

DURHAM COUNTY COUNCIL

At a Meeting of **Police and Crime Panel** held in Committee Room 2, County Hall, Durham on **Monday 22 October 2012 at 11.00 am**

Present:

Councillor L Hovvels (Chairman)

Members of the Panel:

Councillors J Armstrong, D Boyes, M Campbell, D Stoker and G Huntington (Durham County Council)

Councillors I Haszeldine and B Jones (Darlington Borough Council)

K Larkin-Bramley and N Vaulks (Independent Co-opted Members)

Other Members in attendance:

Councillors A Hopgood and H Scott

Apologies:

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors S Harker and A Laing

1 Declarations of interest

There were no declarations of interest.

2 Panel Arrangements

The Panel considered a report of the Monitoring Officer which set out the arrangements for Durham Police and Crime Panel, including details relating to membership, casual vacancies, independent members, terms of office, elected members, allowances and validity of proceedings (for copy see file of minutes).

Mr Vaulks asked why Independent Members were not included in the Membership of the Panel at paragraph 2.2 of the Panel Arrangements at Appendix 2 and suggested that Paragraphs 7 and 8 of the Arrangements should be more reflective of the role of Independent Members.

The Monitoring Officer replied that detailed reference to Independent Members was outlined at section 4 of the Panel Arrangements. It was not appropriate to include Independent Members at paragraph 2.2 because it was the role of the Panel to appoint Independent Members, not the role of the constituent local authorities.

Resolved:

That the recommendations contained within the report be approved.

3 Terms of Reference

The Panel considered a report of the Monitoring Officer which set out the Terms of Reference for the Durham Police and Crime Panel (for copy see file of minutes).

The Monitoring Officer informed the Panel that the Terms of Reference were set out in statute and therefore could not be amended by the Panel. However, the Rules of Procedure could be amended in the way that they dealt with the Terms of Reference.

Resolved:

That the report be agreed.

4 Rules of Procedure

The Panel considered a report of the Monitoring Officer which advised of the need for Rules of Procedure, advised of the necessary contents of those Rules and presented Rules of Procedure for approval (for copy see file of minutes).

Mr Vaulks sought clarification on paragraph 8.1 of the Rules. The Monitoring Officer replied that this paragraph should be amended to remove the words 'the notice of motion only if' from the second line of the paragraph.

In response to a question from Councillor Huntington regarding paragraph 5 of the report, the Monitoring Officer informed the Panel that these were the functions which the Panel could not be discharged to a committee or sub-committee of the Panel.

Ms Larkin-Bramley suggested, and the Panel agreed, that the Rules of Procedure be reviewed after the Panel had been operating for 12 months.

Members expressed some concern at the quorum for the Panel being only a quarter of the membership, suggesting that this level was too low. The Monitoring Officer replied that the Panel would need to have a number of meetings over the forthcoming months, some of which may be called at relatively short notice, which may cause problems if the quorum was increased. Councillor Armstrong suggested that the Panel be given time to bed down and that issues such as this be considered in May of next year, when examples of best practice from other PCP's could be considered.

Resolved:

That the report be agreed and the Rules of Procedure be reviewed in May 2013.

5 Joint working arrangements between the Police and Crime Panel, and Overview and Scrutiny Committees

The Panel considered a report of the Assistant Chief Executive which sought agreement on the joint working arrangements between the Durham Police and Crime Panel and Overview and Scrutiny arrangements at Durham County Council and Darlington Borough Council (for copy see file of Minutes).

Resolved:

That the recommendations contained within the report be approved.

The Chairman of the meeting was of the opinion the following item of business was of sufficient urgency to warrant consideration because of the need to respond to an approach made by Cleveland PCP.

6 Cleveland PCP

The Overview and Scrutiny Manager informed the Panel that a request had been received from Cleveland PCP requesting observer status at Durham and Darlington PCP, such an arrangement to be reciprocal.

Members of the Panel felt that at such an early stage in the development of PCP's there would be no added value to such arrangement.

Resolved:

That the request from Cleveland PCP be declined.