



**SOUTH YORKSHIRE POLICE AND CRIME PANEL**

**20 SEPTEMBER 2021**

PRESENT: Councillor R Haleem (Rotherham MBC) (Chair)

Councillor A Cherryholme (Barnsley MBC) (Vice-Chair)

Councillors: T Baum-Dixon (Rotherham MBC), R Davison (Sheffield City Council), P Garbutt (Sheffield City Council), S Knowles (Doncaster MBC), B Lodge (Sheffield City Council), R Milsom (Sheffield City Council) and C Ransome (Doncaster MBC)

Independent Co-opted Members: W Carratt and Professor A James

Dr A Billings (South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner)

M Buttery, S Abbott, S Parkin, K Wright, M Carroll and F Topliss  
(Office of the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner)

M McCarthy, J Field, L Noble and A Shirt  
(Barnsley MBC)

Apologies for absence were received from  
Councillor C Pickering (Barnsley MBC)

1 **WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced herself to Councillors Milsom, Lodge and Independent Member Mr Carratt.

2 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

An apology for absence was noted as above.

3 **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

None.

4 **URGENT ITEMS**

None.

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

None.

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

None.

7 PUBLIC QUESTIONS:-

8A TO THE POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER

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

8B TO THE POLICE AND CRIME PANEL

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

9 MINUTES OF THE POLICE AND CRIME PANEL MEETING HELD ON 19TH JULY 2021

L Noble provided Members with an update on the Action Log.

The Panel noted that the following actions:

- Action 11 (03-02-21) – Services for Victims of Crime: Progress Update,
- Action 8 (19-04-21) – Information from the Force on Wildlife Crimes, and
- Action 12 (19-04-21) – IEP's work in relation to priorities surrounding disproportionality and inclusion - were all currently 'live' actions.

The Panel requested that the above actions be retained on the Panel's Action Log for further updates.

In response to concerns raised by Councillor Baum-Dixon, the Commissioner said that he would undertake further discussions with K Wright to clarify what data is kept by the Force with regards to wildlife and rural crimes.

Councillor Ransome informed the Commissioner that she was currently experiencing considerable difficulty understanding where the Rural Crime Unit sits in the Force's structure. Furthermore, Councillor Ransome queried how she could contact the Rural Crime Unit to report rural and wildlife crimes.

In response, the Commissioner said that, in the first instance, Members' should contact their local Neighbourhood Policing Team to make contact with the Rural Crime Unit. It was noted that the Rural Crime Unit was located at Ring Farm, Cudworth, Barnsley.

The Commissioner urged all Panel Members' to make contact with their local Neighbourhood Policing Team Inspector and Sergeants to help build a positive working relationship with them.

The Panel agreed that Action 11 (07-06-21) – Monitoring Delivery of the Police and Crime Plan – Quarterly Report (January to March 2021) and Action 11 (19-07-21 iv) – Analysis around the recorded reduction in the number of sexual offences be

marked as 'discharged' on the Panel's Action Log and referred to the Performance Member Sub-Group and added to their Action Log.

Professor James referred to the update provided in relation to Action 11 (19-07-21 v) – Independent Ethics Panel (IEP) agendas and minutes not published to the OPCC website. He made the Commissioner aware that there remained no IEP minutes for two meetings held in 2021 and no IEP agendas published on the OPCC website since 2019.

M Buttery replied that the minutes of the meetings had been published to the OPCC's website, however following discussion with the Chair of the IEP, it was felt that the publication of full IEP minutes would restrict the Panel's ability to have a full and frank discussion.

The IEP had agreed that an exception report would be submitted to the Public Accountability Board (PAB) and published with the PAB agenda papers on the OPCC website detailing the work of the IEP.

Professor James raised concerns and felt that full IEP agendas and minutes should be published to the OPCC website.

The Commissioner acknowledged Professor James' concerns. He said that a correct balance needed to be achieved between openness and transparency, and the discussions at the IEP meetings. He agreed to undertake further discussions with the Chair of the IEP and Chief Constable to try and find an acceptable way forward.

The Panel agreed that the Action be retained on the Action Log for further updates.

The Panel noted that Action 13 (19-07-21) – Independent Ethics Panel's work on Stop and Search was still a 'live' action and agreed that the action be retained on the Panel's Action Log for further updates.

RESOLVED –

- i) That the minutes of the Police and Crime Panel meeting held on 19<sup>th</sup> July 2021 be agreed and signed by the Chair as a correct record.
- ii) Agreed that Action 11 (03-02-21) – Services for Victims of Crime: Progress Update, Action 8 (19-04-21) – Information from the Force on Wildlife Crimes and Action 12 (19-04-21) – IEP's work in relation to priorities surrounding disproportionality and inclusion were all currently 'live' actions and be retained on the Panel's Action Log for further updates.
- iii) Agreed that Action 11 (07-06-21) – Monitoring Delivery of the Police and Crime Plan – Quarterly Report (January to March 2021) and Action 11 (19-07-21 iv) – Analysis around recorded reduction in the number of sexual offences be marked as 'discharged' on the Panel's Action Log and referred to the Performance Member Sub-Group and added to their Action Log.

- iv) Noted that the Commissioner had agreed to undertake further discussions with K Wright to clarify what data is kept by the Force with regards to rural crimes and wildlife crimes.
- v) Noted that the Commissioner had agreed to undertaken further discussions with the Chair of the Independent Ethics Panel (IEP) and Chief Constable to try and find an acceptable way forward in relation to the publication of IEP agendas and minutes to the OPCC website.
- vi) Agreed that Action 13 (19-07-21) – Independent Ethics Panel’s work on Stop and Search was still a ‘live’ action and be retained on the Panel’s Action Log for further updates.

10 QUARTER 1 - CONSOLIDATED BUDGET MONITORING REPORT 2021/22

A report of the Chief Finance Officer was presented setting out the consolidated financial position on the current budget and expenditure managed by the Chief Constable of South Yorkshire Police force and budgets managed by the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for the period 1 April 2021 to 30 June 2021.

Members noted that the PCC had approved a revenue budget of £296.0m (including legacy) for 2021/22. In addition, £1.466m of adjustments had been made since the budget had been approved, taking the revenue budget to £297m.

Based on current assumptions, the forecast outturn position for the revenue budget was an underspend of £2.642m as at 30 June 2021.

As at 30 June 2021, the projected year end outturn position was a £2.761m underspend on the Chief Constable’s budget, net of external funding. The PCC and OPCC budget forecast year end position was an underspend of £149k. The main reasons for the underspend and variances form the budget were presented within the report.

Members noted that the OPCC’s Commissioning Team were working on the submission of various bids to secure additional funding for the county. Two grants had already been received in 2021/22 relating to the Safer Streets bids, covering Dearne (£418k) and Sharrow (£432k).

Members noted that the PCC had approved a capital programme of £17.8m in February 2021, it was likely that this would be revised to £19.63m to include slippages from 2020/21. Expenditure to date amounted to £2.08m, full year projections were £18.95m with a £0.68m underspend relating to IT projects.

As at 30 June 2021, COVID-19 expenditure of £0.63m had been incurred, with opportunity costs and lost income standing at £0.12m.

As at 31 March 2021, the overall level of revenue reserves available was £64.96m. This included general reserves of £42.2m, earmarked, and insurance reserves of £10.6m and £12.1m respectively. The expected movement in year, based on projections at the end of June 2021, were detailed in a table at paragraph 6 of the report.

It was highlighted that £1.25m related to a pension underspend and would be transferred from the general fund reserve to the unusable pension reserve. This treatment was in line with the External Audit's opinion.

Hillsborough, the Stovewood enquiry, and CSE civil claims were currently showing a combined overspend of £0.27m. The overspends would be transferred from the legacy reserve at the end of the financial year.

Paragraph 7 of the report set out a number of risks and uncertainties in the reported financial position in addition to COVID-19 issues raised within the report.

Assurances were provided that the risks are consistently monitored by the OPCC and Force Finance Teams and discussed at the appropriate senior leadership groups.

In response to a question from Councillor Davison, S Abbott confirmed that the Force did receive additional income from various external sources.

Councillor Davison asked how the PCC and Force invested funds and furthermore, did this save on insurance fees.

S Abbott replied that the PCC and Force did have an insurance reserve, which was currently just over £11m, based on actual reserves for claims which were currently pending. An Actuarial Valuation was scheduled to be undertaken shortly.

In relation to investments, S Abbott confirmed that Treasury Management services were provided via a contract with Doncaster MBC to undertake day to day investment and borrowing on the PCC's / Force's behalf. It was noted that the PCC / Force did have a small amount of temporary borrowing. Investments were predominantly kept in banks and building societies in line with the approved Treasury Management Strategy approved by the Commissioner on an annual basis.

Councillor Davison asked if budgets were fixed and if they could be moved from one to another.

S Abbott replied that there was some virement allowed on a local basis, which the Force's Director of Finance could approve up to a set amount, above this amount it would need to be approved by the Commissioner.

Councillor Baum-Dixon referred to the projected £2.7m underspend. He noted that when accounting entries had been taken account of in relation to the COVID-19 grant and the prepayment of the staff pension lump sum, it would be a much improved break-even position. He asked that when the pension contributions had been made, would this put the budget in an improved position in future years.

S Abbott replied that a pension re-valuation was undertaken every three years. As part of the re-valuation last year, it was identified that there was an historical deficit on past payment costs. By paying the lump sum upfront, money had been saved by not paying three years worth of interest charges.

In response to a question from Councillor Baum-Dixon in relation to the levels set for prudent reserves, the Commissioner explained that reserves should not be below five percent of the revenue budget.

Councillor Baum-Dixon noted that the Force had made considerable savings on gas, electric, fuel, mileage, public transport and stationery as a result of employees working from home during the COVID-19 pandemic. He asked if the Commissioner would be reviewing practices and efficiencies made during this period.

The Commissioner replied that the Force were required to have robust efficiency savings, which he would be reviewing ahead of the budget setting process. In relation to the COVID-19 pandemic, there were various impacts arising which both the Commissioner and Chief Constable were still assessing with regards to future office space requirements.

M Buttery added that the Force were currently undertaking a Smarter Working project to take account of learning as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic.

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

11 MONITORING DELIVERY OF THE POLICE AND CRIME PLAN - QUARTERLY REPORT (APRIL TO JUNE 2021)

A report of the Commissioner was presented which set out the Quarterly Report for the period April to June 2021 (Quarter 1 2021/22), produced from the Police and Crime Commissioner's (PCC's) Police and Partners Performance Framework.

The report aimed to provide information about how the police and partners, as well as the Office of the PCC (OPCC) are working to achieve the outcomes and priorities set out in the Police and Crime Plan for South Yorkshire.

Members were informed that the reporting period covered the time of the COVID-19 pandemic and the associated restrictions imposed by the Government.

The report was also the first report covering the transitional Police and Crime Plan from April 2021 to March 2022. Members noted that the Commissioner's priorities had remained the same for 2021/22.

In addition, the performance framework had been updated to take account of The National Policing Priorities for Policing as specified by Government in the National Crime and Policing Measures. The six key National Policing Priorities were detailed in the report.

An additional statement on the contribution of the Force achieving improvements against the national priorities had been published on the OPCC website with a copy circulated to Panel Members via email.

K Wright provided Members with a summary of the key headlines contained in the Quarterly Police and Crime Plan Performance Report attached at Appendix A to the report.

Professor James asked how many referrals the Inspire to Change programme could accommodate, what level of future demand there would be, and if there were robust processes in place to monitor outcomes. Professor James also asked if repeat offenders would be prioritised.

M Carroll replied that no upper limit had been set in the contract in relation to the number of referrals which the programme could accommodate. The Inspire to Change Programme provider had agreed that they could be flexible with the amount of referrals, and had also provided assurances that they could run programmes concurrently.

As part of the monthly contract meetings held in partnership with co-commissioners and the local authorities, they would be keeping a note of the number of referrals. If there was a requirement for expansion, then further discussions would take place.

Under the previous contract there had been over 2,600 referrals. Of this, 400 individuals had completed the programme and over 900 individuals had taken part in the programme, but did not fully complete the programme.

In relation to performance measures, it was confirmed that these were currently in the process of being finalised with the programme provider.

As part of the performance matrix, victim feedback would be sought from partners and family members of those individuals taking part in the programme. Work would also take place with the Force to analyse reoffending.

Professor James asked if work would be taking place to improve the number of individuals dropping out of the programme.

In response, M Carroll confirmed that this area was one which the contractor had been asked to focus on.

Professor James asked if the Commissioner was satisfied that the Force were using the full range of powers available to them. For example, issuing Domestic Violence Protection Orders in relation to dealing with domestic abuse.

The Commissioner provided assurances that he was satisfied with the Force's performance in this area. In addition, the Force did rank very highly in terms of dealing with domestic abuse cases.

K Wright added that the Force had established a Domestic Violence Protection Orders Team. He agreed to undertake analysis to identify the number of Domestic Violence Protection Orders which had been issued.

Professor James asked if there was any local district data available to set out the hotspot areas in South Yorkshire where child sexual abuse was taking place to enable the Force to undertake action in these areas.

K Wright agreed to analyse the data and forward information to the Performance Sub-Group.

W Carratt referred to the Safeguarding Children section in the report. He queried why there was an absence of other safeguarding responsibilities. For example, Operation Encompass and Section 47 of the Children Act 1989.

The Commissioner replied that there was a limit to the amount of information which could be provided within the report, but he would look to respond to this request in a future report.

K Wright added that information on Operation Encompass had been included in PAB reports.

W Carratt referred to Regional Collaboration. He asked why there had been a delay in obtaining procurement data.

K Wright replied that he had now received this information and agreed to circulate to Members after today's meeting.

W Carratt referred to the National Priorities for Policing. He asked if performance indicators or data was available on the number of cases that are closed early, and those cases which are followed through to trial with regards to Violence against Women and Girls.

The Commissioner replied that Violence against Women and Girls was a national issue and a Government priority. The Commissioner said that he was arranging a round table discussion in South Yorkshire with all partners to understand the pattern in South Yorkshire and if there are any gaps in the services which are offered.

M Buttery added that information could be provided to Panel Members setting out details of the data around Violence against Women and Girls which is provided to the Commissioner and also data which is provided to him in his role as Chair of the Local Criminal Justice Board, together with an explanation of their differences.

Professor James commented that, in convening the round table discussion, he asked if the Commissioner could take in to account that, sixty percent of female offenders had been victims of domestic abuse and that offenders were vulnerable people too.

The Commissioner acknowledged Professor James' comment. He added that he also needed to consult with victims.

Councillor Garbutt asked if representatives from the Sheffield South Asian Community Group had been invited to the round table discussion.

The Commissioner asked if Councillor Garbutt could send him further information about the role of the Group and a description of the work they carry out. This would enable him to consider inviting them to the round table discussion.

Councillor Milsom referred to the Tackling Crime and Anti-Social Behaviour section of the report. She asked what the Commissioner's perception was in relation to the effectiveness of the Neighbourhood Policing Teams, particularly in following up incidents of crime and anti-social behaviour, and liaising with local authority Community Safety teams, and in some cases housing officers or other partners.

In addition, she asked if the Commissioner perceived that local authority teams are effective in supporting and liaising with Neighbourhood Policing Teams and are there any weaknesses in the system that the Commissioner perceives; if so how should they be addressed to fulfil the Police and Crime Plan objectives.

In addition, Councillor Milsom asked the Commissioner to what extent he was confident that Neighbourhood Policing Teams might be able to ringfence their area of operation in the future, to ensure 7-days-a-week availability of their availability to their communities and was this an objective being pursued, in line the Police and Crime Plan.

The Commissioner provided a detailed response. In summary, he said that, in response to trust and confidence issues being raised by the public, local Neighbourhood Policing Teams had been restored in 2016. There had also been a commitment to increase officer numbers by 220 by 2024 funded from the Council Tax Precept. In addition, there was a national commitment to increase officer numbers by 20,000 by 2023/2024 (South Yorkshire's share would be 487).

The Commissioner stated that Sheffield City Council had developed a new neighbourhood structure with community groups, which was difficult to fit with the local Neighbourhood Policing Team structure. However, the Force would do its best to accommodate the changes.

The Commissioner said that in terms of ringfencing, the Chief Constable had committed to keep officers in neighbourhoods wherever possible.

M Buttery added that the Chief Constable was currently in the process of reviewing the Force's neighbourhoods offer with regards to the number of officers in response to make sure that this still reflects local authority changes.

Assurances were provided that the Chief Constable still wished to evolve the local Neighbourhood Policing offer in line with local authority developments and their place-based work.

Professor James queried how the Commissioner expected the Independent Ethics Panel (IEP) to assure him that the questions raised by the Panel in their recent report on Digital Policing had been addressed and embedded across the Force.

The Commissioner replied that he was in regular contact with the Chair of the IEP who reports to him by exception. The IEP Chair provides him with assurances. In addition, members of staff from the OPCC attend meetings of the IEP and bring any pertinent matters to his attention.

M Buttery added that the IEP have a thematic lead for Digital Policing. The Lead Member provides assurances to the Commissioner and Chair of the Panel about the thematic area. The next IEP meeting was scheduled for 22 September 2021 where an update on the Digital Policing report would be presented.

Professor James asked how the IEP would assure itself and the Commissioner that issues arising from the Digital Policing report are being addressed by the Force.

The Commissioner replied that he would need to await an exception report from the Chair of the IEP following its meeting on 22 September. The Commissioner added that there was no reason to suggest that the Force were not taking issues seriously in relation to Digital Policing.

In response to a question from Councillor Garbutt, K Wright reported that there was increased awareness of cybercrime due to recent publicity and members of the public having an awareness of cybercrime and the confidence to report crimes to the police.

In response to a question from Councillor Garbutt, the Commissioner confirmed that all officers had received training to recognise mental ill health conditions and to respond quickly by contacting the Ambulance Service.

Councillor Garbutt said that climate change was now an enormous factor affecting children and young people's mental health. He asked how far these worries could be addressed by the Commissioner and if the Force were involved in these discussions.

The Commissioner replied that it was a very difficult balance and judgement to make around educating and informing young people, and organisations need to be mindful that, in doing so, it could increase their anxiety levels.

Councillor Garbutt noted that racial hate crime had increased. He asked if the data could be divided by ethnicity to show which ethnic group were victims of hate crime.

Councillor Garbutt reported that he had become aware of a Chinese community in Sheffield who were not reporting hate crime directly to the Police and queried why this may be.

The Commissioner replied that he was aware of this issue and had met with the Chinese community and the University of Sheffield to address this. The Commissioner had been assured that Chinese students could report issues directly to the University, if they did not wish to go directly to the Police.

Councillor Garbutt noted that there was a big decrease in overall satisfaction of hate crime victims. He asked if the Commissioner was looking to address this and reinvigorate the satisfaction in the Force's action.

In response the Commissioner said that, generally, victim satisfaction was reasonably high in South Yorkshire. The Force continued to work with partners, community groups and the OPCC to seek feedback from victims in order to learn and improve.

Councillor Garbutt noted that it had been stated in the previous quarterly report, and also in the report presented at today's meeting, that work was ongoing to fully understand why there is disproportionality in the use of stop and search within the Black, Asian and Minority ethnic communities. He asked when work would be concluded.

The Commissioner replied that he had previously informed the Panel that he was unhappy with the methodology used to measure stop and searches broken down by ethnicity. The ethnic breakdown of those stopped and searched was based on the rate per 1000 population based on the 2011 population Census data. Changes needed to be made around how the data is presented.

Councillor Baum-Dixon asked how the Force was looking to engage with other networks to engage businesses in the evening economy to help them identify CSE victims.

The Commissioner replied that, along with the Force, he had arranged meetings with the Federation of Small Businesses specifically around CSE and the signs businesses needed to observe and identify potential CSE and child criminal exploitation victims. The Commissioner was assured around the work being undertaken by the Force in this area, but acknowledged that there was further work to be undertaken.

Councillor Baum-Dixon asked if the Commissioner could make a commitment to meet with local Councillors and MPs in their wards.

The Commissioner replied that he did regularly undertake ward visits to understand the issues which were of most concern to them.

In response to a question from Councillor Garbutt, the Commissioner explained that roads policing featured in his transitional Police and Crime Plan and would also feature in his new Police and Crime Plan.

The Commissioner added that he had recently joined road policing officers and Dame Sarah Storey for a close pass operation targeting drivers who overtake cyclists too closely. Publicity on the exercise would be issued later this week.

Councillor Ransome noted that the Force had the second highest rate of total recorded crime compared to the most similar group of police forces. She asked if this was historic.

K Wright confirmed that this was historic and could be due to a number of local demographic factors.

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

- i) Noted the contents of the report and commented on any matters arising.
- ii) Noted that K Wright had agreed to undertake analysis to identify the number of Domestic Violence Protection Orders which had been issued by the Force.

- iii) Noted that the Commissioner had agreed to look to respond to Mr Carratt's request to include details of other safeguarding responsibilities in a future report.
- iv) Noted that procurement data information would be circulated to Members after today's meeting by K Wright.
- v) Noted that M Buttery had agreed to provide information to Members setting out details of the data around Violence against Women and Girls which is provided to the Commissioner and also data which is provided to him in his role as Chair of the Local Criminal Justice Board, together with an explanation of their differences.
- vi) Noted that K Wright had agreed to analyse CSE data on a local district level and forward information to the Performance Sub-Group.

12 POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER'S UPDATE (INCLUDING DECISIONS MADE SINCE THE LAST MEETING)

A report of the Commissioner was introduced to provide Members with an update on key PCC and OPCC activities since the Panel's last meeting held on 19<sup>th</sup> July 2021, under the headings within the OPCC's Delivery Plan.

The report also provided Members with information on the decisions taken by the PCC since the Panel's last meeting.

The key activities reported for the period were detailed in the Executive Summary of the report and noted by Members.

M Buttery paid tribute to the hard work of the OPCC Team during the course of the COVID-19 pandemic to produce the transitional Police and Crime Plan and Annual Report for 2020/21, together with pursuing external funding bids in exceptionally short timescales.

The Panel congratulated the OPCC Team for their hard work and achievements made in pursuing external funding bids.

In response to a request from Professor James, M Buttery agreed to provide Panel Members with the terms of reference and work programmes for the Joint Independent Audit Committee (JIAC) and Independent Ethics Panel.

M Buttery reminded Panel Members that the OPCC's Partnership and Commissioning Manager had offered to provide new Panel Members with an overview of partnerships and commissioning services. If Panel Members wished to take up this offer, then they should contact L Noble.

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

- i) Noted the contents of the report and commented on any matters arising.

- ii) Asked questions on the matters contained within the report, given it explains how the PCC has over this period delivered his Police and Crime Plan, and discharged the wide range of his legal responsibilities.
- iii) Noted that the terms of reference and work programmes for the Joint Independent Audit Committee (JIAC) and Independent Ethics Panel would be provided to Panel Members after today's meeting.

13 ADDITIONAL INDEPENDENT MEMBER - CONSIDERATION TO COMMENCE THE PROCESS WITH LOCAL AUTHORITIES AND THE HOME OFFICE

A report of the Panel's Legal Adviser was presented which informed Members that, in May 2021 the Panel had experienced a considerable turnover of Members, including a new Chair and Vice-Chair.

With that in mind a suggestion had been made by one of the Panel's Independent Members that an additional Independent Member, be recruited and appointed to serve for a maximum of eight years and a minimum of four, unless they wished to resign from their role, to provide resilience through continuity of knowledge and skills, to mitigate the turnover of Members year on year.

Details of the Statutory process to be undertaken to increase the Panel's membership was detailed within the report.

Councillor Baum-Dixon raised concerns around the appointment of a third Independent Member to the Panel. He felt that the Panel may move to a more academic form of scrutiny, rather than elected Members representing the views of the public and the communities who elected them.

Following discussion and clarification of key matters arising from the report, a recorded vote was undertaken and recorded as follows:-

For accepting the recommendations as outlined in the report (10) Councillors Haleem, Cherryholme, Davison, Garbutt, Knowles, Lodge, Milsom, Ransome, Professor James and Mr Carratt.

Against accepting the recommendations (1) Councillor Baum-Dixon and abstained (0).

The recommendations were agreed by the Panel.

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

- i) Agreed to commence the process for approval to increase the number of Co-opted Members to three by:

Seeking the approval of the four South Yorkshire authorities to amend the Panel Arrangements to allow three co-opted Members (the precise wording to be approved in consultation with the Chair); and

Seeking approval from the Secretary of State for the increase in number of Co-opted Members.

- ii) Noted that, if approval is granted from the Secretary of State and the four South Yorkshire authorities, a recruitment exercise would need to be undertaken for another Independent co-opted Member using the same (agreed) process as in previous recruitment exercises.

14 MEMBER ALLOWANCES / SPECIAL RESPONSIBILITY ALLOWANCE (SRA) - CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR OF POLICE AND CRIME PANEL

A report of the Panel's Service Director was submitted to inform Members that, in 2017-18 the Police and Crime Panel had approved a proposal by the, then Chair, to engage an Independent consultant to review the Police and Crime Panel allowances, and take a view on the payment of a Special Responsibility Allowance (SRA) for the Chair and Vice-Chair.

Dr Declan Hall, an expert in the field of Member Allowances, undertook the review and a report was presented to the Panel on 3 December 2018.

Details of the process followed was contained in the 'Background' section of the report and noted by Members.

The report presented highlighted the requirement for primary local authorities and Joint Authorities to review Member Allowances every three years. This was not a requirement for the Police and Crime Panel as a Joint Committee.

However, for good governance, the Panel's own arrangements state that an independent review should be undertaken every three years. It was suggested that the range, and volume, of work of the Panel has not significantly changed since 2018 and the Grant which pays the allowances and the SRA has not increased since 2012. For those reasons it was recommended that any review be postponed until the position on Fire Reform is clear.

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

- i) Noted the current Member Allowances as detailed at paragraph 6 of the report.
- ii) Agreed that any review of the Special Responsibility Allowances paid to the Chair and Vice-Chair, and a wider review of basic allowances, be delayed until the consultation on Fire Reform has taken place.

15 LEARNING AND DEVELOPMENT UPDATE

A report was submitted to update Members on current events – national, regional and local, together with future plans in respect of learning and development for the Panel.

Suggestions for any other learning and development opportunities Members may have to support the Panel's learning and development were welcomed.

A summary of the events which had taken place since the last meeting together with details of proposed future events were set out within the report for Members' information.

L Noble reminded Members that the Chief Constable had kindly offered to arrange a 'Force Induction Day', which she urged all Members to take up. A proposal had been circulated by email to Panel Members, with a request for a response by 1<sup>st</sup> October.

Members were also informed that the Panel's host Authority (Barnsley MBC) had now received the Panel's Grant Allowance from the Home Office for 2021-22. This remained unchanged from 2020-21.

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

- i) Noted the update.
- ii) Agreed to provide suggestions for future learning and development.

16 WORK PROGRAMME / PAB DATES

Members considered the 2021/22 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 scrutinising the Commissioner.

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

Additionally, Members were encouraged to attend the meetings of the Commissioner's Public Accountability Board (PAB) to increase their operational knowledge. These were currently being held virtually and Members could obtain details to 'dial in' to the meeting from L Noble or A Shirt.

Members were reminded that they could also submit questions for PAB through the OPCC, with 5 working days notice prior to the meeting.

Councillor Milsom reported that she had observed the recent PAB meeting. She informed the Commissioner that it was not apparent who was speaking during the course of the meeting. Due to the meeting being held in public, she suggested that it would be beneficial if speakers could announce their name and role when they speak.

F Topliss replied that the edited and published online recorded version of the meeting did contain the names of all speakers.

Councillor Milson reported that information contained on the OPCC website in relation to the PAB did not explain the Board's remit and interface with the public, nor its Terms of Reference.

F Topliss agreed to review the text contained on the OPCC website and provide Councillor Milsom with a draft of any revised text prior to it being published, for her comments.

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

- i) Noted the contents of the 2021/22 Work Programme.
- ii) Noted that F Topliss had agreed to review the PAB text contained on the OPCC website and provide Councillor Milsom with a draft of any revised text prior to it being published, for her comments.

17 DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

RESOLVED – That the next meeting of the Police and Crime Panel be held on Monday 13<sup>th</sup> December 2021, 1:00 pm - venue to be confirmed.

CHAIR