

**POLICE AND CRIME PANEL
28th January, 2013**

Present:-

Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council:-

Councillor M. Noble
Councillor K. Richardson

Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council:-

Councillor P. Bartlett
Councillor C. Ransome (Substitute for Mayor Davies)

Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council:-

Councillor J. Akhtar
Councillor T. Sharman

Sheffield City Council:-

Councillor S. Anginotti
Councillor H. Harpham (in the Chair)
Councillor H. Mirfin-Boukouris
Councillor T. Hussain

Co-opted Member:-

Mr. Kash Walayat
Mrs. M. Tennison

Apologies for Absence were received from:-

Mayor P. Davies (Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council).

Apologies for absence:- Apologies were received from Councillors Davies.

J21. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 19TH DECEMBER, 2012

Consideration was given to the minutes of the previous meeting of the Police and Crime Panel held on 19th December, 2012.

Reference was made to Minute No. J19 (Presentation on Priorities for Community Safety Partnerships) and questions asked as to why the information on the budgets allocated had not yet been circulated. This would be followed up and actioned.

J22. PRECEPT PROPOSAL FOR THE YEAR TO 31ST MARCH, 2014

Consideration was given to a report and presentation made by Shaun Wright, Police and Crime Commissioner, supported by Steve Pick, Treasurer, Erica Redfern, Acting Chief Executive and Tracy Cheetham, Proposed Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner, which detailed his key objectives/manifesto commitments, budget plans and maintaining/enhancing front line visibility.

In accordance with Paragraph 2 of Schedule 5 of the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011, the Police and Crime Commissioner introduced his proposed precept for the financial year 2013/14 set at a level which increased the annual Band D amount by £5.

Several factors were taken into account in reaching this position including:-

- The likelihood of future grant reductions.
- An on-going determination to reduce crime levels and maintain/increase policing visibility.
- The need to dedicate additional resources to particular specialist areas.
- A commitment to invest in Reducing Re-offending; Restorative Justice, Victim Support and Community Safety Initiatives.

The Police and Crime Commissioner explained in more detail as to what would be provided via the proposed budget and his plans to set challenging savings/efficiency targets for the Force during 2013/14. This had been discussed in detail with the Chief Constable and his Director of Finance.

A discussion and a question and answer session ensued and the following issues were raised and clarified:-

- Whether basic commander funding would be cut as this was used for partnership priorities.
- Protection of the most vulnerable and the emphasis on child protection and the timescales for the specialist teams for safeguarding young people.
- Earmarked underspends for distribution to the four Community Safety Initiatives and whether consideration had been given to a more even spread.
- The need to increase visibility across the force, whilst making savings.
- Inclusion of domestic violence within the funding streams.
- Reassurance of the public about policing and the demand for visibility.
- Need to maintain funding for the excellent work undertaken by the

Community Safety and Safer Neighbourhood Teams and the proactive confidence building to create consistency.

- Success rate of neighbourhood policing and the good practice in South Yorkshire.

Resolved:- (1) That the Police and Crime Commissioner be thanked for his informative presentation.

(2) That the proposals and the proposed precept increase for 2013/14 at £5.00 per annum (Band D) be approved.

J23. COMPLAINTS PROCEDURE

Further to Minute No. J17 of the meeting of the this Panel held on 19th December, 2012, consideration was given to a report which proposed a revised complaints procedure reflecting the comments and suggestions made by members.

It was noted that the administration of the procedure with regard to receiving and recording complaints, forwarding complaints to the IPCC and the initial consideration of whether a complaint is a complaint that required consideration by the Panel, had been delegated to the Monitoring Officer of the Host Authority, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman. This was to ensure that matters could be referred to the IPCC within the required timescale and that complaints which did not meet the criteria for consideration by the Panel could be dealt with in a timely manner and without the need to wait for the next Panel meeting.

It was suggested at the previous meeting that consideration be given to providing an appeal against the outcome of any informal resolution. As the Panel was not able to conduct an investigation into the complaint, did not make any findings and could not impose a formal penalty, the provision of an appeal procedure did not appear appropriate. It was noted that the regulations did not provide for an appeal against an informal resolution.

Resolved:- That the Complaints Procedure be approved subject to reviewing the functioning of the procedure in six months time.

J24. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

Resolved:- That, under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act, 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 1 of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act (as amended March, 2006) (information relates to an individual).

J25. COMPLAINT

Consideration was given to a report presented by Jacqueline Collins, Monitoring Officer, which detailed a complaint to be received by the Panel in accordance with the Panel's Complaints Procedure.

Further information was provided on the letter that had been received, a further email and telephone call, which detailed the formal objection to the matter being considered in private.

The complainant was, therefore, asking that consideration of the complaint be deferred so that he could be invited to observe the proceedings or that clarification be sought as to a way forward.

The consensus of the meeting was for the matter to be deferred pending further clarification as to whether the meeting could/should be held in public or private.

Resolved:- That consideration of the complaint be deferred pending further discussions.