



**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
CAMBRIDGESHIRE POLICE AND CRIME PANEL
HELD VIRTUALLY VIA ZOOM
ON 24 MARCH 2021**

Members Present: Edward Leigh (Chairperson), Councillors A Sharp, A Ali, C Daunton, N Massey, M Shellens, S Tierney, S Bywater, A Lynn, S Warren, C Wiggin, and Claire George.

Officers Present: Jane Webb Secretariat, Peterborough City Council
Fiona McMillan Monitoring Officer, Peterborough City Council

Others Present: Ray Bisby Acting Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Commissioner
Jim Haylett Acting Chief Executive from the OPCC
Christina Strood Head of Policy, OPCC
Jon Lee Director of Finance & Resources
Nicky Phillipson Head of Strategic Partnerships and Commissioning
Christina Strood Head of Policy for Fire & Police, OPCC
Matthew Warren Chief Finance Officer

1. Apologies for Absence

Councillor Lynn was in attendance as substitute for Councillor Wallwork.

2. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Massey declared she was a candidate in the forthcoming Police and Crime Commissioner elections.

3. Minutes of the Meeting held on 03 February 2021

Minutes of the meeting held on 3 February 2021 were agreed as an accurate record.

4. Acting Commissioner's Response to Panel's Recommendations

Crime and Disorder Grants – Councillor Lynn asked if the Acting Commissioner could give the Panel an idea of how the grant changes would benefit the CSPs (Community Safety Partnerships). The Acting Commissioner responded, stating it would be down to the new Police and Crime Commissioner

if these changes were made, but it was hoped they would enable the CSPs to better respond to local issues as CSPs would be joint working together to resolve them rather than individually.

Councillor Massey stated her concern was that each CSP (Community Safety Partnership) area was different, hence each individual CSP would need its own voice. Councillor Massey was also concerned that this would lead to a decrease in the amount of funding. The Acting Commissioner stated there would be more funding available; two or three CSPs working on the same project would be far more beneficial than working individually.

The Chair asked for clarification that individual CSPs would be forging an alliance on an ad-hoc basis to bid for funding and this would not be a block grant to be shared for individual CSPs to divide up between themselves. The Acting Commissioner stated this would be a decision for the new Commissioner as to how the grant was allotted but it was envisaged that CSPs would work together.

Councillor Daunton asked what the mechanism was for making this decision, how was it made and who had been consulted? Jim Haylett, the Chief Executive of the OPCC, explained that the money for this grant was part of the overall monies that the Acting Commissioner received and effectively there was no additional monies from the government, these monies were out of the core grant and the precept. The amount that the Acting Commissioner awards this grant, was a matter for the Acting Commissioner, any remaining money was obviously within the constabulary budget; effectively any monies spent on this crime and disorder grant would come out of the constabulary's budget therefore it was a matter for the Commissioner in terms of the balance between the resource given to the Chief Constable and the resource given to the Crime and Disorder grant. He also highlighted the value of the grant compared to the mainstream resources that the partners sitting of the CSP brought to the local resolution of crime and disorder. At the County Wide Community Safety Board this was discussed as the grant period was ending 31st March and the current Acting Commissioner took the opinion that a new Commissioner would come, with a new Police and Crime Plan, and determine what the approach to these grants would be. A new Commissioner could determine not to give any of this money to the CSPs, it could be given individually, or collectively, or put it towards COVID recovery as there were no government rules or regulations on what these grants were for because it was part of the Commissioner's core budget.

Councillor Ali added it was important it was recognised that Cambridgeshire and Peterborough was a unique county, truly diverse in terms of demographics and geography; there was a need to ensure that the resources were targeted where the most need was needed and that no-one loses out. The Acting Commissioner reiterated that this would be up to the new Police and Crime Commissioner.

The Panel **NOTED** the letter.

5. Public Questions/Statements

No public questions or statements were received.

6. Review of Complaints

No complaints have been received since the last report.

ACTION

The Panel **AGREED** to note the report

7. Non-Crime Related Demand on Policing

The Panel received a report with information regarding non-crime related demand on policing within Cambridgeshire Constabulary in response to a request from the Panel at their 3rd February 2021 meeting.

The Panel made comment, asked questions, and received responses from the Acting Commissioner and his staff regarding non-crime related demand on policing, these included:

- a) Councillor Massey stated it was important and key to collate and understand the cost of time and money spent on non-crime related demand on policing for the Commissioner to be the voice of the public when talking to central government and Westminster and to be able to call for more funding for those areas that the police were currently having to pick up. Data was also needed on how many calls were redirected to partners to see where other agencies needed to step up and improve their communication. If the police receive calls for the mental health services, the county council, or other services then these services need to be aware so they can improve their communications to ensure that police time was not used instead. Hoax/abandoned calls needed to be extrapolated further, as the two were different. The Acting Commissioner explained that because these incidents were not crime related, it did not mean that the Police did not have a duty to deal with them; there were times when the police were dealing with issues that were not criminal, but involved the public's health and safety etc. Regarding the level of information, this is what the Panel had requested, further information could be asked of the new Commissioner. The Acting Commissioner did explain that the past year had not been a typical year, due to COVID-19. It was not for just the Police to ask for better funding from the government, but the Partners as well, therefore there was also a need to support our partners, because unless they also received extra funding then more would land in front of the police. Until then we all must do what we can to work for the public and the police will always respond where possible.
- b) Councillor Daunton stated that these non-crime related issues needed looking at via a local level, like the CSPs which was more reason for the CSPs to be treated individually. The Acting Commissioner explained that the Police and Crime Plan was now 5 years old and with a new Police and Crime Commissioner coming into post, who would change the Plan, he did not wish to tie the Commissioner into anything that was against what the proposals of the Commissioner, which was why the money had not been put out to the CSPs, it would be up to the new Commissioner.
- c) Councillor Lynn stated the request for information on the 80% of non-crime related issues was made at the budget/precept meeting where the Panel agreed to raise the precept; to see if the 80% could be dealt with elsewhere to enable the police to focus on crime-related issues that affected the public. To not have this requested information was a little disappointing. If the public were paying for 80% of incidences which did not need to be dealt with by the police, then taxes would be raised to cover this, which would push more public down into the poverty line which in turn increases non-crime situations, which was a false economy. Councillor Lynn added, the information would have been helpful to be able to find new ways of working, with new partners and to help the police work more on the crime related issues, which was why the information was requested. The Acting Commissioner stated that the Panel did receive a full in-depth report on the precept and what the precept was for. He explained the police had answered calls and attended when ambulances had not been able to, with a defibrillator and kept people safe therefore there was good reason behind why they attend some non-crime related incidences and that would never change; where the ambulance service needed to respond and could not, because they are overwhelmed. Jim Haylett, the Chief Executive, explained that the statement "non-crime" did not mean that it was not the police's role, transport, anti-social behaviour, and public safety matters, as in the report, these were all police matters which was why a price could not be put on these. When calls are received regarding a safety or security concern; the nature of the involvement of the police and if a crime has been committed cannot be established until the police have attended the incident. He reiterated that it was not the case that the police were spending 80% of their time on non-

police matters! Councillor Lynn thanked Jim Haylett for the explanation, as it had not been clear and stated that next time the request should be worded “policing issues” and “not policing issues.”

- d) Councillor Ali stated it was commendable what the police were expected to do beyond the call of duty during these challenging times but sadly it was a reflection of underfunding of the public sector organisations over the last decade. Councillor Ali stated that when the public read that 80% of police time is spent on non-crime related issues, they see a different picture; the public state they are not getting a response from the police if they have been broken into and are victims of crime and therefore, they have stopped complaining and reporting crime, especially in diverse communities. There needed to be a way where local partnership working could be more affective as there would be no public confidence with statements of “80% of police time is spent on non-crime related instances”. Jim Haylett responded, clarifying that the 80% figure was 80% of incidents and not necessarily time because clearly the figures would not capture a lot of the crime work, in terms of the time spent in dealing with individual crimes, which was why it was a complex issue. Councillor Ali thanked Jim Haylett for the information but explained these were public documents and if the Panel interpreted them differently, imagine what perception was given to the public, therefore these figures needed to be displayed in a different manner. Presently the public would read the report differently to the way it had been explained to the Panel. The Acting Commissioner stated the Panel could help explain what the figures were via their Councils, wards and help support the OPCC with the meaning in the documents.
- e) Councillor Massey stated that the narrative needed to be thought about when discussing the percentage of police time so not to confuse the public. The Panel were concerned with the areas of work the police were carrying out that they should not have to.
- f) Councillor Sharp stated the Panel should be digging further into the data to understand what the 80% was, as the Panel had been led to believe that the 80% was non-police related, which was not the case. The Acting Commissioner suggested the Panel look at non-crime related demand in the future.
- g) Edward Leigh, Chairman, added the report showed the figures for the admin breakdown looked suspiciously like the figures stated under public safety; had there been an error made? The Acting Commissioner stated that this would be checked, and the Panel updated.

The Panel **AGREED** to **NOTE** the report.

The Panel also made the following recommendations:

- Re-request the breakdown of demand of incidents again, but with hoax/abandoned calls split, sexual harassment identified, and any errors corrected.
- Review how the information is presented to the public, particularly, the term ‘non-crime related demand’ to one less misleading.
- Explore with the constabulary how referrals to other agencies could be recorded and reported
- Explore with the constabulary how police time spent on non-police matters (e.g., covering for another agency) could be quantified and reported

8. Overview of Capital Financing 2021-22 to 2024-25

The Panel received a report with an overview of the Acting Police and Crime Commissioner’s capital expenditure and financing in response to a request from the Panel at their 3rd February 2021 meeting.

The Panel made comment, asked questions, and received responses from the Acting Commissioner and his staff regarding non-crime related demand on policing, these included:

- a) Councillor Massey asked why national initiatives and any necessary upgrades to police stations were not funded by central government instead of the public purse, had the OPCC had discussions around this with central government. Councillor Massey stated her concern was there would be a significant impact to the cost of paying for the loan and interest, which

would fall back to residents via the precept. Matthew Warren, Chief Finance Officer, explained there would be some funding from government but the force would have to cover the remaining amount.

- b) Councillor Lynn stated asked if there were any plans to raise the funds to repay the monies or would it be put onto the communities to repay. Matthew Warren explained that borrowing rates were low, maturity loans would be taken out to repay the interest; this was accounted for in the revenue budget and monies were set aside to repay the loan in 50 years' time, the burden would not be significant at the present time and would hopefully recover over the longer term. The Southern Police station was most of the debt and the best sale/best income option was being investigated for that site, this would repay some of the significant debt in the short term.
- c) Edward Leigh asked for clarification around the current loans and future investment loans and stated that the report did show that in 2024/25, 2.62% of the entire police budget would be required to service the outstanding debt (which is 1.8% more than was currently having to be found out of the budget); did this concern the OPCC? Matthew Warren responded stating that the force was under-borrowed at present and therefore not a debt laden authority, albeit the debt would be increased for a brief period, but it was not a concern and was currently a sustainable position.
- d) Councillor Ali stated he was concerned that services were being reduced at the same time, money was being borrowed, even though it was sustainable. The Acting Commissioner commented that both internal and external audits had regarded this as an extremely minimal risk.
- e) Councillor Bywater stated that the resale cost of Parkside station could be drawn back on which gave an insurance policy as it was a private site in the middle of Cambridge. There were also operational risks because if the infrastructure were not modernised there would be a risk that the force would not be able to deliver investigations. Parkside was built in the 1950s and major changes have occurred over the years regarding forensic exhibits, drying rooms, interview rooms, detention, and custody to make the investigations easier and swifter; modernising the force must be offset alongside the capital risks and Councillor Bywater supported this. The Acting Commissioner agreed and stated if modernisation did not take place, then prosecutions would not be successful, and the force would come under pressure. HMRI CFRS would be carrying out an inspection, but the force had been given leeway because of the plan that was in place. The force had a lot of old buildings that needed bringing up to the standard required therefore it was an operational requirement that was needed to meet the standards of investigations and provide the evidence to courts and provide witnesses and victims with a service to ensure they were no longer victims and left with people not prosecuted properly, therefore it was an all-round issue that was needed to proceed as fast as possible. Councillor Bywater also pointed out that the working environment for staff was just as important as the criminal investigations and other processes that take place within a police station therefore it was crucial that staff had the best places and the best facilities to work in. The Acting Commissioner agreed stating if the staff and their welfare were not looked after then performance would not be as expected.
- f) Councillor Lynn commented it was okay to spend this money, but the public needed to see an improvement in service, a reduction in crime and a better and stronger police force for it.
- g) Edward Leigh asked for clarification around interest and investment income. Matthew Warren explained that the cash reserves were invested at only 1% but these would diminish over time on other projects.
- h) Edward Leigh asked about the £10m loan which would be paid at the end of 2046/47, why was this loan scheduled in that way? Matthew Warren explained a debt was usually applied to the asset and this debt was taken early on for the Southern Police Station which should have a 50-year life (some delays) hence the length of time.

The Panel **AGREED** to **NOTE** the report.

9. Roads Policing

The Panel received a report on Roads Policing in a response to a request from the Panel meeting on the 3rd of February 2021.

The Panel made comment, asked questions, and received responses from the Acting Commissioner and his staff regarding non-crime related demand on policing, these included:

- a) Councillor Daunton stated she was pleased to see a fresh look had been taken at the Zero Vision Partnership as she had not thought it had landed clearly when it was first launched and asked for clarification between the Partnership and Think Communities. Councillor Daunton also stated that speeding and parking were important to the communities therefore how would the police work through Vision Zero and more closely to communities. The Acting Commissioner stated that working with the public was working with Partnerships, there were councils, highways, and others but also those that carry out Speedwatch and allowing those members of public to take some responsibility for their areas. The Acting Commissioner also explained that Vision Zero was not just local but was national and it ensured that best practice was used moving forward.
- b) Councillor Massey added that near miss data needed to be looked at, as these could be where the next accidents occurred. There was also a need to look at the impact of the design of roads had on the safety element of driving and to see more output from Vision Zero about how accidents could be stopped before they happened. The Acting Commissioner stated too many people were killed on roads and more action was needed; when designing roads, the engineering of those roads needs to be considered regarding speeding etc to make them safer therefore it did not involve just the police; it was about education, talking to newly qualified or about to be qualified drivers.
- c) Councillor Sharp encouraged other villages to submit bids to set up their own Speedwatch. He also stated that enforcement issues, like on-street parking should be looked at with council officers having the appropriate powers. The Acting Commissioner stated if officers do see inconsiderate parking, it was hoped they would act, but it was the Chief that allowed the CSAS (Community Safety Accreditation Scheme) powers to be given to councils, councils may want to get together to ensure they have the officers to enforce the parking.
- d) Councillor Massey stated the 20mph zones needed to be looked at and how these could be policed and used in a better way to slow traffic. Councillor Massey also asked how much money had been spent from the casualty reduction fund and on what. The Acting Commissioner replied stating there was a Casualty Reduction Officer that carried out education in schools, colleges, and public arenas. Nicky Phillipson, Head of Strategic Partnerships and Commissioning, explained that the fund varied each year as it was funded by the excess money from the proceeds of the Speed Awareness Courses but the monies could only be used for educational activities and prevention rather than enforcement. The Casualty Reduction Officer is funded through this as well as some Vision Zero work and local speed education activities and some low-level cycling safety. The Roads Victim Trust was also funded from this which was to support families bereaved by road traffic collisions. The Vision Zero Partnership do have oversight over a small amount of the fund which they allocate out on an evidence basis.
- e) Councillor Daunton requested further information regarding Vision Zero and how they worked with county officers on local highway initiatives. The Acting Commissioner explained that Vision Zero was in its infancy and this information would be available shortly.
- f) Councillor Bywater commented that Huntingdonshire Council Council's Cabinet agreed in February that it would take on the enforcement for on-street parking/yellow lines and were currently working with Cambridgeshire County Council to submit an application to the Department of Transport and would be more than welcome to work with the police on this.
- g) Councillor Tierney commented that Fenland District Council were also looking at how it could decriminalise parking and take on some of the parking responsibilities, although Fenland were determined not to allow paid parking.

The Panel **AGREED** to **NOTE** the report.

The Panel also made the following recommendations:

- Receive regular updates/progress on Vision Zero and how the Commissioner is monitoring performance

10. Decisions by the Acting Police and Crime Commissioner

The Panel received a report to enable it to review or scrutinise decisions taken by the Police and Crime Commissioner under Section 28 of the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011. The Panel was recommended to indicate whether it would wish to further review and scrutinise the decisions taken by the Police and Crime Commissioner taken since the previous Panel meeting.

Councillor Bywater thanked the Acting Police and Crime Commissioner for the funding of the Safe Project; it was an extraordinarily successful project.

The Panel **AGREED** to note the report and decisions that had been made by the Acting Commissioner.

Edward Leigh added on behalf of the Panel and the public of Cambridgeshire, that he would like to thank the Acting Commissioner for stepping up and taking on the responsibilities of the role of Commissioner. The role was meant to be for just under six months but had ended up being 18 months and with a global pandemic thrown in. No-one outside the OPCC could really know how demanding the job had been, therefore Edward Leigh gave a huge thank you from the Panel and the public for all his time, effort, commitment, and dedication; it was appreciated.

The Acting Commissioner thanked the Panel for the comments and gave his reflection on the role he had undertaken:

“The job of the Commissioner is to resource the constabulary and to hold its chief constable to account for running an effective and efficient constabulary. I have been responsible for setting up the precept on two occasions and on both occasions, I raised the precept to the maximum that was allowed and that I could not, in all good conscience, leave office having done otherwise. He realised that during COVID this would not have been welcomed by many, but the responses to his surveys have endorsed this. I inherited an aging estate, that, together with other national programmes, placed a significant capital burden, which will also need to be paid for out of revenue.

An enormous success that I am not claiming credit for, was the granting of planning permission for the new police station at Milton which has been needed for many years and will go forward to become reality. I am incredibly pleased about this and pleased that the Panel understand the reason for it. I leave an office knowing that we have a chief constable with the resources he needs to keep people safe and that I have not made short-term political expedient decisions moving forward as that would have left the constabulary in a poor state had I done that; I have made long term decisions.

He also thanked the chief constable; we are blessed in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough to have an outstanding chief constable. He has, with his team, achieved excellent results and I look forward to seeing the next HMICFRS grading of the constabulary; he has already moved the organisation from a “required improvement” to a “good” rating and I strongly believe that they are “outstanding” now and this is through a team of highly capable and dedicated leaders that we have within our officer team and the staff within the constabulary. Throughout the response to COVID, I have supported victims, bringing extra funding and allocations to a range of service providers, and led a bid for the Safer Streets funding, bringing in nearly £550,000 to the county to make homes safer from burglaries.

Road safety has always been a passion of mine, I have chaired the County Road Safety Partnership previously and that has now been transformed into the Vision Zero Partnership with a programme lead funded from my Casualty Reduction fund.

No Commissioner would want to take up their post and find an office in disarray; I took over in exceedingly difficult circumstances, the office was not in disarray, but due to the circumstances, it was a hugely challenging time, given the resignation of the previous PCC (Police and Crime Commissioner), followed by a general election and that in turn, delayed the precept. I then thought it would be, "holding the office for a few months," but I was wrong, due to COVID, it was a further year, which then moved to 18 months. Whoever takes over from me will find a very lean and effective office of which I cannot claim the credit for, as it is testament to the whole of the staff who do a fantastic job; I am sure I would have been blamed if that had not been the case.

My personal style has been to acknowledge that, as a politician, I do not know all the answers and I need to rely on the professional staff for advice and this is something I would urge whoever becomes the next Commissioner to do. I would like to thank every member of the staff in my office; they have worked extremely hard and supported me in every facet of this job. I never expected to be taking office or expected it to be extended for a further year during one of the most challenging years with COVID impacting on the organisation.

My reflection for the Panel and say this in the interest of the next Commissioner, is that I would like to see a more supportive relationship, I know that the Panel have a challenging role, but all the LGA guidance stresses that it is a supporting role as well as a challenging one. It might be helpful for the Panel to reflect on how you support the role and how you exercise that support in the future. At the start of COVID, the OPCC released staff to support the constabulary directly in various roles, from full time specials support up to the County COVID intelligence cell, supporting the victims and witness hub and of course, my Chief Executive, Dorothy Gregson who was released to Public Health and has now taken a permanent job there. Jim Haylett stepped forward for over ten months to fulfil that job and I want to thank him personally; he has brought a lot to this office and having now been appointed, I see him bringing even more. Bearing in mind that at that time there were only about 14 members of staff in my office, it was done in the expectation that we would experience a proportionate governance from the Panel.

It has been known for years that we receive one of the lowest amounts of funding from the government, I lobbied on that, as had previous Commissioners; I would like to see the Panel members add their voice and their strength behind that, not just for the police but also for our partners. A clearer plan of areas of interest would be helpful for Panel sessions, consisting of a main topic for each Panel meeting and look at the outcomes and I would ask you all, to consider that when you bring forward your request for reports, those reports take time and effort from not just my staff but from police staff and police officers and that is putting pressure on the officers and the staff. So, before requesting any kind of report, I would just ask you to say to yourselves; what are we looking for out of this report, how does this relate to our remit and are we putting extra stress on the OPCC, the police and the police staff. I would like to thank every member of the Panel, I know how challenging it is, having been on the Panel and wish you all the best, whatever you do in the future. Thank you."

Edward Leigh thanked the Acting Commissioner and echoed his thanks to the chief constable and all his officers and staff who had all done a sterling job through extraordinary tough times; it had been a team effort. He was very mindful of the points the Acting Commissioner had raised about the Panel supporting the Commissioner and the Panel did need to think carefully about this as it emerged from the pandemic; a longer-term plan was needed.

Edward Leigh also stated the Panel would be saying goodbye to Councillor Shellens who was standing down at the next election in May. He had served on the Panel continuously since it was formed almost 10 years ago; the Panel would lose the most widely experienced and diligent member.

He thanked Councillor Shellens on behalf of the Panel and support officers for his contributions. The Acting Commissioner added his thanks.

Councillor Shellens gave particular thanks to Jane Webb, Paulina Ford and Edward Leigh; he stated that Edward had been a very calm and reasonable chairman.

The Acting Commissioner and his staff left the meeting.

11. Police and Crime Panel – Eastern Network Subscription

The Panel **AGREED** to the renewal of the annual Eastern Network Subscription

12. Task and Finish Group – Verbal Update

Claire George, Chair of the Task and Finish Group explained that the Group had met with Ian Parry (Centre of Public Scrutiny) on 15th March 2021, where a presentation was received and an overview of the preliminary findings that would be thought to improve and strengthen the work of the Panel. Presently the Task and Finish Group were in the process of choosing several key themes out of the areas of improving and strengthening with a view to receiving a full report from Ian including those key themes with clear recommendations as to how the Panel might carry those key themes forward. The report will come back to the Task and Finish Group, where the group will choose their final recommendations to bring back to the next Panel meeting.

Edward Leigh asked if there were any themes that stood out. Claire George listed several themes:

- work planning
- agenda focus
- focusing on core business of the delivery of the Police and Crime Plan
- the Panel owning and driving the agenda
- developing core knowledge and understanding
- how the Panel might source independent information for compare/contrast
- raising the profile around the work of the Panel for the public.

Edward Leigh stated that the Panel also needed to think about ways it could be supportive to the Commissioner.

The Panel **AGREED** to **NOTE** the update.

13. Meeting Dates and Agenda Plan

Forthcoming Meeting Dates:

15th September 2021

10th November 2021

2nd February 2022

16th February 2022 – if needed

23rd March 2022

The Panel **NOTED** the forthcoming meeting dates.

Reports requested for the 23 June 2021 meeting:

- Update on the impact of COVID on Policing

- New Commissioner's outline strategy, policies and plans for their term in office, including relationship with the Panel

The meeting began at 2:00pm and ended at 4:10 pm

CHAIRPERSON

	ITEM	ACTION
1.	Acting Commissioner's Response to Panel's Recommendations	The Panel AGREED to NOTE the report.
2.	Non-Crime Related Demand on Policing	The Panel AGREED to NOTE the report. The Panel also made the following recommendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re-request the breakdown of demand of incidents again, but with hoax/abandoned calls split, sexual harassment identified, and any errors corrected. • Review how the information is presented to the public, particularly, the term 'non-crime related demand' to one less misleading. • Explore with the constabulary how referrals to other agencies could be recorded and reported • Explore with the constabulary how police time spent on non-police matters (e.g., covering for another agency) could be quantified and reported
3.	Overview of Capital Financing 2021-22 to 2024-25	The Panel AGREED to NOTE the report.
4.	Roads Policing	The Panel AGREED to NOTE the report. The Panel also made the following recommendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Receive regular updates/progress on Vision Zero and how the Commissioner is monitoring performance
5.	Decisions by the Commissioner	The Panel AGREED to note the report and decisions that had been made by the Commissioner.
6.	Task and Finish Group - Review of Working Panel Arrangements - Verbal Update	The Panel AGREED to NOTE the update.
7.	Police and Crime Panel – Eastern Network Subscription	The Panel AGREED to the renewal of the annual Eastern Network Subscription
8.	Meeting Dates and Agenda Plan	The Panel NOTED the forthcoming meeting dates. Reports requested for the 23 June 2021 meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on the impact of COVID on Policing

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• New Commissioner's outline strategy, policies and plans for their term in office, including relationship with the Panel
--	--	---

This page is intentionally left blank