



**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH POLICE
AND CRIME PANEL
HELD AT HUNTINGDONSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL
ON 5 FEBRUARY 2014**

Members Present: Councillors Ablewhite (chair), Bick, Curtis, Hunt, Khan, Shellens, Shelton, Todd, Over and Christine Graham.

Officers Present:

Paulina Ford	Peterborough City Council
Hayley Thornhill	Peterborough City Council
Sarah Ferguson	Cambridgeshire County 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
Niki Howard	Acting Chief Financial Officer, Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner
Nicola Fenton	Outreach Worker

1. Apologies for Absence

Received from Councillor McGuire, Councillor Miscandion, Councillor Bullen, Councillor Elsey, and Raja Ali. Councillor Over was in attendance as substitute for Councillor Elsey.

2. Declarations of Interest

No declarations of interest were received.

3. Minutes of the meeting held 6 November 2013.

The minutes of the meeting held on 6 November 2013 were agreed as an accurate record. It was noted that the panel had received responses to the action points.

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. The areas of questioning covered:

- Reporting of Decisions
- Commissioners Diary
- Accuracy of the Commissioners Statements to the Panel
- First Year of Spending
- No Extra Burden on Council Tax

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

The Panel then discussed the questions. Comments included:

- The questions were not focused and had therefore clouded the issues raised and should have been brought to the Panel in stages.
- There were some good and interesting points within the submission which had been highlighted to the Panel and the Panel may wish to consider scrutinising some areas in more depth at future meetings. An example of which was non-emergency call handling performance.
- It was noted that the Commissioner published all statutory decisions and that the Panel should consider looking at the impact of these decisions and scrutinising any areas of concern.
- The fact that the Commissioner was spending some of his time with the Association of Police and Crime Commissioners was considered by the Panel to be very relevant to his role.
- The Commissioner's diary was not relevant to the Panel.
- The Panel would conduct more focussed scrutiny on decisions which affected the public.
- The Panel would need to consider how it would pick up emerging issues for more focused scrutiny going forward.
- With regard to the comments on the Commissioner's first year of spending it was noted that the Panel received budgetary updates.

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

ACTION

The Commissioner agreed to provide the Panel with a response to the statements made by the member of the public.

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 as to why each decision had been taken.

Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Commissioner Youth Fund

The Commissioner informed the Panel of the following:

- Working with Cambridgeshire Community Foundation (CCF) to fund charitable projects which engage young people in positive activities.
- The Commissioner will give £40K to CCF to help bring young people together and to do something useful.
- The Commissioner will receive a list of good causes to identify projects which will help reduce crime amongst the youth.

In response to questions from the Panel, the Commissioner advised the following:

- Cambridgeshire Community Foundation included Peterborough.

- The Chief Constable and Commissioner would look at a list of projects and pick those that helped to reduce crime. A priority would be given to projects in difficult areas but the scheme would be open to all.
- The list of projects would initially be assessed against certain criteria at arm's length through CCF and not by the Commissioner.
- The application process would be simple and the intention was to help smaller groups who were self-sustaining with a one off funding payment.
- The funding would not be ongoing to any project as this would reduce funding for other projects.
- The project would grow over time and it was hoped that other organisations would get involved.
- The Commissioner would talk to other Authorities to see how the scheme can be taken further.
- It was hoped that an Outreach Worker would be provided in the South from April.

The Panel welcomed the fact that the fund had been created and looked forward to seeing a reduction in youth crime. The Panel also felt that the fund could be used to try and develop prevention of crime at the front end.

Memorandum of Understanding

The Commissioner informed the Panel of the following:

- The Collaboration of the three police forces and Police and Crime Commissioners was moving forward at a good pace and there had been some good results in terms of savings, becoming more efficient and delivering a better service.
- 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.
- Savings had already been made in some areas such as insurance services and the collaboration savings this year was just over £800K for Joint Protective Services.
- The Commissioner advised that he would provide the Panel with specific reports if required.

The Panel noted that a copy of the Memorandum of Understanding had not been attached to the decision. The Commissioner advised that a copy of the Memorandum of Understanding would be sent to the Panel.

Op Metis Business Case

The Commissioner informed the Panel that the Business Productivity and Mobile Devices (METIS) Scheme was growing and the Commissioner was now looking at how to reap the rewards of the scheme.

In response to questions from the Panel, the Commissioner further advised:

- Slates were already in operation by frontline users.
- Slates cut out the need to return to a fixed base to complete paperwork, increasing police visibility within communities by freeing up to two hours a day per officer.

Drugs Forfeiture Reserve

The Commissioner informed the Panel that £80K would be utilised from the Drug Forfeiture Reserve to employ a Civilian Drugs Expert to advise the Police force for a period of three years and bringing in an educational programme. This was a targeted investment.

In response to questions from the Panel, the Commissioner advised the following:

- The Civilian Drugs Expert would work with existing groups dealing with drugs including the Drugs and Alcohol Action Team.
- One of the biggest impacts of this decision would be educating people who were involved in drugs.
- Drugs were a national problem and the Commissioner advised that work was being done with the Eastern Region Special Operations Unit (ERSOU).
- The contribution to the Eastern Region Special Operations Unit from Cambridgeshire was just over £1M per year.

Collaboration Agreement – Section 22A

The Commissioner advised the Panel that this decision was to approve the signature of the Section 22A Agreement relating to the ongoing collaboration between Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire and Hertfordshire of Joint Protective Services and for the lead force to change from Cambridgeshire to Bedfordshire.

In response to questions from the Panel, the Commissioner advised the following:

- Each force takes a lead and for Joint Protective Services it was now Bedfordshire.
- An example of successful collaboration is the Major Crime Team which provides a crack force across the region in response to serious crimes and one of the first cases the team dealt with was a triple murder in Peterborough which was dealt with rapidly and would otherwise have drawn considerable resource away from other areas of Cambridgeshire.

Victims Services Grant Funding

The Commissioner informed the Panel that Cambridgeshire had signalled its intention to move out of Ministry of Justice funding arrangements for the provision of victim referral mechanisms to local commissioning from October 2014. Cambridgeshire had agreed to become an 'early adopter' on behalf of, and supported by, Eastern Region Police and Crime Commissioner Colleagues.

In response to questions from the Panel, the Commissioner advised the following:

- Restorative Justice was very important both from a Police perspective and community perspective and would really help victims.

Lease Surrender – Cardinal Park, Godmanchester

The Panel were informed that a considerable amount of money had been saved through the surrender of the lease at Unit 3, Cardinal Park.

The Panel noted the report.

ACTION

The Chief Executive, Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner to provide the Panel with a copy of the Memorandum of Understanding.

6. Review of Complaints

The Panel received a report which provided an update on any complaints made against the Police and Crime Commissioner.

The Panel noted that no complaints had been received against the Police and Crime Commissioner or his Deputy since the last report received.

Panel Members wanted to know if there was a history of no complaints and if not why.

The Officer in attendance did not have the information at the meeting but would find out and report back to the panel.

ACTION

Information to be provided to the Panel on whether there was a history of no complaints against the Police and Crime Commissioner.

7. Police and Crime Plan Update – Enhanced Partnership Working

The Panel received a report which informed them of a draft variation to the Police and Crime Plan, which acknowledged the enhanced status of partnership working on key themes such as Victims, Offenders and Vulnerable Adults.

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.

Members of the Panel welcomed the emphasis on vulnerable people.

Members of the Panel had noted that Districts had not been mentioned in the plan as being part of discussions and requested that the Plan included the mention that all District Councils were also included in discussions.

In response to questions from the Panel, the Commissioner advised the following:

- An outreach worker has been piloted and an additional outreach worker would eventually be transplanted further out to other areas in the south of the county. They will also attend Parish Council meetings and go to places that have not had a police presence before. The idea is to link up with as many people as possible.
- The Outreach Worker will be engaging with the youth and will also look at being present in some supermarkets to raise their awareness and make them more accessible to the community.
- The Outreach Worker had attended some local Neighbourhood Police Panel meetings.
- Members of the Panel commented that outreach workers had not been seen in Rural Areas yet. Nicola Fenton, Outreach Worker was in attendance at the meeting and advised the Panel that she had attended various Parish Council meetings and emailed out to a distribution list which meetings she would be in attendance at. Nicola advised that she would provide her email address to Members of the Panel.
- Members of the Panel suggested that the Outreach Worker could provide a copy of her diary to them as this would help them to know where she was and could be contacted. The Commissioner advised that he would talk to the Outreach Worker.

Having reviewed the draft variation to the Police and Crime Plan the Panel AGREED to endorse the variation of the Police and Crime Plan regarding Enhanced Partnership Working and recommended that the Commissioner include the mention that all District Councils were also included in discussions.

ACTION

1. The Commissioner to speak to the Outreach Worker regarding publishing her diary.
2. The Outreach Worker to provide the Panel with her email address.

8. Precept Report 2014/15

The Panel received a report which provided them with the Police and Crime Commissioners proposed precept for 2014/2015. The Panel were asked to make a report and recommendations on the proposed precept for 2014/2015.

The Commissioner informed the Panel that the number one priority was to protect frontline policing. Funding was down and was close to not being able to balance the budget. Investment was being made to ensure efficiency and effectiveness in policing and tackling crime based on the issues of importance to the public. The proposed precept increase of 1.92% was below inflation and the increase was required to balance the budget and keep frontline officers. This increase would allow the necessary investment to reduce costs next year.

The Panel noted the report and in response to questions from the Panel, the Commissioner and his Deputy advised the following:

- The Commissioner did not want to use reserves to meet a funding gap as the reserves were earmarked for use to implement METIS.
- The Panel noted that last year the Commissioner had stated that he would maintain the status quo in respect of the funding to the Community Partnerships and review it this year. The Commissioner responded that last year maintaining the funding had been possible but it was not possible to maintain it fully this year.
- Funding to the Community Partnerships to purchase services was still value for money but this was being looked at to see if there were ways of working together to get even better value for money.
- Members of the Panel questioned the fairness and affordability of the proposed increase. The Commissioner responded that the public would not be happy if there was a reduction in Police Officers. There was a need to keep the community safe.
- The Panel noted that the report had indicated that there would be thirty fewer PCSO's. What would be the impact of this reduction? Assurance had been given by the Chief Constable that the number of PCSO's remaining was adequate to deliver the service. If any PCSOs have left in the past year they had not been replaced. The Commissioner advised that the number of posts would not be reduced below 150 this year.
- The Panel sought clarification on the increase in expenditure for next year for the administration of the Commissioner's Office. The Commissioner advised that additional tasks had been transferred over to the Commissioner's Office from the Police which was about taking on new responsibilities and the staff that go with that, this increase included the fact that the lead for Estates and Communications would be brought into the Commissioner's Office. The Commissioner's Office was focused on tightening up to ensure there was no waste and providing the best value for money.
- Money was being saved by collaborating with Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire.
- The whole driving force regarding Op Metis was to keep the police outside and more visible.
- There was a drive to increase Specials who have the power of arrest.
- Councillor Over was concerned about the lack of Police presence in his Rural Villages. The Commissioner would talk to the Chief Constable about monitoring Police presence in the Rural Villages in Councillor Over's area
- Cambridgeshire was the second lowest County in the country for national funding.

The Chairman asked the Panel to vote on the proposed increase of 1.92% in the Precept.

The increase in the Precept of 1.92% was approved. (6 in favour, 3 against)
(Councillor Bick was absent at the time of the vote)

Following debate, the Panel AGREED to endorse the Police and Crime Commissioner's proposed budget and precept.

ACTION

The Commissioner to talk to the Chief Constable about monitoring Police presence in the Rural Villages in Councillor Over's area.

9. Agenda Plan

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

The Panel agreed that the following items be included on the Agenda Plan for the next municipal year.

- A report on the effect of the reduction of PCSO's against the new measures being put in place to free up Police Officers.
- Update report on Collaboration and impact on the transfer of staff.

ACTION

1. The Governance Officer to look at diary dates for next year's meetings;
2. Add items to agenda plan.

The meeting began at 2.00pm and ended at 4.20pm

CHAIRMAN

ACTIONS

DATE OF MEETING	ITEM	ACTION	UPDATE
5 February 2014	Public Questions	The Commissioner agreed to provide the Panel with a response to the statements made by the member of the public.	The response was provided on 10/3/14 and forwarded to the Panel.
	Decisions of the Commissioner	The Chief Executive, Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner to provide the Panel with a copy of the Memorandum of Understanding.	A copy of the Memorandum of Understanding was provided on 10/3/14 and forwarded to the Panel.
	Review of Complaints	Information to be provided to the Panel on whether there was a history of no complaints against the Police and Crime Commissioner.	The information was provided on 10/3/14 and forwarded to the Panel on 11/3/14.
	Police and Crime Plan Update – Enhanced Partnership Working	The Commissioner to speak to the Outreach Worker regarding publishing her diary. The Outreach Worker to provide the Panel with her email address.	

DATE OF MEETING	ITEM	ACTION	UPDATE
	Precept Report 2014/15	The Commissioner to talk to the Chief Constable about monitoring Police presence in the Rural Villages in Councillor Over's area.	
	Agenda Plan	<p>The Commissioner to provide reports on the following for the next municipal year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A report on the effect of the reduction of PCSO's against the new measures being put in place to free up Police Officers. • Update report on Collaboration and impact on the transfer of staff. • The Lead Officer to look at dates for next year's meetings. 	

Appendix 1

Question/s for Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Panel

Meeting Date: 5 February 2014

Questioner	Richard Taylor
Questions addressed to which Member of the Panel	Chairman (Cllr Ablewhite)
Date Question was submitted	28 January 2014
Questions: == Reporting of Decisions == The Police and Crime Commissioner repeatedly assures the panel he is reporting all decisions he makes to the panel. I am concerned that panel is allowing the commissioner to select those decisions which the panel are formally notified of. When deciding which decisions to report to the panel for scrutiny the commissioner appears to be reflecting the criteria he uses for publishing decisions on his own website, selecting only those he considers "of significant public interest" to report[1]. Examples of decisions which have not been reported to the panel, which I would have liked to have seen scrutinised include: * Decisions which the commissioner has reported to the media, but not the panel, which he claims have led to the improvement of non-emergency call handling performance.[2] * The decision to hold the commissioner's key decision making committees, particularly his Business Coordination Board[3] in secret and private; only publishing meeting papers well after the meetings take place. From my perspective there has been a significant reduction in transparency with the transition to a Police and Crime Commissioner. Our commissioner is not publishing details of proposed changes to policies before he makes decisions about them. * Decisions relating to the staffing levels in the commissioner's office (though I realise the panel has considered this at a high level in that the commissioner's budget was submitted to the panel). The panel have not challenged the commissioner on how he justifies the number of staff in his office, or his decision to delegate roles, including attending public meetings, to an outreach officer (I note as of December 2013 Warwickshire's Police and Crime Commissioner had no staff in his office and was planning to recruit just three[4]). * Decisions on which transactions to include in the commissioner's published spending data. * Decisions on pro-active publication of information; including police performance statistics and Force Executive Board papers. * Decisions on where the strategic / operational boundary lies, including in relation to the commissioner's refusal to comment on the significant strategic change to the face of policing in the county when non-firearms officers began being armed with TASER weapons from May 2013[5]. * The decision to decline an invitation to attend Cambridgeshire County Council's policing related scrutiny committee[6]. I would suggest that the panel consider their response to that decision and would like to see them take up, for example, scrutiny of call answering performance which the committee dropped from their work programme following the commissioner's decision to refuse to appear at the committee. * The decision to delegate local priority setting to councillors at Cambridge's area committees; having initially decided to set all such priorities himself[7]. The wider issue of local police priority setting was another item removed from Cambridgeshire County Council's scrutiny committee's work programme following the commissioner's refusal to appear and is something else perhaps the Police and Crime Panel could take on. Prior to stopping their consideration of the subject one member of the County Council Committee stated that far from being democratically set, in part of the force area Neighbourhood Watch groups are setting priorities and I have observed mob-rule[8] (where anyone who turns up getting a vote) and the police themselves setting the	

priorities[9] at local priority setting meetings.

I would suggest the panel make clear to the commissioner which decisions they expect him to report to them; and I encourage the panel to review all public sources, including for example the commissioner's statements and spending data, to detect decisions the panel may wish to consider for detailed scrutiny despite even if where commissioner has not pro-actively informed the panel about them.

The panel could point the commissioner to other commissioners who publish, and report, many more decisions and ask the commissioner to explain his approach. (Gwent's commissioner reported 139 in 2013[10], compared with our commissioner's 18, including those from 2013 being reported to this meeting)

==Commissioner's Diary==

The Police and Crime Commissioner has recently released his diary in response to a Freedom of Information request[11]. There are a number of matters raised by the diary which I would like to see the panel raise with the commissioner:

* The diary appears to show the commissioner writing off two working days a week as "keep free"; the panel should determine if he is working a three day week and if he is able to fulfil the role in that time. I note the panel did consider the proposed working arrangements of the deputy commissioner so there is a precedent for this kind of inquiry.

* The commissioner has taken on a directorship of a Limited company, the Association of Police and Crime Commissioners. I think the panel should review his decision to take on this role, and how it is impacting his focus on Cambridgeshire as well as if and how he is using staff from the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner to support his APCC role. The released diary shows one working week when after two days off, and two days with the APCC, only one day was left for Cambridgeshire.

* The commissioner publishes an events calendar on his website; key events including appearances in public at council meetings have been omitted from this (and the released diary). I think the panel ought look at what the commissioner pro-actively publishes about his upcoming official engagements, as well as his historical diary.

== Accuracy of the Commissioner's Statements to the Panel ==

I would like to highlight two instances where commissioner has made statements to the panel which I would like to see the panel probe the accuracy of.

The first was on the ECINS data sharing website; on the 12th of June 2013 the commissioner, responding to a question from the Cambridge City Council representative on the panel, gave an assurance that very little information was shared via the system, saying:

" If you put a name in it just identifies who that person has been in contact with"[12]

This is substantively at odds with what Cambridge's Community Safety Partnership has repeatedly been told[13]; a much greater degree of data sharing via the website has been described to them; well beyond just revealing if an agency has been in contact with an individual or not.

The second came when the commissioner described his ALERT system.[14] The commissioner gave the impression that the system would provide almost comprehensive, near real time, extracts from the police log saying, neighbourhood watch groups would:

"know the very next morning whether there's been a burglary, whether there's been some anti-social behaviour, a car stolen, or whatever the case may be, it's there for them to see."

The commissioner also stated the system was entirely separate from ECops (claiming he had no responsibility for the latter), despite ALERT now taking on the name ECops and users being

migrated from ECops to ALERT.

The panel also heard the commissioner, while speaking about ALERT, state: "it was developed by the Home Office specifically for Neighbourhood Watch." I asked the Home Office about this and they responded: "The Home Office was not involved in this development"[14].

I would suggest the panel ought look into the way the decision to award the contract for this system was made and at the different ways it is being used around the force area.

I would like to see the panel challenging the commissioner when he makes statements which are at odds with what other bodies are saying or appear implausible.

== First Year Spending ==

I note the commissioner's spending in his first year in office, from November 2012 to November 2013 has been released following a Freedom of Information Act request I made.[15] This shows the commissioner spent more running his office in that first year than the Police Authority cost in its last full year of operation.

I don't think the commissioner' spending in this first year ought go uncommented on, and the panel should challenge the commissioner on this, in light of his pre-election promise that his office would cost less, not more, than the Police Authority.[15]

== No Extra Burden on Council Tax ==

I would like to remind the panel of the commissioner's clear pre-election promise "Not to put any additional burden on council tax"[16] [17]. I saw this raised at the February 2013 panel meeting which endorsed a council tax rise proposed by the commissioner. At that meeting Graham Bright admitted to the panel that he had promised "no extra burden" but argued he had not broken this pledge on the grounds the increase was "below inflation".

In my view the pledge was clear and suggested to me the policing element of council tax would not rise under Commissioner Bright. I note that the commissioner's report to today's meeting on his proposed further council tax increase [18], does not mention his pre-election pledge. It is far from the case that everyone's income rises year on year with inflation and it is not the case that rises do not impose an additional burden. I think democracy is damaged when representatives do not fulfil their promises, and in this case I think this is compounded when the panel fail to robustly challenge the commissioner's tax rises. I would like to know if efforts are being made to reduce the proportion of policing funding derived from the council tax, in favour of more progressive taxes.

== Questions ==

1. Does the panel share my concerns?
2. Will the panel take any action in light of what I have said and the suggestions I have made?

== References ==

1. <http://www.cambridgeshire-pcc.gov.uk/work/decisions/>
2. <http://www.peterboroughtoday.co.uk/news/local/cambridgeshire-police-commissioner-congratulates-101-call-centre-staff-1-5442132>
3. <http://www.cambridgeshire-pcc.gov.uk/business-coordination-board/>
4. <http://www.raylor.co.uk/police-crime-commissioner-costs.html#comment-88025>
5. <http://www.raylor.co.uk/cambscops-tasers-to-non-firearms-officers.html>
6. <http://www.raylor.co.uk/councillors-police-scrutiny.html#comment-87125>
7. <http://www.raylor.co.uk/suggesting-cllr-set-police-priorities-to-commissioner.html>
8. <http://www.raylor.co.uk/sawston-police-priorities.html>
9. <http://www.raylor.co.uk/police-set-bassingbourne-and-melbourn-police-priorities.html>
10. <http://www.gwent.pcc.police.uk/decision-log-search/>
11. <http://www.raylor.co.uk/3-day-week-cambps-pcc-bright.html>
12. <http://www.raylor.co.uk/police-database-website.html#comment-82869>
13. <http://www.raylor.co.uk/police-database-website.html>

14. <http://www.raylor.co.uk/pcc-bright-alert.html>
15. <http://www.raylor.co.uk/police-crime-commissioner-costs.html>
16. <http://www.raylor.co.uk/graham-bright.html>
17. <http://www.raylor.co.uk/increase-council-tax-cambs-police-crime-commissioner.html>
18. <http://democracy.peterborough.gov.uk/documents/s19142/14%2002%2005%20Precept%202014-15%20Cover%20report.pdf>