



**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH POLICE  
AND CRIME PANEL  
HELD AT HUNTINGDONSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL  
ON 19 MARCH 2014**

**Members Present:** Councillors Ablewhite (Chair), Bick, Curtis, Elsey, Khan, Shellens, Shelton, and Christine Graham.

**Officers Present:** Paulina Ford Peterborough City Council  
Gary Goose Peterborough City Council

**Others Present:** Sir Graham Bright Cambridgeshire Police and Crime  
Commissioner  
Brian Ashton Deputy Cambridgeshire Police and Crime  
Commissioner  
Dr Dorothy Gregson Chief Executive, Office of the Police and  
Crime Commissioner

**1. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies were received from Councillor McGuire, Councillor Todd, Councillor Hunt, and Councillor Bullen.

At this point Councillor Bick pointed out that a Co-opted Member of the Committee had not attended any of the meetings for a year and sought clarification on how this might be dealt with. The Governance Officer advised that she would look in to how this might be dealt with. Councillor Ablewhite Acting Chair informed Members that in the meantime he would ask the Chair (Councillor McGuire) to write to the Co-opted Member regarding attendance.

**ACTION**

Councillor McGuire to write to the Independent Co-opted Member concerned regarding his non-attendance at the Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Panel Meetings.

**2. Declarations of Interest**

Christine Graham declared an interest with regard to item 5, Decisions by the Commissioner and in particular decision CPCC 2014-007 – Providing Support for Victims in Cambridgeshire and advised that she would leave the room if that decision was discussed.

**3. Minutes of the meeting held 5 February 2014.**

The Chair advised the Panel that the Commissioners Officer had noted an inaccuracy in the minutes and read out the area that required correction as follows:

## Item 5, Decisions by the Commissioner - Memorandum of Understanding

“Bedfordshire provided technical services, Cambridgeshire was leading on HR, Finance and IT and Hertfordshire were leading on organisation support e.g. Call Centres, Detention Centres.”

The text should have read: “Bedfordshire are leading on protective services, Cambridgeshire are leading on organisational support which includes HR, Finance and IT and Hertfordshire are leading on operational support e.g. Call Centres, Detention Centres.”

The minutes of the meeting held on 5 February 2014 were agreed as an accurate record subject to the above correction.

### **4. Public Questions**

Two questions had been submitted by Mr Richard Taylor a resident of Cambridgeshire which are attached at Appendix 1 of the minutes.

Two questions had been submitted by Huntingdonshire District Councils Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Social Well-Being) and are attached at Appendix 2 of the minutes.

Mr Taylor was in attendance at the meeting and the Chair invited Mr Taylor to present his questions to the Panel.

In response to Mr Taylor’s first question regarding the Rules of Procedure the Chair responded that the Panel was a meeting held in Public and not a Public Meeting which were two different types of meeting. Members of public could however lobby a member of the Panel to ask a question on their behalf.

Mr Taylor submitted a supplementary question which included the following points:

- The public participation item could be made more accessible.
- The rules of procedure with regard to Public Participation could be made clearer within the agenda.
- Public questions could be taken by the Panel as they occur at the meeting.
- The contact details for the support officer for the Panel on the CPCP website were inaccurate.
- Questions for the Panel that have been rejected have not been reported to the Panel.

The Chair commented that he was unaware of any public questions that had been presented to the Panel that had been rejected.

In response to Mr Taylor’s second question regarding holding the Police and Crime Commissioners role to account by the electorate and by the Panel the Chair responded that the electorate would get involved in the process by going out to the ballot box. This was the point of having someone who was politically accountable.

Mr Taylor submitted a supplementary question in which he quoted a comment made by the Chair at the last meeting. Mr Taylor felt that this had indicated that a boundary had been drawn and that there were items outside of the scope of the Panel to which they could hold the Commissioner to account. An example was the Commissioners diary. Mr Taylor felt that this was a way to find items to scrutinise the Commissioner on but the Chair had indicated at the last meeting that this was not within the remit of the Panel.

The Chair responded that this had not indicated that any boundaries had been drawn.

A Member of the Panel commented that it did not seem unreasonable for the Panel to receive details of the Commissioners diary. The public may want to understand how the role of the Commissioner was working and his function.

The Chair thanked Mr Taylor for submitting his questions and attending the meeting.

The Chair then moved to the two questions submitted by Huntingdonshire District Councils Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Social Well-Being) and invited Councillor Curtis who was in attendance to present the questions.

The Panel discussed question one. Comments and questions included:

- A Member of the Panel commented that an example of the Panel scrutinising the Commissioner on engagement with the public was at the last meeting of the Panel when the Panel challenged the Commissioner in regard to what outreach work was being done. This would be seen as community engagement.
- Members of the Panel asked the Commissioner if he had an Engagement Strategy in place. *The Commissioner responded that there was an Engagement Strategy in place and that he had just appointed a new Director of Communications and Engagement.* The Chair requested that the Panel receive a copy of the Engagement Strategy.
- A Member of the Panel was concerned that the constabulary was not engaging with the public with regard to events like the proposed EDL march in Peterborough. *The Commissioner responded that this was operational and for the Chief Constable. The Engagement Strategy set out in the Police and Crime Plan held the Chief Constable to account. The Commissioner assured the Panel that he had spoken to the Chief Constable regarding the EDL march and everything possible was being done to address it.*
- A Member of the Panel commented that it was also the role of the Members of the Panel to explain to members of the public at meetings that they attended what the role of the Police and Crime Commissioner was and the work that he was undertaking.

The Chair referred to the supplementary question submitted by Huntingdonshire District Councils Overview and Scrutiny Panel and responded that the Panel would wait until it had seen the Commissioners Engagement Strategy and then comment and make any recommendations if required.

The Panel discussed the second question from Huntingdonshire District Councils Overview and Scrutiny Panel. Comments and questions included:

- Panel Members commented that there appeared to be a challenge with regard to decisions being made by the Commissioner and whether they were being passed across as operational decisions when in reality they were strategic and should be for the Commissioner. The Panel would need to keep a continuous eye on this to ensure the balance of decisions made by the Commissioner was right.
- The Chair suggested that to ensure in depth scrutiny by the Panel going forward that a working party should meet to discuss and formalise a proper scrutiny plan for the forthcoming year. The Panel agreed to this and nominations for the working party were sought. Councillor Shelton, Councillor Bick, Councillor Ablewhite and Christine Graham volunteered to be part of the group. The Chair Councillor McGuire would also be invited. A member from the Centre for Public Scrutiny should also be invited to attend.

The Chair thanked Councillor Curtis for attending and submitting the questions on behalf of the Huntingdonshire District Councils Overview and Scrutiny Panel.

## **ACTIONS**

1. The Chair, Vice Chair, Councillor Shelton, Councillor Bick and Christine Graham to form a working party and meet before the next meeting of the Panel to discuss and formulate a scrutiny work plan for the Panel for the next municipal year.
2. The Panel requested that the Police and Crime Commissioner provide the Panel with a copy of his Engagement Strategy.

## **5. Decisions by the 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.

The Chair went through each of the decisions listed and the Commissioner provided the Panel with further context and clarification on the following decision.

### **Local Commissioning of Victim Referral Mechanisms via a Victim Hub**

- Panel Members sought clarification on whether the Victim Hub would mean losing independent support for victims of crime. *The Commissioner responded that it was currently a Pilot Scheme and was being monitored carefully. The idea was to engage with all partners including the Victim Support Organisation to trigger a rapid response when needed to ensure victims received support more rapidly than they did through the current model. The Chief Executive, Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner had done a lot of work nationally regarding the Pilot Scheme and advised the Panel that the Pilot should improve the system for many victims of crime. Research was being carried out to try and gain a better understanding of how many people were seeking independent support.*
- A Member of the Panel sought clarification that people would receive support dependent on the risk and not dependent on the crime. *The Commissioner confirmed that this was correct.*
- Panel Members wanted to know if the Ministry of Justice were supporting the pilot. *The Commissioner responded that the Ministry of Justice had providing funding for the pilot.*

### **ACTION**

The Panel noted the report and requested that the Commissioner provide a progress report on the Pilot Scheme for Local Commissioning of Victim Referral Mechanisms via a Victim Hub as part of the work programme next year.

## **6. Police and Crime Plan Variation**

The Panel received a report which informed them of a draft variation to the Police and Crime Plan. The variation sought to update the Police and Crime Plan to reflect the 2014/15 precept and budget, latest reiteration of the Medium Term Financial Plan and Community Safety Funding and update where latest information was available as listed in Appendix 1 of the report.

The Panel were asked to review the draft variation to the Police and Crime Plan and make a report or recommendations on the draft variation to the Commissioner. The Panel were advised that the Plan was not set in stone and would continue to be updated.

The Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner informed the Panel that there was a slight variance between the Medium Term Financial Plan figures presented to the Panel at the last

meeting on 5 February and those presented now. The difference related to the collection of contribution rate backwards and forwards, however it was not a matter of budgetary substance and was in favour.

Having reviewed the draft variation to the Police and Crime Plan the Panel **AGREED** to endorse the variation of the Police and Crime Plan reflecting the 2014/15 precept and budget, latest reiteration of the Medium Term Financial Plan and Community Safety Funding and update where latest information was available.

## 7. Agenda Plan

The Panel received and noted the agenda plan including dates and times for future meetings.

### ACTION

The Panel agreed the dates and times of the meetings in the Agenda Plan and agreed that the working group meet to discuss and plan the work programme for the Panel for 2014-2015.

### ACTIONS

DATE OF MEETING	ITEM	ACTION	UPDATE
19 March 2014	Apologies	Councillor McGuire to write to the Independent Co-opted Member concerned regarding his non-attendance at the Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Panel Meetings.	Letter sent on 17 April 2014.
	Public Questions	The Chair, Vice Chair, Councillor Shelton, Councillor Bick and Christine Graham to form a working party and meet before the next meeting of the Panel to discuss and formulate a scrutiny work plan for the Panel for the next municipal year.	The Working Party met on 15 May 2014.
		The Panel requested that the Police and Crime Commissioner provide the Panel with a copy of his Engagement Strategy.	The Engagement Strategy to be programmed into the Agenda Plan over the next municipal year.
	Decisions by the Commissioner	The Panel noted the report and requested that the Commissioner provide a progress report on the Pilot Scheme for Local Commissioning of Victim Referral Mechanisms via a Victim Hub as part of the work programme next year.	Programmed into the Agenda Plan on 30 July 2014.
	Agenda Plan	The Panel agreed the dates and times of the meetings in the Agenda Plan and agreed that the working party meet to discuss and plan the work programme	The Working Party met on 15 May 2014.

<b>DATE OF MEETING</b>	<b>ITEM</b>	<b>ACTION</b>	<b>UPDATE</b>
		for the Panel for 2014-2015.	

The meeting began at 2.00pm and ended at 2.33pm

CHAIRMAN

**Appendix 1**  
**Question/s for Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Panel**  
**Meeting Date: 19 March 2014**

<b>Questioner</b>	Richard Taylor
<b>Questions addressed to which Member of the Panel</b>	Chairman Cllr Mac McGuire
<b>Date Question was submitted</b>	12 March 2014
<b>Questions:</b>  I would like to submit the following questions the "public participation" element of the Police and Crime Panel meeting on Wednesday the 19th of March 2014:  1. Why do the panel's rules of procedure not include provisions for members of the public to make statements to the panel, or to suggest items for scrutiny, during the public participation agenda item?  2. Which aspects of the Police and Crime Commissioner's role does the panel consider are for the electorate, rather than the panel, to hold the commissioner to account in relation to?  I have published my questions, along with background information which I may be able to introduce when presenting my questions in person, and when asking follow-up questions, at: <a href="http://www.rtaylor.co.uk/6711">http://www.rtaylor.co.uk/6711</a>  Section 7.3 of the rules of procedure which the panel have adopted require public participants to identify the panel member to whom questions are addressed. In order to comply with this I will nominate the chairman, or in his absence whoever is chairing the meeting, to address my questions to.	

## Appendix 2

### Question/s for Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Panel

Meeting Date: 19 March 2014

<b>Questioner</b>	Cllr Curtis on behalf of Huntingdonshire District Councils Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Social Well-Being)
<b>Questions addressed to which Member of the Panel</b>	Chairman Cllr Mac McGuire
<b>Date Question was submitted</b>	12 March 2014
<b>Questions:</b>	
<b><u>Question 1</u></b>	
<p><b><i>Given that national research identifies that the Police and Crime Commissioners generally are not engaging with their communities, what action is the Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Panel taking to ensure that the Police and Crime Commissioner is engaging with the public over and above other public sector organisations?</i></b></p>	
<p>NB – the source of national research is the Centre for Public Scrutiny’s report entitled Police and Crime Panels: The First Year.</p>	
<p>There will be a <b>Supplementary Question</b> to this which will be as follows:-</p>	
<p><b><i>What changes will the Police and Crime Panel recommend to the Commissioner’s planned programme of public engagement over the next 12 months which will work towards achieving an improvement in public engagement?</i></b></p>	
<b><u>Question 2</u></b>	
<p><b><i>Is the Panel satisfied that the Commissioner is fully responding to public expectation by taking political decisions on priorities for funding and allocation of policing resource rather than passing them off as ‘operational’?</i></b></p>	
<p>Councillor Ian Curtis will be representing Huntingdonshire District Council’s Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Social Well-Being) and will be in attendance at the meeting. He will be addressing these questions direct to all Members of the Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Panel, directing the questions specifically to the Chairman of the Panel.</p>	