

Minutes

Minutes of the Thames Valley Police and Crime Panel held on Friday, 25 June 2021 in Bodicote House, Bodicote, Banbury, Oxon OX15 4AA, commencing at 11.00 am and concluding at 1.20 pm

Members Present

Councillor Balvinder Bains (Slough Borough Council), Councillor Adele Barnett-Ward (Reading Borough Council), Councillor Robin Bradburn (Milton Keynes Council), Councillor David Cannon (Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead), Councillor David Carroll (Buckinghamshire Council), Councillor Emily Culverhouse (Buckinghamshire Council – Co-Opted Member), Councillor Merilyn Davies (West Oxfordshire District Council), Councillor Neil Fawcett (Vale of White Horse District Council), Cllr Maggie Filipova-Rivers (South Oxfordshire District Council – Substitute Member), Councillor John Harrison (Bracknell Forest Council), Liz Jones (Independent Member), Councillor Andrew McHugh (Cherwell District Council), Phillip Morrice (Independent Member), Councillor Richard Newcombe (Buckinghamshire Council – Co-Opted Member), Councillor Barrie Patman (Wokingham Borough Council), Councillor Simon Rouse (Buckinghamshire Council – Co-Opted Member), Councillor Dr Louise Upton (Oxford City Council), Councillor Richard Webber (Oxfordshire County Council) and Councillor Mark Winn (Buckinghamshire Council – Co-Opted Member).

Officers Present

Khalid Ahmed (Scrutiny Officer)

Others Present

Matthew Barber (Thames Valley Police and Crime Commissioner), John Campbell (Chief Constable, Thames Valley Police – (Virtual)), Paul Hammond (Chief Executive Officer of PCC (Virtual)) and Ian Thompson (Chief Finance Officer of PCC (Virtual)).

Apologies

Councillor Sam Casey-Rerhaye (South Oxfordshire District Council) (Substitute Member - Councillor Maggie Filipova-Rivers) and Councillor Claire Rowles (West Berkshire Council).

If you have a query please contact Khalid Ahmed, Thames Valley Police & Crime Panel Scrutiny Officer (Tel: 07990 368048; Email: khalid.ahmed@oxfordshire.gov.uk)

19/21

ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN OF THE PANEL

That Councillor Merilyn Davies be elected as Chair of the Thames Valley Police and Crime Panel for the 2021/22 Municipal Year.

Councillor Merilyn Davies took the Chair

20/21

APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIRMAN OF THE PANEL

That Councillor Barrie Patman be appointed Vice-Chair of the Thames Valley Police and Crime Panel for the 2021/22 Municipal Year.

WELCOME TO NEW MEMBERS

The Chair welcomed the following new Members of the Panel to their first meeting:

Councillor Balvinder Bains (Slough Borough Council)

Cllr Richard Newcombe (Co-opted Member, Buckinghamshire Council) (See Min No.27/21)

Cllr Simon Rouse (Co-opted Member, Buckinghamshire Council) (See Min No.27/21)

Councillor Richard Webber (Oxfordshire County Council)

Councillor Maggie Filipova-Rivers (South Oxfordshire District Council – Substitute Member)

21/21

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were submitted by Councillor Sam Casey-Rerhaye (South Oxfordshire District Council) (Councillor Cllr Maggie Filipova-Rivers substituting) and Councillor Claire Rowles (West Berkshire Council).

22/21

MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Panel held on 26 March 2021 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

23/21

THAMES VALLEY POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER'S POLICE & CRIMINAL JUSTICE PLAN 2021-2025

Matthew Barber, Thames Valley's newly elected Police and Crime Commissioner attended the meeting to present his draft Police and Criminal Justice Plan 2021-2025.

The Panel was informed that the Chief Constable and PCC staff had been briefed on the content prior to a draft of the Plan being circulated for comment to over 120 key stakeholders, which included MPs, Council Leaders and Chief Executives, NHS partners, criminal justice agencies and to Members of the Police and Crime Panel. As a result of these consultations, modifications had been made to the draft plan before its submission to the Panel.

The Panel was informed that the Police and Criminal Justice Plan had been titled that way to demonstrate the significant role that the PCC had in the wider criminal justice system.

The PCC reported that his plan had five main strategic priorities which would be developed further during his term of office. The five strategic priorities were:

- Strong Local Policing
- Fighting Serious Organised Crime
- Fighting Cyber-Crime and Fraud

- Improving the Criminal Justice System
- Tackling Illegal Encampments

Strong Local Policing – This would be recruiting more police officers, supporting neighbourhood policing and focussing on driving down the crimes which matter most to the public.

Fighting Serious Organised Crime – Cracking down on the threat from “county lines” drugs gangs to protect children from exploitation and abuse.

Fighting Cybercrime and Fraud – Crime was changing and there would be investments in technology and resources the police need to protect the public online.

Improving the Criminal Justice System – Supporting victims of crime, bringing more criminals to justice and reducing reoffending.

Tackling Illegal Encampments – Ensuring a fair but firm response to illegal encampments and reducing the effect on communities.

Reference was made to the other strategies which would be developed which included: - police officer and staff recruitment and retention; Community Safety Partnership funding; improving contact management; specialist capabilities; Police Officer welfare; Emergency Services Collaboration; fly-tipping and environmental crime and Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR).

Performance against the Plan and other areas of work would be monitored at fortnightly Liaison meetings with the Chief Constable and at public bi-monthly Performance and Accountability meetings.

Members Questions

(1) What criminality data has the PCC got to justify having Tackling Illegal Encampments as a strategic priority in his Plan, rather than Rural Crime, and what are Thames Valley Police going to do in relation to this, particularly when it is the responsibility of local authorities to deal with illegal encampments.

[The PCC acknowledged that having Tackling Illegal Encampments as one of his Strategic Priorities was perhaps controversial. Rural Crime was important; however, this was captured by the Strong Local Policing Strategic Priority. Rural areas needed strong neighbourhood policing as did urban areas.

Rural Crime was not a separate Strategic Priority as the PCC was developing a Plan for the whole of the Thames Valley. There were challenges regarding data, with disparities between what is held by command and control and crimes reported in relation to illegal encampments. In addition, the Police did not capture data such as the costs of clearing up sites which were borne by local authorities and the individuals who were responsible. More focus could then be given on these individuals rather than travellers as a whole.

Local Authorities did have the lead role on illegal encampments. There was a joint protocol across the Thames Valley to ensure a consistent approach when dealing with illegal encampments. However, there could be more done in this area. Reference was made to the need for transit sites. There would be reconvening of the Joint Working Group between the PCC, Thames Valley Police and local authorities to look at making further improvements on how illegal encampments are dealt with.

There were elements of prejudice in society against travellers and this would also be covered as part of the Strategic Priority.]

- (2) Reference was made to urban areas such as Reading not having the space or land for transit sites for travellers and that there needed to be a Thames Valley approach to this issue. Neighbouring boroughs with the land needed to cooperate.

[The PCC commented that this was why he believed the PCC should be getting involved in these kinds of issues strategically. There were nuances around the legislation on travellers being asked to move outside of one local authority area to a transit site in a neighbouring borough.]

- (3) With the increase in the number of IT scams, how would a resident report a phishing email scam to Action Fraud as this did not seem to be covered on their website?

[In relation to phishing email scams, Members were informed that these should be forwarded to report@phishing.gov.uk. The PCC agreed that there were too many agencies involved in fraud at a national level and this would be something he would be raising on a national level.]

- (4) In relation to Serious Organised Crime, reference was made to an Area Local Police Commander who had imposed Closure Orders on premises to stop the selling of drugs and the PCC was asked to encourage the use of Closure Orders on the selling of illicit tobacco.

[The PCC replied that using Closure Order was not an easy process but he would encourage the Police to use whatever tools they had at their disposal to deal with issues, which included the sale of illicit tobacco.]

- (5) Reference was made to the information detailed in the covering report on the PCC election that the PCC had received 313,000 votes which equated to a high mandate for this Plan. A Member commented that this was misleading as this included second preference votes so it was misleading to suggest the PCC had the level of support he had described.

[The PCC replied that the number of people who voted for him was relevant for the purpose of the Plan. There was no requirement to consult with the public on the Plan, although their views were important. The fact that thousands of people had voted for him in the knowledge of his Plan gave him and his Plan a mandate.]

- (6) How did the PCC choose the initial five Strategic Priorities, particularly with the large number of policing and crime issues which exist within Thames Valley? Why is Violence against Women and Girls not one of the key Strategic Priorities?

[The PCC reported that the Strategic Priorities had been developed over the years after conversations with the Force and stakeholders. That was why issues such as cybercrime and serious organised crime were in there. With regard to Violence against Women and Girls, the nature of this is varied. Misogamy, hate crime, coercive control etc are all on the spectrum of domestic abuse. Violence against Women and Girls was not included as one of the key Strategic Priorities as there was not a "one size fits all" approach for dealing with violence against women and girls.]

- (7) The PCC was asked for his views on how to deal with low level crime which involved the use of psychoactive substances, nitrous oxide canisters, E Scooters which were crimes which the public considered required strong local policing.

[The PCC replied that work should be done with local authorities on these anti-social crimes. The work of Community Safety Partnerships, working with neighbourhood policing teams, was important and should be looking at longer term issues.]

Police data indicated that anti-social behaviour had fallen, whereas local authority data indicated that it had increased. Was that because of where the public reported these crimes? There was a data project, 'Interact', which would draw on the data from the Police and local authorities which would create a dashboard to see what is going on.

There is an issue about confidence in the Police and the low-level crime was the types of crime which the public were most concerned about. Addressing these things will improve confidence.]

- (8) Did the consultation carried out on the Plan reach all areas of the Thames Valley and, as far as possible, were the responses, both positive and negative, received from groups and individuals from across the diverse population of the area.

[The PCC replied that he was confident that the consultation did reach right across the Thames Valley with lots of responses from Hospital Trusts, Clinical Commissioning Groups, CSPs, charities and local authorities. The PCC reported that this was a high-level strategic document with more detail to come, which would be subject to further consultation and engagement.]

- (9) There needed to be creativity and solutions found for illegal encampments, however, were travellers consulted on the Plan. In addition, there had been over 6,000 reported Hate Crimes which were a higher number than crimes caused by illegal encampments. How can the PCC justify not having Hate Crimes as one of his Strategic Priorities?

[The PCC agreed and referred to the need for the Police to take on board the public's complaints regarding a small minority of travellers who behaved anti-socially as the public sometimes felt that the Police did not take their complaints seriously. The Gypsy, Roma, Traveller (GRT) community were not directly consulted on the Plan,

however, discussions have taken place over the last few years with police officers within the GRT community and there had been a GRT Conference hosted by TVP.

Regarding the number of crimes as a result of illegal encampments, the PCC reported that in the year before Covid, there had been around 650 reported crimes.

On Hate Crimes, it was not listed as a specific Strategic Objective as the PCC's view on Hate Crime was that there were other offences for which Hate was an aggravated factor. There were a number of Hate incidents, but they were not crimes. When there are physical incidents which are clearer, these will be addressed. With limited resources it would be difficult to focus on these incidents.]

(10) Residents want the Police to catch criminals, so in relation to the strategic priority to improve the criminal justice system, will there be greater collaboration with other Forces, other agencies, CSPs and the criminal justice system to ensure there is joined up work in the fight against crime? Particular reference was made to the accelerated justice system in relation to domestic abuse which was piloted at Aylesbury Crown Court.

[The PCC replied that for him, the most important principle was not catching criminals, but reducing crime. Prevention of crime and strong local policing was important, which would free resources for other high harm issues. Collaborations are important with Thames Valley border Forces to ensure joined up work takes place. Discussions will take place with other PCCs to enable senior officers to talk about issues which cross borders.

In relation to the criminal justice system, it was important that there was a good partnership with the Crown Prosecution Service and the PCC had had a meeting with the temporary Chief Crown Prosecutor where the point was made that the accelerated justice system which was used in Aylesbury should be rolled out across the Thames Valley and the data from this could be used to justify rolling out this accelerated justice system.

Collaboration also included sharing data, of which the Local Criminal Justice system was key. With Covid, the court system had lots of useful data which could be shared and bring greater joint working going forward.]

(11) Could the PCC provide details of how the increase in the Police precept be utilised as residents are concerned at the gaps which exist in the Police Community Support Officer (PCSO) ranks; which was an invaluable service to local communities.

[The PCC reported that there was a good Police Settlement, however, there were pressures such as the increase in Police Pensions, which were not visible to the public, but were necessary for Police Officers. Last year's increase would help fund the Rural Crime Task Force, which was being recruited to, filling the Police Community Support Service vacant posts, which were hugely valuable service. Unfortunately, vacancies did occur within the PCSO establishment because some PCSOs left to train to become Police Officers.]

- (12) In relation to speeding, there were two types of speeding, excessive speeding which was criminal and therefore the Police should enforce, and low-level speeding which often the Police explained they cannot enforce due to lack of resources. Could the PCC put forward a case to look at other ways of dealing with and enforcing low-level speeding?

[The PCC informed the Panel that speeding was an issue for all communities and there was a perception issue of speeding as well as reality. As Deputy PCC, a Community Speedwatch programme was launched which was mixed in terms of its success as it was reliant on the local inspector. There was an on-line support to Community Speedwatch.]

There were two trial groups of Community Speedwatch taking place in all three counties of the Thames Valley, with all sites agreed by TVP. Advice would be on-line for the volunteers. The PCC said that he wanted to see a growth in the number of Community Speedwatch schemes in the Thames Valley with TVP and the PCC providing support.

Should the pilot be successful, the PCC would look to roll it out throughout Thames Valley. As a result of this work, there would be more informed data available to assess whether there were problems of speeding in these areas.]

- (13) Trust in the Police and policing by consent has been strained during pandemic, particularly around the policing of the regulations. How damaged has this been in the Thames Valley and what will the PCC do to address this?

[The PCC replied that in relation to trust there was a clear divide, 50/50 in relation to the public's trust with the views that perhaps the Police were enjoying their powers under Covid regulations or they should be doing more. The PCC was looking at some of the fixed penalty notices issued by Thames Valley and was watching body worn video of TVP during policing Covid incidents. There were very few issues where TVP had acted inappropriately during a difficult period of policing.]

- (14) In relation to the PCC's Strategic Objective relating to the criminal justice system and the relationship to the probation service, what does the PCC see as the biggest risk and threat to achieving an improvement in the criminal justice system and reducing reoffending?

[One of the biggest challenges had been around the probation dynamic framework for funding which has not been particularly good. Some of the concerns were regarding some of the local organisations who were doing good work with Community Rehabilitation Companies would lose out in the change in funding model.]

A bid of £1m was put into the Ministry of Justice for a Prisoners' Leaving Scheme, which had not been successful, but a further bid would be put in. The PCC reported that he had decided to go ahead with a review of this and look at how we deal with people coming out of prison.]

- (15) Anti-social behaviour makes people not feeling safe in their communities and if that is not responded to in an effective and robust way it makes people lose

confidence in policing. Part of the issue was the problems people had reporting such incidents to the Police through dialling 101 or reporting on-line. Could these reporting systems be looked at again, including the number of "blocked calls", whereby people have just given up and hung up?

[The point on ASB was noted and improvements needed to be made on how to deal with this problem. Regarding 101 calls, this service had improved. The performance previously was not good; however, this had improved with calls in the last month being answered on average after 40 seconds. Priority was always given to 999 calls and they are answered in less than 5 seconds.]

Contact Management was a shared service with Hampshire Police and there needed to be improvements with this. A WhatsApp messaging service was being looked at to enable messages to be sent to the Police, an auto translation service was being looked at, Rural Crime Module, which allowed people to report rural crime on the website.]

(16) Reference was made to people who report crimes, but they did not get any feedback from the Police. Many households have CCTV to safeguard themselves, images are picked up and reported and no feedback is received from the Police on reported crimes and anti-social behaviour. Could the PCC look into this? Also, sometimes in ethnic minority households such as those found in Slough, Reading, High Wycombe, etc. victims find it very difficult to report domestic abuse. Could the PCC look at this?

[The PCC commented that all parts of the Thames Valley were important to the Police and all required strong local policing. In Slough, there needed to be a different approach to policing. Regarding feedback, there are often times when the Police cannot report back, however, there needed to be better communication. For example, there have been a number of recent bike thefts in Slough and people have been caught. This would be a good message to communicate to the public.]

(17) Reference was made to the Section 60 of the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act which was in place in Bletchley, Milton Keynes following stabbings and gang fights. The residents would be rather doubtful of illegal encampments being a priority when knife and gang crime was so prevalent. In the PCC's foreword, specific mention is made in his vision for policing, of Berkshire, Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire and Milton Keynes. Why has this vision singled out Milton Keynes?

[The PCC replied that knife crime was a priority and was in the document under both strong local policing and fighting serious organised crime. The work of the Violence Reduction Unit (VRU) was key to fighting knife crime. Additional funding had been received from the Home Office of £1.16m for the VRU. Milton Keynes was a large unitary authority and was separate to Buckinghamshire and that was why it was singled out in the foreword.]

(18) In relation to strong local policing, where does the closing of front counters in Police stations fit in with this priority? Is this purely financial and also could this be a job be carried out by a civilian?

[The PCC replied that if a front counter service was maintained in a rural area it would be difficult to be accessible and convenient for everyone. The PCC commented that even with more resources, he would rather the Police went out to the public as it would not be feasible to have front counters everywhere due to cost.]

Resources were being spent on more Police Officers and the public were being asked to report incidents on-line.]

- (19) A Member commented that the Police and Criminal Justice Plan seemed to be a Plan for rural areas, rather than urban areas. On the point of PCSOs, some of them had secondary specialisms which meant they were pulled away from community policing. Could the PCC champion that PCSOs were their primary roles?

[The PCC disagreed that his Police and Criminal Justice Plan focused on rural areas as the list of priorities applied to all areas of the Thames Valley. Neighbourhood policing applied to all areas, serious and organised crime applied to urban areas.]

Regarding the neighbourhood teams, there will always be emergency incidents which pull PCSOs from their areas but he agreed that this should be a specialism.]

- (20) In relation to speeding, could the PCC lobby for local authorities to enforce low level speeding which the Police cannot enforce?

[The PCC said he would welcome this and could not see this as an issue of local authorities taking on enforcement of lower levels of speeding, which the Police could not enforce.]

- (21) There is no reference in the Plan on the issues around the Night-Time economy such as violence which occurs. Anti-social behaviour which occurs in town centres, CSPs have some good ideas and the PCC was asked to have discussions and development policies to alleviate these problems.

[The PCC agreed that CSPs were important in terms of working with TVP on developing strategies for combatting anti-social behaviour and crime in town centres and some good work was taking place in places such as Oxford. This work with CSPs would continue.]

- (22) With the previous PCC having a Deputy, what plans are there to appoint a new Deputy PCC to help the PCC to carry out his role effectively across the large geographical area of Thames Valley?

[The PCC informed the Panel that at this stage there were no plans for him to have a Deputy, however, it could be that the Government make it mandatory that Deputy PCCs be appointed if fire service governance has to be taken on board.]

RESOLVED – That the Police and Criminal Justice Plan 2021-2025 be endorsed.

POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER'S ANNUAL REPORT 2020/21

Consideration was given to the previous PCC's Annual Report for 2020/21 and reflects the work undertaken in meeting the following strategic priorities and Key Aims contained in the PCC's Police and Crime Plan for 2017-2021:-

- Vulnerability
- Prevention and early intervention
- Reducing re-offending
- Serious organised crime and terrorism
- Police ethics and reform

The report provided details of the progress made against the strategic priorities which were achieved during an unprecedented year because of the Coronavirus pandemic.

Reference was made to the 32.6% Rape charge increase which was contrary to the national headlines of Rape convictions. The PCC was asked what Thames Valley Police was doing differently to achieve these results.

The PCC recognised that this figure was still too low but acknowledged this was to do with the work of the CPS. This was possibly an anomaly as there was still lots of work to do in this respect.

The PCC referred to the work of officers in the PCC Office who had put the report together and the Panel placed on record their thanks to officers of the PCC, together with the previous PCC, Anthony Stansfeld, for the work during his term of office.

RESOLVED – That the previous PCC's Annual Report for 2020/21 be received and noted.

COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIPS - PCC UPDATE REPORT

The Panel was provided with a report which outlined details of the funding provided by the PCC to local authority Community Safety Partnerships in the Thames Valley.

The PCC had a community safety budget of £3 million, of which £2.7 million was allocated to county and unitary councils in the Thames Valley area in the form of grants, and £0.3 million is retained by the Office of the PCC (OPCC) to fund Force-wide initiatives.

The PCC was asked about the £144,000 funding to CSPs which had been unallocated and whether this funding could have been provided elsewhere to deliver other community safety initiatives. The PCC replied that a review would be taking place into the funding of CSPs as the funding formula was outdated. CSPs would be asked for clearer plans on what their spend would be and funding would be released quarterly upon delivering part of their plan.

In response to a question about achievements and performance of CSPs in relation to the funding allocated, the PCC reported that part of the review would be looking at the allocation of funding more strategically. An example was given of CSPs providing funding for domestic abuse whereas the PCC received significant funding from the

Ministry of Justice for domestic abuse which ended up with duplication. Performance information to justify the funding would be worked into the process.

RESOLVED - That the report be noted.

26/21 **POLICE AND CRIME PANEL'S ANNUAL REPORT 2020/21**

The Panel's Annual Report for 2020/21 was submitted and Members placed on record their appreciation of the work of Councillor Kieron Mallon, the previous Chairman of the Panel.

RESOLVED - That the Annual Report be adopted and published and that Panel Members submit the Annual Report to their respective local authorities for information.

27/21 **REVIEW OF POLICE AND CRIME PANEL'S RULES OF PROCEDURE, COMPLAINTS PROCEDURE, PANEL MEMBERSHIP AND APPOINTMENT TO SUB-COMMITTEES AND TASK GROUPS**

For the first meeting of the Municipal Year, the Police and Crime Panel reviews its Rules of Procedure and Panel Arrangements. Consideration of the Rules of Procedure and Panel Arrangements also reminds Panel Members, particularly new Members, of the role and functions of the Panel.

The report also requested consideration of an updated Complaints Handling Procedure as it applied to the Panel's Complaints Sub-Committee which considers Non-Criminal Complaints against the Police and Crime Commissioner and his Deputy, where one is appointed.

Appointments were required to the Panel's Complaints Sub-Committee, its Budget Task and Finish Group and other Task and Finish Groups if established.

The Panel were reminded that in accordance with the Panel Arrangements (paragraph 3.15), Co-opted Members were subject to interview before confirming their appointment.

For this Municipal Year, two of the newly appointed Co-opted Members from Buckinghamshire Council were not existing Members of the Panel, so their appointments were subject to these rules. Informal interviews had taken place, but the appointments had to be confirmed by all Panel Members before they were officially appointed.

Discussion took place on the process for the four Co-Opted Members from Buckinghamshire Council. The Panel was reminded that a decision was taken at the Panel meeting in November 2019 which updated the Rules of Procedure to include the appointment of four Co-Opted Members from Buckinghamshire Council due to local government reorganisation in Buckinghamshire.

The four Co-Opted members were in addition to the one Member nomination to the Panel from Buckinghamshire Council. The changes were required in order to satisfy the requirements of the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 and produce a balanced panel.

The representative from Milton Keynes Council expressed concern at these arrangements and referred to the changing populations around Thames Valley, particularly in relation to Milton Keynes (population 250,000) who had one Member representative on the Panel and Buckinghamshire (population 535,000), who had one Member representative and four Co-Opted Member representatives.

It was agreed that a Task and Finish Group be set up to examine the representation on the Panel, in accordance with the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011, and after consultation with the Home Office.

RESOLVED – (1) That the Panel’s Rules of Procedure and Panel Arrangements (Appendices 1 and 2) be noted.

(2) That the Panel reconfirms the decision to hold future meetings of the Panel at Buckinghamshire Council’s Gateway House in Aylesbury.

(3) That approval be given to the Protocol for the Informal Resolution Procedure regarding Complaints made against the Police and Crime Commissioner and his Deputy, where one is appointed (Appendix 3).

(4) That approval of the memberships of the Panel’s Complaints Sub-Committee and the Budget Task and Finish Group be delegated to the Chair in consultation with the Panel’s Scrutiny Officer.

[Subsequent to the meeting the memberships were agreed as follows:

Complaints Sub-Committee (7) – Cllr Bains, Cllr Culverhouse, Cllr Davies, Liz Jones, Cllr McHugh, Phillip Morrice and Cllr Webber.

Budget Task and Finish Group (5) – Cllr Bradburn, Cllr McHugh, Cllr Newcombe, Cllr Patman and Cllr Rouse.]

(5) That the established Sub-Committee and Task Group be agreed with no changes to their terms of reference for the following year (subject to any legislative changes).

(6) That the appointments of Councillor Richard Newcombe and Councillor Simon Rouse as Co-Opted Members of Buckinghamshire Council be confirmed.

(7) That a Task and Finish Group looking at the Panel Membership be established, with the membership agreed by the Chair, in consultation with the Panel’s Scrutiny Officer and a draft scoping report be submitted to the next meeting of the Panel for discussion and approval.

[Subsequent to the meeting the membership was agreed as follows:

Task and Finish Group on Panel Membership (7) – Cllr Bains, Cllr Barnett-Ward, Cllr Bradburn, Cllr Carroll, Cllr Harrison, Cllr Newcombe and Cllr Winn.]

28/21 **PROTOCOL DEFINING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THAMES VALLEY POLICE AND CRIME PANEL AND THE POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER FOR THAMES VALLEY**

The Panel was informed that the aim of the Protocol was to provide clarity of the roles and expectations of the Panel and the Commissioner for the benefit of all involved in the process of policing and crime accountability.

The Protocol was agreed by both the Panel and the Police and Crime Commissioner.

29/21 **CHAIRMAN AND PCC UPDATES**

The PCC informed the Panel that his Office was recruiting new members of his team to vacancies which exist. A Head of Victims Services, a Head of Partnerships and Community Safety and a Corporate Accountant to replace Judi Banks who was leaving after 17 years' service in the Office of the PCC and the former Police Authority.

30/21 **WORK PROGRAMME**

Discussion took place on the Panel's work programme for the forthcoming Municipal Year and Members were asked to send in their views and ideas to the Panel's Scrutiny Officer.

Reference was made for the need for performance data to be reported to the Panel to measure the PCC's performance in relation to his Strategic Priorities

..... in the Chair

Date of signing