members were advised this information had been provided via a separate e-mail, and also included in the briefing for the meeting.

Cllr Sansome referred to the lack of elected representatives on PAB – other than the PCC - and whether this meant the Board was not effectively accountable to the people of South Yorkshire, whereas the Panel is. The Commissioner noted the role of PAB is essentially to enable him to hold the force to account, and the membership of PAB (with additional public and press attendance) and its subsidiary committees are structured to enable this function to be effectively discharged. The Commissioner noted that the Chairs of other Panels and Boards within his

governance structure are appointed following open and transparent recruitment processes.

M Buttery reminded Members of the differences between the statutory responsibilities of the Panel and the operational responsibilities of PAB, and commented on how the work of the two bodies are timed and co-ordinated to ensure the Commissioner holds the force to account and the Panel can subsequently hold the Commissioner to account.

Cllr Cutts noted he had raised a sensitive matter with the Commissioner two months ago and had not yet received a satisfactory response. The Commissioner advised Cllr Cutts that he needed to provide further information so the matter could be investigated further.

**RESOLVED:-**

- i) That the PCC would investigate the possibility of the HMICFRS providing independent assurance around the IT system to support the 101 service.

8 TO THE POLICE AND CRIME PANEL

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

Cllr Cutts suggested there had been little time to read the draft minutes of the previous meeting and asked whether the reason was one of late circulation. However, it was suggested the reason for the apparent reduction in time was due to a shorter than usual time period between meetings. Members were assured officers will make all attempts to ensure draft minutes of meetings are provided as soon after the Panel meetings as possible.

The Chair noted past discussions around the appropriate protocol for receiving and addressing Members' questions and asked whether the changes to the Rules of Procedure were now too restrictive. He noted that the Monitoring Officer had provided Cllr Otten with a comprehensive response to his concerns, and the suggestion is that a slight change to the Rules of Procedure could be made to clarify the situation.

D Cutting indicated a report on this matter would be presented to the next meeting for Members' consideration.

Cllr Otten suggested there was a lack of clarity regarding whose responsibility it was to determine if a question to the Commissioner would be deemed 'appropriate'. D Cutting suggested this was the responsibility of the Panel. Cllr Otten suggested he had not come across a Committee operating in that vein before. L Noble reiterated that advice had been sought from the Monitoring Officer, which suggested a minor change (for clarity) to the Rules of Procedure, but ultimately it is for the Panel to decide whether questions are relevant to the statutory functions of the Panel. It is for the Panel to decide on the advice of either the Monitoring Officer or the Panel's Legal Adviser. It is hoped the minor amendment to the Rules of Procedure would satisfy Members whilst focussing the Panel's agenda on their

statutory role. Cllr Wilkinson asked if the agendas for future Panel meetings could be timed to avoid the risk of over-run.

**RESOLVED:-**

- i) That the Panel would receive a report at the September meeting with further suggested amendments to the Rules of Procedure to address questions to the PCC.
- ii) That officers investigate the possibility of timed agendas.

9 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 4 JUNE 2018

Matters arising were addressed in the previous two agenda items, and through the Panel's Decision Log.

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the Annual Meeting of the Police and Crime Panel held on 4 June 2018 be agreed and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

10 ANNUAL REPORT (OPCC)

Members were presented with the Annual Report (Police and Crime Panel) 2017/18 and reminded of the Commissioner's statutory responsibility to provide such a report.

It was noted this was the 4<sup>th</sup> such report presented by the Commissioner.

The Commissioner advised Members of the substantive inclusions in the report relating to his three over-riding priorities for the force and eight associated requirements of the Chief Constable.

Cllr Wilkinson asked whether the priorities and requirements were supported by monitored performance indicators. The Commissioner noted this was the case and informed Members there were various sources of information used to help quantify the delivery of the priorities and requirements. It was confirmed this information was available on the Commissioner's website.

The Commissioner informed Members the Annual Report is the overall general review of progress and noted more detailed information could be provided on specific areas as required.

Cllr Sansome suggested there were some gaps in the hate crime and domestic abuse data for Rotherham. The Commissioner confirmed this matter would be looked into.

Cllr Cutts raised a question regarding the cost of running fire engines. However, it was suggested that questions of this nature should be received by the SY Fire Authority or the Public Accountability Board.

Cllr Frost) noted the 'required improvements' commented on in the report and asked whether the levy increase was helping to achieve these improvements. The

Commissioner suggested the responsibility to achieve the required improvements lies with the Chief Constable.

A Carter confirmed he was reasonably happy with the report and suggested this represents a generally improving picture across many areas and provides insight into how policing affects the lives of individuals.

A Carter commented on the excellent work the YOYO initiative is having on protecting younger people and asked whether a similar initiative could be introduced to help support the county's older residents.

The Commissioner said the requirement to help protect older residents against a number of crimes had been recognised and noted a joint initiative with the Fire Service to help tackle crime in areas of the county where older residents might be particularly at risk.

It was noted there are sessions held at Lifewise for older people to learn more about how they can protect themselves from becoming victims of crime.

Members were informed the YOYO initiative had been recommissioned for September and a report would be brought back to the Panel in due course regarding its effectiveness. An opportunity to sit in on a YOYO session was offered to the Members and duly welcomed.

RESOLVED:-

- i) That the Annual Report (Police and Crime Panel) 2017/18 be noted
- ii) That comments on the Annual Report would be provided to the OPCC by 9<sup>th</sup> July 2018.
- iii) That the data in respect of hate crime and domestic abuse for Rotherham be checked.
- iv) That a report on the effectiveness of the YOYO initiative be included on the Panel's work programme.

## 11 COMMISSIONING BUDGET

It is a statutory responsibility of the Commissioner to assure the maintenance of effective police finances, and a report was received to provide Members of the Panel with information on the Police and Crime Commissioner's Commissioning Budget.

The report set out key components (Victim of Crime Fund, Community Grant Fund, Partnership Fund, Community Safety Fund and Priority response Fund) which make up the commissioning budget and information on the performance monitoring arrangements in place to ensure these components contribute to the delivery of the Police and Crime Plan outcomes.

It was noted all project proposals need to set out how they will contribute to these outcomes when they are submitted, and also comment on how they will contribute to the 13 strands of vulnerability.

Members were advised as to the Commissioning Strategy's principles by which the Commissioner and his team aim to identify and secure the right services to deliver the Police & Crime Plan outcomes.

Cllr Sansome asked if the project proposers' expectations in respect of subsequent years funding was proactively managed when bids are submitted. It was confirmed this is the case and proposers are clearly informed how much they are guaranteed to receive and over what time period.

It was noted the components are managed as rolling programmes. Unsuccessful bids are given feedback and the opportunity to reapply after 3 months.

Members were advised of an innovative partnership with local newspapers to help promote funding opportunities to harder to reach community groups. It was confirmed there are a number of safeguards associated with this approach and each local allocation is overseen by a multi-agency panel who consider what grants should be awarded.

Members were advised that cross checks are undertaken between the funds to avoid instances of double funding.

RESOLVED – That Members noted the contents of the report and commented on any matters arising.

## 12 POLICE AND PARTNERS PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

A report of the Police and Crime Commissioner was submitted to provide Members of the Panel with details of the Commissioner's proposed Police and Partners Performance Monitoring Framework.

Members noted that, when finalised, the Framework would help the Commissioner and stakeholders to assess whether the outcomes in the refreshed Police and Crime Plan are being achieved.

It was noted the framework has been developed with the input of all partners, and the expectation that those partners will adhere to agreed expectations around the quality and consistency of the performance data being received.

It was confirmed quarterly reports (with 'RAG' ratings and narrative) will be taken to PAB and all progress will be kept under review to enable potential improvements to be incorporated.

RESOLVED – That Members:-

- i) Noted the arrangements being proposed.

- ii) Suggested any amendments that the Panel would wish to be made to the Framework, which would support their work

13 JOINT INDEPENDENT AUDIT COMMITTEE - UPDATE

The Panel was presented with a copy of the Police and Crime Commissioner and Chief Constable's Joint Independent Audit Committee (JIAC) Annual Report.

Cllr Otten suggested the report focused too heavily on process and did not provide enough proposals or recommendations. The Commissioner cited the case studies included in the report as a means to address this suggestion but felt the subject matter somewhat limits what else can be provided.

It was noted that update reports from JIAC will be received by PAB by exception.

It was noted that officers from the OPCC and JAGU are discussing how risk management might be reported to the Panel.

RESOLVED - that the Panel receives the JIAC Annual Report

14 PCC DECISIONS

A report of the Police and Crime Commissioner was presented to provide Members of the Panel with information on the decisions taken by the Commissioner since the last meeting.

RESOLVED – That Members noted the contents of the report and commented on any matters arising.

15 COMPLAINTS UPDATE

Members were reminded that they had previously agreed to receive a six-monthly update on its role in dealing with complaints against the PCC.

Members were informed there had been no reports within the last six months.

RESOLVED – That Members noted the verbal update.

16 LEARNING AND DEVELOPMENT - UPDATE

L Noble reminded Members that they had been offered a Development Discussion by email on 11 June 2018. To date, two responses had been received, with the offer remaining open.

In relation to proposed Learning and Development, Members were informed of the following opportunities and details of Members' attendance at each event.

**LGA PCP Workshop – 11th July 2018**

- The Chair, Vice-Chair, Alan Carter and Linda Noble will be attending the LGA's Annual PCP Workshop in London on 11th July.



- Feedback will be provided after the meeting, and formally at the Panel meeting in September.

### **Early Autumn 2018**

- It is hoped to work with Frontline Consulting over the Summer to put together a session for Members around their proactive scrutiny and support role.

### **18th Criminal Justice Management Conference - 19th September**

- Councillor Sansome will be attending this event in London and will provide feedback to the Panel.

### **Annual PCP Conference – 12th November 2018**

- The Chair, Vice-Chair, Steve Chu, David Cutting and Linda Noble will be attending Frontline Consulting's Annual PCP Conference in Warwick.
- Feedback will be provided after the event and formally at the Panel meeting in December.

RESOLVED – That Members noted the update.

## 17 **WORK PROGRAMME**

Members considered the 2018/19 Work Programme and were reminded that they could submit issues for the Work Programme that fall within the Panel's statutory role in supporting and / or holding the Commissioner to account.

All issues would be given full consideration by the Chair, Vice-Chair and Commissioner at the pre-agenda planning meetings.

RESOLVED – That Members noted the contents of the 2018/19 Work Programme.

## 18 **DATE AND TIME OF THE NEXT MEETING**

RESOLVED – That the next meeting of the Panel will be held on Monday 3 September 2018, at 1:00 pm in Meeting Room 11, Town Hall, Church Street, Barnsley.

CHAIR