



**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
CAMBRIDGESHIRE POLICE AND CRIME PANEL
ON 15 SEPTEMBER 2021**

Members Present:	Edward Leigh (Chairperson), Councillors A Ali (left 15:06), S Bywater, C Daunton, S Ferguson, C Hogg, A Lynn, A Sharp, S Tierney, S Warren, and Claire George.	
Officers Present:	Jane Webb Fiona McMillan	Secretariat, Peterborough City Council Monitoring Officer, Peterborough City Council
Others Present:	Darryl Preston Jim Haylett Matt Warren	Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Commissioner Chief Executive OPCC Chief Finance Officer OPCC

20. Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Councillors Bradnam and Collis

21. Declarations of Interest

No declarations of interest were declared.

22. Minutes of the Meeting held on 24 March 2021

Jim Haylett asked, for clarity that an amendment be made under "Impact of COVID on Policing in Cambridgeshire," Paragraph c) reads -

"The Commissioner stated that the service to 999 calls and the first part of 101 calls were good, but it was the second part of 101 calls, where calls ~~were~~ *had already been triaged*, that struggled."

With the above amendment made the minutes of the meeting held on 24 March 2021 were agreed as an accurate record.

23. Public Questions/Statements

No public questions or statements were received.

24. Review of Complaints

No complaints have been received since the last report.

ACTION

The Panel **AGREED** to note the report

25. Budgetary Monitoring Outturn 2020-21 - Cambridgeshire Constabulary & OPCC

The Panel received a report with an overview of the financial outturn for Cambridgeshire Constabulary (the “Constabulary”) and the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC) for the financial year 2020/21.

The Panel made comment, asked questions, and received responses from the Commissioner, these included:

- a) Councillor Hogg asked about the underspend of £846,000 and the issue of recruiting the right people to the right jobs; what had been the impact to service in protecting vulnerable people. The Commissioner explained it was not about money but about outcomes, the constabulary had recently undergone an HMICFRS inspection in relation to safeguarding, and the results were due out later in the year. The Commissioner also held monthly meetings and at present there were no significant concerns, the Panel also had his assurance that he would keep a close eye on the issue.
- b) Councillor Hogg stated there were also underspends on the Roads Policing Unit of £209,000, and Cameras, Tickets and Collisions of £251,000 and this was a huge area of concern. The show of an underspend did not look good to the public who have to deal with the ASB (anti-social behaviour) of loud cars and asked the Commissioner what his response would be to the budget figures. The Commissioner stated he had spoken with both departments whereby road safety was absolutely a key priority, not just a matter for the Roads Policing Unit but for Partners too and one the Commissioner took extremely seriously; so much so, the Commissioner stated he would double check that nothing had been missed.
- c) Councillor Hogg stated that the car meets and ASB involved required specialist knowledge to robustly look at exhaust modifications, tread depth etc which required the Traffic Unit rather than a Police Unit therefore it was important to investigate having a response that could technically deal with these issues. The Commissioner stated he was aware of the issues, and had visited the areas involved, there was a need to do more but this was an operational matter and went wider than just the police, it required a multi-agency response. There was currently a Task and Finish Group covering this topic at the Council, but it needed a joined-up partnership approach.
- d) Councillor Tierney asked why there had been difficulty with recruitment and what plans had been put in place to address this. The Commissioner explained that the difficulty in recruitment had not been with officers, (the constabulary now had record numbers of police officers – 1659/1700 officers (in 2010 there were 1400)) but had been recruitment into specialist units, e.g., the Demand Hub; this was a concern, but he had received assurances that recruitments had been made and that an improvement would be seen in the secondary calls of 101. The Commissioner did explain that it would be the outcomes and delivery of service that he would be holding the Chief Constable to account on.
- e) Councillor Sharp commented that there was a shortfall in capital spend of £6.2m from last year, which was great. £5.4m of that shortfall had been carried forward into the current year; therefore, Councillor Sharp asked if there were any major projects that had been dropped or procured better also, was £3.8m for the Southern Police Station and if this project were to be delayed, would there be more pressure due to extra interest payments going forward? Matt Warren responded, stating that the underspend was due to projects not being completed as quickly as anticipated. There had been delays with the Southern Police Station, of which a

£10m loan had been taken out but there was no significant pressure on interest rates at present, but this was kept under review.

- f) Edward Leigh stated that a staged draw-down loan may have been more appropriate and asked Matt Warren, with hindsight, if he agreed. Matt Warren explained the £10m loan was taken early to take advantage of low interest rates and a decision may be made to draw down further debt in the coming months depending on interest rates but it would be kept under constant review.
- g) Councillor Bywater stated the report from the Commissioner's office was good and asked for reassurance from the Commissioner of how the spending of policing operations within Huntingdonshire District Council was being monitored. The Commissioner stated he had spoken to the Chief Constable about this matter and these costs would be made public, the protests were being carried out on a commercial company's activity and the police had a responsibility to uphold the law enabling lawful businesses to operate which resulted in a considerable number of police being deployed. The Commissioner explained he had asked the Chief Constable for a piece of work about what the cost and impact of this had been in relation to the Constabulary, but in the meantime, he had been reassured that there were no significant impacts. Jim Haylett added that regarding central government funding, there was a process in place where the Commissioner, on behalf of the Constabulary, could apply for a special grant funding for such a matter, and this process had been started should the threshold spending be reached.
- h) Councillor Lynn asked how the underspend affected local policing now and going forward. The Commissioner explained that the deployment of resources was the Chief Constable's duty and the Chief Constable had given his reassurance that he was committed to bolstering neighbourhood policing; and the Commissioner would hold the Chief Constable to account for the neighbourhood policing teams being fully staffed going forward.
- i) Councillor Hogg asked if the Commissioner's Office had assessed what the impact would be on the budget with the increase in national insurance. The Commissioner stated that the risk was recognised, and it was hopeful that there would be an increase in the comprehensive spending review to cover this.
- j) Edward Leigh stated it was the Panel's role to scrutinise how the Commissioner is holding the Chief Constable to account. Although it is useful for the Panel to be in receipt of raw data, it tends to steer the Panel into questioning operational matters. The Panel need to see how the Commissioner is interpreting and using the data to scrutinise the Chief Constable. The Commissioner stated that was a fair point and there were mechanisms in place to do this and this can be done around some analytical capabilities within the office which would enable the ability to drill down and understand what the figures mean. Jim Haylett asked, how would we reassure ourselves on outcomes? To do so would need to link into the Medium-Term Financial Strategy (from a finance perspective), which would be a key document for the panel and the Constabulary's STRA process (a very comprehensive annual planning process that balances service, cost, and risk across the organisation) and the HMCFRS reports on effectiveness and efficiency.
- k) Councillor Daunton stated that the Panel had asked for reports relevant to the Panel and stated that it would be good to have reports relevant to the Commissioner's role and not to the role of the Chief Constable.
- l) Councillor Hogg asked if the underspend on the vacant business support and other full-time roles had taken warranted officers off the streets to fill these roles and had the Chief Constable dismissed too many PCSOs (Police Community Support Officers). The Commissioner stated that the deployment of warranted officers was an operational matter and he did not have the details, but he would seek clarification. Regarding the PCSOs, the decision was taken in December 2020 and was again, an operational decision.
- m) Edward Leigh stated the Chief Constable had explained on several occasions the challenges he had faced with meeting the mandated uplift of officers and having insufficient resource.

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

26. Update on the Development of the Police and Crime Plan

The Panel received a report with an update on the development of the Police and Crime Plan.

The Panel made comment, asked questions, and received responses from the Commissioner and his staff these included:

- a) Edward Leigh asked what the timetable was for the publication of a draft plan and was the Commissioner intending to bring the final version of the Plan to the November Panel meeting. Jim Haylett explained that legislation stated that a draft Plan had to be brought to the Panel and therefore this would be done at the Panel meeting on the 10th of November, although the Panel would get sight of the draft prior to this date, as the draft would be taken to the BCB (Business Coordination Board) in October. Edward Leigh asked if it were the intention for the draft to be distributed to CSPs (Community Safety Partnership), elected members around Peterborough and Cambridgeshire for feedback; Jim Haylett stated that CSPs would be critical to the process along with other key partners.
- b) Councillor Daunton asked how the Panel could assist the Commissioner with visibility and asked about the Commissioner's thinking around CSPs. The Commissioner stated that he was keen the Constabulary were outward facing in relation to residents and neighbourhood policing teams and was happy to announce that the website had just been improved which would allow the public to report concerns directly to their local neighbourhood policing teams. The Commissioner did reiterate that where the Chief Constable deployed his officers was an operational matter; but in order to help, Panel Members could encourage those that had concerns, to report their concerns to the police. (The Police do not know there is a problem unless they have been informed.) The Commissioner stated he would ask his office to collate a briefing pack for Members, and all other Councillors, as Councillors were a fantastic way of disseminating information into the public.
- c) The Commissioner stated that early on he had been very keen to look at CSPs across the county, as across the country the effectiveness of CSPs was variable and he wanted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough's to be outstanding and effective. He had already met with the relevant chairs and there was a need for improvement, issues such as car cruising and ASB, these did not just involve policing; these issues needed a joined-up partnership approach; the key delivery of this would come from the CSPs, with the Commissioner putting in the resource and funding for this.
- d) Councillor Tierney stated the Panel often asked questions only to be told they were operational, but the Police and Crime Plan was an opportunity to influence operational matters through policy and therefore Councillor Tierney encouraged the Commissioner to be radical in producing the Police and Crime Plan, to try new things and lead the way and the public would welcome this approach. The Commissioner stated he recognised what Councillor Tierney had said and explained the Police and Crime Plan contained key community priorities as policing had changed, they now had to adhere to strict policing requirements and government policy – high harm, high threat, and high risk, which he understood as did the public, but the missing part, was the local issues and resolution. The Commissioner stated that visibility was not just about seeing more police officers, it was about resolution of local issues, which was key and part of the Plan; it would not change overnight and would take a journey with all partners to improve upon.
- e) Councillor Ali stated he was encouraged to hear the Commissioner was interested in outcomes as it did seem that the needs of the communities were not being met. Communities were frustrated as they felt there was no response from the police when they reported a crime. The Commissioner stated that he had heard himself from the public that they felt the police

had not taken any action when crimes were reported but he explained that they may have used the information or acted but this had not been communicated back to the public and this needed to be improved even though there would be a resource cost, as it would reassure the communities.

- f) Edward Leigh stated this was reassuring to hear and showed that the Commissioner had a good grasp of what the public expected from him. Some of the phrases within the Plan were critical in speaking to the public, visibility of police officers did need to be interpreted into what it meant to manage expectations and explained what does go on that is “unseen” to reassure the public. Edward Leigh completely endorsed the idea of investing in providing more feedback; this would be worthwhile as it was clear that the public withheld information unintentionally from the Police simply because they believed it would not make a difference.
- g) Councillor Daunton asked if the Commissioner would have a hold over local agencies “pulling their weight”. The Commissioner recognised the Councillor’s frustration but there had been good evidence during the pandemic that local agencies could work well together, he did have some convening powers and there would be a duty of reduction on partner agencies around serious violence, which was significant. Are the right people turning up to CSPs? Are they the decision makers? These questions were more key and he would do all he could in his powers to convene the right partners to the meetings.
- h) Edward Leigh asked if the Panel could have a clearer sight on where the Commissioner thought the CSPs were not delivering. The Commissioner stated he would do this.
- i) Councillor Lynn stated he was also Chair of the Fenland CSP, and the Commissioner had brought all the Chairs together, listened to them and put a Plan together and it was too early for the Panel to hold him to account until the Panel were aware of where the CSPs were going forward, so far, the right steps had been taken; the Commissioner wanted the best outcome and the Panel needed to give him time to achieve this.
- j) Edward Leigh stated the Panel were interested to see the plan for CSPs as it developed as it was a critical part of the puzzle.

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

27. Decisions by the 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.

Decision Record CPCC-2021-014

Councillor Daunton asked for reassurance that those employed on the cleaning contract were paid the real living wage. The Commissioner stated he did not have the answer and would therefore come back with an answer after the meeting

Decision Record CPCC-2021-012

Councillor Hogg asked if this was finally sold. The Commissioner stated the cash was now in the bank and had turned out to be an exceptionally good deal in the end.

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

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

28. Home Office - Review into the Role of Police and Crime Commissioners - Part 2 - Review (For Information)

Edward Leigh stated a questionnaire was being circulated for feedback and this would be looked at by the Panel after the meeting.

29. Meeting Dates and Agenda Plan

Forthcoming Meeting Dates:

- 27th September 2021 – Workshop
- 2nd November 2021 – Conference (Coventry)
- 10th November 2021
- 2nd February 2022 - Precept
- 16th February 2022 – if needed
- 23rd March 2022

Future meeting dates were **NOTED**; live streaming of Panel meetings to be reconsidered when councils in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough have decided on whether to stream their own council and committee meetings

	ITEM	ACTION
1.	Budgetary Monitoring Outturn 2020-21 - Cambridgeshire Constabulary & OPCC	The Panel AGREED to NOTE the report.
2.	Update on the Development of the Police and Crime Plan	The Panel AGREED to NOTE the report. <i>The Commissioner stated he would ask his office to collate a briefing pack for Members, and all other Councillors, as Councillors were a fantastic way of disseminating information into the public.</i>
3.	Meeting Dates and Agenda Plan	Jane to collate view figures

The meeting began at 2:00pm and ended at 3:15 pm

CHAIRPERSON