

North Yorkshire County Council

Police and Crime Panel

Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 16 November 2017, commencing at 10.30 am in the Ashfields Restaurant at York College, York.

Present:-

Councillors: Val Arnold (Ryedale District Council), Michael Chambers MBE (Harrogate Borough Council), Peter Dew (City of York Council), Mel Hobson (Selby District Council), Carl Les (North Yorkshire County Council), Russell Lord (Richmondshire District Council), Peter Madeley (Craven District Council), Ashley Mason (City of York Council), Sandra Turner (Scarborough Borough Council), Peter Wilkinson (Hambleton District Council).

Community Co-opted Member: Santokh Singh Sidhu.

North Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority-appointed observer to Panel: Councillor Tony Richardson (Vice Chair, NYFRA).

Julia Mulligan (Police and Crime Commissioner).

Officers from the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner: Fraser Sampson (Interim Chief Executive Officer), Michael Porter (Chief Finance Officer), Will Naylor (Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner), Tom Thorp (Policy and Scrutiny Manager).

Odette Robson (Head of Safer Communities, NYCC) – for Item 7.

David Dryburgh (Chair, Safer York Partnership) – for Item 7.

Jane Mowat (Head of Community Safety, City of York Council) – for Item 7.

Officers from NYCC: Diane Parsons (Panel Secretariat).

Apologies:

Community Co-opted Member: Paula Stott.

North Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority-appointed observer to Panel: Councillor Andrew Backhouse (Chair, NYFRA).

Dr Justin Ives (Chair, NY Community Safety Partnership) – for Item 7.

Copies of all documents considered are in the Minute Book

244. Minutes

Resolved –

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 14 September 2017, having been printed and circulated, be taken as read and be confirmed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

245. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Val Arnold notified of an interest in Item 8 (Working Better Together consultation report) as a current Member of the North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Authority. The same interest was notified by the Chair on behalf of Councillor Tony Richardson, who was not yet seated for this item.

Councillor Carl Les declared an interest in relation to a Public Question which had been accepted regarding the sale of Newby Wiske Hall, on the grounds of being the Chair of North Yorkshire Youth; an organisation which may be considered a competitor to PGL Travel Ltd.

246. Progress on Issues Raised by the Panel.

Considered -

Diane Parsons advised that since publication of the meeting papers, information had been provided by the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC), detailing the costs of the work undertaken by PA Consulting in relation to developing the local business case. The OPCC had advised that the information had been published on their website on completion of the contract with PA Consulting in October 2017. The OPCC has since also made some tweaks to the presentation of the information to help reinforce its accessibility. Diane Parsons highlighted that as Members had accepted a public question at Item 4 in relation to these costs and would also be reviewing the PCC's consultation report at Item 8, they may wish to consider the detail of this matter at that point.

The PCC emphasised that the publication of the information had conformed with the publication strategy set out by the OPCC early in the process.

Resolved –

That further consideration would be given by the Panel to expenditure around development and submission of the business case at Item 4.

247. Public Questions or Statements

Question 1 – Neil Wilby

A question had been submitted, and agreed, by the Panel in advance of the meeting by Mr Neil Wilby, as outlined below:

1. Under agenda item 3 at Minute 216 the PCC refused to disclose the amount paid for the cost of the work, undertaken by PA Consulting, in relation to developing the local business case (for the takeover of fire services). The PCC agreed this could be shared once the contract with PA has completed:

Why didn't either the Secretariat or any of the Panel Members secure the information via the PCC's public accounts inspection process in July/August, 2017?

2. Would Members be happy for me to pass around copies (one for each Member) of the very same information that I obtained (as a press card-carrying journalist active in North Yorkshire) from the chief constable's chief financial officer, Jane Palmer, under the Local Audit and Accountability Act, 2014?

Mr Wilby thanked the Panel for the opportunity to ask a question but felt that the question was no longer needed in view of the information provided at the meeting under Item 3 and the further discussion to be had on this by the Panel. Mr Wilby also expressed the view

that he did not feel that the costs information had been published in a transparent way and had not been apparent on the OPCC website.

Question 2 – Gwen Swinburn

A question had been submitted, and agreed, by the Panel in advance of the meeting by Miss Swinburn, as summarised below.

I have been unable to assertion [sic] to date the costs (time and money) of the PCC's efforts to take over the Fire Service. I have also heard from a number of citizens who were 'randomly selected' that the questions used to elicit opinions from citizens as to their views on the fire brigade takeover were biased.

Can the panel confirm they know the true costs in time and money spent on this lobbying effort and that they are satisfied with that level of expenditure (whether local or national taxes)? Can the panel confirm they are satisfied the questionnaire was unbiased, hence have confidence in the outcome reported by the PCC?

Miss Swinburn added that she felt clarity was needed as to the entirety of the costs incurred by the PCC in this exercise, including expenditure on consultants and interviewers. She also asked whether the Panel felt the survey process to have been fair and transparent. The Chair clarified that the Panel had only been provided with the detail of the costs information the previous evening so had been unable to share this until the meeting. Councillor Mason proceeded to outline the costs as detailed by the OPCC.

- The total value of the contract was £141,437.50 (excl. VAT)
- This is made up of:
 - £127,750 for the original quotation;
 - An additional £13,687.50 due to the Strategic Reference Group's request to extend the development period and additional work that arose from this extension.
- The PCC received a grant of £88,995 from the Home Office towards these costs.

Councillor Mason advised that the Panel had some concerns regarding these costs and would consider further under Item 8 on the agenda.

Question 3 – David Stockport MBE

Councillor Les, having declared an interest in this matter, removed himself from the discussion and Councillor Peter Wilkinson took the Chair for this question.

Councillor Wilkinson reminded those present of the detailed discussion which had taken place at the previous meeting in relation to the PCC's disposal of Newby Wiske Hall. The Panel had issued its statutory report based on that discussion and recommendation which had been distributed as necessary to all of the councils in the area.

Mr Stockport was invited to address the Panel, during which he summarised the correspondence he had submitted in advance of the Panel meeting. Mr Stockport referred to comments submitted by him to the previous Panel meeting regarding the importance of due diligence checks surrounding the sale to PGL Travel Ltd. He felt that the recent Panorama programme on the "Paradise Papers" highlighted issues of concern regarding PGL and its role as the parent company of a firm reported to have used tax avoidance methods. Mr Stockport stated that whilst this was not illegal, he felt it to be morally and ethically indefensible. His concerns, as stated, had regard to the potential for Newby Wiske Hall as a public asset being used by PGL as part of a tax avoidance scheme. His question to the Panel was:

In view of these revelations does the Panel now feel that they can justify the sale of a public asset to a company who have been shown at the very least not to work to accepted ethical standards?

Councillor Wilkinson asked the PCC for her reflections on this question. The PCC clarified that the price obtained for the Hall was in line with the valuations received and as such disputed a comment by Mr Stockport that a “fire sale price” had been accepted. Michael Porter added that the highest bid received was that accepted and as such the PCC obtained Best Value, which she would be expected to do. Fraser Sampson outlined that throughout the process conducted by the agents acting for the PCC in discharging the sale, there was nothing to indicate evidence of unlawful conduct by PGL Travel Ltd and no reason to doubt the propriety of the process undertaken.

Councillor Mason stated that whilst he could see that there is a moral point of interest to the wider community regarding the “Paradise Papers”, the Panel can only scrutinise the PCC in relation to her considerations around getting the best value for the community at large.

Councillor Wilkinson highlighted that guidance had been sought on this matter from the legal advisor to the Panel, Barry Khan (Assistant CEO and Monitoring Officer, NYCC). It was noted that PGL Travel Ltd has not been accused of operating unlawfully and as such from a purely legal perspective, there is no legal bar to prevent the PCC from entering into a legal contract with them. Additionally, as there had been no accusation of unlawful conduct, it was noted that no reasonable due diligence checks would have flagged up this tax avoidance mechanism of having a parent company registered in a tax haven. Councillor Wilkinson concurred that as a public body, the Panel would expect everyone to pay their taxes and there is a moral debate to be had about companies using legal loopholes to exploit them. However after hearing from the PCC, the Panel considered that she has a duty to ensure that best consideration is obtained and the Panel noted that stamp duty will also be payable on the sale of the land.

It was also noted that Mr Sampson had been in contact with Barry Khan to consider the legal implications around this matter. Mr Khan had shared the guidance he had provided to the Panel (as outlined in the meeting by Councillor Wilkinson) with Mr Sampson, and both officers had concurred on the points outlined to the Panel Members.

The PCC was invited to consider whether she would review her decision to sell to PGL in light of the points made at the meeting. The PCC advised that she would not review the decision as to do so would be at significant expense to the public purse and because the legal guidance she had received on the matter concurred with that provided to the Panel.

Question 4 – Peter Richardson

Councillor Les re-joined as Chair of the meeting.

Mr Richardson referred to the correspondence he had submitted to the Panel on previous occasions, and in person earlier this year, which contended that historical freeze grant allocations had been included in the PCC’s precept calculations for 2017/18. Mr Richardson contended that the PCC was not entitled to include historical freeze grant allocations within the budget calculations. He further stated by doing so this has boosted the budget by £2.5m and meant that the income has been short of some £9.5m. He stated that he felt the Panel had not adequately addressed a query posed by him earlier in the year in relation to the inclusion of the council tax surplus to the precept. He subsequently asked the Panel members to resign. Following communication of his statement, Mr Richardson left the meeting and no further comment was made by the Panel.

248. Members' Questions

Freedom of Information Act – correspondence handling and performance

Councillor Mason had submitted the following question in advance of the meeting for the PCC's consideration:

Following recent adverse social media coverage around the Force's and the OPCC's handling of Freedom of Information Requests (Fols), can you please update us on the following:

For the last 2 years (Sep 2015 to Sep 2017)

- *How many Fol requests have been received?*
- *How many were responded to within the 20 working day statutory requirements?*
- *How many were not responded to within the 20 working day statutory requirements?*
- *How many Fols were turned down?*
- *How many Fols were internally reviewed as they were not satisfied with the original results provided or the fact it was turned down?*
- *How many Fols were referred/complaints were made to the Information Commissioners Office?*

For clarity, please break these results down to show the OPCC and NYP separately. Please also show numbers value and % value.

Can you also please update the Panel if there are any ongoing matters with the Information Commissioner's Office (ICO) further than just a standard complaint?

The PCC responded by outlining the shift in target set by the ICO for compliance with Fols from 80% to 90%. The PCC stated that North Yorkshire Police (NYP) had historically had some issues in achieving the 80% target but once improvements were put in place over the last few years the 80% target had been reached, only for the ICO to raise the target further. There has also been a rise in subject access requests, including some very large ones, which have taken up a considerable amount of staff time and resource. One solution may be to recruit additional staff to the compliance team but the PCC felt it important to ensure that everything that could be done to improve is being done before this option is pursued, particularly where budgets are being squeezed.

Fraser Sampson provided detailed responses to Councillor Mason's questions as follows for the period September 2015 to August 2017:

- 2,742 Fol requests received (NYP – 2,623 (96%); OPCC – 119 (4%));
- 2,099 received responses within 20 working days (NYP – 2,000 (76% compliant); OPCC – 99 (83% compliant));
- 643 did not receive responses within 20 working days (NYP – 623 (24% average non-compliance); OPCC – 20 (17% average non-compliance));
- It is not easy to retrieve information about the numbers of requests refused as the data is not categorised by Exempted or Invalid Requests. However, the PCC has recommended to the Chief Constable that this becomes part of future processing;
- 97 Fols were internally reviewed (NYP – 81; OPCC – 16);
- 14 Fols/complaints were referred to the ICO (NYP – 11; OPCC – 3) and there have been 4 information rights tribunals.

Councillor Mason recommended that the Panel take a future substantive item on Fol performance. The PCC advised that the matter will be going to the Executive Board the following week where an action plan for improvements will be reviewed, but reiterated that recruitment of additional staff would not be viewed as the primary solution. Councillor Mason stated that changes would need to be implemented to the process to better

understand the numbers of Fols which are refused, before any assessment regarding staffing can be made.

Resolved –

That the Panel will take a substantive item with regard to performance in the handling of Fol requests (within North Yorkshire Police and the OPCC) at a future meeting.

Operation Kingfisher

Councillor Turner had submitted the following question for the PCC's consideration in advance of the meeting:

In view of the ongoing resources required to police Operation Kingfisher (the policing of the anti-fracking protests at Kirby Misperton), could the PCC give an update on the impact, if any, this is having on policing our local communities and not least the police officers attending?

The PCC acknowledged that some disruption to normal policing has been inevitable but NYP has looked at other force areas and how they have handled protests alongside their 'business as usual'. There is a 'Gold Commander' in place for the fracking operation and also a second Chief Officer has responsibility for ensuring service levels are maintained elsewhere. Operation Kingfisher is also reviewed at the monthly Public Accountability Meetings. NYP can potentially draw on support from other forces in the region in the form of 'mutual aid' but this is an expensive option so needs careful consideration. The Deputy PCC acknowledged that local policing teams are starting to feel the impact of Kingfisher in terms of things being perhaps a little slower by way of response within some communities but there has been no impact on emergency call-outs. NYP is taking the welfare of the officers involved in Kingfisher very seriously, including measures in place to support staff on shift. There is data capture via video on-site for the protests to help provide evidence where this is needed. NYP has been working to spread the load for those officers who have found working on Kingfisher to be difficult. The Deputy PCC also clarified that NYP alone is currently managing the policing of the protests.

Santokh Sidhu asked about the impact on officers' families, to which the Deputy PCC responded that supervisors ensure that those involved are supported to manage their time off in a way which also helps support their families.

Councillor Mason suggested that the PCC involve local councillors in a further review of neighbourhood policing. The PCC advised the Panel that she will soon be launching a survey on neighbourhood policing, following the changes made to the model last year, and has been keen to involve local councillors more in feeding back on issues. The PCC will share the review with the Panel when launched and seek their help in getting responses.

HMICFRS report on Police Efficiency (including Leadership) within NYP (2017)

Councillor Peter Wilkinson submitted a question regarding the recent report published by HMICFRS following their inspection of NYP earlier this year, looking in particular at Police Efficiency (including Leadership). Further to a query from the OPCC, Councillor Wilkinson also clarified as a point of order that although his question had not been submitted in advance of the meeting, Panel members were not obliged to do this.

Councillor Wilkinson outlined the four areas outlined by HMICFRS as requiring improvement by NYP, which included investment in ICT and NYP needing to develop a better understanding of service demand. Councillor Wilkinson invited the PCC to comment and outline the steps being put in place to improve.

The PCC advised that many of the issues outlined by HMICFRS had not been a surprise to her or the senior team at the OPCC as they had identified concerns across the areas highlighted some time ago. This will be a significant agenda item at the Executive Board next week and the PCC welcomed that HMICFRS has brought focus to the concerns. There have been wider issues and reasons for the delay in rollout of the mobile working programme and there has been a significant investment in ICT. Difficulties impacting on the ICT side, as stated by the PCC, included an historical under-investment in this area which her office inherited and also a national police programme of ICT changes which NYP has to link up with.

Michael Porter advised that there are areas of NYP where the OPCC are looking for NYP to drive down their spend where this is above average, rather than reduce staffing. The OPCC are looking for NYP to provide proposals to achieve this.

Councillor Mason queried why the PCC is looking to take on responsibility for oversight of the Fire and Rescue Service and also take a much wider role on handling of police complaints in the near future, if there are fundamental issues to address within NYP. The PCC advised that adoption of the Governance Model over the FRS would assist these issues and will provide an opportunity to drive efficiencies through both organisations, especially by joining up back-office functions. The PCC also advised that she has been vocal since 2012 in trying to bring about reform to police complaints and as such welcomes the broader role to be offered to PCCs. Four PCCs are currently considering taking on the full role of assessment, triage and resolution.

Councillor Wilkinson reiterated his concern that NYP received the worst report on Police Efficiency out of all force areas in the North East in 2017. He asked the PCC to provide a written response for the Panel on the areas identified by HMICFRS as requiring improvement and the remedial measures that are being put in place.

Resolved –

That the PCC will provide a report for the next Panel meeting outlining measures planned or in place to tackle those areas within NYP identified by HMICFRS as requiring improvement.

Officer numbers within NYP and tackling ASB effectively

Councillor Richardson highlighted the concern of City of York councillors in relation to addressing anti-social behaviour effectively and put it to the PCC that there are insufficient police officers within the force now to be able to help deal with such issues. The PCC advised that whilst there remains an aspiration to bring officer numbers up to 1400, effective resourcing is also about looking at the skills required for particular roles and deploying these to the right places. NYP has to be responsive to dealing with the changing nature of crime. This is why, for example, a significant investment has been made into tackling vulnerability, including domestic abuse.

Drink driving testing: distances travelled to testing sites

A couple of Members asked questions around the difficulties inherent with having to convey members of the public suspected of drink driving to a suitable site for evidential testing, particularly where they may be required to travel some distance away from where they have been stopped. The concern raised was both in relation to drawing officers away from a locality for a prolonged period but also in relation to the risk to public safety if someone's alcohol level is able to drop to a safer level if their journey time is longer. This linked in to the report of the recent custody suite trial in Northallerton (Item 10) whereby detainees were instead conveyed to Harrogate. This was considered by Members to potentially be a problem where for example someone is stopped in Skipton and has to be conveyed to Harrogate, thereby becoming a sufficiently long journey that the potential for

positive evidential testing in a custody suite has been reduced. The OPCC responded that while there may be the odd occasion where this happens, it would be very rare and NYP has looked carefully at how to mitigate this. The PCC agreed to ask NYP to provide a substantive response to the Panel on this matter.

Resolved –

That the PCC will facilitate providing further information to the Panel to help clarify the volumes of people who are conveyed to Harrogate for evidential testing for drink driving and where those journey times may have impacted upon the result.

249. Promoting engagement between the Panel and Community Safety Partnerships.

Considered –

The report of the Panel Secretariat and Chairs of the area Community Safety Partnerships, exploring the potential for both parties to work more closely together.

The Chair highlighted that Dr Justin Ives, Chair of the North Yorkshire Community Safety Partnership (NYCSP), would be unable to join the meeting due to heavy traffic following a traffic collision. The Chair had recommended that Dr Ives attend another meeting of the Panel and that the focus today be on the Safer York Partnership.

Jane Mowat outlined the synergies between the two area partnerships and the fact that further engagement with the Panel would be welcomed. Jane alluded to the shift in emphasis in community safety terms around vulnerability and looking at more complex crimes, which has meant working much closer together. The OPCC also funds some specific areas of work, such as for domestic abuse services and there are close working links between the OPCC and the CSPs.

The PCC expanded around partnership working successes, such as the Mental Health Crisis Care Concordat and York Pathways, which will continue to help support around crisis care and complement what the NHS can provide.

It was agreed that a fuller discussion needed to take place between both CSPs and the Panel at a future date and when both CSP Chairs would be available, to be able to fully explore the implications for closer working.

Resolved –

That the Panel will add an item in to its forward work plan to give further consideration to the benefits of promoting a closer dialogue with the area Community Safety Partnerships.

250. Working Better Together consultation report.

Considered -

The PCC's report evaluating the outcomes of the recent consultation on her local business case proposing adoption of the Governance Model.

Further to the public question posed under Item 4 by Gwen Swinburn, the PCC advised the Panel that the exercise to consult the public when developing a business case of this kind is both a legal obligation and the right thing to do by the public.

Councillor Mason asked a couple of questions in relation to the quotes received to undertake the development of the business case work and how much time and money (staff resource) had been spent in its entirety on the whole exercise. The PCC explained that the salaries of the OPCC staff involved in the work were paid anyway and Parliament

had given permission to PCCs and their staff to undertake this work where a local case can be made. A Single Tender Action had been executed between the OPCC and PA Consulting on the work as PA Consulting had already undertaken similar work for the development of the Essex case.

Councillor Richardson asked about the material used in the residents' survey and contended that he felt it to be misleading, particularly with regard to the introductory information which he felt should have clarified that the collaboration would involve both the Police and Fire and Rescue Service (FRS). Fraser Sampson clarified that the legislation is specifically about the FRS and a possible transfer of governance from the Fire and Rescue Authority (FRA) to the PCC.

At this point in the proceedings (12:25pm), the Chair formally adjourned the meeting to enable the Panel to have an informal discussion with students of York College who had come to observe the meeting and who had another commitment to attend.

The Panel meeting was re-convened at 12:45pm.

Councillor Richardson highlighted to the PCC that one of the responses provided in the FAQs used by MEL Research in the residents' survey was incorrect. The second question on the FAQs asked "how is the FRS currently governed?" with a response which suggested that only County Councillors make up the FRA. Councillor Mason advised that this was a considerable oversight by the PCC. He felt that any York residents who were given that response would have been concerned that there was no York representation and may therefore have considered a vote in favour of the Governance Model to be a means of redressing an issue of governance which did not need to be redressed. Councillor Richardson asked the PCC if the analysis of the public survey results could therefore be relied upon if some of the information provided to residents was not factually correct.

The PCC acknowledged responsibility for the oversight on the FAQs but stated that the analysis was not incorrect as the methodology used – particularly in avoiding basing results purely on a self-selecting survey - had been robust.

Councillor Richardson alluded to comments made by the PCC at the previous Panel meeting in relation to low morale within the FRS. He had subsequently spoken to managers in the FRS who had felt that morale had been poor because of the way the consultation had been introduced by the PCC. The PCC outlined that she had encountered both positive and negative feedback about the FRA but advised that the strength of feeling in this regard across the workforce was palpable. The PCC additionally felt that there had been recent u-turns by the FRA in relation to particular issues affecting staff, which acknowledged the concerns she had raised. The PCC advised Councillor Richardson that if he had points of concern on this matter that he would like to put forward formally then she would be happy to look at them.

Councillor Mason also asked about the volumes of face-to-face surveys completed in York, which Tom Thorp offered to check on during the meeting. He also queried the methodology in relation to ensuring that out-of-area results were not incorporated. Tom Thorp confirmed that the online survey was open to all but those from out of area were disqualified from analysis.

Councillor Wilkinson raised a concern with the PCC regarding a comment she had made directly prior to his involvement in a recent local radio interview regarding the consultation. The PCC had referred to Councillors having "vested interests" in rejecting the PCC's proposal for the Governance Model. Councillor Wilkinson felt that the implication of Councillors having a financial interest in the matter was disrespectful. He confirmed that he is not a Member of the FRA and his only interest on the Panel is to ensure the best outcome for the community at large. The PCC responded that some of the Panel Members

are from the FRA and also that describing an “interest” in such a matter doesn’t purely or necessarily relate to a financial interest.

Councillor Wilkinson added that he felt the PCC’s published comments on the Panel’s response to her local business case, particularly with regard to the future of robust scrutiny, were very dismissive. He clarified that the Panel will take over responsibility from the FRA Audit Committee in addition to broader scrutiny of the PCC in discharging an oversight role of the FRS. He further clarified that comments made by the PCC regarding NYCC being responsible for future funding of the Panel under an increased remit were incorrect. The Chair clarified that the Panel is resourced by a limited Home Office grant and that NYCC provides the Secretariat. Councillor Wilkinson advised that the Home Office has made it clear that there will be no additional resources made available to Panels which take on the additional scrutiny remit and as such he found these comments unacceptable. The PCC clarified that funding of the Panel, albeit with an extended remit, was not the responsibility of her office.

Councillor Arnold expressed concern at the point made regarding the interests and propriety of NYFRA Members in relation to various discussions on the local business case. She clarified, for the record, that she had declared her interest at each Panel meeting where discussions were held regarding the local business case and had removed herself from the room completely at the previous meeting when the Panel took a decision on the business case.

Councillor Madeley expressed the view that good scrutiny is one of the most important roles in public life and that the PCC should be keen to ensure that proper scrutiny of her office is in place.

The PCC recommended that the Panel look at how the Essex Panel is operating as they are taking on an extended scrutiny remit over FRS.

Tom Thorp responded to the earlier query from Councillor Mason by advising that 379 York residents had been surveyed door-to-door during the public consultation. Councillor Mason felt this called into question over 300 results analysed as part of the survey outcomes, which could have been prejudiced by the incorrect FAQs. Tom Thorp confirmed that the correct FAQs were used on the OPCC website and also that if a resident asked “who are the Fire Authority?” then an accurate response would have been provided from further down the FAQ list. It would be impossible to assess which questions had been sought or answers provided.

At around 2:00pm, the Chair recommended that due to the Panel meeting having significantly overrun, the Panel would complete its business for that meeting and defer the remaining substantive items on the agenda for the subsequent meeting.

243. Any other business

No urgent business was identified through the Chair. Members were reminded that the date of the next Panel meeting will be Thursday 11th January 2018 at Selby District Council.

The meeting concluded at around 2:00pm.

DP