

REVIEW OF MEMBERSHIP – BALANCED APPOINTMENT
OBJECTIVE - UPDATE

Purpose of the Report

1. To review the decision made at the last Panel meeting about the number of elected Members on the Panel, in line with the balanced appointment requirements.

Information and Advice

2. The Panel needs to review its membership at its Annual Meeting in June (or following elections which may have affected the Panel's political balance). The Police and Social Responsibility Act 2011 stipulates that Police and Crime Panels must represent all parts of the relevant area, be politically balanced and have a membership that has the necessary skills, knowledge and experience.
3. The Panel considered its overall membership at its last meeting on 29 June 2017 and it was explained that the existing number of elected Members needed to change to achieve political balance across the Panel's area (this was to reflect changes following the recent County Council election).
4. The Panel made the decision to reduce the number of elected Members on the Panel to 10 with each constituent Council being granted one seat, other than Nottingham City Council which would be given two seats (but would no longer receive the additional two co-opted places which had been previously agreed on the basis of the relative populations of the City and County areas).
5. It was also agreed that should Nottingham City Council confirm they would prefer to retain four places in total then this decision would be reviewed at the next meeting of the Panel.
6. Nottingham City Council has subsequently confirmed that they would like to retain four places and therefore the Panel is asked to review the decision it made on 29 June.
7. Updated proportionality figures are shown at **Appendix A**. Following further clarification, these figures are based on political parties rather than political groups (this approach is in line with the Local Government Association(LGA) guidance 'Police and Crime Panels – Panel arrangements and the balanced appointment objective').

8. Issues for the Panel to consider:-

Issue 1- whether to increase size of elected membership.

The Panel is asked to review its original decision to reduce to 10 elected members.

Issue 2 – if increasing, to what extent?

If the Panel decides to increase then it will need to agree the size of the increase. There appear to be three options available which would enable the number of places available to the City Council to be increased from 2 and which would still enable political balance to be achieved:-

Option A - increase to 14 elected members, apportioned as follows:-

Total Seats	Labour	Conservative	Mansfield Independent Forum	Other political parties & Independents
14	7	5	1	1

This option would enable the City Council to retain four places, all allocated to the Labour Group. A further co-option would then be required to fill the remaining Conservative place and the Panel would need to decide from which Council to seek this representative.

Option B – increase to 13 elected members, apportioned as follows:-

Total Seats	Labour	Conservative	Mansfield Independent Forum	Other political parties & Independents
13	6	5	1	1

Under option B, the City Council could still retain four places but that would be on the proviso that, in order to achieve political balance, they would need to allocate one of those places to a Conservative member. It should be noted that a similar arrangement was operated previously although the City's Conservative Group struggled to send a Member on a regular basis, due to its limited pool available.

Option C – increase to 12 elected members, apportioned as follows:-

Total Seats	Labour	Conservative	Mansfield Independent Forum	Other political parties & Independents
12	6	4	1	1

Under Option C, the City Council could be given three places only, in order to enable all Councils to be represented by their ruling group (or Mayor in the case of Mansfield).

Issue 3 – if increasing, how should the remaining places be allocated?

The LGA has clarified that there is no definitive approach for dealing with smaller political parties and independent members. Some PCPs have chosen to place all 'smaller' parties and 'purely independent' Members within the same pool and asked those within that pool to agree a representative. There are 39 members that could fall within that definition within Nottinghamshire. Another option would be to allocate any available place to the next largest political party (in Nottinghamshire this would be the Ashfield Independents Group). The Panel therefore needs to consider how the remaining co-optee place should be allocated to best meet the balanced appointment objective.

Other Options Considered

9. None – other size Panels would not enable political balance and the Panel is expected to keep to as small a size as possible to achieve the balanced appointment objective.

Reason/s for Recommendation/s

10. To enable the Panel to meet the balanced appointment objective to the best of its ability.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1) That the Panel considers the issues detailed in paragraph 8 above and reviews the decision made at the meeting of 29 June 2017.

Background Papers and Published Documents

- 1) Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 (published)
- 2) Nottinghamshire Police and Crime Panel's Panel Arrangements (published)
- 3) Report to Police and Crime Panel of 19 October 2012 and minutes of that meeting (published)
- 4) Report to Police and Crime Panel of 29 June 2017 and minutes of that meeting.
- 5) LGA Guidance document – 'Police and Crime Panels – Panel arrangements and the balanced appointment objective' (published)

For any enquiries about this report please contact:

Keith Ford, Team Manager, Democratic Services, Nottinghamshire County Council
Tel: 0115 9772590 E-mail: keith.ford@nottscc.gov.uk