



South Yorkshire

POLICE & CRIME PANEL

SOUTH YORKSHIRE POLICE AND CRIME PANEL

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

29 SEPTEMBER 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), 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 (Office of the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner), S Slater (Office of the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner) and F Topliss (Office of the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner)

Chief Constable S Watson (South Yorkshire Police) and Inspector C Foster (South Yorkshire Police)

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

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor R Sixsmith MBE and S Parkin

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were noted as above.

2 ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chair explained that, prior to the meeting commencing, it was important to inform Panel Members that the Chief Constable had been invited to attend today's meeting to discuss Neighbourhood Policing with the Panel informally, and not for scrutiny purposes. It was felt important for Members of the Panel, and the public, to hear from the Chief Constable about this important piece of work.

The Chair reminded Members that the Panel's role was very clear; this was to challenge and scrutinise the Police and Crime Commissioner.

On behalf of the Panel, the Chair thanked Chief Constable Watson for taking time out of his extremely busy schedule to attend today's meeting.

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 public questions to the Police and Crime Panel.

9 VERBAL QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC TO THE POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER

There were no verbal questions from the Public to the Police and Crime Commissioner.

10 VERBAL QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC TO THE POLICE AND CRIME PANEL

There were no verbal questions from the Public to the Police and Crime Panel.

11 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 questions had been submitted and the response from the Police and Crime Commissioner:-

Question from Mr A Carter

"It is understood that, assuming their knowledge of how to go about it innocent, i.e. so-called "unconvicted" people may apply for the deletion from police records of their custody image - there being a presumption that this will then be automatically deleted unless its retention is deemed necessary for an operational policing purpose and/or there is an exceptional reason to retain it.

Whilst recognising the need to strike a careful balance between protecting individual privacy and giving the police the tools they need to keep us safe it is also to be recalled that a High Court ruling of 2012 asserts that the retention of custody images of such persons is unlawful.

Despite concerns having been raised by the Commons Science and Technology Committee over the lack of controls or safeguards, police forces apparently routinely continue to build up a massive and largely unregulated photographic database, readily capable of biometric scanning but without any of the controls or privacy safeguards that apply to police DNA and fingerprint databases.

Has the Commissioner any concerns about this issue and does he have a view about the South Yorkshire Police's access to a database of images of potentially a great many individuals who have never been charged with, let alone convicted of, an offence?"

Response

At the current time, South Yorkshire Police are only responding to requests for photographs to be removed on a case by case basis as set out in the Home Office guidance.

A meeting is planned (4 October) with the relevant business leads to introduce the necessary processes to address the wider position of retention of photographs. For requests to have data removed, South Yorkshire Police will adopt a similar process to the one used nationally for the removal of DNA and fingerprints.

Currently, the wider retention of photographs is carried out under the Authorised Professional Practice (APP) Management of Police Information. The processes around retention and deletion of photographs will also form part of the CONNECT implementation plan.

Supplementary Question from Mr A Carter

Mr Carter thanked the Commissioner for his response. He commented that, from questions he had previously asked, he did have concerns regarding the increasing use of Artificial Intelligence within the Police service.

Mr Carter asked if he could be informed what the term 'Connect' referred to. Additionally, he asked if this was ongoing and something that the Panel may wish to receive further information on.

The Commissioner replied that, Connect was an IT system; further discussion around Connect would be brought up on today's agenda under the item on the 101 Service.

Question from Councillor B Cutts

I am referring back to the last public demonstration in Rotherham that was police controlled, what was the level of liaison between SYP and RMBC?

Who is responsible for what and who determines the level of restraint and final approval?

Is there a final assessment, is there a de briefing?

Response

The planning for the EDL protest on 25th February 2017 started in January when we were notified of it taking place. Liaison with RMBC took place at multiple levels throughout the planning and delivery phase. The Gold Commander (ACC Forber) met with both the Chief Executive and the Leader of the Council during the planning phase. RMBC representatives were present at every strategic and tactical planning meeting, and were present in Gold and Silver Control on the day.

All decisions regarding the route and the method of policing the event rest with the Gold Commander, in this case ACC Forber. While extensive consultation took place with different stakeholders and the community, these decisions are based on the best possible option in order to prevent harm to people and to minimise crime and disorder.

ACC Forber attended a meeting at RMBC Council Chambers on 22nd February (at which I believe Cllr Cutts was present) where he fully explained the policing strategy for the protest and how he intended to ensure there was no disorder.

A full multi-agency debrief was conducted after the event which involved senior officers from RMBC.

Question from Councillor J Otten

Councillor Otten commented that a response to his question had not been provided. He stated that, from discussions held earlier this morning, the Chair was minded not to allow his question.

Councillor Otten felt that his question was relevant, and asked ‘Does the Commissioner believe it was right for Sarah Champion MP to “resign” from Labour’s front bench over remarks reported in The Sun newspaper?’

The Chair reiterated the role of the Panel was to hold the Police and Crime Commissioner to account regarding his statutory functions. In his opinion Councillor Otten’s question was not relevant to the function of this Panel. The Chair stated that he would be disallowing Councillor Otten’s question.

Councillor Otten protested the Chair’s decision; in his opinion the Chair was taking a narrow view, which diminishes the Panel’s role in a vital function with regards to holding the Police and Crime Commissioner to account.

The Chair reiterated his position and asked for other Members’ views.

With regard to the Judicial Review: Outcome, Councillor Otten stated that he felt that the following statement in the minutes was inaccurate: "to request the Commissioner to explain his actions was inappropriate in this forum and did not help the Panel going forward".

Councillor Otten queried what the role of the Panel was; if these words could be spoken and recorded in the minutes.

L Noble confirmed that the words recorded in the minutes were spoken by the Monitoring Officer at the meeting.

Councillor Otten stated that, in his opinion, this was a matter arising. He raised concerns that Panel Members needed to understand what the role of the Panel was, if it was not appropriate to ask the Commissioner to explain his actions.

The Chair recalled from the meeting that, in terms of Judicial Review Outcome, it would not help matters moving forward, if Panel Members were to go back and ask the Commissioner to explain his actions and decisions.

Councillor Otten commented that, it was a supremely narrow view of the role of this Panel's work if there are whole areas of the Commissioner's work, which fall outside of the remit of this Panel's scrutiny and challenge of his decisions. Furthermore, Councillor Otten stated that, in his opinion, it was his fear that the Panel had become emasculated to the nth degree over the last few meetings.

Councillor Sansome commented that, he too shared Councillor Otten's frustrations regarding the Panel's role not being able to challenge the Commissioner on the issues that Panel Members felt are relevant, but this was a Home Office decision and not one taken locally.

The role of Police and Crime Panels, and their powers, was discussed at the 12th July LGA workshop and would, undoubtedly, be discussed again at the Annual Police and Crime Panel Conference in November.

Councillor Sansome asked the Commissioner to provide details as to how he was holding the Joint Independent Audit Committee (JIAC) and the Chief Constable to account regarding outstanding internal audit recommendations which had been outstanding for a long period of time. Additionally, he asked what timescales had been given in terms of completing the outstanding issues.

The Commissioner replied that the JIAC was currently in the process of working through these outstanding issues. The Commissioner added that he received regular updates from the JIAC, which were received via exception reports at his Public Accountability Board (PAB). It was the responsibility of the Chair of JIAC and Committee Members to ensure that they got the responses they required to those outstanding items.

Mr Chu recalled that he had requested information at the previous meeting on contact management performance to see how it had improved or otherwise.

Mr Chu felt that there had been a missed opportunity at agenda item 11 (101 Update) which did detail the volume of calls received, but did not set out the performance information which he had asked for. Mr Chu asked if this information could be provided at the December Panel meeting.

The Commissioner agreed to provide this information.

Councillor Hughes commented that, following the restoration of Neighbourhood Policing, he had not yet seen any extra PCs and PCSOs in his village (Highfields, Doncaster) or in his Wards (Adwick and Carcroft, Doncaster), and that various crimes were on the increase. He asked how the Commissioner was holding the Force to account in relation to one of his priorities “to tackle offenders that cause the most harm in the community”.

The Commissioner noted Councillor Hughes’ concerns. He agreed to follow up these points with the Force.

The Commissioner added that the restoration of Neighbourhood Policing was only just beginning to be rolled out across the county by the Chief Constable. Furthermore, the Force had been proactive with its use of Operation Duxford, which had been rolled out in different areas in South Yorkshire involving a large concentration of Police Officers and partners in specific ‘hot spot’ areas.

Councillor Wilkinson reported that Operation Duxford had worked well within her Ward. She asked if Operation Duxford would be rolled out into other ‘hot spot’ areas within Doncaster.

The Commissioner replied that Operation Duxford had been operating in all four South Yorkshire districts, and that this would be continued.

Councillor Cutts asked if South Yorkshire Police were giving up on drugs and drug addicts. He referred to a case where video evidence had been supplied to the Police. However, the Police had stated because the video did not contain audio footage, they were unable to pursue the case.

The Commissioner replied that the Force was not giving up in this area. He asked that, if Councillor Cutts had a specific question he could contact his local Inspector or submit a question via his Office.

RESOLVED – That:-

- I) The minutes of the Police and Crime Panel held on 7 July 2017 be agreed and signed by the Chair as a correct record.
- ii) The Commissioner follows up Councillor Hughes’s concerns with the Force regarding Neighbourhood Policing as outlined above.
- ii) The Commissioner provides Mr Chu with information on contact management performance at the December Panel meeting.

The Panel received a briefing from Chief Constable Watson on the revised Neighbourhood Policing Model. A [YouTube video clip](#) introducing the improved policing service was shown for Panel Members' information.

Panel Members were informed that the initial revised Neighbourhood Policing Model had been launched on 25 September 2017, with 12 neighbourhood areas across South Yorkshire; four in Sheffield, three in Doncaster and Rotherham and two in Barnsley, with over 350 dedicated officers, and a planned increase to over 400 by January 2018.

Each area was now led by a Local Inspector with a Sergeant, PCs and PCSOs dedicated to policing the local neighbourhoods. The teams would also provide support and assistance to local communities operating as problem solvers, with regular engagement events and drop-ins to enable members of the public to speak directly about any issues or concerns in their areas.

The Force would continue to engage with members of the public to find out how they are doing and if the implementation of the Neighbourhood Policing Model was meeting their needs and expectations.

The Chair thanked Chief Constable Watson and invited questions from Panel Members.

Councillor Hughes invited the Chief Constable and the Commissioner to attend the next Doncaster PACT meeting. He asked if they could provide a presentation on Neighbourhood Policing. Furthermore, Councillor Hughes asked if there were enough resources to carry out the proposals outlined by the Chief Constable.

Chief Constable Watson replied that there would be a significant number of Officers dedicated to Neighbourhood Policing. He was confident that these Officers would make a huge difference in South Yorkshire.

Councillor Otten asked if the whole of South Yorkshire would be covered by Neighbourhood Policing Teams. Additionally, he asked how the Force would deal with demands in more difficult areas.

Chief Constable Watson confirmed that the whole of South Yorkshire would be covered by a dedicated Neighbourhood Policing Team. Some areas would have a Neighbourhood Team more widely dispersed than others; every Town Centre and City Centre now had a dedicated Team. The Force would prioritise high priority areas, via demand data and deploy other resources accordingly.

Councillor Sansome asked if he could be provided with details regarding the background as to how the Force had decided on the number of dedicated Neighbourhood Officers for each district.

Chief Constable Watson replied that a significant degree of detailed work had been carried out to decide the number of dedicated Neighbourhood Officers in each district using a nationally agreed model of calculation.

Councillor Sansome recalled that, at a previous PAB meeting the Chief Constable had referred to a number of officers who were “shining stars” within the Force. He asked if any of those officers had been deployed to Neighbourhood Policing.

Chief Constable Watson confirmed that those Officers had all been allocated to Neighbourhood Policing Teams, with their training being specific to problem solving.

Councillor Cutts asked how members of the public could contact their local Neighbourhood Policing Team via the Force’s website.

Chief Constable Watson replied that there was a page on the Force’s website which allowed members of the public to input their home postcode, and information was then supplied on how to contact their local Neighbourhood Policing Team.

Councillor Hughes asked if the Force would be publishing any of its successes with regards to tackling crime.

Chief Constable Watson replied that the Force would begin to showcase good news achieved via Neighbourhood Policing.

It was noted that arrangements were currently being made for the Chief Constable to provide separate briefings on the revised Neighbourhood Policing Model for all Elected Members, at each of the four district councils.

The Chair commented that the new model was very welcome; he looked forward to its successful implementation. He commented that, to ensure the model was successful, work needed to take place at a “grass roots level” regards the public’s perception of SYP within the communities of South Yorkshire.

The Chair asked that, given the diverse range of communities in South Yorkshire, had the Force taken account of the different approaches required when interacting with different communities.

Chief Constable Watson replied that he wanted all of his Officers, in all circumstances, to behave with the highest integrity and be able to tailor their methods of communications and understanding to the sensitivities in certain areas of the communities they serve. The Force was currently looking at this element, with officers being fully engaged with the communities they serve.

In relation to the Force’s interaction with the public, Chief Constable Watson hoped that the Panel would see this reflected in reports from HMIC etc.

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

- i) Noted the presentation.
- ii) Thanked Chief Constable Watson for attending today’s meeting and for providing Panel Members with an interesting and informative presentation.

A report was presented to inform Members of the Panel of the capital expenditure planned for 2017/18.

The Panel noted that the Commissioner had approved the capital programme for 2017/18 as part of the budget setting process on 15 February 2017. The capital programme for 2017/18 amounted to £13m.

The forecast outturn as at 31 July 2017 showed capital expenditure of £14.8m, with the majority of the variance to budget relating to projects that would slip from 2017/18 to 2018/19.

S Slater provided Members with a detailed breakdown of the projects contained within the 2017/18 capital programme.

Councillor Wilkinson asked what the effect on removing the pay cap on Police Officer salaries would have on police finances; would this be funded by the Force or would it affect Police Officer numbers.

The Commissioner replied that Government had announced a 1% pay increase in Police Officer salaries and a 1% bonus on top of the pay increase, back dated to September. There was currently uncertainty around the payment of the 1% bonus. The Commissioner was assuming a 1% salary increase next year. In relation to police staff, the Commissioner was currently unclear what the Government were proposing.

The Commissioner confirmed that to fund salary increases this year, these had been met from reserves; if salaries continued to rise there could be implications on the number of staff employed.

Councillor Griffin asked how the Commissioner holds the Chief Constable to account with regards to the Force's revised Estates Strategy.

The Commissioner replied that he was regularly updated on the Force's Estates Strategy, which was currently being reviewed. It had been acknowledged that the Force would need to sell some of its unused buildings, as part of that review.

Councillor Griffin stated that in terms of public confidence, the disposal of police buildings on a large scale would need to be undertaken sensitively.

The Commissioner concurred with Councillor Griffin, he stated that the Chief Constable was extremely aware of public sensitivities around the disposal of any police buildings.

M Buttery added that, in terms of holding the Chief Constable to account, she could confirm that the Commissioner owned the assets (as set out in law).

Furthermore, the Commissioner also had an interest in the appointment of a new Head of Estates for South Yorkshire Police, and he had asked to sit on the interview panel because of his interest. Previously, there had been an Estates Board, Chaired by a representative of the PCC, where the Force was held to

account for its Estates Strategy and the decision making around the finance, the operational need and the public consultation around the disposal of buildings etc.

The Commissioner would be asking the new Head of Estates, on their appointment, to discuss with them the best way of holding the Force to account in this area.

Mr Carter asked if he could be informed how the apportionment of financing the Connect system was worked out via the various partners. Additionally, Mr Carter noted the 'Specific Grants' in the 2017/18 capital budget showed a nil sum, he asked what would feature in 'Specific Grants', and at what point, if any.

S Slater confirmed that in terms of apportionment, there was a set net revenue expenditure split between the Force and Humberside Police for the Connect project. In respect of the Specific Grants, it was confirmed that, at the beginning of the year, the Commissioner did not know what grants he would be receiving, therefore a nil balance was shown. As grants are received, this information would be applied.

Councillor Sansome commented that there had been a recent report released concerning the levels of overtime paid by South Yorkshire Police to its officers and staff; he asked how this overtime was being managed against the budget.

S Slater replied that monthly budget monitoring reports containing the overtime figures are presented at the Commissioner's Public Accountability Board (PAB) for scrutiny and monitoring. This issue of overtime was ongoing and this was being closely monitored by the Force's Finance Team and its Senior Leadership Group.

Councillor Sansome asked how the Chief Constable intended to maintain staff morale, bearing in mind the amount of additional hours officers were working.

The Commissioner confirmed that he regularly asked the Chief Constable to monitor the overtime budget to understand why overtime was being paid for particular duties.

The Chair reported that the Commissioner's Chief Finance and Commissioning Officer, Allan Rainford would shortly be leaving the OPCC.

On behalf of the Panel, the Chair thanked Allan for his hard work and for the support provided to both past and present Members. His work around the budget had been invaluable in helping the Panel make informed decisions.

M Buttery informed Panel Members that, Allan Rainford's replacement would need confirming by the Panel, as required in law. L Noble was currently making arrangements for a meeting date.

RESOLVED – That Members of the Police and Crime Panel noted the report on Capital Expenditure.

A report was submitted that provided Members of the Panel with information on how the Commissioner determines the policing and crime priorities for South Yorkshire, approves the budget, issues the council tax precept and issues or varies his Police and Crime Plan.

Members noted that the OPCC had a Strategic Planning Timetable which supported the Commissioner in fulfilling these requirements. The Timetable set out the activities necessary throughout the current planning and financial year, including consultation with the public, Chief Constable, partners and the Police and Crime Panel to refresh the Police and Crime Plan.

It was noted that the Commissioner had indicated to the Chief Constable that he did not intend to refresh the strategic priorities this year; however, this would be dependent upon the information gathered by the OPCC.

M Buttery provided the Panel with an example of the detailed information the Commissioner required from the Chief Constable.

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

16 101 UPDATE

A report was submitted to provide Members of the Panel with an update on the 101 system and the total number of emergency and non-emergency calls received per year by South Yorkshire Police.

Members noted that a full review on the contact management service at Altas Court was currently taking place around resources, IT and governance.

The Commissioner informed the Panel that the Force were making considerable investments to replace its existing information systems and contact management platforms with the introduction of the Connect system and Smartcontact.

The Connect System would be launched in December 2017, with Smartcontact due to be implemented in March 2018. This brought four existing data bases into one.

The new technology would enable the Force to better respond to calls and reduce the demands which are currently being received via 101. People would be able to contact the Police in several new different ways via Smartcontact.

The Panel was informed that Humberside Police had already gone live with the Connect System which was currently enabling the Force to learn lessons from their implementation.

Councillor Wilkinson asked why the Force were not advertising more widely about the facility to report a crime etc. via their website.

The Commissioner asked his Community Engagement and Communications Manager, Fiona Topliss to take up this issue with the Force on his behalf.

Councillor Wilkinson suggested that the Force could develop a mobile App which would allow smart phone users to report a crime etc. via the App.

The Commissioner commented that this may be possible and would be considered with the implementation of the new technology.

Mr Chu asked if there was a particular reason why the number of non-emergency calls had doubled since 2014.

The Commissioner suggested that this may be due to public sector resources being squeezed; where people may have contacted another service in the past, they now contacted 101 for assistance. Understanding what the demand is was currently part of the review of Atlas Court.

M Buttery suggested that the increase in non-emergency calls in 2014 may have been a result of the 'Sheffield factor' where a triage of calls had been taken by the Police and re-routed to Sheffield City Council. M Buttery agreed to investigate and report back to Mr Chu.

Councillor Sansome asked if the Commissioner felt the failings of the 101 service were being properly communicated to the public of South Yorkshire and if not, how could this be improved.

The Commissioner replied that the system failings were well known by the public who had used the service. He added that there needed to be an educational campaign around when it was appropriate to dial 999, 101, and when it was appropriate to dial another service.

The Commissioner anticipated that the Panel would see a gradual improvement in call handling performance from March/April 2018 onwards.

Councillor Sansome asked if Panel Members could receive the Force's scope for the 101 Review.

The Commissioner acknowledged Councillor Sansome's request. M Buttery stated that this information would be included within the next Performance report.

The Chair asked if the Panel could receive regular updates on the progress of the Force's Review of 101.

The Commissioner acknowledged the Chair's request.

Mr Carter asked if Panel Members could visit Atlas Court, at an appropriate time, when the new systems had been implemented and staff had received training.

The Commissioner stated that arrangements would be made by his Office for Panel Members to visit Atlas Court at a later date.

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

- i) Noted the contents of the report.

- ii) Noted that the Commissioner had asked his Community Engagement and Communications Manager to speak with the Force regarding wider advertising of reporting crimes etc. via the Force's website.
- iii) Noted that M Buttery had agreed to investigate why there had been an increase in non-emergency calls in 2014 (possibly due to the 'Sheffield Factor') and report back to Mr Chu.
- iv) Noted that the Force's scope for the 101 Review would be included within the next Performance report to the Panel.
- v) Noted that a visit to Atlas Court would be arranged by the Commissioner's Office for Panel Members, shortly after the new systems had been implemented and staff had received training.

17 HATE CRIME

A report was presented which provided Panel Members with information regarding how the Commissioner holds the Chief Constable to account for Hate Crime.

The Commissioner highlighted that there had been a rise in the number of hate crime and hate incidents reported to both the police and crime monitoring organisations nationally, post the EU Referendum, numerous terrorist attacks across Europe and elsewhere.

The Commissioner provided the Panel with assurances that the Force had understood the importance of hate crime and hate incidents, along with understanding the five protected characteristics which may result in a hate crime. It was highlighted that the public had found it difficult to distinguish between a hate incident and a hate crime; both of which were recorded. Hate incidents had decreased, whereas hate crime had increased.

Panel Members noted that the Commissioner's Independent Ethics Panel (IEP) had the role of monitoring hate crime on the Commissioner's behalf, via bi-annual update reports. IEP Members reported any exceptions / areas of concern to the Commissioner via his Public Accountability Board.

Councillor Sansome asked if Panel Members could receive a breakdown of the types of hate crimes / hate incidents reported in each of the four South Yorkshire districts.

The Commissioner acknowledged Councillor Sansome's request for information.

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 would provide Panel Members with a breakdown of the types of hate crimes / hate incidents reported in each of the four South Yorkshire districts.

18 THE PCC'S AND SOUTH YORKSHIRE POLICE'S PARTNERSHIPS AND COLLABORATION ARRANGEMENTS

A report was submitted which provided Members of the Panel with a high level overview of the Police and Crime Commissioner's (PCC's) and South Yorkshire Police's (SYP's) partnerships and collaboration arrangements.

The report highlighted that there was a need for Panel Members to understand the PCC's and SYP's partnerships and collaboration arrangements, in order that the Panel could decide where and when it needs to involve itself in supporting or scrutinising the PCC's activities and decision making.

The Commissioner highlighted that the PCC's and SYP's partnership and collaboration arrangements were part of a complex landscape, with some being statutory and others non-statutory and on a formal or informal basis.

Panel Members noted the PCC's and SYP's principal arrangements, which were set out under four category headings within the report.

The Commissioner reported that under Category One, he was now a Member of Sheffield's Health and Wellbeing Board. Furthermore, the Commissioner was a Member of South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Authority. A Police and Fire Collaboration Board had been established, Chaired by the Commissioner.

Councillor Otten asked if Panel Members could question the Commissioner with regards to his conduct, actions and voting on South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Authority.

D Cutting replied that he was aware of this emerging area of the Commissioner's accountability. He agreed to provide Members with a written response to Councillor Otten's question via email after today's meeting.

M Buttery informed the Panel that, in relation to governance and ensuring that the partnerships were adding value, the OPCC, on behalf of the Commissioner and the Force had agreed to carry out joint work to review their current collaborations and partnerships, which would form part of the budget setting process regarding future funding decisions.

It was noted that the Force and Commissioner would only enter into collaborations and partnerships which added value in terms of efficiency and effectiveness for the communities of South Yorkshire.

Mr Carter indicated that he was a Member of the Sheffield Safer and Sustainable Communities Partnership Board. He stated that he was concerned about this Board, which had last met on the 16th May 2017. At the May meeting there had been no representatives from the Commissioner's Office or the Force present.

Subsequently, the Board meeting scheduled for 19th September 2017 had been cancelled due to the number of apologies received. The Board had now been rescheduled to December 2017. Mr Carter commented that, in his opinion, if this

was supposed to be an effective and effective partnership, he needed to be convinced.

The Commissioner acknowledged Mr Carter's concerns; he commented that he would need to consider if his Office should be giving more support to this particular Board.

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

- i) Noted the contents of the report.
- ii) Noted that D Cutting would provide Members with a written response via email after today's meeting to clarify if Panel Members could question the Commissioner with regards to his conduct, actions and voting on South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Authority.
- iii) Noted that the Commissioner would take on board Mr Carter's concerns relating to meetings of the Sheffield Safer and Sustainable Communities Partnership Board.

19 UPDATE TO THE RULES OF PROCEDURE

A report was presented to draw Members attention to revisions to the Panel's Rules of Procedure.

Panel Members were informed that the Panel's current Rules of Procedure did not include elements for dealing with disruptive behaviour, Notices of Motion or Amendments to the Rules. These elements had now been added with some minor amendments for clarification.

D Cutting stated that, during the course of this morning's meeting he had considered further amendments to the Rules of Procedure, which may be helpful in clarifying the function of the Police and Crime Panel.

In respect of Rule 22.2, D Cutting stated that he would add extra wording setting out the conditions, where the Rules may be suspended (with the Monitoring Officer's consent) to deal with emergency or urgent matters.

In respect of written questions from members of the public at Panel meetings, the Rules of Procedure would be amended to reflect that a member of the public must give at least five working days' notice in writing to the Monitoring Officer.

D Cutting asked Panel Members to consider if Rule 10 needed to be amended to take account of urgent oral questions from members of the public at Panel meetings.

Councillor Griffin suggested that the Panel needed to consider the wider role of the public in this meeting.

M Buttery suggested that it may be helpful for Panel Members to know how many individuals viewed webcasts of the Panel meetings.

L Noble agreed to obtain details and report back to Members of the Panel.

Councillor Wilkinson pointed out that questions from Panel Members to the Commissioner, set out that questions which had been asked and answered, must not be repeated at a Panel meetings in the 6 months preceding the date of the meeting. Councillor Wilkinson suggested that this point be added to the Rule of Procedure relating to questions from members of the public.

Members agreed to Councillor Wilkinson's suggestion.

D Cutting added that he would amend the Rules of Procedure to take account of the matter. If it was considered still to be a 'live' matter, then this would be at the discretion of the Chair to allow the question.

Mr Chu stated that, in his opinion, the facility for submitting written public questions was adequate; there was no need for the Panel to take oral questions from members of the public.

After consideration, Panel Members agreed that written questions from members of the public would continue to be allowed.

With regard to oral questions from members of the public, Panel Members agreed that under normal circumstances these would not be allowed. However, in exceptional circumstances, at the discretion of the Chair, a member of the public may be allowed to ask a question at a Panel meeting on the day.

D Cutting referred to Rule 11.2 (written general questions to the Commissioner by Members), he suggested that Members may wish to consider increasing the word count currently set at 50 words to now not exceed 100 words.

It was agreed that a reasonable approach would be taken in relation to the word count.

D Cutting asked Panel Members to consider if there needed to be a time limit set at Rule 11.4, to state that the Members questions agenda item shall last no more than x amount of minutes for both written and oral questions, unless the Chair of the meeting extends this period.

Panel Members agreed that the time set for the Panel Members questions agenda item would be at the discretion of the Chair.

Councillor Otten suggested that provision to suspend the Rules of Procedure be added to points listed at Rule 13.3. D Cutting agreed to add this point at Rule 13.3.

A Carter referred to Rule 13, he commented that, usually, Notice of Motions are moved and seconded. He suggested that this be added to the Rules of Procedure. D Cutting agreed to add a sentence at Rule 13.

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

- i) Noted the contents of the report and the suggested amendments.
- ii) Agreed that the Rules of Procedure be amended, taking account of Panel Members' comments as outlined above.
- iii) Authorise the publication and use of the revised Rules of Procedure.
- iv) Noted that L Noble would provide Panel Members with details regarding how many individuals viewed the webcasts of Panel meetings.

20 PCC DECISIONS

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

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

21 SOUTH YORKSHIRE POLICE AND CRIME PANEL - WORK PROGRAMME 2017/18

The Panel considered its 2017/18 Work Programme.

RESOLVED – That Members of the Police and Crime Panel noted the 2017/18 Work Programme.

22 ESTABLISHMENT OF A NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF POLICE AND CRIME PANELS

L Noble reported that, Members may already be aware that there was a National Association of Police and Crime Commissioners and that, there had been discussions around the establishment of a national association of Police and Crime Panels.

At the LGA's Police and Crime Panels Workshop in July, the Chair of Hertfordshire PCP announced that he had resurrected discussions around a national association and would be putting together a consultation paper to inform the way forward.

A consultation document was received in August and sent to Members for comment. The Panel had responded to the Clerk of Hertfordshire PCP on 22 September.

It was very likely that the LGA would be facilitating some kind of Special Interest Group, as the general consensus from those present at the Seminar in July was that there was no spare money within existing Grants to set up, develop and support an independent Association.

It was anticipated that a revised document on the Independent Association would be discussed at the National PCP conference in November, at which the Chair and Vice-Chair would be present. A written update report on the National PCP

conference would be presented at the December Panel meeting for Members' information.

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

- i) Noted the update.
- ii) Noted that a written update report on the National PCP conference would be presented at the December Panel meeting.

23 DATE AND TIME OF THE NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Panel will be held on Friday 15 December 2017, 10:00 am at the Offices of the Joint Authorities, 18 Regent Street, Barnsley, S70 2HG.

CHAIR