

# Cleveland Police and Crime Panel

A meeting of Cleveland Police and Crime Panel was held on Tuesday, 14th September, 2021.

**Present:** Cllr Tony Riordan (Chair), Cllr Barrie Cooper, Cllr Chris Jones, Cllr Tom Mawston, Mr Paul McGrath, Cllr Steve Nelson, Cllr Shane Moore (Substitute for Cllr Stephen Picton, Cllr Amy Prince, Cllr Carl Quartermain, Mr Luigi Salvati and Cllr Norma Stephenson O.B.E.

**Officers:** Julie Butcher, Nigel Hart, Peter Bell (Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council).

**Also in attendance:** Steve Turner (PCC), Lisa Oldroyd, Rachelle Kipling, Amy Forsyth (OPCC).

**Apologies:** Cllr Chris Gallacher, Cllr Stefan Houghton, Mayor Andy Preston and Cllr Stephen Picton.

## **PCP 16/21 Welcome by the Chair and Introductions**

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and introductions were given.

## **PCP 17/21 Declarations of Interest**

There were no interests declared.

## **PCP 18/21 Minutes**

Consideration was given to the minutes of the meeting held on 6 July 2021 and the Attendance Matrix for 2021/22.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meetings held on 6 July 2021 be approved as a correct record and the Attendance Matrix for 2021/22 be noted.

## **PCP 19/21 Members' Questions to the Commissioner**

The following question had been submitted by Cllr Amy Prince for response by the Commissioner:-

“How many times has the community trigger been activated in Hartlepool and what were the outcomes?”

The Commissioner responded with:-

“During 2020/214 applications for case review were received, 1 was refused, 3 case reviews were conducted and 0 case reviews resulted in recommendations.

The following question had been submitted by Cllr Amy Prince for response by the Commissioner:-

“What was the cost of the recent ‘reopening’ of Hartlepool’s custody suite? How many days has it been ‘open’ since you made the announcement? What would the total cost be of reopening them fully, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year?”

The Commissioner responded with:-

“It cost £36k to do the refurbishment and had been used on 5 separate occasions since it re-opened and during these times it has had 17 detainees. If we were to re-open fully the annual cost would be £1 million to £1.1 million.”

The following question had been submitted by Cllr Barrie Cooper for response by the Commissioner:-

“I would like the Commissioner to know that I am receiving numerous complaints of speeding in the populated 20mph zones around Middlesbrough, I’m also aware of similar problems in neighbouring Local Authority areas so I would ask the Commissioner if more Speed Camera vans could be made available as a deterrent in these vulnerable areas?”

Cllr Barrie Cooper also asked about an incident that had happened over the weekend involving a motorbike and a drugs delivery.

The Commissioner responded with:-

“3 arrests have been made regarding the incident. In terms of off-road motorbikes, a robust plan is needed, it is sadly something that has been lacking for a long time. We have done a lot of good work in at Hartlepool. What we do need is quality community intelligence about where the bikes are being stored and who is using them.

Regarding the speed camera vans I’m aware that there is new kit available which is about the size of an iphone that fits onto a tripod and can be used in most locations, I do personally think these could make a massive difference.”

The following question had been submitted by Cllr Chris Gallacher for response by the Commissioner:-

“What is the cost to the tax-payer for the operation of the Office of the PCC on a fully established basis per annum?”

As a post was recently advertised for a Chief of Staff I would be also interested in seeing the organagram for this establishment.”

The Commissioner responded with:-

“The organagram for the PCC Office is on the PCC website. In terms of cost we will spend approximately 0.6% of the Forces total budget which is approximately £900k. One of the primary roles of the OPCC is commissioning services and looking for funding for various schemes to fight crime. Since May my office has brought in and extra £1.1 million so that £900k cost has already generated in less than 6 months over £1 million.”

The following question had been submitted by Cllr Steve Nelson for response by the Commissioner:-

“In his proposed Police and Crime Plan the commissioner has stated that he wants to increase the number of special constables by using financial inducements in the form of councils agreeing to a reduction in council tax for those volunteering to be a special constable. At the last Stockton Borough

Council Meeting a motion put forward by the Conservative Group proposing this was roundly rejected by other councillors. This was for a number of reasons but principally because it was felt to be divisive in respect of the other estimated 45,000 volunteers in the borough and the council did not want to send a message to those volunteers that some volunteers are more valued than others. It was felt that if the Commissioner feels that financial inducements are needed to increase numbers he has the legislative and financial ability to pay allowances himself as Commissioners in the West Midlands and Devon & Cornwall have done. I would therefore ask the Commissioner what thoughts, if any, he has given to paying special constables allowances and whether he intends to pay said allowances and if not why-not?

The Commissioner responded with:-

“Firstly, I would say financial inducements doesn’t do what we are trying to do justice. I think it was a reward and the other thing that there might be 45k volunteers across the area but you can’t compare policing in Middlesbrough on a Saturday night to other volunteer work.

In terms of what has happened elsewhere, there is and always has been a mechanism to pay special constables but that can only be used in certain circumstances. In terms of what has happened at other Councils, Middlesbrough Council is keen to do something with special constables but would like to see the money come from a different direction, Hartlepool Council and Redcar and Cleveland Council haven’t formally come back to me. If you do it through council tax that doesn’t affect HMRCs. So I’m extremely disappointed that Stockton Council chose to respond in the way that it did. The message that it sends to the special constables is that policing isn’t important.”

The following question had been submitted by Cllr Steve Nelson for response by the Commissioner:-

“Arguably the best Chief Constable Cleveland Police has ever had has resigned just a few months into the new Police & Crime Commissioner taking up his new role. Is there a connection between the two events and what steps, if any, did the Commissioner take to try to retain the services of Mr Lewis?”

The Commissioner responded with:-

“I see absolutely nothing but? political motivation for this question. The easy answer is no there is no connection and secondly I took every possible step to retain the services of Mr Lewis.”

Councillor Steve Nelson asked the following supplementary question:-

“At the last Panel the Commissioner said that the people of Cleveland had no confidence in Cleveland Police and for somebody who wanted to keep his Chief Constable who had been in post for over 2 years and who had improved Cleveland Police was hardly a real endorsement of the Chief Constable. I also asked why the Chief Constable wasn’t at the meeting and he and his predecessors had always attended the Panel meetings where possible and your response was that he will come when I think it is appropriate for him to come. I was hearing that the Commissioner is very operational minded and so I wasn’t

surprised at all. Also I believe you have gone out to recruitment at £20k more than Mr Lewis was paid.”

The Commissioner responded with:-

“Regarding the last point I find it amazing that you as a member of this Panel didn’t know how much your Chief Constable was being paid. The salary is exactly the same.

In terms of why he wasn’t at the Panel, it isn’t the job of the panel to scrutinise the Chief Constable that is my role. Your role is to scrutinise the Commissioner and that is why I’m here. In terms of why he is going to suggest that he is using his family as a shield because he doesn’t want to work with me is extremely unfair.”

The following question had been submitted by Cllr Steve Nelson for response by the Commissioner:-

“Given the concerns the public has regarding the criminal use of motor bikes and the dangers they pose to public safety what consideration has been given to giving Cleveland Police Officers tactical stop powers?”

The Commissioner responded with:-

“Cleveland Police already have them.”

Councillor Steve Nelson asked the following supplementary question:-

“I have used the term tactical stop powers but in London we see bikes given a nudge to stop them, is this something that could be used in Cleveland?”

The Commissioner responded with:-

“When the Policing Minister visited Cleveland we showed him a presentation of a situation that happened in Cleveland where we had an ARV knocking two individuals off their moped using tactical stop powers. The officers seized a number of weapons off them and made two arrests.”

The following question had been submitted by Paul McGrath for response by the Commissioner:-

“In 2019 following the appointment of Richard Lewis, he appointed Mr Ian Arundale as temporary deputy Chief Constable to assist in certain issues facing Cleveland police. Mr Arundale had retired from the police service 7 years earlier. The Police and Crime Panel were given to understand that this was a temporary appointment. In July 2020 Helen McMillan was appointed Deputy Chief constable following competitive interview, Mr Arundale remained in post.

I understand that Mr Arundale remains in post some two years from his original temporary appointment and despite the appointment over a year ago of a new deputy. Other Police forces of a vastly bigger size to Cleveland seem able to operate with one deputy, why does Cleveland require two people? What earnings has Mr Arundale received from the Force during this period?”

The Commissioner responded with:-

“The salary of Mr Arundale is a matter of public record and I don’t propose to get into that but what I would say is that Mr Arundale is still in post today. I think the important part of this is that the Chief Constable chose to keep Mr Arundale due to the sheer number of historical cases that are here in Cleveland Police. Mr Arundale is the best to my knowledge in this field and he spends every working day dealing with such cases. This allows Helen McMillan to work as Deputy Chief Constable.”

**PCP  
20/21**      **Cleveland Police and Crime Plan**

A copy of the draft Cleveland Police and Crime Plan was tabled for members consideration. A final version the Plan would be presented to a future meeting of the Panel for final consideration. Any comments/amendments should be emailed through to the Office of the PCC for consideration.

RESOLVED that the draft Cleveland Police and Crime Plan be noted and that the Plan be presented to a future meeting of the Panel for final consideration.

**PCP  
21/21**      **Programme of Engagement for the Commissioner**

PCCs are elected by the public to hold Chief Constables and the Force to account, effectively making the police answerable to the communities they serve. A key role for PCCs is representing and engaging with local communities to help deliver their policing priorities. The PCC produces a Police and Crime Plan covering their term of office that sets out the priorities for local policing for the whole force area, and how they are going to be addressed. This document sets out the PCC's objectives for policing and reducing crime and disorder in the area, how policing resources will be allocated, agreements for funding and performance reporting requirements.

On 6th July the PCC presented his draft Police and Crime Plan to the Police and Crime Panel, setting out 10 clear objectives for his 3-year term of office.

- More police on the streets
- Effective support for victims and witnesses of crime
- Bringing offenders to justice
- Getting tough on drugs and gangs
- Tackling antisocial behaviour head on
- Preventing, tackling and reducing serious violence
- Using technology to combat crime
- Building confidence in Cleveland’s communities
- Tackling violence against women and girls
- Ensuring an effective policing and criminal justice system

An online public consultation was launched on 8th July to inform the final version of the Plan which will go to the Police and Crime Panel for approval on 14th September.

The consultation ran until Monday 23rd August and was promoted through OPCC social media and press releases, together with linking into key community safety partner organisations. In addition to the online survey OPCC

staff attended a range of community events across Cleveland with paper copies of the survey to ensure a wider representation of views were included in the consultation. Roadshows were held at the following events:

- Loftus Community Fayre
- Middlesbrough Mela
- Hartlepool Middleton Grange shopping centre
- Redcar market
- Stockton market
- Thornaby market
- Billingham market

Specific workshops were also undertaken with young people, older people and the hearing-impaired community.

The OPCC commissioned VCSE organisation Skills for People, who work with the learning-disabled community, to produce an Easy Read version of the survey for consultation with their service users and the wider learning-disabled community.

A member felt that a copy of the recent revisit HMICFRS inspection report should have been shared with all members of the Panel. The report outlined how Cleveland Police had improved and how areas of Cleveland Police still needed to improve. The Commissioner outlined that the document was available on the website but agreed that the document could have been circulated to the Panel. Reference was to poor previous consultation had been done in the past, the Commissioner responded that consultation had now improved greatly particularly the consultation that had been done around the Cleveland Police and Crime Plan.

A member asked a question around providing more police officers on the streets and how the Commissioner envisaged Cleveland Police becoming a more proactive force. The Commissioner responded that Cleveland Police are facing many issues including cyber-crime, OCG, modern slavery and child exploitation. Proactively Cleveland Police are looking at working with partners and gathering solid intelligence. One key area was also domestic violence and looking at ways of reducing the figures and work with perpetrators and victims. Police Officers are being actively recruited and are all doing 2 years working on the streets.

The Chair felt that the consultation regarding the Cleveland Police and Crime Plan had very good. The Chair had criticized the previous consultation that had taken place 18 months previously on the Police Precept. A lot of the consultation had reflected what Cleveland Police needed to do following the HMICFRS inspection report and there was open questions towards the end of the consultation document.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

**PCP  
22/21**

#### **Police and Crime Commissioner Resolution Team**

The Commissioner gave the Panel a presentation on a new model for the Resolution Team. Consultation had been carried out on the various options that were available to the Commissioner.

Members supported the new model (model 3) and felt that the new model added a layer of direct accountability and may help to restore some confidence in Cleveland Police. The Commissioner outlined that there would be no overall increase in cost to the OPCC to transfer to this new model and that previous complaints that had been considered under the previous model had also been handled well.

The Chair outlined that the costs associated with the new model were all contained within the business case consultation document.

RESOLVED that the presentation be received.

**PCP  
23/21**      **Decisions of the Commissioner**

Consideration was given to a report that provided an update on decisions made by the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) and the Forward Plan.

The Police and Crime Commissioner made all decisions unless specifically delegated within the Scheme of Consent/Delegation. All decisions demonstrated that they were soundly based on relevant information and that the decision-making process was open and transparent.

In addition, a forward plan was included and published on the PCC website which included items requiring a decision in the future. This was attached to the report.

Each decision made by the PCC was recorded on a decision record form with supporting background information appended. Once approved it was published on the PCC website.

Decisions relating to private/confidential matters would be recorded; although, it may be appropriate that full details were not published.

Decisions made since the last meeting of the Police and Crime Panel were attached to the report.

The Chair outlined that there may be a technical issue regarding the link to the OPCC website. The Commissioner responded that someone from the OPCC would investigate the problem.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

**PCP  
24/21**      **Commissioner's Scrutiny Programme**

Consideration was given to a report that provided an update on the Police and Crime Commissioner's (PCC's) scrutiny programme.

Holding the Chief Constable to account was the key duty of the Police & Crime Commissioner and must encompass all the functions of the Chief Constable and functions of those who were under the Chief Constable's direction and

control.

The PCC was establishing a range of scrutiny approaches to engage with the Chief Constable and hold Cleveland Police to account. These take place on a daily, weekly and monthly schedule both formally and informally and included a range of meetings, data and feedback from partners and the public.

A scrutiny handbook had been produced which sets out the approach to scrutiny and a copy of this was attached to the report.

The PCC had developed a scrutiny programme which challenged Cleveland Police in a firm but fair way. Since taking office the PCC had held 2 formal scrutiny meetings which were held on 13 July and 11 August and details of these meetings was included within the report.

Details of each scrutiny meeting were held in order to record if the PCC was assured or otherwise by the Force's response. Where further assurances were required, additional information would be required by the Force at future meetings.

A discussion took place around the areas of scrutiny that may not be suitable to be shared with the public. The Commissioner responded that there may always be elements of scrutiny that can't be made public for various reasons. If there was something that needed to be discussed by the Panel there are means in which to exclude the public.

The Chair asked a question around the force control room. The Commissioner responded that he had received a presentation from the force control room and he had received assurances and he now had a good understanding on what they were working on and the challenges that they were facing.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

**PCP  
25/21**

### **Appointments to the Complaints Sub Committee**

Consideration was given to a report that sought to appoint to a vacancy on the Police and Crime Panel Complaints Sub-committee.

At a meeting of the Police and Crime Panel on 17 November 2020 the membership of the Complaints Sub-Committee was agreed. It was agreed that, where possible, one elected member from each authority and one non-political independent member sit on the panel.

The membership was agreed as follows;-

Councillor Norma Stephenson OBE (Stockton-on-Tees BC)

Councillor Barrie Cooper (Middlesbrough BC)

Councillor Chris Jones (Redcar and Cleveland BC)

Councillor Lee Cartwright (Hartlepool BC)

Paul McGrath (non-political independent member)

Councillor Lee Cartwright was no longer a member of the panel and the seat for

Hartlepool Borough Council was vacant.

Nominations/volunteers were therefore sought for the appointment of a member of the current panel to that vacant seat, in the first instance from Hartlepool Borough Council, but open to other members if Hartlepool members do not wish to join the sub-committee.

RESOLVED that Councillor Stephen Picton (Hartlepool Borough Council) be appointed to the Complaints Sub Committee.

**PCP  
26/21**

### **Potential of 'Live Streaming' Meetings - Options Appraisal**

Consideration was given to a report that considers a request received from the Police & Crime Commissioner Council for all future public meetings of the Police & Crime Panel to be streamed live to the public and includes an options appraisal evaluating this proposal.

At the last meeting of the Police & Crime Panel (6th July 2021) Members were advised that the Police & Crime Commissioner had requested that all public meetings of the Police & Crime Panel be live streamed so that members of the public could follow proceedings remotely. The Commissioner considered that Live streaming future meetings would not only allow more people to watch proceedings in real time but it would also increase the accountability of the panel and the Police & Crime Commissioner and by association Cleveland Police to the communities, which they all served.

Stockton Borough Council's policy was to not stream its own public meetings; and therefore there were no current arrangements in place to facilitate this proposal.

This policy was last reviewed in detail by full Council in March 2017 when up until that time, meetings of its Council, Cabinet and Planning Committee were recorded and later hosted on the Council's website via YouTube. A decision was taken at that time to cease continuation of this practice as a consequence of the viewing figures for such meetings being extremely modest, particularly when taking into account the costs involved of doing so which equated to approximately £10k per annum.

The policy was again addressed in January 2021 at a time when the Remote Meeting regulations were in place which allowed remote attendance by all parties. Members were aware that these Regulations expired on the 7th May 2021 and that there was no timescale set for the Government to consider whether it wished to approve legislation that would re-introduce remote access for all parties.

Members were aware that the Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014 introduced rights for the public to report and commentate on public meetings of local government bodies when attending in person.

It was noted that in the time since the introduction of the legislation affording members of the public the opportunity to report and comment on public

meetings, there had been no occasions when members of the public had invoked the protocol and requested permission to make their own recording of the meeting. Notwithstanding that, it remained open to both the PCC and the OPCC to make their own recording should they wish to do so.

Should the PCP however determine that it would now wish to live stream its future meetings, it should be mindful that the technology in place within venues hosting meetings of the PCP, e.g. SBC Municipal Buildings, Police HQ or other local authority buildings, may differ significantly, therefore making a 'one size fits' solution harder to achieve.

Meetings of the Panel had been held at Stockton within the Jim Cooke Conference Room and at the Baptist Tabernacle, the latter being an external facility for which a hire charge of £350-£500 applies for half day use subject to extent of IT/audio required.

Within the Jim Cooke Conference Room, the location has a (portable, Bosch) microphone system so sound can be covered by utilising this, and a feed taken from the microphones into a computer. That facility had 11 speakers available to use which cost £12k a number of years ago. Additional speakers may be required to facilitate attendance by all members of the Panel and officers in attendance to provide one device per person present.

A camera can be connected and pointed at the room which will provide a single camera input, so a wide shot of the room. A suitable streaming camera and tripod would be needed which would cost in the region of £500. A member of staff would also be required to operate the live stream computer. The recording could be shared on whichever social media platform was preferred by the PCP.

Should other local authority or HQ venues be used to host the meetings, it would not be possible to use the 11 current devices used within the Jim Cooke facility as their usage policy is confined to use within their own building as it is also commercially let. However, provided the venue had the same IT setup as the Jim Cooke facility, the devices purchased by the PCP could be used along with the camera.

Should the facilities provided by the Baptist Tabernacle be preferred, this facility had all the necessary equipment in house to live stream an event, including audio, multi angle video, mixing desks, and staff with experience and the necessary expertise for live streaming meetings, including in the recent past those of the PCP, and Stockton's Planning and Licensing Committees. The only requirement would be the PCC providing a login to the streaming platform they wish to stream to (e.g. their YouTube channel or Facebook page).

Members discussed the various options that were available to them and felt that as the uptake of the viewing numbers was unknown and the costs would be quite substantial if recording equipment was purchased, a pilot scheme would be the best way forward. All four Cleveland Police area local authorities should be contacted to ask if they would be willing to share the cost of recording a single meeting of the Panel as a pilot and then if they agree a future meeting of the Panel should be recorded and then promoted on the PCC website. Following this the amount of views will be monitored to see what the uptake is and then a decision can be made by the Panel if all future meetings should be

recorded.

RESOLVED that:-

1. All four Cleveland Police area local authorities be contacted to ask if they would be willing to share the cost of recording a single meeting of the Panel as a pilot.
2. If the above is agreed, a future meeting of the Panel should be recorded and then promoted on the PCC website.
3. Following the above, the number of views will be monitored to see what the uptake is and then a decision can be made by the Panel if all future meetings should be recorded.

**PCP  
27/21**      **Public Questions**

Members were informed that there were no Public Questions.

**PCP  
28/21**      **Forward Plan**

Members were presented with the Forward Plan for the Panel.

RESOLVED that the Forward Plan be noted.